

*This tract is a 'must read'.*

and he who keeps it as changed is thereby marked as a follower of the power that made the change. In no other way can the two classes of worshipers be distinguished. From this conclusion, no candid mind can dissent: but in this conclusion we have a general answer to the question, "What constitutes the mark of the beast?" and that answer is simply this: The mark of the beast is the change which the beast has attempted to make in the law of God. {DAR 599.1}.

*The change in the law.* We now inquire what that change is. By the law of God, we mean the moral law, the only law in the universe of immutable and perpetual obligation, -- the law of which Webster says, defining the term according to the sense in which it is almost universally used in Christendom, "The moral law is summarily contained in the decalogue, written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, and delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai." {DAR 600.1}.

If now the reader will compare the ten commandments as found in Roman Catholic catechisms with those commandments as found in the Bible, he will see in the catechisms -- we mean those portions specially devoted to instruction -- that the second commandment is left out, that the tenth is divided into two to make up the lack caused by leaving out the second, and keep good the number ten, and that the fourth commandment (called the third in their enumeration) is made to enjoin the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, and prescribe that the day shall be spent in hearing mass devoutly, attending vespers, and reading moral and pious books. Here are several variations from the decalogue as found in the Bible. Which of them, if any, constitutes the change of the law intended in the prophecy? or are they all included in that change?

Let it be borne in mind, that, according to the prophecy, he was to think to change times and laws. This plainly conveys the idea of intention and design, and makes these qualities essential to the change in question. But respecting the omission of the second commandment, Catholics argue that it is included in the first, and hence should not be numbered as a separate commandment; and on the tenth they claim that there is so plain a distinction of ideas as to require two commandments; so they make the coveting of a neighbor's wife the ninth command, and the coveting of his goods the tenth. {DAR 600.2}

In all this they claim that they are giving the commandments exactly as God intended to have them understood; so, while we may regard them as errors in their interpretation of the commandment, we cannot set them down as

professedly intentional changes. Not so, however, with the fourth commandment. Respecting this commandment, they do not claim that their version is like that given by God. They expressly claim a change here, and also that the change has been made by the church. A few quotations from standard Catholic works will make this matter plain. In a work entitled, Treatise of Thirty Controversies, we find these words:

"The word of God commandeth the seventh day to be the Sabbath of our Lord, and to be kept holy; you [Protestants], without any precept of Scripture, change it to the first day of the week, only authorized by our traditions. Divers English Puritans oppose, against this point, that the observation of the first day is proved out of Scripture, where it is said, the first day of the week. Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10. Have they not spun a fair thread in quoting these places? If we should produce no better for purgatory and prayers for the dead, invocation of the saints, and the like, they might have good cause indeed to laugh us to scorn, for where was it written that these were Sabbath days in which those meetings were kept? or where is it ordained they should be always observed? or, which is the sum of all, where is it decreed that the observation of the first day should abrogate, or abolish, the sanctifying of the seventh day, which God commanded everlastingly to be kept holy? Not one of these is expressed in the written word of God." {DAR 601.2}.

---

THE LOUD CRY HERALD MINISTRY  
Box 315, Katima Mulilo, Namibia, 9000  
Web: [www.theloudcryherald.com](http://www.theloudcryherald.com)  
Email: [josh@theloudcryherald.com](mailto:josh@theloudcryherald.com)

## *Changing the Decalogue*

The worship of the beast and his image, and the reception of his mark, must be something that involves the greatest offense that can be committed against God, to call down so severe denunciation of wrath against it.

This is a work, as has already been shown, which takes place in the last days; and as God has given us in his word most abundant evidence to show when we are in the last days, that no one need be overtaken by the day of the Lord as by a thief, so, likewise, it must be that he has given us the means whereby we may determine what the receiving of the mark of the beast is, which he has so strongly condemned, that we may avoid the fearful penalty so sure to follow the commission of this act. God does not so trifle with human hopes and human destinies as to denounce a most fearful doom against a certain sin, and then place it out of our power to understand what that sin is, so that we have no means of guarding against it. {DAR 596.1}

What constitute the mark of the beast? The figure of a mark is borrowed from an ancient custom. Bishop Newton (Dissertations on the Prophecies, Vol. III, p 241) says: - {DAR 596.2}. "It was customary among the ancients for servants to receive the mark of their master, and soldiers of their general, and those who were devoted to any particular deity, of the particular deity to whom they were devoted. These marks were usually impressed on their right hand or on their forehead, and consisted of some hieroglyphic character, or of the name expressed in vulgar letters, or of the name disguised in numerical letters, according to the fancy of the imposer." {DAR 597.1}.

Prideaux says that Ptolemy Philopater ordered all the Jews who applied to be enrolled as citizens of Alexandria to have the form of an ivy leaf (the badge of his god, Bacchus) impressed upon them with a hot iron, under pain of death. (Prideaux's Connection, Vol. II, p. 78) {DAR 597.2}.

The word used for mark in this prophecy is (charagma), and is defined to mean, "a graving, sculpture; a mark cut in or stamped." It occurs nine times in the New Testament, and with the single exception of Acts 17:29, refers every time to the mark of the beast. We are not, of course, to understand in this symbolic prophecy that a literal mark is intended; but the giving of the literal mark, as practiced in ancient times, is used as a figure to illustrate certain acts that will be performed in the fulfilment of this prophecy. And from the literal mark as formerly employed, we learn something of its meaning as used in the prophecy; for between the symbol and the thing symbolized there must be some re-

semblance. The mark, as literally used, signified that the person receiving it was the servant of, acknowledged the authority of, or professed allegiance to, the person whose mark he bore. So the mark of the beast, or of the papacy, must be some act or profession by which the authority of the power is acknowledged. What is it? {DAR 597.3}.

He shall think to changes times and laws. It would naturally be looked for in some of the special characteristics of the papal power. Daniel, describing that power under the symbol of a little horn, speaks of it as waging a special warfare against God, wearing out the saints of the Most High, and thinking to change times and laws. The prophet expressly specifies on this point: "He shall think to change times and laws." These laws must certainly be the laws of the Most High....And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and shall think to change the times and laws of the Most High," and all is consistent and forcible. The Hebrew has (dath), law, and the Septuagint reads, (nomos), in the singular, "the law," which more directly suggests the law of God.

The papacy has been able to do more than merely "think" to change human laws. It has changed them at pleasure. It has annulled the decrees of kings and emperors, and absolved subjects from allegiance to their rightful sovereigns. It has thrust its long arm into the affairs of nations, and brought rulers to its feet in the most abject humility. But the prophet beholds greater acts of presumption than these. He sees it endeavor to do what it was not able to do, but could only think to do; he sees it attempt an act which no man, nor any combination of men, can ever accomplish; and that is, to change the law of the Most High. Bear this in mind while we look at the testimony of another sacred writer on this very point. {DAR 597.4}.

The Pope sitting in God's temple. The apostle Paul speaks of the same power in 2 Thessalonians 2; and he describes it, in the person of the pope, as "the man of sin," and as "sitting as God in the temple of God" (that is, the church), and as exalting himself "above all that is called God, or that is worshiped." According to this, the pope sets himself up as the one for all the church to look to for authority, in the place of God. And now we ask the reader to ponder carefully the question how he can exalt himself above God. Search through the whole range of human devices, go to the extent of human effort; by what plan, by what move, by what claim, could this usurper exalt himself above God? He might institute any number of ceremonies, he might prescribe any form of worship, he

might exhibit any degree of power; but so long as God had requirements which the people felt bound to regard in preference to his own, so long he would not be above God. He might enact a law, and teach the people that they were under as great obligations to that as to the law of God; then he would only make himself equal with God. But he is to do more than this; he is to attempt to raise himself above him. Then he must promulgate a law which conflicts with the law of God, and demand obedience to his own law in preference to God's law. There is no other possible way in which he could place himself in the position assigned in the prophecy. But this is simply to change the law of God; and if he can cause this change to be adopted by the people in the place of the original enactment, then he, the law-changer, is above God, the law-maker. And this is the very work that Daniel said he should think to do. {DAR 598.1}.

Worshipping the beast. Such a work as this, then, the papacy must accomplish according to the prophecy; and the prophecy cannot fail. And when this is done, what do the people of the world have? -- They have two laws demanding obedience, -- one, the law of God as originally enacted by him, an embodiment of his will, and expressing his claims upon his creatures; the other, a revised edition of that law, emanating from the pope of Rome, and expressing his will. And how is it to be determined which of these powers the people honor and worship? It is determined by the law which they keep. If they keep the law of God as given by him, they worship and obey God.

If they keep the law as changed by the papacy, they worship that power. But further: the prophecy does not say that the little horn, the papacy, should set aside the law of God, and give one entirely different. This would not be to change the law, but simply to give a new one. He was only to attempt a change, so that the law that comes from God, and the law that comes from the papacy, are precisely alike, excepting the change which the papacy has made in the former. They have many points in common. But none of the precepts which they contain in common can distinguish a person as the worshiper of either power in preference to the other.

If God's law says, "Thou shalt not kill," and the law as given by the papacy says the same, no one can tell by a person's observance of the precept whether he designs to obey God rather than the pope, or the pope rather than God. But when a precept that has been changed is the subject of action, then whoever observes that precept as originally given by God, is thereby distinguished as a worshiper of God;