

transgressing the radius of the probable, is what carries the reader spellbound to the catastrophe at the bitter end." In other words if [the] events in Daniel can be shown to be at all possible they may be accepted as probable since they are contained in what purports (elsewhere) to be a contemporary document. ^{historical}

If this principle be accepted the author has largely proved his case, but the reviewer finds it impossible thus easily to transform the possible into the probable. Surely there is a wide gap there. Many a jury has sent a man to prison, when there was a possibility that he was innocent, because of a probability that he was guilty; that is, a man is innocent until he is proven guilty, but that proof of guilt need not destroy every vestige of a possibility of innocence. The fact that the author of "She" "keeps within the sphere of the possible, while transgressing the radius of the probable" is what forces us to believe it is fiction, and if the author should suddenly swear that he was an eye-witness of the events contained therein, or if a later age should accept it as true, it would require more than showing that he kept "within the sphere of the possible" to prove its probability. In addition to internal possibility we need external ^{shown} or internal witness as to the date of the book or the character ^{at length in} of the author to make a document credible, and it is unfortunate ^{other} ^{chapters,} that this matter was not considered before that of the possibility of the events contained in the book. Probability, and not possibility, is said to be the guide of life, I believe.

The book opens with a chapter on the argument from silence, which is good. but would be somewhat strengthened, it seems to me, did the author not seem to employ this very argument later in the book. (125 "the title 'king of lands' alone, thus suggesting that