

Whole of it in connection with all the other
evidence in the case. Sufficient not only to
render the hypothesis of the Fox probable - but
also to exclude to a vast certainty, all
and every other theory which was reasonably
to be suggested.

If the testimony of L is, upon such examination,
brought into doubt, - if it falls a single particle
below the standard which ~~the~~ ^{the} best
reasonable doubt, it is insufficient to establish
a verdict of conviction.

1. In considering these questions, it is necessary in
the first place to ascertain precisely the position
of the dog & the witness.

And here it is to be noted, that Dr W. denies
all those statements of L which can be deemed to
implicate him in the guilt of covering by any
means the death of Dr N. He denies
Specifically, 1. the charge of conduct imputed
to him in the management of his rooms -
2. the keeping of them locked a secret in
any way a unusual manner - 3. the
concealment or attempted concealment of those
pieces of a human body which have been found.