

of the heathen, all missionaries are brothers. The cause of one is the cause of all. And because the interest of all churches in the matter is the same. Therefore, it was wise to point out the specious mistake of the Baptist Committee that other churches might be warned in time. And in doing this, Mr. Grant has thrown more light on the special difficulties that the missionary in India has to meet than any other writer we know of. We are deeply grateful for his letters, and hope he will continue to write and Dr. Cramp to read them—for instruction and not for the authoritative purpose of “animadversion and rebuke,” as we have no room in the RECORD for censorship. Even should his style be not always grave, may we not ask with Horace:—*Ridentem dicere verum, Quid vetat?* And considering the amount of “heavy” matter in religious periodicals, we believe that our readers will be most thankful for the change.]

### LETTER FROM OUR SCOTCH CORRESPONDENT.

DR. CUMMING has lately received a communication from the Pope in answer to a letter which he wrote regarding the approaching Ecumenical Council. He wrote requesting to know whether Protestants would be allowed the liberty of speaking, and stating the grounds on which they separated and divided from the Church of Rome. We are not aware whether Dr. Cumming expected an answer in the affirmative or not, but certainly the public in general were not surprised when he was reminded that the Church of Rome could not permit “errors which it has carefully considered, judged and condemned,” to be again brought under discussion, and consequently, the liberty which he craved could not be granted. The Pope, in his reply, states that no doctrine or article of faith which has once been received by the Church, can ever be removed from its public profession. The object of this is apparent. If she would claim the power of reconsidering the doctrines and articles of faith which have been once accepted as truths, and removing them from her common confession, it would be virtually admitting that she had erred in placing them there, and consequently that she is not infallible. He then goes on to show that such a discussion would be useless, even were it permitted. He lays it down as a first principle, that those who are out of the church are destitute of that living principle which governs and directs mankind in whatever relates to salvation. The opinion of such individuals, before their divinely appointed Council, however sincere and conscientious in the views which they hold, would be of little value. That the Church can do no wrong, is a tenet which is held by every true Roman Catholic. They believe that she is under the guiding power of the Holy Spirit, and that her voice is the voice of the Holy Spirit. Her creed is thus, according to them, “*the absolute and infallible truth of God.*” Protestants, on the other hand, profess to accept of Scripture as the highest authority in faith and morals. Roman Catholics add to Scripture the traditions of the church, and these only as they are interpreted and laid down in the decrees of the Church; consequently, the highest authority which they have is the Church. The opinions of heretics or those who discard the Church, they maintain, are against Scripture and tradition, and with such they can have no fellowship or communion. This is the ground on which the Pope takes his stand in refusing to allow Protestants to bring forward the reasons why they stand aloof from the Roman Church. “Before any question is treated or discussed with heretics,” says one of the Popes, “one thing, which is matter both of divine and human law, must be strictly observed—that they should first give in their adhesion to the tribunal and the judge, and acknowledge that the Church of Christ is one spread throughout the world, and that her one head is the Vicar of Christ, and that a lawful General Council is one summoned and approved by that same head, and that they will submit to the decrees, determinations and declarations of the said,