

Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 4

Article 95

9-1-1933

Miscellanea

P. E. Kretzmann

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kretzmann, P. E. (1933) "Miscellanea," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 4 , Article 95.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol4/iss1/95>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Miscellanea.

Concerning Sunday-School Literature.

Just how serious the situation is with regard to modernistic Sunday-school literature appears from a short article contributed to the *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* for May, 1933. We quote from this article: "When parents send their children to Sunday-school, they have a right to expect that they will be taught the Bible. But, alas! this is not often the case these days. Recently our ten-year-old daughter brought home a pupil's book entitled *Hero Stories and Being Heroic*, accompanied by a parents' guide. My child was to study for that quarter secular characters, or 'heroes,' such as Booker T. Washington, Clara Barton, Dr. Walter Reed, Samuel Morse, etc., and last of all the 'hero of heroes,' the 'boy Jesus.' There are 365 names in the Holy Scriptures emphasizing our Lord's deity, and there is something sacrilegious and repellant about that word 'hero' as applied to Him. The Scriptures do not hold up Christ as an example [except 1 Pet. 2, 21. — Ed.]; for men are neither saved nor sanctified by an *example* (Rom. 15, 3). Let us turn to 1 Pet. 1, 18—23, which assures us we are redeemed 'with the precious blood of Christ as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot.' From the above list one would think that the children were studying in the public school rather than a so-called Bible-school; for only meager portions of unrelated Scripture are selected, 98 per cent. of the time being devoted to music, nature study, good citizenship, hero-worship of mere man; in fact, everything else *but the Bible*. . . . The responsibility of those who teach is that of making known the Holy Scriptures, and that work cannot begin too soon. It is not final work, but it is fundamental. It cannot compel faith, but it can constrain it. . . . The greatest tragedy of the hour is that in so many cases, even on the part of those who are supposed to be doing Christian work, this most dynamic work of all is being largely neglected or done in such a manner as not to produce results. . . . How do *your* church and *your* teachers measure up? Are we furnishing our boys and girls 'comprehensive, consecutive, and complete Bible instruction?'—This outcry of an outraged mother is not only another testimonial for our Christian parish-schools, but also a strong argument for the splendid Sunday-school literature published by our Synod. It is encouraging to know that this is now being published in quantities second only to the International Series.

P. E. K.

The Omission of the Hallelujah during the Lenten Season.

That the *Hallelujah* or *Alleluia* of the Christian liturgy was taken over from that of the Jewish Church is a well-known fact. Equally well known is the meaning of the word according to the Hebrew *halclu*, "praise ye," and *Jah*, the abbreviated form of the name *Jahweh*, the Lord, or God, of the covenant, the expression thus meaning simply: "Praise ye the Lord." Its liturgical significance from ancient times agrees with its exact meaning, for it is always an acclamation of joy. Vigouroux writes in his *Dictionnaire de la Bible*: "It soon became a sort of formula for rejoicing, and it was sung as a chant of joy on feast-days. The streets of Jerusalem

are pictured to us as vibrant with the cry of *Alleluia*. . . . In the Apocalypse the saints give glory to God in heaven by singing *Alleluia*." In his *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* the noted French liturgiologist Cabrol writes: "*Alleluia* is used in its exact Hebrew sense, as a triumphant exclamation and as a chant."

In the Roman Church the *Hallelujah* is omitted from the liturgy from the Vespers of Septuagesima eve until the Vespers of the Great Sabbath, or the Holy Saturday. In the explanation which Dom Guéranger gives in his monumental work *The Liturgical Year* he states: "Our holy mother the Church knows how necessary it is for her to rouse our hearts from their lethargy and give them an active tendency toward the things of God. . . . She takes the song of heaven away from us: she forbids our further uttering that *Alleluia* which is so dear to us, as giving us a fellowship with the choirs of angels, who are forever repeating it. . . . It is not a mere word nor a profane, unmeaning melody; it is the song that recalls the land we are banished from, it is the sweet sigh of the soul longing to be home."

In accordance with this extravagant appreciation of the *Hallelujah* one can well understand why its omission becomes a matter of such deep sentiment with the Roman Catholics, so that its return on the eve of Easter is hailed with exultant chants. Just after the Epistle on Holy Saturday the organ peals forth, and priest and choir alternately chant the *Alleluia* three times, each time on a higher note, after which it is formally reintroduced into the liturgy.

Although the Lutheran Church also regards the period from Septuagesima to Ash Wednesday as the pre-Lenten season, it does not drop the *Alleluia* until the actual beginning of Lent, as a mark of respect to Him whose suffering and death is so prominently featured during this season. It is not necessary to drop the *Hallelujah* on the Sundays during Lent, for these are not properly considered as a part of Lent, although the regular lessons sometimes refer to the Lord's Passion. The return of the *Hallelujah* on Easter Day is properly emphasized in connection with the Introit of the day. This is sufficient for all liturgical purposes of the Lutheran Church.

P. E. K.

Birds of Jerusalem and Vicinity.

In an article in the April, 1933, number of *The Auk* R. W. Shepard discusses some birds of Jerusalem and vicinity which came under his observation during an extended stay. Of the forty-three species which he describes many come under the general heading of the "fowls of the air," spoken of by the Savior in Matt. 6, 26. On the other hand, quite a few may be identified as birds spoken of even in Bible times by their specific names. Although Ps. 84, 3 may refer to various kinds of small birds (Lev. 14, 14; Ps. 102, 7), there can be little doubt that Matt. 10, 29, 31 and Luke 12, 6, 7 speak of the common *house-sparrow*, of which not only the city of Jerusalem, but every small town or village or other human habitation has its full quota. We cannot be quite as sure of the "swallow" spoken of in Ps. 84, 3, although the description and the context in Jer. 8, 7; Is. 38, 14; Prov. 26, 2 would seem to indicate that the *oriental swallow* might be the migrant or possibly the *European chimney-swallow* (Tob. 2, 11), while the

red-rumped swallow has a characteristic chirp. The word "raven," used as a generic term in the Bible (for example, Job 38, 41; Ps. 147, 9; Prov. 30, 17), may refer either to the *Syrian rook* or to the *hooded crow*. It is difficult to settle the identity of the "owls" mentioned in the Bible, though a distinction is made between the great owl, the little owl, and the horned owl (cp. Lev. 11, 17; Deut. 14, 16; Is. 34, 11, also v. 15, with Lev. 11, 18 [cp. v. 10] and Deut. 14, 16, *tinshemeth*). According to Mr. Sheppard's article the little owl of Scripture may well be either the *southern little owl*, which is not uncommon in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, or the *short-eared owl*, which is numerous on the exposed hillsides. As for eagles and vultures the context in a number of passages would permit the supposition that we are dealing with the *golden eagle* or possibly the *imperial eagle* (Ezek. 17, 3; Micah 1, 16), while in other passages it is more likely that the *griffinvulture* or the *Egyptian vulture* is meant (Prov. 30, 17b; Matt. 24, 28). The "dove" of the Bible may be one of various wild pigeons found in cultivated parts of the Holy Land. The "stork," so frequently mentioned in the Bible, is the *white stork*, which visits the Jordan Valley as well as the Judean hills. Of value for the understanding of 1 Sam. 26, 20 is the fact that the *red-legged chukar partridge* is to be found everywhere over the mountains north and east of Jerusalem, being especially abundant on the grassy hills overlooking the Jordan Valley and the Dead Sea.

P. E. K.

"Raised — Rose."

When avowed enemies of the Savior, such as the ancient Arians and the present Modernists, deny the deity of Christ, according Him at best only a form of divinity which is hardly above that of any ordinary human being, their denial makes little impression upon the believing Christian, since their position immediately brings out the defense mechanism of the believer. But the position taken by modern subtle subordinationism is much more dangerous, since most of its proponents are in many respects staunch defenders of the truth. Their attitude is undoubtedly, consciously or unconsciously, influenced by the false exposition of Phil. 2, 5 ff. given by kenoticists of various kinds. That Christ's state of humiliation did not consist in His not *possessing*, but in His not *using constantly*, the divine attributes communicated to His human nature at the time of His incarnation has somehow not penetrated into their theological consciousness, and for that reason they persist in their views of subordinationism.

One of their chief difficulties seems to be with regard to the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. For does not Holy Writ time and again state that "God raised up Jesus, our Lord, from the dead," that He "was raised again for our justification"? Rom. 4, 24. 25. This statement is quite definite, and it can be multiplied many times; for there are more than thirty passages in the New Testament containing statements like the above, as any comprehensive concordance will show.

But over against these passages we have even more declarations (almost forty) which refer to the resurrection of Jesus as of an act of His own free will and power, an act not indeed of His human nature, but of His divine-human person. The most notable of these passages is found in John 10, 15. 17. 18: "I lay down My life for the sheep. . . . Therefore

doth My Father love Me, because I lay down My life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of My Father." Here the majesty of the omnipotent Son of God is speaking, and His words permit of no misunderstanding. They are as powerful as those which He spoke at the beginning of His public ministry, at the time of the first purging of the Temple: "Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up," John 2, 19. But in addition we find the word "rise" ("rose," "risen") used time and again, both by Christ and by the holy apostles, especially in the great Resurrection Chapter, 1 Cor. 15, 4, 12, and in more than thirty other passages, which the Bible-class leader may do well to list some time in a topic discussion on the resurrection of our Lord. It simply goes to show once more that Scripture does not contradict itself, but that there was complete harmony between the will of the Father and of the Son, just as there was full cooperation between the work of the Father and the Son in effecting the reconciliation of the world. It is a topic which cannot be studied too carefully or presented too emphatically.

P. E. K.

The Rubrics of the Marriage Ceremony.

It is somewhat unfortunate that our Agenda, or Service Book, is not as complete in its ritual directions as it might be. As a result some pastors are at a loss what they ought to advise or insist upon with regard, e. g., to the solemnization of holy matrimony. Yet some of the ancient rubrics concerning this sacred act contain some most interesting and, to some extent, enlightening information.

According to the ancient use of Salisbury the publication of banns on three successive Sundays was required, "the object being to guard against clandestine or unlawful unions." This object is in a measure attained by the license system as in use in this country, but it is a pity that the congregation no longer has the opportunity to show its direct interest in the marriages performed in its midst as according to the former custom. In some of the older service books a fourth publication of banns was included in the marriage ceremony proper, the beginning of this section reading: "If any of you can show just cause or impediment," etc.

Assuming that our churches for the most part recognize the validity of the betrothal or engagement, one may expect the espoused persons to approach the chancel according to the ancient rubrics: *vir a dextris mulieris et mulier a sinistris viri* (the man on the woman's right and the woman on the man's left), the rule being that this order is reversed in returning from the altar, the woman then walking on her husband's right side. This rule the ancient Church connected with the Marriage Psalm of Solomon: "Upon Thy right hand did stand the queen in a vesture of gold," Ps. 45, 10.

It is interesting to note that according to ancient English usage the given names only were used in the marriage ceremony. Even now the rubrics prescribe that only the baptismal name should be employed, which means the given name commonly used, with the family name, but not the full complement of names given in Holy Baptism and repeated, as a rule, at the rite of confirmation.

P. E. K.