Malachi*

Malachi 1:2-5 (2) I have loved you, saith the LORD. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the LORD: yet I loved Jacob,
(3) And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness.
(4) Whereas Edom saith, We are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the LORD of hosts, They shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them, The border of wickedness, and, The people against whom the LORD hath indignation for ever.
(5) And your eyes shall see, and ye shall say, The LORD will be magnified from the border of Israel.
The book of Malachi is the last book of the Old Testament, although there were about four hundred "silent years" before Christ came, still the book is a harbinger of what was to come, the end of the Jewish age giving way to the new covenant. The New Testament reveals how God has kept every promise that He made to the nation Israel and ultimately fulfilled His covenant with them in One Man, Jesus Christ. It contains an accurate account of the gospel of Jesus Christ, His life, His history on earth, His Words, and His plan for all nations including Israel. It is appropriate that Malachi, the last Old Testament prophet, should prophesy the coming of John the Baptist, who should be considered the harbinger New Testament prophet, to herald the coming of Jesus Christ, please turn to the Prophesy recorded in;
Malachi 4:5-6 (5) Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the LORD:
(6) And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.
Isaiah 40:3-5 (3) The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in

the desert a highway for our God.
(4) Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain:
(5) And the glory of the LORD shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it.
The Fulfillment, turn to; **Luke 7:25-28** (25) But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they which are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately, are in kings' courts.
(26) But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet.
(27) This is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.
(28) For I say unto you, Among those that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist: but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.
Apparently, there is a problem arising in the book of Malachi that is similar in respect to our own time. The problem, offering polluted bread, turn with me to;
Malachi 1:6-7 (6) A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the LORD of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name. And ye say, Wherein have we despised thy name?
(7) Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar; and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the LORD is contemptible.
{They despised God's name in what they did. It is evident that these understood not the meaning of the sacrifices, as shadowing forth the unblemished Lamb of God; they grudged the expense, thinking all thrown away which did not turn to their profit. If we worship God ignorantly, and without understanding, we bring the blind for sacrifice; if we do it

carelessly, if we are cold, dull, and dead in it, we bring the sick; if we rest in the bodily exercise, and do not make heart-work of it, we bring the lame; and if we suffer vain thoughts and distractions to lodge within us, we bring the torn. And is not this evil? Is it not a great affront to God, and a great wrong and injury to our own souls? In order to the acceptance of our actions with God, it is not enough to do that which, for the matter of it, is good; but we must do it from a right principle, in a right manner, and for a right end. Men now, though in a different way, profane the name of the Lord, pollute his table, and show contempt for his worship. It was "polluted," in that it was contrary to the law of God which forbade to sacrifice any animal, "lame or blind" or with "any ill blemish," as being inconsistent with the typical perfection of the sacrifice. "Blind is the sacrifice of the soul, which is not illumined by the light of Christ. Lame is his sacrifice of prayer, who comes with a double mind to entreat the Lord." "He offereth one weak, whose heart is not established in the grace of God, nor by the anchor of hope fixed in Christ. "And ye say, Wherewith have we polluted Thee?" It is a bold expression. Yet a word, to which we are but too ill-accustomed, which expresses what most have done, "dishonor God," comes to the same. "Much more in the new law, in which the Sacrifice is Christ Himself our God, whence the Apostle says expressly 1 Corinthians 11:27, "Whoso eateth this bread and drinketh this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." "For when the sacraments are violated, Himself, whose sacraments they are, is violated." God speaks of our acts with an unveiled plainness, which we should not dare to use. "As we are said to sanctify God, when we minister to Him in holiness and righteousness, and so, as far as in us lies, show that He is holy; so we are said to pollute Him, when we conduct ourselves irreverently and viciously before Him, especially in His worship, and thereby, as far as in us lies, show that He is not holy and is to be dishonored." (Matthew Henry's

Concise Commentary)**}** *Now let's turn to;*
1Corinthians 11:23-29 (23) For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread:
(24) And when he had given thanks, **he brake it**, and said, Take, eat: **this is my body, which is broken for you**: this do in remembrance of me.
(25) After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.
(26) For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.
(27) Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.
(28) But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.
(29) For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.
{Those who live in careless neglect of holy ordinances, who attend on them without reverence, and go from them under no concern, in effect say, The table of the Lord is contemptible. Men now, though in a different way, profane the name of the Lord, pollute his table, and show contempt for his worship. (Matthew Henry's Concise Commentary)**}**
It was after the process of breaking bread that He said; this is my body, which is broken for you. *An unbroken loaf does not portray His body broken or wounded for sin or the veil torn in twain (Matt 27:51) by which Christ became our high priest. He could not be a priest while still alive (Heb 9:15-26).*
One may say, when a partitioner breaks off his portion to consume, isn't it then His body which is broken for you? The answer is no. The purpose of the partitioner's breaking is to receive his portion. It is evident that these understand not the meaning of the sacrifices. It is not enough to do that,

which, has the appearance of good; but we must do it from a right scriptural principle, in a right manner, for a right conclusion. Jesus first gave thanks for the loaf, then broke it before confirming it to be the His body broken. Without that process complete it cannot be said, 'the Lords body broken' or 'the veil torn in twain.' Whatever we do righteously is by authority of the Lord. Jesus said; God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. (John 4:24). *The truth is, Jesus established His memorial, first giving thanks for, then breaking the bread with an act of praise declaring it as His body broken, let's turn to;*

Mark 14:22-24 (22) And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and **blessed, and brake it, and gave to them**, and said, Take, eat: this is my body.

(23) And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it.

(24) And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many.

{This "breaking" of the bread represented the sufferings of Jesus about to take place - his body "broken" or wounded for sin. Hence, Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:24 adds, "This is my body which is broken for you;" that is, which is about to be broken for you by death, or wounded, pierced, bruised, to make atonement for your sins. It is to call to "remembrance," in a vivid manner, the dying sufferings of our Lord. (Barnes' Notes on the Bible)**}**.

But just how did the practice of "individual breaking" of an unbroken loaf begin? After many years people tend to forget, tend to accept unbibical doctrines, tend to heed profane and vain babblings. There is a letter authored by Bro. J.D. Logan that touches on these issues, I offer a portion for your consideration; **{**In 1928 Harper and J N Cowan (a prominent cups teacher) held a debate on the question of the cup. This was conducted in Graham, Texas. It was because of the notoriety of this proposal that Cowan made the following

statement: "The Bible tells us *in like manner Jesus also took the cup*...If we can divide (break) the loaf, we can also divide the cup." Then he said, "The next thing we know, you boys will be advocating that we shouldn't divide the loaf." Harper took the bait and replied, "I will affirm that it is unscriptural to divide the loaf." This precipitated a night-long augment with Bro. Bedingfield on one side, and the others against him. This was the beginning of the public rupture in the churches over this subject. (J.D. Logan)**}**
Please turn to;
Galatians 1:6-9 (6) I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel:
(7) Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.
(8) But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.
(9) As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.
{THE BREAKING OF THE LOAF PROPOSITION V. by Alexander Campbell. We have said the loaf must be broken before the saints partake of it. Jesus took a loaf from the paschal table and broke it before he gave it to his disciples. They received a broken loaf, emblematic of his body once whole, but by his own consent, broken for his disciples. In eating it we then remember that the Lord's body was by his own consent broken or wounded for us. (The Millennial Harbinger, Vol. I, 1830)**}**
The breaking of the loaf, is both scriptural and historically correct, unbroken is neither scriptural or historical.
When Jesus broke bread at the establishment of His memorial, He was following an already stated custom of the Jews passover, however for a different purpose, listen to Paul;
The bread which **we break**, is it not the communion of the

body of Christ? (1Cor 11:16). *Observe; Paul said, the bread which **we break**, not the bread which **they break**.*
Jesus hath broken down the middle wall of partition (Eph 2:14) graphically shown in Matthew 27:50-54 as the veil torn in twain and further explained in
Hebrews 10:19-20 (19) Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus,
(20) By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh;
There was in all respects a resemblance between the veil and the flesh of Jesus, not that the veil was in any manner typical of his body, but there was a resemblance in the respect under consideration, in the fact that the holy place was rendered accessible by withdrawing the veil, and that heaven was rendered accessible through the slain body of Jesus.
According to Sefer Yohassin written by the Zacuto, the tradition of breaking bread came from King Hezekiah. So, obviously Judaism had been "breaking bread" for a long time prior to Christ and that was the reason Christians were meeting on the first day of the week. The first day of the week worship was an Apostolic order, don't take my word, turn with me to;
1Corinthians 16:1-2 (1) Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye.
(2) Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.
{(1) That there is here clear proof that the first day of the week was observed by the church at Corinth as holy time. If it was not, there can have been no propriety in selecting that day in preference to any other in which to make the collection. It was the day which was set apart to the duties of religion, and therefore an appropriate day for the exercise of charity and the bestowment of alms. There can have been no reason why

this day should have been designated except that it was a day set apart to religion, and therefore deemed a proper day for the exercise of benevolence toward others.
(2) this order extended also to the churches in Galatia, proving also that the first day of the week was observed by them, and was regarded as a day proper for the exercise of charity toward the poor and the afflicted. And if the first day of the week was observed, by apostolic authority, in those churches, it is morally certain that it was observed by others. This consideration, therefore, demonstrates that it was the custom to observe this day, and that it was observed by the authority of the early founders of Christianity. (Barnes' Notes on the Bible)**}**.
It appears from the whole that the first day of the week, was the day on which their principal religious meetings were held in Corinth and the Churches of Galatia and Troas (Acts 20:7); and, consequently, in all other places where Christianity had prevailed. This is a strong argument for the keeping of the first day of the week as the Christian day of worship. We may observe that the apostle follows here the rule of the synagogue; it was a regular custom among the Jews to make their collections for the poor on the Sabbath day, that they might not be without the necessities of life, and might not be prevented from coming to the synagogue. The day, Upon the first day of the week,.... In an ancient copy of Beza's, and in some others, it is added, "the Lord's day". The Syriac and Arabic versions render it, "every first day". Breaking bread on the first day of the week, and no other, is the stated command, (Acts 20:7). How many verses, then, are necessary to establish the day of religious duties for the Church of Christ? Why are there so many variations on the very doctrines Christ himself established while He was on earth. Allow me to ask, what is faith if one does not heed, follow and practice what faith contains? The same was true for Judah, let's return to;

Malachi 2:7-11 (7) For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the LORD of hosts.
(8) But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the LORD of hosts.
(9) Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law.
(10) Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers?
(11) Judah hath dealt treacherously, and an abomination is committed in Israel and in Jerusalem; for Judah hath profaned the holiness of the LORD which he loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange god.
What Malachi said of the covenant of the priesthood, is true of the covenant of grace made with all believers, as spiritual priests. It is a covenant of life and peace; it assures all believers of all happiness, both in this world and in that to come. It is an honor to God's servants to be employed as His messengers. The priest's lips should not keep knowledge from His people, but keep it for them. Those ministers, and those only, are likely to turn men from sin, who preach sound doctrine, and live holy lives according to the Scripture. Many departed from His way; thus they misled the people. Those that walk with God in peace and righteousness, and turn others from sin, honor God; he will honor them, while those who despise him shall be lightly esteemed.
{[The prophecy of Malachi deals with the people brought back from the captivity of Babylon, and is most important as shewing the moral condition of the people consequent upon their return. Its last Verses evidently close the testimony of Jehovah to the people, till the coming of him who should prepare the way of Jehovah, in a word, till John the Baptist. The law and

the prophets were until John, and Malachi is professedly, and from the nature of his testimony, the last. The great moral principle unfolded in the book, is the insensibility of the people to that which Jehovah was for them, and to their own iniquity with respect to Jehovah-their want of reverence for God, their despisal of Jehovah. Alas! this insensibility had reached such a point that, when the very actions that proved their contempt were laid before their consciences, they saw no harm in them. Nevertheless this did not alter the purposes and counsels of God, although it brought judgment on those who were guilty of it. All was prepared to put the people morally to the proof, with respect to the accomplishment of this, at the time when John the Baptist was sent; but Israel had not ears to hear, and all was lost. The longsuffering of God towards Israel had been great; for, when they had rejected His Son, He sent them-through the intercession of that same well-beloved Saviour on the cross-the message by the mouth of Peter, that, if they repented, the Christ whom they had slain would return. But their leaders were more than deaf to this grace on the part of God, and their house still remains empty and desolate. (Darby's Bible Synopsis)].

Your house need not remain empty and desolate because; Faith cometh by hearing the word of God and is the effect of belief; FAITH-is destroying the love of sin, Repentance-is destroying the practice of sin, Confession-is destroying the pleasures of sin, and Baptism-is destroying the very state of sin. The blessing of grace by faith in Christ is to great to bypass, do not delay, come repenting, confess Jesus and be baptized into Him for remission of your sins. If prayer is in need for other reasons, in either case come while we sing.

This message approved by
Jack Warford
a minister for Christ

On The Meaning of “Break” as Pertaining to the Loaf of the Lord’s Supper (As defined by two of the most able scholars of both Greek and Hebrew: Adam Clark, LLD, FSA & Alexander Campbell)
Adam Clark on Matt 26:26, *“And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body.”*
“We often read in the scriptures of “breaking bread”, but never cutting it. The Jewish people had nothing similar to our high raised loaf: their bread was made broad and thin, and was consequently brittle, and to divide it there was no need of a knife. The breaking of the bread I consider essential to the proper performance of this solemn and significant ceremony, because it was designed by our Lord to shadow forth the wounding, piercing, and breaking of His body upon the cross; and, as all this was essentially necessary to the making a full atonement for the sin of the world, so it is of vast importance that this apparently little circumstance, AS THE BREAKING OF THE BREAD, should be carefully attended to, that the godly communicant may have every necessary assistance to enable him to discern the Lord’s body. That the breaking of this bread to be distributed, and is a necessary part of this rite is evident, first by the continual mention of St. Paul and all the evangelists, when they speak of the institution of this sacrament, which shows it to be a necessary part of it. Secondly, our Lord said, “1 Corinthians 11:24 And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, “Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you.” (1 Cor. 11:24).
But when the elements are not broken, it can no more be said, “this is my body broken for you”, than were the elements not given. Thirdly, our Lord said, “this do in remembrance of me”, eat this bread, broken in remembrance of my body broken on the cross; now when there is no body broken is distributed, there, nothing can be eaten in memorial of this broken body. Lastly, the Apostle, by saying “The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” sufficiently informs us that the eating of a BROKEN body is necessary to that end. (1 Cor.10:16). Hence it was that this rite, of distributing bread BROKEN continued for a thousand years, and was, as Hambertus testifies, observed in the Roman church in the eleventh century. At the present the opposite is as boldly practiced as if the real scriptural rite had never been observed in

the church of Christ." From Clark's Commentaries.
Alexander Campbell on the one loaf at the Lord's table.
"We have said that the loaf must be BROKEN before the saints partake of it. Jesus took a loaf from the paschal table and broke it before He gave it to His disciples. They received a broken loaf, emblematic of His body once whole, but by His own consent broken for His disciples. In eating it we then remember that the Lord's body was by His own consent broken and wounded for us. Therefore, he that gives thanks for the loaf should break it, not as the representative of the Lord, but after His example; and after the disciples had partaken of this loaf, handing it to one another, or while they are partaking of it, the disciple who brake it partakes with them of the same loaf, thus, they all have communion with the Lord and with one another in eating the broken loaf. And, thus, they as priests feast upon His sacrifice. For the priests eat of the sacrifices and were partakers of the altar. The proof of this found in Matt. 26, Mark 14, Luke 22, and 1 Cor. 10. In each of which his breaking of the loaf after giving thanks and before His disciples partook of it, is distinctly stated." From "Christian System", page 329.
In his report of the churches he visited (pg. 353), setting forth their method and manner of procedure in the public assembly on the first day worship, when he came to the manner of partaking the Lord's Supper, the one officiating at the table, "RAISED THE LOAF IN HIS HAND, AND SIGNIFICANTLY BRAKE IT, AND HANDED IT TO THE DISCIPLES ON EACH SIDE OF HIM, WHO PASSED THE BROKEN LOAF FROM ONE TO ANOTHER, UNTIL THEY ALL PARTOOK OF IT."
Note: These two accounts agree perfectly with the scriptural writings cited. This practice was continued by churches of Christ for over a thousand years until the year 1928, when several preachers began to advocate that we should not (significantly) break the bread before passing to the congregation, but should merely "break off" a piece (and eat it) before passing to the congregation. This, of course, required proof that Christ "broke off" a piece and ate it, which they cannot do, inasmuch so that the scriptures do not teach it. This scriptural practice is still practiced by a small minority of congregations throughout our nation to the

present day.
Many are the arguments advanced by the advocates of this innovative practice, but always falling short of success because it cannot be proven. This, however, is not the thrust of this article: merely the testimony of these two scholars, one of which was a member of Christ's body.
J. D. Logan

Info concerning the division
over the individual bread breaking question.

First, some background as related to me by J S Bedingfield.
This practice (individual breaking) had never been practiced prior to 1928 but had been proposed through the paper THE TRUTH, published by E H Harper of Sneads, Florida.
(I believe the initials are correct, but possibly wrong on one)
It had been taken up by some few about 1928 through the paper.
It was an attempt to combat an argument by the cups preachers in debate on that subject, which was raging at that time.
In 1928 Harper and J N Cowan (a prominent cups preacher) held a debate on the question of the cup. This was conducted in Graham, Texas. In attendance were Homer King, Homer Gay, J D (Doug) Phillips, J S Bedingfield, along with Dorothy Sage, age 16 (a school teacher in New Mexico at the time), Lurana McCluskey, and others. They were all staying at Bro Franklin's house at Seymour, TX.
It was because of the notoriety of this proposal that Cowan made the following statement:" The Bible tells us in like manner Jesus also took the cup...If we can divide (break) the loaf, we can also divide the cup" Then he said, "The next thing we know, you boys will be advocating that we shouldn't break the loaf."
Harper took the bait and replied, "I will affirm that it is unscriptural to divide the loaf".
This precipitated a night-long argument with Bro Bedingfield on one side, and the others against him. This was the beginning of the public rupture in the churches over this subject.
Following the debate, Homer King returned to Lebanon, Missouri and began to propose this digression in the churches there and also (to my knowledge) in New Mexico where he was known. Phillips went West and worked privately among members of many congregations introducing this practice. He subverted the congregations at El Centro, Montebello, East Los Angeles, (Siskiyou St) and others.
(This was the congregation where the Nichols
family attended; Paul, Ray, Nelson, along with their parents)
Bro Jim Taylor (Bill's grandfather), along with the Elmer Hunts rejected this and began meeting in North Long Beach, and finally Bellflower.) An interesting note: Many years later, my

step-mother's brother in law, Ed Atchley attended the congregation at Austin, Texas, where Phillips was preaching at the time of his death a few years later.
Visiting in Modesto where we lived at the time, he stated to my father that Phillips no longer contended for this practice exclusively; he would accept either practice. I wonder how he felt about the troubles he helped introduce into the churches.
This much I am certain of from my personal acquaintance with J S Bedingfield, J D Stark, Dorothy Sage, and others.
At the time of the recording (on C D) with Dorothy Sage, she was the last remaining attendee at the debate where this all started.
J D Logan

Proposition 5 –The one loaf must be broken before the saints feast upon it, which has obtained for this institution the name of "breaking the loaf."

But some, doubtless, will ask, 'Is it not called the Lord's Supper?' Some have thought, amongst whom is Dr. Bell, that 1 Cor. 11:20. applies to the feasts of love or charity, rather than the showing forth the Lord's death. These may read the passage thus:--'But your coming together into one place is not to eat a Lord's supper; for in eating it every one takes first his own supper; alluding, as they suppose, to a love feast eaten before the breaking the loaf.' But this Lord's supper iscontradistinguished from their own supper. And might it not as reasonably be said, you cannot call your showing forth the Lord's death a Lord's supper; for before eating it you have eaten a supper of your own, which prevents you from making a supper of it? You do not make it a Lord's supper, your supper. Nor, indeed, could the Corinthians call any eating a "Lord's supper," conducted as was the eating of their own suppers; for one ate and drank to excess, while another who was poor, or had no supper to bring, was hungry and put to shame. Could this be called a supper in honor of the Lord!

But as the Lord had eaten a religious supper, had partaken of the paschal lamb with his disciples, before he instituted the breaking of the loaf, and drinking of the cup, as commemorative of his death, it seems improper to call it a supper; for it was instituted and eaten after a supper. Not in the sense of one of the meals of the day, can it be called either dinner or supper; for it supplies the place of no meal. Deipnos,here rendered supper, in the days of Homer, represented breakfast.

12 It also signified food in general or a feast. In the times of Demosthenes, it signified a feast or an evening meal. But it is of more importance to observe, that it is in the New Testament used figuratively as well as literally. Hence, we have the

gospel blessings compared to a supper. We read of the 'marriage supper of the Lamb,' and 'the supper of the Great God.' Jesus says, 'If any man open to me, I will (deipneso) take supper with him and he with me.' When thus used it neither regards the time of day, nor the quantity eaten. If applied, then, to this institution it is figuratively, as it is elsewhere called "
the feast." For not only did the Lord appoint it, but in eating it we have communion with the Lord.The same idiom with the addition of the article occurs in Rev. 1:10. 'he kuriake hemera,' the Lord's day. Upon the whole it appears more probable that the Apostle uses the words kuriakos
deipnos, or Lord's supper, as applicable to the breaking of the loaf for which they gave thanks in honor of the Lord, than to their own supper or the feasts of love, usual among the brethren. If we say in accordance with the Apostle's style, the Lord's day, the Lord's table, the Lord's cup, we may also say the Lord's supper. For in the Lord's house these are all sacred to him.

As the calling of Bible things by Bible names is an important item in the present reformation, we may here take the occasion to remark, that both "the Sacrament" and "the Eucharist" are of human origin. The former was a name adopted by the Latin church; because the observance was supposed to be an oath or vow to the Lord; and, as the term sacramentum signified an oath taken by a Roman soldier, to be true to his general and his country, the presumed to all this institution a sacrament or oath to the Lord. By the Greek church it is called
the Eucharist, which word imports the giving of thanks, because before participating, thanks were presented for the loaf and the cup. It is also called the communion, or "the communion of the saints;" but this might indicate that it is exclusively the communion of saints; and, therefore, it is more consistent to denominate it literally 'the breaking of the loaf.' But this is the only preliminary to the illustration and proof of our fifth proposition.

We have said that the loaf must be broken before the saints partake

of it. Jesus took a loaf from the paschal table and broke it before he gave it to his disciples. They received a broken loaf, emblematic of his body once whole, but by his own consent broken for his disciples. In eating it we then remember that the Lord's body was by his own consent broken or wounded for us. Therefore, he that gives thanks for the loaf should break it, not as the representative of the Lord, but after his example; and after the disciples have partaken of this loaf, handing it to one another, or while they are partaking of it, the disciple who brake it partakes with them of the broken loaf
--thus they all have communion with the Lord and with one another in eating the broken loaf. And thus they as priests feast upon his sacrifice. For the priests ate of the sacrifices and were thus partakers of the altar. The proof of all that is found in the institution given in Matt. 26:1-75: Mark 14:1-72: Luke 22:1-71: and 1 Cor. 11:1-34: In each of which his breaking of the loaf, aftergiving thanks, and before his disciples partook of it, is distinctly stated. It is not, therefore, strange, that the literal designation of this institution should be, what Luke has given it in his Acts of Apostles thirty years after its
institution. The first time he notices it is Acts 2:42. when he calls it emphatically te klasei tou artou, the breaking of the loaf, a name at the time of his writing, A.D. 64, universally understood. For, says he, in recording the piety and devotion of the first converts, 'they continued steadfast in the teaching of the Apostles, in the fellowship, in the breaking of the loaf,in the prayers--praising God.' It is true, there is more than breaking a loaf in this institution. But, in accordance with general, if not universal usage, either that which is first or most prominent in laws, institutions, and usages, gives a name to them. Thus we have our Habeas Corpus,our Fieri Facias, our Nisi Prius, our Capias,our Venditioni Exponas, names given from the first words of the law. But to break a loaf, or to break bread,was a phrase common amongst the Jews to denote ordinary eating for refreshment. For example, Acts 2:46. 'Daily, with one accord, they continued in the

temple and in breaking bread from house to house. They ate their foodwith gladness and simplicity of heart.' Also, after Paul had restored Eutychus at Troas, we are informed he brake a loaf and ate. Here it must refer to himself, not only because it is used indefinitely,but because he that eats is the same number with him that breaks a loaf. But when an established usage is referred to, the article or some definite term ascertains what is alluded to. Thus, Acts :42. it is 'the
breaking of the loaf.' And Acts 20:7. it is 'They assembled for the breaking of the loaf.' This loaf is explained by Paul, 1 Cor. 10:16. 'The loaf which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ.' This proposition being now, as we judge, sufficiently evident, we shall proceed to state our sixth.
Proposition 6 –The breaking of the loaf and the drinking of the cup are commemorative of the Lord's death. Upon the loaf and upon the cup of the Lord, in letters which speak not to the eye, but to the heart of every disciple, is inscribed, "When this you see, remember me." Indeed, the Lord says to each disciple, when he receives the symbols into his hand, 'This is my body broken for you. This is my blood shed for you.' The loaf is
thus constituted a representation of his body--first whole, then wounded for our sins. The cup is thus instituted a representation of his blood--once his life, but now poured out to cleanse us from our sins. To every disciple he says, For you my body was wounded; for youmy life was taken. In receiving it the disciple says, "Lord, I believe it. My life sprung from thy suffering; my joy from thy sorrows; and my hope of glory everlasting from thy humiliation and abasement even to death." Each disciple, in handing the symbols to his fellow-
disciple, says, in effect, "You, my brother, once an alien, are now a citizen of heaven; once a stranger, are now brought home to the family of God. You have owned my Lord as your Lord, my people as your people. Under Jesus the Messiah we are one. Mutually embraced in the everlasting arms, I embrace you in mine: thy sorrows shall be my sorrows, and thy joys

my joys. Joint debtors to the favor of God and the love of Jesus, we shall jointly suffer with him, that we may jointly reign with him. Let us, then, renew our strength, remember our King, and hold fast our boasted hope unshaken to the end.""

Blest be the tie that binds Our hearts inChristian love; The fellowship of kindred minds Is like to that above."

Here he knows no man after the flesh. Ties that spring from eternal love, revealed in blood, and addressed to his senses, draw forth all that is within him of complacent affection and feeling, to those joint heirs with him of the grace of eternal life. While it represents to him 'the bread of life'--all the salvation of the Lord--it is the strength of his faith, the joy of his hope, and the life of his love.

13 This institution commemorates the love which reconciled us to God, and always furnishes us with a new argument to live for him who died for us. Him who feels not the eloquence and power of this argument, all other arguments assail in vain. God's goodness, developed in creation and in his providence, is well designed to lead men to reformation. But the heart, on which these fail, and to which Calvary appeals in vain, is past feeling, obdurate, and irreclaimable, beyond the operation of any moral power known to mortal man

Every time the disciples assemble around the Lord's table, they are furnished with a new argument also against sin, as well as with a new proof of the love of God. It is as well intended to crucify the world in our hearts, as to quicken us to God, and to diffuse his love within us. Hence it must in reason be a stated part of the Christian worship, in all Christian assemblies; which leads us to state, illustrate, and sustain the following capital proposition, to which the preceding six are all preliminary.

(The Millennial Harbinger, Vol. I, 1830)

Ref. Introduction to Malachi; Institute of Creation Research
Dictionary.com; harbinger (noun), anything that foreshadows a future event; omen; sign: Frost is a harbinge of winter.
(verb), to act as harbinger to; herald the coming of.
Matthew Henry's Concise Commentary
Barnes' Notes on the Bible
Rabbi Mayer Berlin's Talmudic Encyclopedia on Havdalah
Darby's Bible Synopsis
Breaking of the Loaf, Proposition V by Alexander Campbell
Letter by J.D. Logan

'Malachi' Revised 01082020
This message presented to; BaronOk-Sep2013/WestvilleOk-Feb2020 PineMt.Ar.-Feb2020/PleasentViewOk-March2020/