Article 4 -- No Title
New York Times (1857-1922); Oct 17, 1859;
ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2009)
pg. 4

lighten the public in regard to it. It certainly was not without their knowledge that the fact of the engagement was made known months ago through the Press: the statements of the extent and nature of the bridegroom's wealth were too minute, and we presume too accurate, to have come from any but the most reliable quarter, especially as he had not previously been well enough known in New York to render such details otherwise accessible; and we have no reason to suppose that the jewelers, milliners, costumers and out-fitters generally, whom he made prosperous and happy by his lavish disbursements, were sworn to secresy as to the extent and character of the orders they received. And when tickets to the ceremony, cards of invitation to both the church and house, were sent in advance to editors and reporters of newspapers in their professional capacity, there was room certainly for the belief that a description of the affair would not only not be regarded as an infringement of the proprieties of private life, but would also fulfill the just and reasonable expectations of the parties most prominently concerned. We beg the Press to believe, therefore, that there has been in this affair no trespassing upon

private rites on the part of the New-York journals. If it means merely to censure the public taste which relishes such details, we may point to the fact of its copying them, as proof that the taste in question, bad as it is, is not confined to New-York.

THE LATE WEDDING-THE PRESS AND PRIVACY. -The Philadelphia Press is shocked at the conduct of the New-York newspapers in giving a detailed account of a private marriage. Such a violation of propriety, it is quite confident, could never have been perpetrated in Philadelphia. It vindicates this opinion by proceeding immediately to copy one of those minute descriptions and by devoting a leading editorial, a column long, to the general subject. We should concur in the sentiments of the Press, in spite of its own inconsistency, if the marriage in question had really been a private one in any other sense of the word than this,that the parties held no official position before the public. But they have themselves never claimed for it the immunities which New-York journals are quite as ready to accord to private affairs as our neighbors further South.

They have on the contrary not only consented to its being regarded and treated as a public affair, but have given all possible aid to the newspapers in their endeavor to en-