for him, and defendant knowing it to be stolen, and placed there for him, took control of it to fraudulently deprive the owner of his property, this was in law a felonious receiving of the property, is correct. *Id.*

5. BRIBING WITNESS FOR STATE.— Where it appears that defendant paid a witness for the commonwealth to leave the county, and also paid half of a sum afterwards demanded by the witness in a letter to defendant's partner, who was also concerned in receiving the stolen property, the letter is admissible to show why the money was advanced. *Id.*

ROBBERY.

WHAT SUFFICIENT TAKING TO CONSTITUTE.— While B. was in his smokehouse, about fifteen paces from his house, defendant came up and said that if B. put his head out he would "shoot it off." While B. was thus detained co-defendant entered the house and carried off valuables belonging to B., who did not know for what purpose he was being detained until defendants had left. *Held*, a sufficient taking in the presence of B. to constitute robbery. *Clements et al. v. State*, 692.

SEDUCTION.

1. INSTRUCTION — SUFFICIENCY OF EVIDENCE.— Under Revised Statutes of Missouri, sections 1259, 1912, making it a felony to "seduce and debauch" an unmarried female of good repute under promise of marriage, and providing that, unless the evidence of the woman as to such promise is "corroborated to the same extent required of the principal witness in perjury," it is error, on a trial for such an offense, to instruct that, as to the promise of marriage, there must be evidence to corroborate that of the woman, which may be supplied from the circumstances of the case, as the degree of proof required by the statute is ignored by such an instruction. *State v. Reeves*, 698.

2. SAME.— The instruction is also faulty for failing to designate the circumstances which would supply the necessary corroboration, and for the omission to define "corroboration." *Id.*

3. SAME — OMITTING ELEMENT OF THE CRIME.— In such case, an instruction that, if the defendant promised the prosecutrix, an unmarried female of good repute, to marry her, on the faith of which she allowed him to have sexual intercourse with her, the defendant should be convicted, is erroneous, for omitting the element of seduction from the essentials of the crime. *Id.*

4. SAME.— An instruction that, if defendant had carnal intercourse with the prosecutrix, and that she submitted to him without promise of marriage, he should be found not guilty, should be given at the instance of defendant, there being evidence tending to establish that state of facts. *Id.*

5. EVIDENCE — COMPETENCY.— There being conflicting evidence as to the material facts in the case, and no prosecution having been instituted until more than a year after the birth of the child alleged to be the result of the connection between the prosecutrix and defendant, during which time the latter married, it is error to refuse to allow the prosecutrix to be asked, on cross-examination, if the idea of prosecuting him did not first present itself to her after his marriage, as that fact might tend to throw light on the *animus* of the prosecutrix. *Id.*

6. FELONY.— Under said section 1259, making said offense punishable either by confinement in the penitentiary or by fine and imprisonment in the county jail, and section 1676, defining a "felony" as any offense liable to be punished by confinement in the penitentiary or death, such offense is a felony and not within the statute of limitations. *Id.*