

MOORE, HEMPHILL, Editors & Proprietors.  
THE COUNTRY DOLLAR.  
Weekly Paper, will be published at the  
following low Rates:  
1 YEAR IN ADVANCE \$1.00  
1 YEAR IN 3 MONTHS 1.25  
1 YEAR IN 6 MONTHS 1.50  
1 YEAR IN 9 MONTHS 1.75  
1 YEAR IN 12 MONTHS 2.00  
No paper will be sent to those who  
pay in advance after the expiration of the  
time paid for.  
All letters on business connected  
with the office, to receive attention, must be  
post paid.

# THE COUNTRY DOLLAR.

A WEEKLY PAPER: DEVOTED TO LITERATURE, AGRICULTURE, MORALITY, AND FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC INTELLIGENCE.

Volume I. Clearfield, Pa., April 13, 1850. Number 40.

PRICES OF ADVERTISING.	
1 square of 10 lines or less, insertion, 10 days	50 cts.
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	1.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	1.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	2.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	2.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	3.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	3.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	4.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	4.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	5.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	5.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	6.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	6.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	7.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	7.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	8.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	8.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	9.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	9.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	10.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	10.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	11.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	11.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	12.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	12.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	13.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	13.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	14.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	14.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	15.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	15.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	16.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	16.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	17.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	17.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	18.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	18.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	19.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	19.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	20.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	20.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	21.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	21.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	22.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	22.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	23.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	23.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	24.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	24.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	25.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	25.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	26.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	26.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	27.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	27.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	28.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	28.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	29.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	29.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	30.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	30.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	31.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	31.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	32.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	32.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	33.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	33.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	34.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	34.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	35.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	35.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	36.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	36.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	37.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	37.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	38.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	38.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	39.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	39.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	40.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	40.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	41.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	41.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	42.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	42.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	43.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	43.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	44.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	44.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	45.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	45.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	46.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	46.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	47.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	47.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	48.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	48.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	49.00
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	49.50
1 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do. 10 do.	50.00

POETRY.  
FOR THE COUNTRY DOLLAR.  
WHAT I LIKE BEST.—BY J. W. WEBSTER.  
Of all the countries, East and West,  
America I like the best,  
The birth-place of the free;  
The country has ten thousand charms—  
Is filled with people, towns and farms;  
A land of Liberty.  
Of all the men, both East and West,  
Americans I like the best,  
They have an honest face;  
Are active, honest, true and kind,  
Dutch, English, Irish, French combined,  
A real Yankee race.  
Of all the Women, East and West,  
The American I like the best—  
In virtue they excel;  
They are true sweethearts, loving wives,  
And careful mothers. And their lives  
Are spent in doing well.  
Of all the soldiers, East and West,  
The American I like the best—  
They're kind to conquered foes;  
And calm upon the battle-field,  
Would rather die than they would yield,  
Though five to one oppose.  
Of all the Homes, both East and West,  
That where I live I like the best—  
A quiet, safe retreat;  
Though domes and spires cannot be seen,  
But, then, the pines are always green,  
The air so fresh and sweet.  
Of all Newspapers, East and West,  
The Dollar I do like the best—  
'Tis free from party trash;  
But information, and much news,  
It weekly brings us to peruse,  
All for one dollar cash!

The Trial of Dr. J. W. Webster.  
For the Murder of Dr. George W. Park-  
man, before the Supreme Judicial  
Court.  
(Concluded.)  
Boston, March 27.  
The prisoner took his seat to-day, with  
the air of a Professor going to deliver a  
lecture to a tardy class. His seat, by the  
by, is a wooden arm chair, with a stuffed  
morocco cushion, and a little heart shaped  
leaf of cherry, about ten inches wide, on  
which he sometimes places his gloves, and  
sometimes makes memoranda with a  
pencil in a little book.  
We are cheered this morning with the  
report, that the government has only five  
more witnesses to examine. If so, they  
will have a few more left, for they came  
into Court this morning, with a list of more  
than seventy.  
The Court came in a few minutes be-  
fore ten, having, doubtless, been engaged  
in settling questions arising out of the  
matter submitted by the Attorney General,  
just before the adjournment last evening,  
in regard to the anonymous letters.  
Nathaniel D. Gold, sworn—I am an old  
resident of the city, and not personally  
acquainted with the defendant; but I have  
seen his handwriting in filling the diploma  
of the College, for twenty years; I have  
seen Dr. Webster's writing often, in filling  
diplomas; I have attended to writing par-  
ticularly since my youth; I have taught  
penmanship over fifty years, and have  
published books on the subject.  
Mr. Bemis—We propose to show by  
this witness that the three anonymous let-  
ters sent to Marshall Tukey, and received  
by him, were written by Dr. Webster.  
Mr. Sohler—I object to this. This would be to in-  
troduce a kind of testimony always con-  
sidered weak and doubtful. I do not think  
this Court will be disposed to extend the  
Doctrine laid down in Moody and Rollins,  
on the evidence of "experts." Here they  
do not propose to introduce an expert to  
testify to the hand writing of Dr. Web-  
ster, but compare letters which are not in  
his hand writing with some genuine letters  
of his, and get the inference that these are  
in a feigned hand writing. The learned  
counsel argued the point at length.  
The Attorney General replied, referring  
to cases in the books and recent practice,  
in the case of Miller, in which the op-  
posing counsel were engaged.  
The Court ruled the testimony compe-  
tent.  
Mr. Bemis—I shall first show the witness  
the letter signed "Civis," postmarked  
November 20th.  
Witness—I should think this the hand  
writing of Dr. Webster; to show how con-  
fident I am I should feel embarrassed not  
to be allowed to explain, considerably the  
grounds of my opinion.  
Mr. Marshack objected to his giving his  
reasons.  
Attorney General—I consider that this  
witness stands here with the right of any  
person, and expect in giving his reasons  
that he may make it perfectly plain to the  
Court and the jury that his opinion is  
well founded. The Court ruled that the  
witness be allowed to give his reasons.  
Witness—I never yet knew any one  
who could make two letters exactly alike,  
or two words exactly alike; yet, I have  
never known two hands which I could  
not tell apart. There are two ways to

feign a hand—one is to let the hand loose  
in a flourishing way, the other is by care-  
ful attention to each letter, to avoid pecu-  
liarities. It is next to impossible to avoid  
any peculiarities, or keep it up consistently  
to any considerable length. I find in  
this letter, that the letter A and the letter  
R, which Dr. Webster makes, in a pecu-  
liar manner, are made differently. Also,  
the character "G" is written, instead of  
the word—and some other letters which  
he makes, peculiarly agree, particularly  
the large P, is made in the same way;  
the capital D, is similar.  
The figures 1, 3, 4, and 9, are all simi-  
lar to Dr. Webster's; the small "f" is  
made in his way, with no loop at the top,  
and the word "November," and the words  
"of" and "his," and "Boston" are like his.  
The capital "B" is not the same; the letter  
"Y" sometimes, and always when used  
as a capital, is his, not made as well as  
he makes it usually, but placed above the  
line in this manner. In my opinion I  
have no doubt that this letter was written  
by Dr. Webster. Another letter, post-  
marked Boston, Nov. 26th, and directed  
Francis Tukey, was put in the witness's  
hands; it was signed "Dart." This letter  
is a very fine hand; it first seems the  
hand of a boy, but on examination we see  
the capitals, which show it to be the hand  
of one practised with a pen. I think it is  
the hand writing of Dr. Webster; I see no  
reason to doubt it.  
The witness then proceeded with delib-  
eration, and examined the same Cambridge  
letter, postmarked Nov. 30th, brought to  
Mr. Tukey, by the postmaster. I have  
no doubt this letter was written by the  
same hand as the other letters; there is no  
single letter on which this conclusion  
could not be come to; there is a striking  
resemblance between the words "as" and  
"was" in all; and the words beginning  
with a capital "W" and the word "be"  
all strike me as similar or the same, there  
is a striking similarity in the letter "t,"  
which is scarcely ever turned up at the  
end of a word. The words "Boston" in  
all three are alike; I am positive that it  
was not written with a pen, nor was it,  
in my judgment, with a brush; it was not  
written with anything soft. [Witness ex-  
plained the peculiar effects of pens and  
brushes in making letters.] I have ex-  
perimented with an instrument given me  
by the counsel. The prisoner's counsel here  
objected to the questions. The Attorney  
General remarked that he proposed to  
show that an instrument found in the  
prisoner's private room would produce  
just such a document, and no other would.  
The Court ruled the evidence entirely in-  
admissible. The marks might have been  
made with some other instrument. Wit-  
ness testified that the words "paid," "paid"  
written across the \$400 note, were in the  
prisoner's hand writing; also the pencil  
mark at the bottom of the \$2432 note; also  
the memorandum at the bottom of the  
amount, signed "C. C." and the super-  
scription on the same, he had no doubt,  
were in the prisoner's handwriting; the  
marks across the face of the note were  
certainly not made with a pen.  
Cross-Examined—I have seen these  
papers before; I have seen other anonym-  
ous letters; do not know where they  
came from, witness was shown a letter  
which he said was in Dr. Webster's ordi-  
nary hand-writing, written in haste; it  
was addressed to Marshall Tukey; the  
"Civis" letter was not much disguised to  
me; I considered it disguised; partially,  
but could not say whether it was so in-  
tended; if it had been shown to me alone—  
I could not say certainly that it was in-  
tentionally a disguised hand; I cannot say  
why some letters are different; cannot say  
whether Dr. W. intended to disguise his  
hand by making some letters different.  
The letters that are different from Dr.  
W.'s, are generally like each other, but  
not always. The letter "d" I will now  
say, for it did not occur to me in Dr.  
W.'s; is generally turned over to the left  
in Dr. W.'s usual hand, the "a" is not  
closed at the top; in these letters, it is  
closed by a separate stroke at the top; do  
not recollect any "a" in Dr. W.'s genuine  
handwriting that is closed at the top; the  
letter "r" in the "Civis" letter is made  
with what we call a hook at the right; the  
letter is carried round with a sweeping  
curve; he generally makes an "r" with a  
hook, but sometimes it is a singular letter,  
looking more like the letter part of a K.  
Do not pretend to be able to tell with cer-  
tainty by looking at the document whether  
it is a simulated hand or not; my usual  
way is to compare it with a genuine hand.  
I should not judge a document to be simu-  
lated, unless some of the letters were made  
unaccountably or irregularly. When I  
first saw these letters, my impression was  
that they were Doctor Webster's.  
The general appearance of the "dart"  
letter is, unlike Dr. W.'s hand, but on a  
close inspection it appears to be his; do not  
know how many letters in it are made  
similar to Mr. W.'s; I did examine and  
say at first, but don't now recollect.  
Mr. Sohler gave the letter to the witness,  
and asked him to say how many letters  
were made like Dr. Webster's. He went  
on to name the similar letters, and describ-  
ed their similarity.  
I should say this was an unnatural hand

when shown a letter in which the letters  
were made regularly, I mentioned that I  
could not say that it was intentionally dis-  
guised, but when, as in this case, the let-  
ters are made unnaturally and inconsis-  
tently; I should think it disguised, and,  
from the letters and words, similar to Dr.  
W.'s I should say that it was his hand  
disguised.  
THE DEFENCE.—Mr. Sohler, in opening  
for the defence, said he should confine  
himself to the merits of the charge, instead  
of the customary manner in such a case,  
of dwelling on the mighty interests the  
prisoner had at stake. He asked the jury  
to divest their minds of all prejudice, and  
referred to the excitement attending the  
disappearance of Dr. Parkman, which, at  
one time, threatened to spend itself, even  
in violence, on the innocent Medical Col-  
lege itself, an excitement so creditable to  
the community, but so dangerous to the  
defendant. The law implies malice in  
homicide, where the killing is a deliberate  
and cruel act, without a sufficient provoca-  
tion—in sudden combat or heat of blood.  
Here is a narrow line, with death on one  
side, and life on the other, though it may  
be in circumstances of suffering and priv-  
ation. We are now left to inquire what  
is a sufficient provocation to require a homi-  
cide to manslaughter. In deciding this,  
the law has a great regard to the weapons  
or instruments used to produce death.  
What would be a sufficient provocation  
for killing with a stick, would not answer  
for a broad axe or an iron bar. The  
deadly instruments argue an intention to  
kill. The law, therefore, makes a dis-  
tinction, in regard to the provocation, be-  
tween weapons which are dangerous and  
those which are not so. This leads us to  
the first inquiry—what is a reasonable  
provocation for homicide with a dangerous  
weapon, to constitute it manslaughter?  
Referring to the last, we find the law  
laid down, that any assault of great indi-  
gnity upon the person—such as pulling the  
nose—is held a sufficient provocation to  
make homicide with deadly weapons, or  
manslaughter. To refer to a particular  
case by way of illustration: Two soldiers  
were drinking together in a room, when a  
dispute arose, and one wounded the other,  
and finally turned him out of doors, which  
he had the undoubted right to do, but the  
man who was turned out, came and stab-  
bed the other to the heart. This was held  
to be manslaughter. As to homicide com-  
mitted with some instrument, not likely to  
produce death, it is held, (I refer to the  
same authority, that abusive and reproach-  
ful words may be sufficient.  
Homicide may also be manslaughter,  
when committed in sudden combat, when  
two persons get into a quarrel on equal  
terms—no matter which strikes first. The  
law supposes that heat and passion, in-  
stead of malice; and the killing of either,  
if it take place under those circumstances,  
is held to be manslaughter, even if it take  
place by a deadly weapon. Professor  
Webster then stands charged, virtually,  
with murder and manslaughter. He is  
charged with the killing. If he did it with  
malice aforethought, as a deliberate and  
cruel act, it was murder. If it was with  
sufficient provocation, or in sudden com-  
bat and heat of blood, it was manslaughter.  
But, gentlemen, (and this is a provision  
which the law wisely sets around the safe-  
ty of us all,) it is of no sort of conse-  
quence, in law, how many crimes a man  
has committed, if he has not committed  
precisely that for which he is to be tried.  
If the government fails to prove that he  
stands charged with, there is an end of  
the case; nor is it of any consequence if a  
man has committed a crime he stands  
charged with, if he has not committed it  
in the manner and form as set forth in the in-  
dictment.  
The government is bound in the case to  
state, not only what the crime is, but what  
the manner of it. Their statement must  
not only be substantiated, but even formal.  
The accused has a right to know to what  
he is to plead, that he may prepare his de-  
fence. Any mistake or inaccuracy in the  
statement is fatal to the prosecution. This  
is the shield which our law throws around  
us, and without which there would be no  
safety for us or our lives.  
In other lands, there may be other crim-  
inal laws, with more or less beneficial re-  
sults. But this is the law under which we  
live, in peace and quietness, and the de-  
fendant, and every man accused of this  
great crime, has a right to the benefit of  
it. I now ask your attention, gentlemen,  
to the indictment—it consists of four  
counts. The government is allowed to  
prove its indictments, and if they be sub-  
stantiated, proving either of them is suf-  
ficient to establish the guilt of the defend-  
ant.  
He then called the attention of the jury  
first to the rules of law. First—Defining  
the offence against the defendant. Sec-  
ond—To the rules of law in regard to the  
modes of bringing the charge in the in-  
dictment. Third—From the rules of law in  
regard to the proof of the facts.  
He then went into a disquisition on the  
various kinds of murder, and manslaughter,  
and spoke of the law in a quarter of an hour.  
TESTIMONY FOR DEFENCE.  
Joseph T. Buckingham, sworn—

known Dr. Webster for thirty years; al-  
ways knew him to be a peaceable man, &  
never knew him to be charged with any  
act of violence.  
John G. Palfrey, sworn—Knew Web-  
ster eight years, during my first residence  
in Cambridge; seven years as a neighbor,  
never heard anything charged against him  
as a man of violence; while he was Pro-  
fessor of Chemistry in Harvard; he is a  
man subject to harmless moments of pas-  
sion, but they are soon exhausted.  
John B. Blake, sworn—Have known Dr.  
Webster 25 years; and was in the labora-  
tory with him, at the medical college, one  
year; always knew him as a peaceable &  
humane man.  
James Walker, sworn—I have known  
Doctor Webster about 10 years; never  
knew anything against him as a peace-  
able and humane man.  
Daniel Treadwell, sworn—I have been  
connected with the college 11 years; I  
have known Webster 20 years; have al-  
ways known him as a humane and honest  
man, though some irritable.  
Francis Bowen, sworn—I have known  
Dr. Webster 20 years; I am acquainted in  
the society in which he moves; I under-  
stand him to be a hasty and irritable man,  
quickly excited, but soon forgets the  
cause; never knew any acts of violence at-  
tributed to him.  
Professor Joseph Lovering, sworn—I  
have known Prof. Webster 20 years; al-  
ways knew him to be a humane and mild  
man.  
George S. Savory, sworn—I reside in  
Charlestown; I have known Prof. Web-  
ster twelve years, he has always been held  
in the community as a peaceable and quiet  
man.  
Converse Fennos, sworn—I reside at  
Cambridge; I have known Dr. Webster as  
a neighbor since 1842; I have always  
known him as a peaceable and quiet neigh-  
bor, and an honorable man.  
Abel Willard, sworn—I reside in Cam-  
bridge; I am acquainted with Prof. Web-  
ster; have known him for many years,  
never knew anything against his charac-  
ter; always heard him spoken of very  
highly.  
A number of other witnesses testified to  
the good character of the defendant, and  
the court adjourned at 7 o'clock.  
Boston, March 28.  
Eighth Days Proceedings.—The evi-  
dence for the defence in the case of Prof.  
J. W. Webster, charged with the murder  
of Dr. George Parkman, closed on Thurs-  
day, with the testimony, first, of several  
additional witnesses proving his high moral  
character and general uprightness; second,  
the evidence of his three daughters, Prof.  
Treadwell and others, as to his be-  
ing at home and elsewhere at certain  
hours when, according to Littlefield's tes-  
timony, he was at the college; third, the  
evidence of Dr. Morton in relation to the  
teeth found; and lastly, a number of wit-  
nesses who testified positively to having  
seen Dr. Parkman after the hour at which  
he was entering the college, & from  
which the indictment alleges he never  
came alive. We copy the more impor-  
tant portions of this testimony, with the re-  
mark that a severe cross-examination of  
the witnesses who testified to seeing Dr.  
Parkman after the time of the alleged mur-  
der, had little effect on their testimony:—  
Dr. W. P. G. Morton, sworn—I have  
practised dentistry about 8 years; I man-  
ufacture my own mineral teeth; I took in-  
struction of Dr. Keep, in his method of  
manufacturing teeth, some five years ago.  
(Witness was shown the teeth found in the  
furnace.) I see no particular marks on  
the teeth, by which they could be identi-  
fied; the teeth are ground on the inside;  
that is not unusual; it is done by a small  
grindstone, from the size of a fourpence to  
that of a dollar; we do it usually when  
the patient complains that he has not room  
for his tongue; there is nothing peculiar  
in the use of platinum pins, or in the posi-  
tion of the hole drilled in the block; this  
plate does not fit the model of Dr. Keep  
any better than one could easily be found  
to do in almost any refuse lot of teeth;  
there is no peculiarity in the absorption of  
the "alveolar process;" there are many  
not so much absorbed; and many far more;  
(the witness here showed the jury how  
some old plates of teeth of his own would  
fit the model of Dr. Parkman's pins) the  
eye-teeth, and the bicuspids, in the lower  
jaw, are most likely to last; we common-  
ly let them remain on that account; one  
of the blocks found in the furnace, in con-  
tact with that which is supposed to fit the  
model of Dr. Keep, has evidently been ex-  
posed to a high heat, and is much warped;  
which inclines me to think that the  
lower block in contact may have been  
warped, and if warped, it may have been  
warped to fit.  
Cross examined—I make my teeth to  
fit the cases of my patients; as they arise;  
no set of teeth finished on the plates will  
fit two mouths, but then blocks of teeth  
which go on the plate may answer for two.  
A model does not usually copy the form  
of the jaw, but the  
Joseph Hatch, sworn—

but more I could not. The peculiarities  
of a jaw could make an impression on me  
for a time, but I could not say how long.  
Samuel A. Wentworth, sworn—I live in  
Vine street; am a provision dealer; was  
acquainted with Dr. George Parkman;  
had known him two years; saw him last  
in Court street, between the hours of half-  
past two and half-past three; I fix the time  
because our dinner hour is at one o'clock;  
had been to dinner and got back, and my  
young man went to dinner at two o'clock,  
and had got back; I then went down town;  
my young man was gone about half an  
hour; as I was going to Haymarket square,  
and from thence to the market, for my  
Saturday marketing; I met him in Court  
street, near Mrs. Kidder's medicine shop,  
on the same side; when he got opposite  
there, he stopped suddenly on the side-  
walk, and turned towards the middle of  
the street, with his hands behind him un-  
der his coat; he was looking up; as if at  
the opposite houses. On Saturday eve-  
ning, after I had shut up, when I came  
home, my wife said there had been two  
men there after Dr. Parkman. I remark-  
ed that I guessed then he had not gone a  
great ways, for I had seen him yesterday  
afternoon in Court street. Dr. Parkman  
was coming towards me when I saw him.  
I passed him, and then went across the  
street, and from the opposite side I looked  
back, and saw Dr. Parkman standing as I  
had said. I was walking with a gentle-  
man by the name of J. Russell, and men-  
tioned the fact at the time; he remembers  
it, but does not remember the day.  
Samuel Clelland, sworn—I live in Chel-  
sea; I have known Dr. George Parkman  
11 years; I last saw him on Friday, Nov.  
23d; I saw him in Washington street, be-  
tween Milk street and Franklin street; it  
was as near as I can put it, between a  
quarter and half-past three; I should think  
20 minutes past; it was on the east side  
of the street; he was going from Dock  
Square; I fix the time because I had been  
to call on the Rev. George Wells, who  
boards at 18 Franklin street; I always call  
upon him at 3 o'clock; I fix the day be-  
cause I had addressed a note that day to  
Rev. Mr. Allen at East Boston, to know  
whether he could supply our pulpit on the  
next Sabbath; the lad returned the note,  
not being able to find Mr. Allen. It is dated  
on Friday; I have the note in my pocket.  
At three o'clock I concluded to go  
and see the Rev. Mr. Wells, and as I was  
sure not to find him except at 3 o'clock,  
I waited, and left my store at that hour.  
I had called on Mr. Wells, and was going  
along Washington street, when I saw Dr.  
George Parkman coming before me, as I  
thought in company with a laboring man,  
in his working dress. It was this that at-  
tracted my attention to it; it was a mis-  
take, however—how was alone; the reason  
I did not mention it to Mr. Tukey was,  
that the offer of a reward for him men-  
tioned his having been seen at the South End,  
I thought my information could be of no  
consequence.  
Abby S. Rhodes, sworn—I have been  
acquainted with Dr. George Parkman; I  
last saw him on the afternoon of Friday,  
Nov. 23, in Green street, at the corner of  
Lyman Place, in front of Emory South-  
er's store. I think it was a quarter to 5.  
There was a man with him. I was go-  
ing towards Chamber street, and he was  
going towards Bowdoin square. I was as  
near him as I could be in passing, with  
my daughter between us. We bowed to  
him. I remember the day, because it  
was the only day that week when I went  
out with my daughter and came home with  
her; we went out shopping, and made pur-  
chases at Hovey's store in Winter street;  
I bought eleven yards moussolin d'aine at  
twenty cents a yard, two dollars & thirty  
cents, and paid the money; I have since  
gone to their store and ascertained by their  
books it was not Thursday, for I was at  
home all that day; I have taken the great-  
est pains to be certain of the day; I was  
so certain of it that I went to the Rev. Dr.  
Francis Parkman; I first heard of Doctor  
Parkman's disappearance from the papers  
on Sunday; my daughter went up into the  
country on Saturday, and came back the  
next Tuesday; that day I asked my son if  
anything had been heard of Dr. Parkman;  
my daughter then reminded me that we  
bowed to him in Green street, and I im-  
mediately remembered it.  
Philonia D. Hutch, sworn—I live at 15  
Vine street; I used to know Dr. George  
Parkman; and have known him for four-  
teen years. I saw Dr. Parkman in Cam-  
bridge; he was going into Blosson street  
on Friday, Nov. 23d; it was 12 or 13  
minutes before 2; he was going toward  
Court street; I fixed the time because I  
go to Vermont. My sister came the  
day. I had been out to see my  
daughter; I looked at the block  
long I had been out.  
Joseph Hatch, sworn—

Charleston, and he was coming towards  
Leverett street; I met him beyond the mid-  
dle of the street, at a place where there is a  
millinery store on one side, and a carpenter's  
shop on the other; it was near Port-  
land street; I was on the left-hand side  
going down Dr. Parkman was on the op-  
posite side, going towards Leverett street;  
I fix the hour, because I started to East  
Cambridge at three or four minutes before  
two, by the clock there; the clock in the  
Court-house said 2; I walked; the first  
place I had to call was in Elm street; I ar-  
rived there at 23 or 25 minutes after two;  
I passed on my way into Leverett street,  
where I saw Dr. Parkman; then into Port-  
land street, and Hanover street to Elm st.;  
Dr. Parkman had on a check frock coat,  
dark pants, and dark hat; when I saw him  
he had his hands behind his back, and  
seemed to be somewhat excited, as if he  
were angry.  
Mary Rhodes, sworn—Daughter of the  
previous witness. I knew Dr. George  
Parkman for nearly two years. I remem-  
ber seeing Dr. Geo. Parkman on Friday,  
Nov. 23d, at about five o'clock. My moth-  
er was with me. There was a gentleman  
walking with Dr. Parkman; I did not  
know him. We had been out and bought  
a muslin-de-laine dress at Hovey's; I had  
the bundle carrying it home.  
Sarah Greenwood, sworn—I have  
known Dr. George Parkman from early  
life. I saw him last on Friday, the week  
in which he disappeared, in Cambridge  
street, between Belknap and South Rus-  
sell streets, it was 10 minutes before three;  
I had an engagement at three o'clock in  
Temple street, to meet my son; was on  
my way up Cambridge street to meet this  
engagement; when I got to Lynde street,  
I took out my watch and it was ten min-  
utes to three, and I had time to go to my  
son's; I there saw Dr. Parkman on the  
opposite side of the street. My belief that  
I saw him is positive.  
Samuel B. Green, sworn—I am sales-  
man in Hovey's store,