combine into a compact whole a *new physiology* with the results of pathological anatomy, and thereby more clearly indicate the principles which ought to guide us in the practice of medicine. By a new physiology, I mean a physiology that can maintain the dignity of a science independent of the chemical props which appear to be necessary to sustain the present tottering fabric.

I remain, Gentlemen,
Yours obediently,
WILLIAM ADDISON.

Great Malvern, Feb. 26, 1844.

DONCASTER UNION MEDICAL OFFICERS.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL JOURNAL.

GENTLEMEN,—A second letter from "Provincial," published in your Journal for last week, has confirmed the opinion which I had previously privately expressed to you, that I am one of the individuals alluded to in that first letter, which charges two medical practitioners with "holding offices in the Doncaster and Rotherham unions, who possess neither medical, surgical, nor pharmaceutical knowledge from any source."

I certainly do not feel myself called upon to answer the sarcasms of "Provincial," so long as he conceals himself beneath his anonymous garb; when, however, he chooses to come forward, and ask those questions as a man of honor, and a gentleman, I pledge myself to prove to him, by such evidence as he cannot dispute, that I am, in every sense of the word, a regular practitioner, with the single exception of not being a member of the college, which, you are aware, at the time I entered the profession, was not a *sine qua non* for those who intended themselves solely for country practice; and I will convince him that I commenced my studies purposely for the medical profession at an early age, served a regular apprenticeship, passed a year as assistant to a surgeon of considerable eminence, finished my studies at St. Thomas's and Guy's hospitals, and, on the 1st of June, 1815, besides having private patients, was in full practice as parochial surgeon in a very extensive district.

I remain, Gentlemen,
Yours most respectfully,
JAMES BURMAN, Surgeon.

Wath-upon-Dearne, March 6, 1844.

THE BENEVOLENT FUND.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL JOURNAL.

GENTLEMEN,—Having already made some observations in your Journal respecting the proposition of Dr. Lee, in reference to the Benevolent Fund, and having then stated what I considered to be the original constitution of the Association, I should not again have thought it necessary to have approached the subject until our next annual meeting, had not I found the following sentence in a second letter from Dr. Lee, bearing date Feb. 6. In it he says, "I am decidedly of opinion that district branches will never effect the amount of good their benevolent

projectors contemplate. Our strength lies in union. A district branch can do but little towards the attainment of so God-like an object as our Benevolent Fund is intended to promote. Look at the number of applicants, and how small a portion of aid to each such district, though well meant, charity will yield."

Now, let us examine how far Dr. Lee is justified in his opinion—but first, let it be remembered that Dr. Lee's proposition is that the sum of four shillings be added to the annual subscription, and that this, according to his calculation, will yield an annual income of £350 to the Benevolent Fund.

One feels unwilling at any time to draw comparisons, but more especially is this disinclination felt in matters of benevolence; nevertheless, when one looks, upon the one hand, at the result of the calculation of Dr. Lee, and finds that an increase of four shillings upon the subscription of every member of the Association would only produce to the Benevolent Fund an annual income of £350—and when, upon the other hand, he finds from the last report of the West Riding Medical Charity, that the distribution of charity for the present year alone amounts to £206, he is constrained to compare, and having compared, to conclude, that the report furnishes us, not with a "melancholy," but with a pleasing truth, and that we have good reason to hope, not "that district branches will never effect the amount of good their benevolent projectors contemplate," but that by a little kindly feeling and good management such *may* be effected.

In writing thus in favor of district branches, and in opposition to a constrained and compulsory benevolence, it cannot be supposed that I myself object to a *voluntary* contribution of five shillings to the Benevolent Fund, inasmuch as that is my annual subscription; but being a member of the above-mentioned charity, and knowing the workings of a well-conducted district branch, I feel bound to encourage, so far as I can, the more general formation of such throughout England.

I speak, therefore, disinterestedly, and in doing so I confess that I feel that Dr. Lee does not make a fair quotation from my letter when he, without noticing the context, merely remarks that "Dr. Inglis is glad that every member of the Association is not called upon to do likewise," *i.e.*, to make a compulsory addition of *four* shillings to his annual subscription of £1 ls. Surely Dr. Lee cannot have forgotten his own language in a former letter; it was as follows:—"Preferring deeds to words, I have added *four* shillings to my annual subscription, and call upon every member of the Association to do likewise." It was, therefore, in contradistinction to this that I made use of Dr. Lee's own words, adding to them the negative, inasmuch as I feared lest a compulsory increase of subscription of either nine shillings or of four might have "the effect," as Dr. Heygate justly remarks, "of withdrawing many annual subscriptions."

Without any further observations, I beg to conclude by again offering my best wishes for the welfare of the Benevolent Fund, so long as the contributions to it are voluntary; and instead of calling upon the members for any stated sum towards it, I would quote from the letter of Mr. Phené (Jan 20), and say that "it is very desirable that each member should con-