

he is ~~now~~ as ~~well~~ on trial as W. for
 the murder, and, therefore, his wife is no more
 a credible witness than if he were legally on trial.
 I do not think her, however, a particeps criminis, but
 that she has been deceived throughout by her husband.

The jury seems to be of the right kind, considering the
 circumstances of the deceased and his powerful friends.
 Their sympathies will be likely to go with Webster.

Recog not the testimony of the ^{Clapp} officers, who find care-
 lessly searched Prof. Webster's apartments, that "W. told them
 that his private laboratory was a day or two ^{Mr. Clapp.} before
 been originally devised from Littlefield, - the officers at
 last confessed its origin with Webster." Is it probable
 that Dr. W. would have made such a remark on such an
 occasion? It is like that of one child saying to another
 "take care, there are bigger ones than you."

After all, the reports which we get here are so very
 imperfect, I have no doubt that I have been engaged
 in a work of supererogation.

acted
 tried
 two miles
 dancing
 appears to be
 kind of
 like
 Tuesday
 sample
 tests of the
 out of court
 second mortgage
 really under
 commission,
 and as to
 probably be
 which one
 of absolute
 the case
 The case on
 H. did not hold
 a conspiracy,
 mean time