

ADDENDUM.

After this work was completed for the press, a chance perusal of the late Samuel Warren's "Miscellanies"¹ brought to my notice a case which I believe to be unknown to the present generation of lawyers, though in all respects most deserving of professional study—the case of *R. v. Goldsborough*, tried at York in March, 1842. Its remarkable resemblance to the case of Aram was observed upon by the author of "Ten Thousand a Year," than which he said it was little less remarkable. A perusal of it brings out the following extraordinary resemblances.

- I. In each case a man recently in possession of a considerable sum in cash disappears suddenly.
 - II. In each case he is last seen in company with the person subsequently accused, who is aware of his possession of the money.
 - III. In each case that person at the time of the disappearance gave out that the vanished man had gone off to evade creditors, for which there was some colour, and was himself found in possession of that man's effects, which he pretended to hold as security for a debt (Houseman's pretence).
 - IV. In each case a long period of years elapsed before the chance discovery of remains by workmen—in one case over thirteen, in the other about twelve years.
 - V. In each case the supposed murderer fell at the time of the disappearance under such suspicion as to compel him to withdraw from the neighbourhood.
 - VI. In each case an accomplice turned "approver," though in the later case the approver died before the trial, his deposition being put in.
 - VII. In each case the questions of forensic medicine were identical. Were the remains those of the missing man? Was the lesion of the skull the cause of death?
 - VIII. Evidence of motive and of possession of wealth after the disappearance was startlingly similar; as also conduct of accused when charged with doing away with supposed victim.
 - IX. Clothing hunted and threats used by alleged murderer when questioned on the subject of the disappearance.
 - X. In each case a party to the crime previously indicates where the body will be found.
- It may well be asked how it came about that Goldsborough was acquitted on a case in many respects stronger than that against Aram. A careful examination of both cases yields the following answer:—The weakness in each was as to the proof of the *corpus delicti*, but as against the evidence tending to identify the body found in Stokesly Beck with Huntley, which was inconclusive,

¹ "Miscellanies" (Blackwood), 1885, i., 185.