

the fourth commandment to point out the Author of the decalogue, the claims of every false god are annulled at one stroke; for the God who here demands our worship is not any created being, but the One who created all things. The maker of the earth and sea, the sun and moon, and all the starry host, the upholder and governor of the universe, is the One who claims, and who, from his position, has a right to claim, our supreme regard in preference to every other object. The commandment which makes known these facts is therefore the very one we might suppose that power which designed to exalt itself above God would undertake to change. God gave the Sabbath as a memorial of himself, a weekly reminder to the sons of men of his work in creating the heavens and the earth, a great barrier against heathenism and idolatry. It is the signature and seal against atheism and idolatry. It is the signature and seal of the law. This the papacy has torn from its place, and erected in its stead, on its own authority, another institution designed to serve another purpose. {DAR 605.2}.

This change of the fourth commandment must therefore be the change to which the prophecy points, and the Sunday sabbath must be the mark of the beast! Some who have long been taught to regard this institution with reverence will perhaps start back with little less than feelings of horror at this conclusion. We have not space, nor is this, perhaps, the place, to enter into an extended argument on the Sabbath question, and an exposition of the origin and nature of the observance of the first day of the week. Let us submit this one proposition: If the seventh day is still the Sabbath enjoined in the fourth commandment; if the observance of the first day of the week has no foundation whatever in the Scriptures; if this observance has been brought in as a Christian institution, and designedly put in place of the Sabbath of the decalogue by that power which is symbolized by the beast, and placed there as a badge and token of its power to legislate for the church, - is it not inevitably the mark of the beast? The answer must be in the affirmative. But these hypotheses are all certainties. 1 {DAR 606.1}.

Have all Sunday keepers received the mark of the beast? It will be said again, Then all Sunday-keepers have the mark of the beast; then all the good of past ages who kept this day had the mark of the beast; then Luther, Whitefield, the Wesleys, and all who have done a good and noble work of reformation, had the mark of the beast; then all the blessings that have been poured upon the reformed churches have been poured upon those who had the mark of the beast; and all Christians of the present day who are keeping Sunday as the Sabbath, have the mark of the beast. We

answer, Not so! And we are sorry to say that some professedly religious teachers, though many times corrected, persist in misrepresenting us on this point. We have never so held; we have never so taught. Our premises lead to no such conclusions. Give ear: The mark and worship of the beast are enforced by the two-horned beast. The receiving of the mark of the beast is a specific act which the two-horned beast is to cause to be done. The third message of Revelation 14 is a warning mercifully sent out in advance to prepare the people for the coming danger.

There can therefore be no worship of the beast, nor reception of his mark such as the prophecy contemplates, till it is enforced by the two-horned beast. We have seen that intention was essential to the change which the papacy has made in the law of God, to constitute it the mark of that power; so intention is necessary in the adoption of that change to make it, on the part of any individual, the reception of that mark. In other words, a person must adopt the change knowing it to be the work of the beast, and receive it on the authority of that power, in opposition to the requirement of God. {DAR 606.2}.

THE LOUD CRY HERALD MINISTRY
Box 315, Katima Mulilo, Namibia, 9000
Web: www.theloudcryherald.com
Email: josh@theloudcryherald.com

This tract is a 'must read'!

Rome Confesses
she changed 7th day Sabbath for Sunday

We are at the threshold of a final conflict when the whole world is pitting those who follow God's commandments against a coalition of apostate and Roman power. The whole world, except a small number, is ready and willing to honor the priests and rulers instead of honoring God.

Rome's confession of the change. In the Catechism of the Christian Religion, by Stephen Keenan (Boston, Patrick Donahue, 1857), p. 206, on the subject of the third (fourth) commandment, we find these questions and answers: {DAR 601.3}. **Question.** What does God ordain by this commandment? {DAR 602.1}. **Answer.** He ordains that we sanctify in a special manner, this day on which he rested from the labor of creation. {DAR 602.2}. **Question.** What is this day of rest? {DAR 602.3}. **Answer.** The seventh day of the week, or Saturday; for he employed six days in creation, and rested on the seventh. Gen. 2:2; Heb. 4:1; etc. {DAR 602.4}. **Question.** Is it, then, Saturday we should sanctify, in order to obey the ordinance of God? {DAR 602.5}. **Answer.** During the old law, Saturday was the day sanctified; but the church, instructed by Jesus Christ, and directed by the Spirit of God, has substituted Sunday for Saturday; so now we sanctify the first, not the seventh day. Sunday means, and now is, the day of the Lord. In the Catholic Christian Instructed (J. P. Kenedy, New York, 1884), p. 202, we read:- {DAR 602.7}. **Question.** What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday preferable to the ancient Sabbath, which was Saturday? {DAR 602.8}. **Answer.** We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and apostolic tradition. {DAR 602.9}. **Question.** Does the Scripture anywhere command the Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath? {DAR 602.10}. **Answer.** The Scripture commands us to hear the church (Matt. 18:17; Luke 10:16), and to hold fast the traditions of the apostles. 2 Thess. 2:15. But the Scriptures do not in particular mention this change of the Sabbath. {DAR 602.11}.

In the Doctrinal Catechism (Kenedy, New York), p. 174, we find further testimony to the same point:- {DAR 602.12}. **Question.** Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept? {DAR 602.13}. **Answer.** Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her -- she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no Scriptural authority. {DAR 602.14}.

In Abridgment of Christian Doctrine (Kenedy, New York), p. 58, we find this testimony:- {DAR 603.1}. **Question.**

How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days? {DAR 603.2}. **Answer.** By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which protestants allow of! and therefore, they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church. {DAR 603.3}. **Question.** How prove you that? {DAR 603.4}. **Answer.** Because by keeping Sunday they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin." {DAR 603.5}.

And finally, W. Lockhart, late B.A. of Oxford, in the Toronto (Catholic) Mirror, offered the following "challenge" to all the Protestants of Ireland, - a challenge as well calculated for this locality as that. He says:- {DAR 603.6}. "I do therefore solemnly challenge the Protestants of Ireland to prove, by plain texts of Scripture, these questions concerning the obligations of the Christian Sabbath: (1) That Christians may work on Saturday, the old seventh day; (2) that they are bound to keep holy the first day, namely Sunday; (3) that they are not bound to keep holy the seventh day also." {DAR 603.7}

No scriptural authority for the change. This is what the papal power claims to have done respecting the fourth commandment. Catholics plainly acknowledge that there is no Scriptural authority for the change they have made, but that it rests wholly upon the authority of the church; and they claim it as a token, or mark, of the authority of that church; the "very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday" being set forth as proof of its power in this respect. For further testimony on this point, the reader is referred to a book published by the Southern Publishing Association, Nashville, Tenn., entitled, The Change of the Sabbath, in which are also extracts from Catholic writers refuting the arguments usually relied upon to prove the Sunday-sabbath, and showing that its only authority is the Catholic Church. {DAR 603.8}.

Christ never changed the Sabbath. A great many suppose so, and it is natural that they should; for they have been so taught. And while we have no words of denunciation to utter against any such persons for so believing, we would have them at once understand that it is, in reality, one of the most enormous of errors. We would therefore remind such persons that, according to the prophecy, the only change ever to be made in the law of God, was to be made by the little horn of Daniel 7, the man of sin of 2 Thessalonians 2; and the only change that has been made in it, is the change of the Sabbath.

Why should any one labor to prove that Christ changed the Sabbath? Whoever does this is performing a thankless task. The pope will not thank him; for if it is proved that Christ wrought this change, then the pope is robbed of his badge of authority and power. And no truly enlightened Protestant will thank him; for if he succeeds, he only shows that the papacy has not done the work which it was predicted that it should do, and so that the prophecy has failed, and the Scriptures are unreliable. The matter would better stand as the prophecy has it, and the claim which the pope unwittingly puts forth would better be granted.

When a person is charged with any work, and that person steps forth and confesses that he has done the work, that is usually considered sufficient to settle the matter. So, when the prophecy affirms that a certain power shall change the law of God, and in due time that very power arises, does the work foretold, and then openly claims that he has done it, what need have we of further evidence? The world should not forget that the great apostasy foretold by Paul has taken place; that the man of sin for long ages held almost a monopoly of Christian teaching in the world; that the mystery of iniquity has cast the darkness of its shadow and the errors of its doctrines over almost all Christendom; and that out of this era of error and darkness and corruption, the theology of our day has come. Would it, then, be anything strange if there were yet some relics of popery to be discarded ere the reformation will be complete?

A. Campbell (Baptism, p. 15), speaking of the different Protestant sects, says:- {DAR 604.1}. "All of them retain in their bosom, - in their ecclesiastical organizations, worship, doctrines, and observances, - various relics of popery. They are at best a reformation of popery, and only reformations in part. The doctrines and traditions of men yet impair the power and progress of the gospel in their hands." {DAR 605.1}.

The seal of God in the fourth commandment. The nature of the change which the little horn has attempted to effect in the law of God is worthy of notice. True to his purpose to exalt himself above God, he undertakes to change that commandment which, of all others, is the fundamental commandment of the law, the one which makes known who the lawgiver is, and contains his signature of royalty. The fourth commandment does this; no other one does. Four others, it is true, contain the word God, and three of them the word Lord, also. But who is this Lord God of whom they speak? Without the fourth commandment, it is impossible to tell; for idolaters of every grade apply these terms to the multitudinous objects of their adoration. With