

wound, in which the whole nation seemed stretched on the couch with him, Dr. Hamilton, one of his physicians, published a medical history of the case so desperately baffling to the surgeons. The late Dr. Hunt, of the Newark *Daily Advertiser* (one of the most learned, philosophical and discerning of editorial writers, as well as most poetical and graceful in his diction and style), in the issue of that paper Sept. 27, 1881, made the following observations, in which the saying is traced back considerably further, as well as shown to be in reality the professional observation of a large thinker on the limitations of the surgical art rather than a merely poetic conceit:

"Dr. Hamilton tells not much that is new, but he groups the incidents of the case, and leaves it in a clear light as difficult in judgment and impossible in cure. In the aphorisms of Hippocrates, written by a physician some centuries before Christ, the toil of the surgeon was expressed as truly for now as then. He wrote, '*Ars longa, vita brevis; experientia fallax, momentum argens, judicium difficile.*' Longfellow's 'Psalm of Life' is a paraphrase of Hippocrates, or is at least suggested by it; for where he says 'Art is long and time is fleeting,' Hippocrates said, 'Art is long and life is short, experience is fallacious, action is urgent, and judgment is difficult.' That old wisdom was singularly illustrated in the difficulties, or impossibilities, which surrounded the bedside of the murdered President."

It seemed to me the saying would be enhanced if presented in this setting, and less like an impertinence than if given as a bare correction of the notice in your December issue. The aphorisms of Hippocrates are pursued by Galen, who wrote in the second century. HENRY U. SWINNERTON.

CHERRY VALLEY, N. Y.

A Light that Does Lighten.

IN THE HOMILETIC REVIEW (Dec., p. 544), under the heading "A Light

that Does Not Lighten," a brother quotes from Dr. Crosby's interpretation of John v: 37-44, these words: "And it is easy to believe that the drawing of the Father is the giving of the Father." The writer criticises this, and says: "That may be easy for Dr. Crosby; but it is very hard, I think, for the average mind to believe that two things which are radically different are exactly alike. It seems to me that the learned Doctor's logic here is lame—lame as his logic on Prohibition."

Now, it seems to my "average mind" that Dr. Crosby's critic makes the latter to say just the opposite of what he did say. It seems to me that the Doctor's clear statement is that "drawing" and "giving" are *not* "two things which are radically different," but two *terms* for a thing which is radically the same. And it is just here that the light had been shining in the darkness, which it seems is not quite comprehended yet. But why does the brother knock the good Doctor's theological legs from under him with the "Prohibition" mallet? I cannot see the soundness of this logic. Politics and religion, Prohibition on the brain, and theology on its legs, are *not* "exactly the same thing," but are two "things radically different." And I believe that this is just what the Doctor's logic has been, and still is, on the temperance question; and it can travel yet. L. P. CUMMINGS.

MORRISANIA, N. Y.

The Prayer-Meeting.

EVERY Christian and every pastor knows that unless the prayer-meeting service of the church be one of life and power, all the other services of the sanctuary will languish; and every now and then spasmodic efforts are made to revive interest in the prayer-meeting. And still the service, in most churches, is all but a dead, perfunctory service. And *why*? There must be a general and powerful reason to explain this. *What* is