

50

2  
16

THE  
REMARKABLE TRIAL  
OF  
EUGENE ARAM,  
OF KNARESBOROUGH, IN THE COUNTY OF YORK,  
SCHOOLMASTER;

FOR  
**The Murder**  
OF  
DANIEL CLARK,  
*SHOEMAKER,*

COMMITTED ON THE 8<sup>TH</sup> OF FEBRUARY, 1744-5.

---

LONDON:

JOHN HEARNE, 81, STRAND.

---

1832.



THE  
REMARKABLE TRIAL

OF

EUGENE ARAM,

OF KNARESBOROUGH, IN THE COUNTY OF YORK,

SCHOOLMASTER;

FOR

**The Murder**

OF

DANIEL CLARK,

*SHOEMAKER,*

COMMITTED ON THE 8<sup>TH</sup> OF FEBRUARY, 1744-5.

---

LONDON:

JOHN HEARNE, 81, STRAND.

---

1832.

## THE TRIAL OF EUGENE ARAM.

---

DANIEL CLARK, the deceased, had been newly married, under the colour of having received a good fortune with his wife, entered into a confederacy with Aram and Houseman, a flax-dresser, to defraud several persons of great quantities of plate, and other goods, which Clark was to borrow from his friends and acquaintance, to make a first appearance in the marriage state. This Clark effectually did, and borrowed goods of great value, such as linen and woollen-drapery goods, besides three silver tankards, four silver mugs, one silver milk-pot, one ring set with an emerald, and two brilliant diamonds, another with three rose diamonds, a third with an amethyst, and six plain rings, eight watches, two snuff-boxes, &c.; all these in a private manner, and from different people. Clark having fraudulently obtained these goods, the place of distribution was fixed at Aram's house. Clark soon after was missing; and upon his intimacy with Aram and Houseman, a suspicion arising that they might be concerned in the fraud, search was made, some of the goods were found at Houseman's, and others dug up in Aram's garden; but as no plate was found, it was believed that Clark had gone off with that, and the business was dropt till the month of June, 1758, when Aram was found to be at Lynn, in Norfolk, where he was usher of a school, and arrested for the murder of Clark.

The wife of Eugene Aram, after his departure from her, had intimated her suspicion of Clark's being murdered, having seen her husband and Houseman in a close conference, and on missing Clark, asked what they had done with him. She overheard their concern at her suspicion, on which Aram, her husband, said to Houseman, that he would shoot her, and put her out of the way: and after their departure, she went down and found several pieces and shreds of linen and woollen, which she suspected to be Clark's wearing apparel.

This, and other testimony, was given before the inquest, at which Houseman, being present, showed all the marks of guilt, as trembling, paleness, stammering, &c. Upon the skeleton's being produced, Houseman also dropt this unguarded expression; taking up one of the bones, he said, "This is no more Dan. Clark's bone than it is mine;" which showed, that if he was so sure that those bones before him were not Daniel Clark's, he must know something more, as indeed he did; for these were not the bones of Clark, but an accident designed to bring the real body to light, which Houseman, after some evasions in his first deposition, discovered to be in St. Robert's Cave, near Knaresborough, where it was found in the posture described;

he then was admitted King's evidence against Aram, and brought in one Terry as an accomplice in the murder. Houseman gives his deposition as follows:—

“That Daniel Clark was murdered by Eugene Aram, late of Knaresborough, schoolmaster, and, as he believes, on Friday, the 8th of February, 1744-5; for that Eugene Aram and Daniel Clark were together at Aram's house early that morning, and that he (Houseman) left the house, and went up the street a little before, and they called to him, desiring he would go a little way with them, and he accordingly went along with them to a place called St. Robert's Cave, near Grimble-bridge, where Aram and Clark stopped, and there he saw Aram strike him several times over the breast and head, and saw him fall as if he was dead, upon which he came away and left them: but whether Aram used any weapon or not to kill Clark he could not tell; nor does he know what he did with the body afterwards, but believes that Aram left it at the mouth of the cave; for that seeing Aram do this, lest he might share the same fate, he made the best of his way from him, and got to the bridge-end, where, looking back, he saw Aram coming from the cave side, (which is in a private rock adjoining the river), and could discern a bundle in his hand, but did not know what it was; upon this he hasted away to the town, without either joining Aram, or seeing him again till the next day, and from that time to this he never had any private discourse with him.” Afterwards, however, Houseman said that Clark's body was buried in St. Robert's Cave, and that he was sure it was then there; but desired it might remain till such time as Aram should be taken. He added further, that Clark's head lay to the right, in the turn at the entrance of the cave.

Aram being thus accused by Houseman, was taken in the school at Lynn, and after some evasions, on his first examination, signed the subsequent:—“That he was at his own house the 7th of February, 1744-5, at night, when Richard Houseman and Daniel Clark came to him with some plate, and both of them went for more several times, and came back with several pieces of plate, of which Clark was endeavouring to defraud his neighbours: that he could not but observe, that Houseman was all that night very diligent to assist him to the utmost of his power; and insisted that this was Houseman's business that night, and not the signing any note or instrument, as is pretended by Houseman. That Henry Terry, then of Knaresborough, ale-keeper, was as much concerned in abetting the said frauds as either Houseman or Clark; but was not now at Aram's house, because, as it was market day, his absence from his guests might have occasioned some suspicion: that Terry, notwithstanding, brought two silver tankards that night, upon Clark's account, which had been fraudulently obtained; and that Clark, so far from having borrowed 20*l.* of Houseman, to his knowledge never borrowed more than 9*l.*, which he had paid him again before that night.

“That all the leather Clark had, which amounted to a considerable value, he well knows was concealed under flax in Houseman’s house, with intent to be disposed of by little and little, in order to prevent suspicion of his being concerned in Clark’s fraudulent practices.

“That Terry took the plate in a bag, as Clark and Houseman did the watches, rings, and several small things of value, and carried them into the flat, where they and he (Aram) went together to St. Robert’s Cave, and beat most of the plate flat. It was then thought too late in the morning, being about four o’clock, on the 8th of February, 1744-5, for Clark to go off so as to get to any distance; it was therefore agreed he should stay there till the night following, and Clark accordingly staid there all that day, as he believes, they having agreed to send him victuals, which was carried to him by Henry Terry, he being judged the most likely person to do it without suspicion, for as he was a shooter he might go thither under the pretence of sporting: that the next night, in order to give Clark more time to get off, Henry Terry, Richard Houseman, and himself, went down to the cave very early; but he (Aram) did not go into the cave, or see Clark at all; that Richard Houseman and Henry Terry only went into the cave, he staying to watch at a little distance on the outside, lest any body should surprise them.

“That he believes they were beating some plate, for he heard them making a noise; they stayed there about an hour, and then came out of the cave, and told him that Clark was gone off. Observing a bag they had along with them, he took it in his hand, and saw that it contained plate. On asking, Why Daniel did not take the plate with him? Terry and Houseman replied, that they had bought it of him, as well as the watches, and had given him money for it; that being more convenient for him to go off with, as less cumbersome and dangerous. After which they all three went into Houseman’s warehouse, and concealed the watches with the small plate there; but that Terry carried away with him the great plate: that afterwards Terry told him he carried it to How-hill, and hid it there, and then went into Scotland, and disposed of it: but as to Clark he could not tell whether he was murdered or not; he knew nothing of him, only that they told him he was gone off.”

After he had signed his confession he was conducted to York Castle, where he and Houseman remained till the assizes.

From the above examination of Aram there appeared great reason to suspect Terry to be an accomplice in this black affair; a warrant was therefore granted, and he likewise was apprehended and committed to the castle. Bills of indictment were found against them; but it appearing to the court upon affidavit, that the prosecutor could not be fully provided with his witnesses at that time, the trial was postponed till Lammas assizes.

On the 3d of August, 1759, Richard Houseman and Eugene

Aram were brought to the bar. Houseman was arraigned on his former indictment, acquitted, and admitted evidence against Aram, who was thereupon arraigned. Houseman was then called upon, who deposed, "That, in the night between the 7th and 8th of February, 1744-5, about eleven o'clock, he went to Aram's house: that, after two hours, and upwards, spent in passing to and fro between their several houses, to dispose of various goods, and to settle some notes concerning them, Aram proposed, first to Clark, and then to Houseman, to take a walk out of town: that when they came to the field where St. Robert's cave is, Aram and Clark went into it over the hedge, and when they came within six or eight yards of the cave he saw them quarrelling: that he saw Aram strike Clark several times, upon which Clark fell, and he never saw him rise again: that he saw no instrument that Aram had, and knew not that he had any: that upon this, without any interposition or alarm, he left them and returned home: that the next morning he went to Aram's house, and asked what business he had with Clark last night, and what he had done with him? Aram replied not to this question; but threatened him if he spoke of his being in Clark's company that night; vowing revenge, either by himself or some other person, if he mentioned any thing relating to the affair."

Peter Moor (Clark's servant) deposed, "That a little before his disappearing, Clark went to receive his wife's fortune: that upon his return he went to Aram's house, where Moor then was: upon Clark's coming in, Aram said, *How do you do, Mr. Clark? I am glad to see you at home again, pray what success?* To which Clark replied, *I have received my wife's fortune, and have it in my pocket, though it was with difficulty I got it.* Upon which Aram said to Clark (Houseman being present) *Let us go up stairs;* accordingly they went; upon which this witness returned home."

Mr. Beckwith deposed, "That when Aram's garden was searched, on suspicion of his being an accomplice in the frauds of Clark, there were found several kinds of goods, bound together in a coarse wrapper; and, among the rest, in particular, a piece of cambric, which he himself had sold Clark a very little time before."

Thomas Barnet deposed, "That on the 8th of February, about one in the morning, he saw a person come out of Aram's house, who had a wide coat on, with the cape about his head, and seemed to shun him; whereupon he went up to him, and put by the cape of his great coat; and perceiving it to be Richard Houseman, wished him a good night, alias a good morning."

John Barker, the constable, who executed the warrant granted by Mr. Thornton, and indorsed by Sir John Turner, deposed, "That, at Lynn, Sir John Turner, and some others, first went into the school where Aram was, the witness waiting at the door. Sir John asked him if he knew Knaresborough?"

He replied, *No.* And being further asked, *If he had any acquaintance with one Daniel Clark?* He denied, *that he ever knew such a man.* The witness then entered the school, and said, *How do you do, Mr. Aram?* He replied, *How do you do, Sir? I don't know you.* *What!* said the witness, *don't you know me? Don't you remember that Daniel Clark and you always had a spite against me when you lived at Knaresborough?* Upon this he recollected the witness, and owned his residence at Knaresborough. The witness then asked him, *If he did not know St. Robert's Cave?* He answered, *Yes.* The witness replied, *Ay, to your sorrow.* That, upon their journey to York, Aram inquired after his old neighbours, and what they said of him. To which the witness replied, that they were much enraged against them for the loss of their goods. That upon Aram asking if it was not possible to make up the matter? The witness answered, He believed he might save himself, if he would restore to them what they had lost. Aram answered, that was impossible; but he might perhaps find them an equivalent. Aram was then asked by the judge, if he had any thing to say to the witness before him? He replied, that, to the best of his knowledge, it was not in the school, but in the room adjoining to the school, where Sir John Turner and the witness were, when he first saw them.

The skull was then produced in court, on the left side of which there was a fracture, that from the nature of it could not have been made but by the stroke of some blunt instrument; the piece was beaten inwards, and could not be replaced but from within. Mr. Locock, the surgeon, who produced it, gave it as his opinion, that no such breach could proceed from any natural decay; that it was a recent fracture by the instrument with which it was dug up, but seemed to be of many years' standing.

It should seem that Houseman and Aram murdered Clark, and did jointly drag his body into the cave, where it was found in the posture described by Houseman, and that they returned home with the clothes, which they burnt according to the testimony of Aram's wife, who found the shreds, and overheard their conference. Aram being asked what motive could induce him to commit the murder, answered, that he suspected Clark to have had a criminal correspondence with his wife. It appeared further on the trial, that Aram possessed himself of Clark's fortune, which he got with his wife, a little before, about 160*l.* And thus, after fourteen years' concealment, this notable discovery was made by two skeletons being found much at the same time. Having thus, in brief, given the substance of the trial and conviction of Aram, we shall give his defence, which he delivered into court in writing.

“First, my Lord, the whole tenor of my conduct in life contradicts every particular of this indictment. Yet I had never said this, did not my present circumstances extort it from me, and seem to make it necessary. Permit me here, my Lord, to

call upon malignity itself, so long and cruelly busied in this prosecution, to charge upon me any immorality, of which prejudice was not the author. No, my Lord, I concerted no schemes of fraud, projected no violence, injured no man's person or property. My days were honestly laborious, my nights intensely studious. And I humbly conceive my notice of this, especially at this time, will not be thought impertinent, or unseasonable; but, at least, deserving some attention: because, my Lord, that any person, after a temperate use of life, a series of thinking and acting regularly, and without one single deviation from sobriety, should plunge into the very depth of profligacy, precipitately and at once, is altogether improbable and unprecedented, and absolutely inconsistent with the course of things. Mankind is never corrupted at once; villany is always progressive, and declines from right, step by step, till every regard of probity is lost, and every sense of all moral obligations totally perishes.

“Again, my Lord, a suspicion of this kind, which nothing but malevolence could entertain, and ignorance propagate, is violently opposed by my very situation at that time, with respect to health: for, but a little space before, I had been confined to my bed, and suffered under a very long and severe disorder, and was not able, for half a year together, so much as to walk. The distemper left me, indeed, yet slowly and in part; but so macerated, so enfeebled, that I was reduced to crutches; and was so far from being well about the time I am charged with this fact, that I never to this day perfectly recovered. Could then a person in this condition take any thing into his head so unlikely, so extravagant? I, past the vigour of my age, feeble and valetudinary, with no inducement to engage, no ability to accomplish, no weapon wherewith to perpetrate such a fact; without interest, without power, without motive, without means.

“Besides, it must needs occur to every one, that an action of this atrocious nature is never heard of, but when its springs are laid open, it appears that it was to support some indolence, or supply some luxury; to satisfy some avarice, or oblige some malice; to prevent some real, or some imaginary want: yet I lay not under the influence of any of these. Surely, my Lord, I may, consistent with both truth and modesty, affirm thus much; and none who have any veracity, and knew me, will ever question this.

“In the second place, the disappearance of Clark is suggested as an argument of his being dead; but the uncertainty of such an inference from that, and the infallibility of all conclusions of such sort, from such a circumstance, are too obvious, and too notorious, to require instances; yet superseding many, permit me to produce a very recent one, and that afforded by this castle.

“In June 1757, William Thompson, for all the vigilance of this place, in open daylight, and double-ironed, made his escape; and, notwithstanding an immediate inquiry set on foot, the

strictest search, and all advertisement, was never seen nor heard of since. If then Thompson got off unseen, through all these difficulties, how very easy was it for Clark, when none of them opposed him? But what would be thought of a prosecution commenced against any one seen last with Thompson?

“Permit me next, my Lord, to observe a little upon the bones which have been discovered. It is said, which is perhaps saying very far, that these are the skeleton of a man. It is possible indeed they may: but is there any certain known criterion, which incontestibly distinguishes the sex in human bones? Let it be considered, my Lord, whether the ascertaining of this point ought not to precede any attempt to identify them?

“The place of their depositum too claims much more attention than is commonly bestowed upon it; for of all places in the world, none could have mentioned any one, wherein there was greater certainty of finding human bones than a hermitage; except he should point out a church-yard. Hermitages, in times past, being not only places of religious retirement, but of burial too. And it has scarce or ever been heard of, but that every cell now known, contains, or contained, these relics of humanity; some mutilated, and some entire. I do not inform, but give me leave to remind your Lordship, that here sat solitary sanctity; and here the hermit, or the anchoress, hoped that repose for their bones, when dead, they here enjoyed when living.

“All this while, my Lord, I am sensible this is known to your Lordship, and many in this court, better than I. But it seems necessary to my case that others, who have not at all, perhaps, adverted to things of this nature, and may have concern in my trial, should be made acquainted with it. Suffer me then, my Lord, to produce a few of many evidences, that those cells were used as repositories of the dead, and to enumerate a few, in which human bodies have been found, as it happened in this in question; lest, to some, that accident might seem extraordinary, and, consequently, occasion prejudice.

“1. The bones, as was supposed, of the Saxon, St. Dubritius, were discovered buried in his cell at Guy’s Cliff, near Warwick, as appears from the authority of Sir William Dugdale.

“2. The bones, thought to be those of the anchoress Rosia, were but lately discovered in a cell at Royston, entire, fair, and undecayed, though they must have lain interred for several centuries, as is proved by Dr. Stukely.

“3. But our own country, nay, almost this neighbourhood, supplies another instance: for in January, 1747, was found by Mr. Stovin, accompanied by a reverend gentleman, the bones, in part, of some recluse, in the cell at Lindholm, near Hatfield. They were believed to be those of William of Lindholm, a hermit, who had long made this cave his habitation.

“4. In February, 1744, part of Woburn-abbey being pulled down, a large portion of a corpse appeared, even with the flesh on, and which bore cutting with a knife; though it is certain

this had laid above 100 years, and how much longer is doubtful; for this abbey was founded in 1145, and dissolved in 1538 or 9.

“What would have been said, what believed, if this had been an accident to the bones, in question?”

“Further, my Lord, it is yet not out of living memory, that a little distance from Knaresborough, in a field, part of the manor of the worthy and patriot baronet who does that borough the honour to represent it in parliament, were found in digging for gravel, not one human skeleton only, but five or six, deposited side by side, with each an urn placed on its head, as your Lordship knows was usual in ancient interments.

“About the same time, and in another field, almost close to this borough, was discovered also in searching for gravel, another human skeleton; but the piety of the same worthy gentleman ordered both pits to be filled up again, commendably unwilling to disturb the dead.

“Is the invention of these bones forgotten, then, or industriously concealed, that the discovery of those in question may appear the more singular and extraordinary; whereas, in fact, there is nothing extraordinary in it? My Lord, almost every place conceal such remains. In fields, in hills, in highway-sides, in commons, lie frequent and unsuspected bones. And our present allotment for rest for the departed, is but of some centuries.

“Another particular seems not to claim a little of your Lordship’s notice, and that of the gentlemen of the jury; which is, that perhaps no example occurs of more than one skeleton being found in *one cell*; and in the cell in question, was found but *one*; agreeable, in this, to the peculiarity of every other known cell in Britain. Not the invention of one skeleton, then, but of two, would have appeared suspicious and uncommon.

“But then, my Lord, to attempt to identify these, when even to identify living men sometimes has proved so difficult, as in the case of Perkin Warbeck and Lambert Symnel, at home, and of Don Sebastian abroad, will be looked upon, perhaps, as an attempt to determine what is indeterminable. And I hope too it will not pass unconsidered here, where gentlemen believe with caution, think with reason, and decide with humanity, what interest the endeavour to do this is calculated to serve, in assigning proper personality to these bones, whose particular appropriation can only appear to eternal Omniscience.

“Permit me, my Lord, also very humbly to remonstrate that, as human bones appear to have been the inseparable adjuncts of every cell, even any person naming such a place at random as containing them, in this case shows him rather unfortunate than conscious prescient, and that these attendants on every hermitage accidentally concurred with this conjecture. A mere casual coincidence of *words* and *things*.

“But it seems another skeleton has been discovered by some labourer, which was full as confidently averred to be Clark’s as

this. My Lord, must some of the living, if it promote some interest, be made answerable for all the bones that earth has concealed, or chance exposed? And might not a place where bones lie be mentioned by a person by chance, as well as found by a labourer by chance? Or, is it more criminal accidentally to *name* where bones lie, than accidentally to *find* where they lie?

“Here too is a human skull produced, which is fractured; but was this the *cause*, or was it the consequence of death? Was it owing to violence, or the effect of natural decay? If it was violence, was that violence before or after death? My Lord, in May, 1732, the remains of William Lord Archbishop of this province were taken up, by permission, in this cathedral, and the bones of the skull were found broken; yet certainly he died by no violence offered to him alive, that could occasion that fracture there.

“Let it be considered, my Lord, that upon the dissolution of religious houses, and the commencement of the reformation, the ravages of those times both affected the living and the dead. In search after imaginary treasures, coffins were broken up, graves and vaults dug open, monuments ransacked, and shrines demolished. Your Lordship knows that these violations proceeded so far as to occasion parliamentary authority to restrain them; and it did about the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth. I entreat your Lordship, suffer not the violences, the depredations, and the iniquities of those times to be imputed to this.

“Moreover, what gentleman here is ignorant that Knaresborough had a castle, which, though now run to ruin, was once considerable both for its strength and garrison. All know it was vigorously besieged by the arms of the parliament; at which siege, in sallies, conflicts, flights, pursuits, many fell in all the places around it, and where they fell were buried; for every place, my Lord, is burial place in war; and many, unquestionless, of these rest yet unknown, whose bones futurity shall discover.

“I hope, with all imaginable submission, that what has been said will not be thought impertinent to this indictment; and that it will be far from the wisdom, the learning, and the integrity of this place, to impute to the living what zeal in its fury may have done; what nature may have taken off, and piety interred; or what war alone may have destroyed, alone deposited.

“As to the circumstances that have been raked together, I have nothing to observe; but that all circumstances whatsoever are precarious, and have been but too frequently found lamentably fallible; even the strongest have failed. They may rise to the utmost degree of probability; yet are they but probability still. Why need I name to your Lordship the two Harrisons, recorded in Dr. Howel, who both suffered upon circumstances, because of the sudden disappearance of their

lodger, who was in credit, had contracted debts, borrowed money, and went off unseen, and returned a great many years after their execution? Why name the intricate affairs of Jacques de Moulin, under King Charles II. related by a gentleman who was counsel for the crown? and why, the unhappy Coleman, who suffered innocent, though convicted upon positive evidence, and whose children perished for want, because the world uncharitably believed the father guilty? Why mention the perjury of Smith, incautiously admitted King's evidence; who to screen himself, equally accused Faircloth and Loveday of the murder of Dun; the first of whom, in 1749, was executed at Winchester; and Loveday was about to suffer at Reading, had not Smith been proved perjured, to the satisfaction of the court, by the surgeon of the Gosport hospital?

“Now, my Lord, having endeavoured to shew, that the whole of this process is altogether repugnant to every part of my life; that it is inconsistent with my condition of health about that time; that no rational inference can be drawn, that a person is dead who suddenly disappears; that hermitages were the constant repositories of the bones of the recluse; that the proofs of this are well authenticated; that the revolutions in religion, or the fortune of war, have mangled or buried, the dead; the conclusion remains, perhaps, no less reasonably than impatiently wished for. I, last, after a year's confinement, equal to either fortune, put myself upon the candour, the justice, and the humanity of your Lordship, and upon yours, my countrymen, gentlemen of the jury.”

*Some Particulars of the Life and Writings of Eugene Aram*

EUGENE ARAM seems perfectly acquainted with his family, as he is able to trace it up to the reign of Edward III. It was of the middle gentry of Yorkshire, and several of his relatives were high sheriffs for the county.

He was removed, when young, to Skelton, near Newby, and thence to Bondgate, near Rippon; it was here he received the first rudiments of literature, and he studied mathematics so as to be equal to the management of quadratic equations, and their geometrical constructions. He was, after the age of 16, sent for to London, by Mr. Christopher Blacket, to serve him as clerk in his counting-house; here he pursued his studies, and soon became enamoured of the belles lettres and polite literature, whose charms destroyed the heavier beauties of numbers in lines, that he quitted the former study for poetry, history, and antiquity. After a stay of a year or two in London, and having the small-pox, he returned to his native place, whence being invited to Netherdale, he engaged in a school, where he married, and, as he says, unfortunately for him; “for the misconduct of the wife, which that place afforded, did procure him this place (the prison), this prosecution, this infamy, this sentence.”

He next having perceived his deficiency in the learned languages, applied himself to grammar, in both the Greek and Latin languages, and with great avidity and diligence every one of the Latin classics, historians and poets; then went through the Greek Testament; and, lastly, ventured upon Hesiod, Homer, Theocritus, Herodotus, Thucydides, together with all the Greek tragedians.

In the year 1734, a man and horse came for him from his good friend William Norton, Esq.; inviting him to Knaresborough, the scene of his misfortune. Here he attained some knowledge in the Hebrew; he studied this language intensely, and went through the Pentateuch. In 1744 he returned to London, and served the Rev. Mr. Painblanc as usher in Latin and writing in Piccadilly, and from this gentleman he learned the French language, with which, by severe application, he became tolerably well acquainted. He succeeded to several tutions and usherships in different places in the south of England, and in the sundry intervals got acquainted with heraldry and botany; and there was scarce an individual plant, domestic or exotic, which he did not know: he also ventured upon Chaldee and Arabic, the former of which he found easy from its near connexion with the Hebrew. Not satisfied with this unwearied application, he resolved to study his own language, and in order thereto began with the Celtic, which, as far as it was possible, he investigated through all its dialects; and having discovered, through all these languages, and the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, Chaldee, Arabic and Celtic, such a surprising affinity, he resolved to make a comparative lexicon, having already collected for that purpose above 1,000 notes.

And now he comes to the fact for which he was committed, and says, "All the plate at Knaresborough, except the watches and rings, were in Houseman's possession; as for me, I had nothing at all\*. My wife knows that Terry had the large plate, and that Houseman himself took both that and the watches, at my house, from Clark's own hand; and if she will not give in this evidence for the town, she wrongs both that and her own conscience; and if it is not done soon, Houseman will prevent her. She likewise knows Terry's wife had some velvet; and, if she will, can testify it: she deserves not the regard of the town if she will not. That part of Houseman's evidence, wherein he said I threatened him, was absolutely false; for what hindered him, when I was so long absent and far distant? I must needs observe another thing to be perjury in Houseman's evidence, in which he said he went

---

\* It is generally believed, and upon good grounds, that Aram got all the money Clark had received for his wife's fortune, viz. about 160*l.* and there were strong circumstances to prove it, but it was thought unnecessary, as there was sufficient proof against him without it.

home from Clark ; whereas he went straight to my house, as my wife can also testify, if I be not believed. EUGENE ARAM."

*The Editor's Remarks on the Proceedings against  
Eugene Aram.*

Aram's sentence was a just one, and he submitted to it with that stoicism he so much affected ; and the morning after he was condemned, he confessed the justice of it to two clergymen, (who had a license from the judge to attend him), by declaring that he murdered Clark. Being asked by one of them, What his motive was for doing that abominable action ? he told them, " He suspected Clark of having an unlawful commerce with his wife ; that he was persuaded, at the time he committed the murder, he did right ; but since he has thought it wrong."

After this, *Pray*, says Aram, *what became of Clark's body, if Houseman went home (as he said upon my trial) immediately on seeing him fall ?* One of the clergymen replied, *I'll tell you what became of it ; you and Houseman dragged it into the cave, and stripped and buried it there, brought away his clothes, and burnt them at your own house :* to which he assented. He was asked, whether Houseman did not earnestly press him to murder his wife, for fear she should discover the business they had been about : he hastily said, *He did, and pressed me several times to do it.*

This was the substance of what passed with Aram the morning after he was condemned ; and as he had promised to make a more ample confession on the day he was executed, it was generally believed every thing previous to the murder would have been disclosed ; but he prevented any further discovery, by a horrid attempt upon his own life. When he was called from bed to have his irons taken off, he would not rise, alleging he was very weak. On examination his arm appeared bloody ; proper assistance being called, it was found he had attempted to take away his own life, by cutting his arm in two places with a razor, which he had concealed in the condemned hole some time before. By proper applications he was brought to himself, and, though weak was conducted to Tyburn ; where, being asked if he had any thing to say, he answered, No. Immediately after he was executed, and his body conveyed to Knaresborough-Forest, and hung in chains, pursuant to his sentence.

*On his table, in the cell, was found the following paper, containing his reasons for the abovesaid wicked attempt.*

" What am I better than my fathers ? To die, is natural and necessary. Perfectly sensible of this, I fear no more to die than I did to be born. But the manner of it is something which should, in my opinion, be decent and manly. I think I have regarded both these points. Certainly nobody has a better right to dispose of man's life than himself ; and he, not others,

should determine how. As for any indignities offered to my body, or silly reflections on my faith and morals, they are (as they always were) things indifferent to me. I think, though contrary to the common way of thinking, I wrong no man by this, and hope it is not offensive to that eternal Being that formed me and the world: and as by this I injure no man, no man can be reasonably offended. I solicitously recommend myself to the eternal and almighty Being, the God of nature, if I have done amiss. But perhaps I have not; and I hope this thing will never be imputed to me. Though I am now stained by malevolence, and suffer by prejudice, I hope to rise fair and unblemished. My life was not polluted, my morals irreproachable, and my opinions orthodox.

“I slept sound till three o'clock, then awaked, and wrote these lines:—

“Come, pleasing rest, eternal slumber fall,  
Seal mine, that once must seal the eyes of all;  
Calm and composed my soul her journey takes,  
No guilt that troubles, and no heart that aches;  
Adieu! thou sun, all bright like her arise;  
Adieu! fair friends, and all that's good and wise.

These lines, found along with the foregoing, were supposed to be written by Aram just before he cut himself with the razor.

Notwithstanding he pleads a sovereign right over himself, in vindication of this last horrid crime, and appears, at first view, actuated by honour and courage; yet a little reflection will convince any one, his motive for such an inhuman deed was nothing more than the fear of shame. His pride would not permit him to confess a crime he had once so strenuously denied; and, guilty as he knew himself to have been, his obstinacy held out to his last moments. That he murdered Clark is beyond all doubt, as he himself voluntarily confessed it; but the excuse he afterwards made for it is greatly to be suspected, it being at the expense of an innocent, industrious poor woman, whom he has ever treated in an infamous, inhuman manner.

To his life are subjoined several pieces and fragments, which he possibly might have finished, had he lived. The first is a lexicon, or rather an essay towards it, upon an entire new plan; in this essay are many very curious, and pertinent remarks, particularly his animadversions on lexicographers. All our lexicographers, says he, a very few excepted, for aught I have adverted to, have been long employed, and have generally contented themselves too, within the limits of a narrow field. They seem to have looked no farther than the facilitating for youth the attainment of the Latin and Greek languages, and almost universally consider the former, as only derived from the latter. These two single points seem to have confined their whole view, possessed their whole attention, and engrossed all their industry.

Here and there indeed, and in a few pieces of this kind, one

sees interspersed, derivations of the English from the Latin, Greek, &c. inferred from a conformity of orthography, sound, and signification, and these are very true. But whence this relation, this consonancy arose—why it has continued from age to age to us—has floated on the stream of time so long, and passed to such a distance of place—how ancient words have survived conquests, the migrations of people, and the several coalitions of nations, and colonies, notwithstanding the fluctuating condition of languages in its own nature, they have neither observed with diligence, nor explained with accuracy.

Almost every etymologist that has fallen into my hands, and detained my eye, have not been mistaken then in the comparison they have made, or the uniformity they have observed, between the Latin and the Greek, and between both those languages and our own; but then their instances have been but short and few, and they have failed in accounting for this uniformity; they have indeed sufficiently evinced a similarity, but produced no reasons for it. It is not to be thought of, much less concluded, that the multitude of words among us, which are certainly Latin, Greek, and Phœnician, are all the relics of the Roman settlements in Britain, or the effects of Greek or Phœnician commerce here: no, this resemblance was coeval with the primary inhabitants of this island, and the accession of other colonies did not obliterate, but confirm this resemblance, and also brought in an increase, and accession of other words, from the same original, and consequently bearing the same conformity. How nearly related is the Cambrian, how nearly the Irish, in numberless instances, to the Latin, the Greek, and even Hebrew, and both possessed this consimilarity long ago, before Julius Cæsar, and the Roman invasion, I know not; but the Latin differed more from itself in the succession of six continued centuries, than the Welsh and Irish at this time from the Latin. Concerning this agreement of theirs with the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, not to mention others, a gentleman of great penetration, and extraordinary erudition, Dr. Davis, may be consulted; and the learned Sheringham, who has exhibited a long and curious specimen of Greek and Cambrian words, so exactly correspondent in *sound* and *sense*, or at least so visibly near, that, as far as I know, no gentleman has ever yet questioned, much less disputed their alliance.

The similitude subsisting in common between the Irish, Cambrian, Greek, Latin, and even Hebrew, as it has not escaped the notice and animadversions of the learned, so their surprise has generally increased with their researches, and considerations about its new circumstances of agreement perpetually arising. A great many gentlemen, conversant in antiquities, and pleased with literary amusements of this kind, have ascribed these palpable connexions to conquest or to commerce; they have supposed that the intercourse which, on the latter account, anciently subsisted between the Phœnicians, Greeks, and the Britons (see Boch. Huet. &c.) occasioned this very

remarkable community between their languages. Indeed this accident of commerce must needs have had its influence; but then this influence must have been but weak and partial, not prevalent and extensive. Commerce has, and always will, make continual additions to any language, by the introduction of exotic words; yet would words of this kind, and at that time, hardly extend a great way; they would only affect the maritime parts, and those places frequented by traders, and that but feebly, and would be very far from acting or making any considerable impression upon the whole body of our language.

But even supposing that a number of Greek vocables may have found admittance and adoption in Britain, and after this manner, yet could they never penetrate into the more interior parts of it, into recesses remote from the sea; strangers to all correspondence, without the temptation, without the inclination to leave their natural soil, their own hereditary village—yet is Greek even here; we find pure Greek in the Peak itself, whither foreigners, especially at the distance of more than twice ten centuries, can scarcely be supposed to have come. There could have been but few invitations to it then, and perhaps there are not many now.

As a specimen of his knowledge in most languages, we shall give his ensampler word *Beagles*.

“*Beagles*, a race of hounds, so named for being little; and perfectly agreeable to the primary signification of the Celtic *pig*, (i. e.) *little*. The Greeks have anciently used this word too, and in the sense of *little*, of which they seem to have constituted their *πυγμαῖος*, (i. e.) a dwarf. It still subsists among the Irish, and still, in that language, conveys the idea of *little*; as, *sir pig*, a little man; *ban pig*, a little woman; *beg aglach*, little fearing. It was common in Scotland, in the same acceptation also; for one of the *Hebrides* is named from this cubital people, *Dunie Begg* (see Mr. Irvin), and it yet exists in Scotland, in the word *philibeg*, (i. e.) a little petticoat. And we ourselves retain it in the provincial word *peagles*, (i. e.) cowslips, a name imposed upon them of old, from the littleness of their flowers. And our northern word *Peggy* is properly applicable to no female as a Christian name; but is merely an epithet of size, and a word of endearment only.”

He left several other curious tracts relative to British antiquities.

THE END.