

The Seminar

The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia

Volume II Commencement 1938 Numbers 5 and 6

C O N T E N T S

Page

Charles Michael Jacobs.	Luther D. Reed '95	3
Our Real Apostasy.	Russell D. Snyder '22	4
What Chance Has Christianity?	E.T. Bachmann '37	7
Through a Glass Darkly.	Hermann Miller '38	11
Symbols and Parables.	William J. Leifeld '39	14
The Whole Man.	Joseph Schantz '39	16
A Humanistic Pastime.	John N. Ritter '39	18
Asking Them Questions.	Robert A. Boettger '39	20
Notice!	John P. Stump '40	22
Antisemitism or Judeophilism?	I. Yost '40	25
The Last Supper.	John F. Ritter '39	27
Retrospect.	Robert W. Stackel '38	29

The October issue of TSE SEMINARIAN will be dedicated to the memory of our beloved teacher and friend, Dr. Charles Michael Jacobs.

We shall try not to duplicate the articles which have appeared in various church papers and magazines.

CHARLES MICHAEL JACOBS

A great, a good man has been called from the church militant to the church triumphant. We are stronger men, better men, for having known and loved him.

A tireless student of God's word and of Christian history; a faithful pastor and eminent preacher; a loving husband and father; an inspiring teacher and author with the gift of presenting the ripe fruits of scholarship in clear and convincing form; a wise administrator whose discipline of self enabled him to govern others; — his was a three dimensioned soul with ample breadth, depth, and height to his thinking and his living.

Brilliant, but constant; purposeful, but patient; courageous, yet considerate; deeply in earnest, but with a ready fund of humor; a counsellor and commander in the Church, and a friend, faithful and understanding; a molder of men and maker of history,—his was a strong, wise, brave spirit whose influence will live in the lives of thousands.

His place no man can take. Others will occupy his offices and do his work, but his place in the history of the Seminary, in the history of the Lutheran Church in America, and in the hearts of all who knew him, is secure.

May God grant him an abundant entrance into Life and Joy everlasting.

OUR REAL APOSTASY

"I want some ideas," said the editor of THE LUTHERAN. "I want an article," said the editor of THE SEMINARIAN. Pressed for time, I have decided to expand one of the ideas I submitted to Doctor Melhorn into an article for THE SEMINARIAN.

We believe that in Christ we have become children of God. We also believe that the doing of the Father's will ought to be our meat and drink. What does this involve?

Is it the Father's will that we should spend certain periods of the day on our knees in prayer? By all means, let us do it. Prayer is fellowship and it is manifestly the Father's will that we should live in fellowship with Him.

Is it the Father's will that we should read certain portions of the Scriptures every day? By all means, let us do it. The Scriptures are the Father's trysting place, where He comes to us and speaks to us and reveals Himself to us.

Is it the Father's will that we should enter frequently into that most sacred of all fellowships, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? By all means, let us do it. In Word and Sacrament Christ comes to us and offers us what Disraeli called "muscular Christianity," the power to overcome ourselves and the world. In Word and Sacrament He comes to us and offers us Himself.

Is it the Father's will that we should support the Church in all her enterprises? That we should try to inculcate Christian principles into the life of the nation? That we should abstain from even the appearance of evil? That we should feed the hungry, clothe the naked, minister to the sick and dying? By all means, let us do it. In all these acts and attitudes we are but doing the Father's will and the doing of the Father's will is to be our meat and drink.

But is that all? Have we not omitted something? I must confess to an uneasy feeling that in our conventional interpretations of the Father's will we are guilty of slighting the primary concern of the New Testament. We interpret the Father's will primarily in terms of ethical principles; the New Testament interprets it primarily in terms of reconciliation. We lay all the emphasis upon good deeds as such; in the New Testament the good deeds are but means to an end and the end is persons.

Consider, for example, St. Paul's conception of the Christian life as a ministry. The thought is that God is engaged in a process of reconciling the world to Himself and that in this process we are instruments in His hands. Now reconciliation, whatever else it may mean, is a process that involves persons. How can we say that we are exercising this ministry, how can we say that we have become instruments in the Father's hands, unless we bring persons into His fold?

Or consider the familiar allegory of the vine and the branches. "I am the vine, ye are the branches," says Jesus. What of the grapes on the branches? The answer is easy, we say; the grapes are good deeds. But is that the right answer? Or rather, is it the whole answer? To limit the application to any single category of fruitfulness would, no doubt, be precarious exegesis; at the same time we must acknowledge that there are sound reasons for believing that the conception is personal and evangelical throughout. Christ is the vine, the disciples are the branches. The grapes on the branches are not merely good deeds as such; they are persons. Even if we go back to the more conventional application of the allegory, we have to remember that in the New Testament good deeds have only ancillary significance. They are but means to an end; the end is persons.

Indeed, no matter how you look at it, the New Testament makes it very clear that the winning of

persons is the real business of the child of God. Someone (Carlyle?) once said, "Produce persons and the rest follows." That is a right Christian maxim. Produce persons, the right kind of persons, and the rest follows. With our Western minds and our Western outlook, we have shifted the emphasis from persons to principles, from persons to deeds, from persons to abstractions, not to speak of downright irrelevancies. This, as I told the editor of THE LITTELAN, is our real apostasy. Manifestly our first task is to get down on our knees and repent of this our apostasy; our next is to do what we can to win persons.

And the students at the Seminary can contribute to this goal by concentrating upon this phase of their preparation. We are not here to become specialists in abstractions; we are here to learn to bear testimony by word and by deed, the kind of testimony that will win persons. Before we can do this, we must pray for a little more of the love that is Christlikeness. "Your influence over a soul," wrote Pere Didon, "is conditioned by the depth of your love for it. In order to save it, and bring a divine influence to bear upon it, you must have a divine love for it." We believe that we already love men, but it is to be feared that we have only fallen in love with an abstraction, what Chesterton called anthropoids. We love humanity—after a fashion. Jesus did not love humanity; He loved men. And we have been called to be like Him. We have been called to minister to others as He ministered to the woman at the well, to minister to others to the end that they may be reconciled to God. The Westminster Catechism declares that the chief end of man is "to glorify God and enjoy Him forever." That, surely, fails to cover the ground. The chief end of man is to glorify God, by word and by deed, with the kind of testimony that will lead others to glorify Him. Think it over!

Written 3-14-58.

WHAT CHANCE HAS CHRISTIANITY?

Ineeling on a bench on the railway platform, and bowing reverently in the direction of Mecca, the conductor of the night train from Luxor to Cairo was saying his evening prayer. Now there is nothing at Luxor (located at the site of ancient Thebes, capitol of the famous Upper Kingdom) which does not recall some fact in connection with the religion of the ancient Egyptians. But at this moment the improvised prayer bench of the conductor at once reminded me that modern Egypt also is religious. In fact, to anyone who interests himself with such things, Egypt seems to exude religion.

The train was bringing me back to Cairo, strategic center of the Moslem world. Here all along the southern and eastern shore of the Mediterranean is the unique Arab civilization. It is altogether different in social customs, political institutions, philosophy of life and moral ideals from anything we have known under the name of Western civilization. Cairo is the brain center of the religion which has made this civilization. For the religion of Islam, with its 240 million adherents, presents not only an impressive front, but depends today for its driving power on the religious leadership of Cairo.

At el-Azhar University in Cairo, Islam has its leading school of learning. This institution is world famous in power and age. None may challenge its interpretation of the Koran, nor its standards of classical Arabic. For the Moslem world, a course of study there will yield the prestige and authority of a higher degree from Oxford, Paris or the top American universities.

Having visited the Azhar I was impressed not so much by the lively Arabic chatter which characterized the classes, as by the fact that here for nearly a thousand years the Koran, the tradition and law of Islam have been taught with

almost no variation. Time seems to have here stood still, and I left the place with a sense of humility and respect for a type of life and learning which for centuries has known how to reproduce itself without much loss of dynamic power. (A longer account of my visit to the Ashar is to appear in a forthcoming issue of THE LUTHERAN.

Along with this amazing and austere continuity Islam has made itself famous for its attacks upon Christianity. Perhaps when we study the history of the church we pay too little attention to the terrible struggles which have taken place between these two religions. Islam is the only great religion which is the sworn enemy of Christianity (Russian communism and neo-paganism are another matter), and its attacks have come in waves. The first was perhaps the most phenomenal and ended only at Tours in the eighth century. Then came the "God wills it" reaction of the crusades, which for Christianity did more harm than good, for a few centuries later Luther's greatest concern next to the pope was the terrible Moslem Turk. But since the Reformation, while Islam's threat seemed stemmed, and even Christians for example found favor with the Turkish government, nothing has happened which could change things for the better. Christians under Moslem rule have been gradually diminishing because of sustained persecution in the community. Although Western machine culture has been increasingly accepted in the Islamic world, persucution is again the haunting spectre in many a village and town. One who has seen the people it strikes cannot forget the impression.

If we wonder why this is so we must remember that the Moslem feels himself definitely superior to the Christian, or "Fazarene" as he calls him. For example he abstains quite consistently from the use of intoxicants; yet in Cairo one of the usual remarks about drunkenness is, "he's drunk as a Christian." Here then is one indication

how the Moslem identifies everything European or American with Christianity. If a business man pulls off a dirty deal, then one generalizes and says all the Christians are like that. And then if his government steps in to protect his business interests over against the Moslem's - as has happened all too often in Egypt - the cry goes up that this is Christianity penetrating and trying to conquer Islam. Then when, as in the Great War, Christian nations battle against each other and bargain for the favor of Moslem powers (read T. E. Lawrence, *Revolt in the Desert*), then the Mohammedan says he will have nothing to do with such a religion.

The religion of Islam has always been realistic and the Moslem cannot understand how anyone can prize ideas or ideals which he does not keep. He may therefore respect the missionary who lives his Christianity in all areas of life, yet he will frankly discourage him from continued mission effort. For the Moslem remembers the War and he is awakening to the burden which European imperialism has laid upon him. The post-war period has given him the slogan "the self-determination of nations." As a realist he wants to make this a fact. Note therefore the unrest not only in Egypt, but more so in other parts of the Mohammedan world; only we hear little of it.

In the face of this situation, this is the decisive hour of Christian missions. The direct method of missioning, that is, by a head-on argument against Islam and an attempted conversion through mainly intellectual channels, is by experience doomed to fail. Just as we use the indirect method to interest college boys in Christianity, so we must work among the Moslems. One may characterize them as fanatic, fatalistic, ignorant and superstitious. If so, then one must work gradually to change this way of life by good will, endless patience. Then they may come

to see the truth in the Christian revelation of God. Results are painfully meagre; yet one must be satisfied with even little. A discussion of religion between a Christian and a Moslem is always difficult, for the latter without fail suspects the former of ulterior motives and puts up all his defenses to block him, or to change the subject. In this attitude the chief of the Egyptian Broadcasting Company remarked to Mr. Wilbert Smith, senior secretary of the YMCA in Cairo, "Don't tell me that you're not trying to make little Christians of the boys down at your place." Mr. Smith's answer was the only one we too could give, "No, you're wrong, we're trying to make big Christians out of them."

If this hour is decisive for Christian missions, so is it for the Moslem religion. For Christianity is meeting the religious and ethical problems raised by modernity; and it would seem as though we are moving forward. Islam, on the other hand, at least till now, has refused to adjust itself in the face of change. No one will deny that among the Egyptians and Arabs old religious beliefs and moral standards are now disintegrating. Here then, if anywhere, is the chance for Christianity to prove itself over against Islam!

Cairo, March, 1938.

THROUGH A GLASS DARKLY

The first of modern philosophers deliberately made it his goal to cast aside all the wisdom of the men who had gone before him, and from a perfectly neutral basis to build up his own point of view. Of course, he did not deny all the knowledge of the past. But only by ignoring it as best he could did he feel that he might build a system of thought which would be truly his own. This fact, plus the fact that he would only accept as valid that which he clearly saw to be true are the facts that come most quickly to one's mind when one thinks of Descartes.

It is the first of these characteristics that occupies our attention. Descartes saw fit to doubt everything. His method has become the keyword of all the critical sciences. And the spirit of criticism has penetrated into all fields. That this temper has not been an unmitigated blessing one cannot deny. It has led to the destruction of values as well as to the questioning of false facts. The inevitable compensation comes even in our own age, not only in politics, but in theology, in increased authoritarianism.

It is a long, long jump, perhaps, from the preceding common enough generalizations to the classrooms of Mt. Airy. Perhaps a brief incident may serve to lessen the gap. In the Junior year of the present Senior class, one of the professors made a memorable remark. He had been the subject of a torrent of questions expressing uncertainties on serious doctrinal problems. To them he gave no clear-cut answer, but ventured the statement that by the time we were Seniors, all these questionings would vanish like the evil witches of Macbeth. (Needless to say, this is no verbatim quotation!)

Well, he proved to be an admirable prophet. In well-conducted tours through the fundamental

beliefs of Lutheranism we have absorbed enough answers to quell almost any questioner. Our implicit faith has been enunciated with far greater clarity than any of us could have hoped to do in an entire lifetime. And as he predicted our questions in class are no longer much concerned with doctrine, they are rather practical. But I should venture to say that in the minds of all there are still a few facts which must be "heroically gulped" because we haven't yet quite absorbed all the ways and wherefores sufficient to make them clear as day. They are too close to our realm of knowledge to have had time to be coated with living experiences, which alone can show true reality. There are and must be rich spaces for our faith to grow in.

The task before us then is to make our knowledge a real conviction, and to deepen the faith we already have. As a method for this one can turn back to our French scientist and the thoughts he had one winter afternoon as he sat by the fireside. His belief began with his doubts. Only thus could he make them really his own.

Now doubt has a bad name. It makes one think too much of those who know what is right but find it most convenient to escape the truth by attempting to deny it. And in church circles some doubt is rightly called heresy. But doubt, as I would like to think of it has none of these connotations. Instead of a stumbling block it is a cornerstone of faith. It is the sign of a growing conviction; something to distinguish it from petrified thought processes.

First of all, doubt need not be unbelief. Rather it is only imperfect belief. Therefore, everyone is a doubter for no one's belief is perfect. It is all "as through a glass darkly." And the sooner we recognize this the better. What we repeat in words is but a shadow of what the words represent. So if we find ourselves doubting in the sense I have mentioned, our attitude is

healthy, not ill. One of the primary distinctions between our teaching and that of the Methodist Church is that we maintain that one who is brought up in a Christian environment will not necessarily have that indispensable (to the Methodist) sense of conversion at a definite time and place. But, likewise, we must admit that though we have the certainty that we are "on the right road," yet we have never arrived at the destination, and our dogmatic statements will be tempered accordingly.

Secondly, doubt tends to clear away non-essentials and emphasize anew or for the first time the essentials. If we could sit by the fire-side as Descartes did and clear our minds of all our beliefs, perhaps the voice of God might have a little less interference than it does when we interpose all that which we have accepted through tradition, and muddled then by our own hazy thinking. And when we start questioning things, we should not jump on small insignificant facts. Rather, the more imposing the subject, the more necessary the doubt. One eminent divine went so far as to say that the only thing in religion that he ever had and still does have doubts about is the unbelievable love of God. But one can feel likewise that because of that very doubt, his faith is a much more vital force than if that love were always taken for granted like the probable annual rainfall. Doubt is the crucible out of which flow the refined metals of faith. Man is not born with the love of God. He must realize his inadequacy and then accept joyfully the gift of salvation. And lest his joy turn into a frozen grin, he must constantly realize through his doubt how perpetually new this gift is. We are born again, not once, but daily.

Professor Köberle, in the conclusion of his Quest for Holiness, states that "it is the tacit assumption of all theological study that our thinking and speaking will be moved by our conscience,

and ever and again moved by it anew, if everything is not to degenerate into a 'vain repetition of the he, then.' " And he quotes Luther as writing, "it is not a geometrical science, where it is enough if we have grasped it once, but we must always be learning it, and through tribulations we must be schooled in acquiring it." With such authority, we need not shrink, ostrich-like, from constructive doubt.

SYMBOLS AND PARABLES

Symbols and parables each represent a fascinating field of research. The modern mind seems rather to take them as distinctly separate and only remotely related; perhaps from our historical perspective this is a justifiable position. However, they are not only related; they are intrinsically bound up, philologically, historically, and practically.

Briefly consider their dependence upon the same Greek root "ballein" (to throw), the one with the prefix "syn" (together), the other with "para" (beside). Their kinship here is worth noting even though it proves little. How close they may have been in their early usage can not be claimed on this basis alone, for it is lost in antiquity. When we meet them in ancient Greek they already have divergent meanings—even more divergent than they are now. Could some hypothesis account for such a separation?

To look hastily at the history of these words, not particularly as words in themselves, but rather at the concepts which they as words, represent, we can establish for them a closer point of contact. Picturegraphs, ideographs, and hieroglyphics, the oldest types of recording ideas known, are symbols in the truest sense. Symbols, from the first, have been concerned with man's religious concepts.

Indeed, the term hieroglyphic means sacred carving. These, thanks to the Rosetta Stone, can be deciphered. There are many of the ancient symbols whose meanings remain a mystery, yet they stand as recordings of a forgotten thought-world.

Less buried in the past are the symbols of the Early Christian Church. With the spread of Christianity, all the existing knowledge was turned to the advancement and perpetuation of the Gospel Story. It is no surprise then to see symbols, long in use before the Advent of the Logos used to teach and record His Message. These Christians borrowed from all sources and read into and out of the time-worn symbols their new thought-patterns, mental associations, and relationships. This process continued and found its elaborate climax in the profound mental gymnastics of the Medieval metaphysicians. The more abstract one's thinking becomes the more one must rely on graphs of one kind or another, so Medieval religion multiplied and elaborated symbols on end.

Practically speaking symbols have been and are comparisons which arouse associations. That is also what parables are and do. As such they are representations of an idea or a related system of ideas. They portray relationships. That, essentially, is what we do with words. A grouping of words conveys to us the same type of comparisons, associations, and relationships as did symbols for the ancients. Thus symbols were used as and for comparisons, i.e., parables, at their very inception; and we use words and related word-groups for the same purpose.

Some people can be heard proudly condescendingly putting charitable interpretations on ancient and medieval thought, for it is common knowledge that modern thinkers have outdistanced this quaint and trite style of language. To find the true status and proper evaluation of any age one must turn to its Zeitgeist: ours is science. Nathan Smyth

in his book, *Through Science to God*, says, "The physicist of today quite frankly admits that he is merely drawing patterns and pictures and that his portrayals represent, not an external universe, but only the order and relationships which are discoverable in our real subjective, perceptive experiences." The danger, he warns is that "Mankind has continually erred in taking his pictures too literally." Nowhere has symbols and parables (as comparative relationships) been more in evidence and in wider usage than in the modern scientific world.

Symbols and parables touch every life, some with more discernment, some with less. Since they are man's way of understanding relationships, the more perfect the understanding and the wisdom, the more is one apt to present his concepts with them. One would expect a perfect perspective in a perfect man; one would further expect extreme clarity of thought and expression in such a One. The difficulty lies rather with those who attempt the interpretation than with the One who presents the relationships. About Christ, Matthew says in the 34th verse of the 13th chapter of his recording, "All these things Jesus spake unto the multitude in parables and without a parable spake He not unto them."

THE WHOLE MAN

From a study of First Thessalonians 4:1-12 I became acquainted with the fact that all the commentaries at my disposal agreed that verses 1 to 3 were directed solely against sins of sexual impurity. This form of sin is without a doubt included. However, careful and intensive study of the words and their compound formations in the Greek text has led me to the conclusion that Paul is here talking not only about part of man, but about the whole man. When Paul entreats the

Thessalonians to increase in godliness, he does not merely refer to their sexual nature, but to all of their human faculties, including the dynamics of sex, nourishment, and self-preservation. He points out to them that it is God's will that they should abstain from fornication. The next requirement of the will of God is "that each of you know how to possess his own vessel in holiness and honor." Recognized modern commentators agree that the word "vessel" refers to the body as the instrument of the soul. Paul makes the positive exhortation that we keep this mechanical body in holiness and honor. We are to determine to consecrate this physical body of ours to tasks which will aid God's work of sanctification in us, rather than hinder it; tasks which will bring honor rather than dishonor.

This positive exhortation takes on more meaning in the light of the negative qualification which follows. The Authorized Version gives the following translation: "not in the lust of concupiscence, even as the Gentiles who know not God." The words "lust of concupiscence" are not only an inadequate rendering, but are also misleading, as they narrow and limit the meaning contained in the original. "*En pathel epithumias*" has been made to refer by the translators of the Authorized Version only to a man's sexual appetites. I prefer to go to the root-meaning of the word 'epithumias,' and translate this phrase by the words "in the passion of heart-felt yearning." (*Thumos* means 'heart' or 'soul').

Paul is qualifying his exhortation to keep the body in holiness and honor by telling us how not to live. This injunction is directed against the practice of making physical and material objects and temporal desires the ruling passions in our lives. We yearn for many such things and we could avoid much misery and suffering if we did not try to satisfy all these yearnings and impulses, if

we but tried to guide them along more wholesome channels. Sexual appetites are naturally included here. But the translation, "lust of concupiscence," gives an undue prominence to only one of the natural functions of man. It does not take into consideration the natural, biological drives which may be just as devastating as a man's unregulated sexual desires. What could be a greater hindrance to God's process of sanctification in a man, than if that particular man had to resort to stealing his food to satisfy his hunger; or what could keep him further away from God, than if he were forced continually to kill people in order to insure his own physical safety?

A HUMANISTIC PASTIME

From the very earliest times, when Scriptures were written to be read, it had been the custom of many to translate them into various languages. It would be impossible to tell exactly how many different translations have been done. A list of all the languages used would not even give a hint to the number of translations, either available or lost. Down through the centuries certain men have fancied themselves translators. With some there was that burning desire to give the Word to the people in their own language; to some it was only a method of exegesis; to others, perhaps most of them, it was only a humanistic pastime. Hundreds of Bibles representing the hundreds of "indoctrinations" and pleasures of men.

The pastime still appeals. I have often enjoyed it, (together with having derived some little learning, I hope), and wish to pass this pleasure on to you. Why not begin at the beginning of the Gospel, from Matt. 1:17 to quote:

Consequently there are fourteen birthrights from Abraham to David, fourteen from David to the

Babylonian Captivity, and fourteen from the Babylonian Captivity to Christ.

But in contrast to the other birthrights the birth of Christ was truly thus: When Mary his mother was promised to Joseph in marriage, before they were united, she learned that she was pregnant by the Holy Spirit. But since Joseph, her espoused, was a just man and did not want her to be seen, he wished to send her away secretly. Having thought over these things however, the Angel of the Lord (you see) appeared to him in a dream, saying: Joseph, descendant of David, do not hesitate to take Mary as your wife, for what is born in her is of the Holy Spirit, she will indeed bear a son, and you are to name him JESUS: for he will save his people from their sins. This I say all happened for the fulfillment of what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, when he said: Behold, a maiden shall conceive, and bear a son, and they will name him Emmanuel, (which means God with us). Then Joseph starting from his sleep did just what the Angel of the Lord commanded him to do: he was married. But he did not acknowledge her until she had her firstborn son. He named him Jesus.

When Jesus was born in Bethlehem Juda during the reign of King Herod, Magi, that is, learned men from Persia, came to Jerusalem asking: Where is he who is born king of the Jews? We in the East have heard of his rising, and have come to worship him. King Herod hearing this was disturbed, and all Jerusalem with him. And calling together all the high priests and the scribes of the people, he sought to find out from them where the Messiah was to be born. But they told him: In Bethlehem of Judea, for thus it is written through the Prophet: And thou Bethlehem in the land of Juda are by no means the least among the rulers of Juda, for from you a leader will come who will shepherd Israel my people.

Then Herod, having called the learned men aside begged them to tell him the time of HIS RISING, but

—sending them to Bethlehem said: Go, and seek diligently for the boy, and when you have found him, report to me, that I might come to worship him. Who, when they had finished the audience went away, and——. (End of quote).

Have you also left me? That is a sample of the humanistic pastime. If you have taken no offense perhaps you might want to continue the quotation in your own language. And if you were offended may I assure you that this "translation" was not "authorized."

Book Review

ASKING THEM QUESTIONS

(Problems in Religious Faith and Life)

Edited by Ronald Selby Wright

Published by Oxford University Press, 1936

One night, at a regular meeting, the members of the St. Giles' Cathedral Club for Boys in Edinburgh, were handed slips of paper. Each boy was asked to write the religious problem which most perplexed him. This book contains those questions and their answers.

The nature of the questions asked by the boys, none of whom were over eighteen at the time, makes the book unique among its kind. Compare "What is Meant by the Kingdom of God?", "What Was Christ's Position as God if He Prayed to God?", "Is It Possible to Reconcile the Thought of Eternal Punishment with an All-loving God?", "Why Should a Christian Man not Be a Communist?" with the type of questions that find expression, if not always answers, in our own informal discussions. To an American reader, the level of religious maturity these boys display in their queries seems an unfavorable commentary on our Luther League programs.

Space will not permit citation of any of the answers. In general they are clear, though not always easy. Now and then there is a touch of British self-satisfaction; but most of the problems are met fairly and answered as simply as possible, logically, warmly, stimulatingly. The writers, clergymen and laymen, are university professors, ministers, bishops. Many are Anglican, some members of the Society of Jesus, some Presbyterians.

As to the values and use of the book, clearly it is usable in Young People's organizations. In answer to the question: "Need a Christian Go to Church?", Rev. Dr. William D. Maxwell says, "Youth, with its splendid power of harnessing action to vision, will not forsake the churches, but on the contrary will insist upon them being made finer and more beautiful, fitting houses for the worship of God. Let the vigor and enthusiasm of our youth, seeing visions of what our churches might be, shape a nobler tradition in our day for the generation to come." In so saying, though he is speaking of church buildings, he makes the same sort of appeal which the whole book possesses, the end at which the answers to these questions are aimed.

Many of the answers are inspirational toward finer Christian living. Thus the book becomes an excellent reference for leaders of many church organizations. It will help them make the necessary transfer for themselves and their followers from dogmatics to everyday life.

NOTICE!

"Precisely at 6 o'clock A.M. the bell will be rung, when the students shall promptly rise, and at 45 minutes thereafter shall assemble in the Chapel for morning worship."

Fisions of sleepy-eyed Seminary students filling into the chapel every morning at 6:45 are comfortably dispelled by the date of the RULES AND REGULATIONS of which the above notice is but a part. It would seem that in the early days of our Seminary a quite different mode of life prevailed. Even a hasty glance at the copy of the RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE STUDENTS OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY in our library will bear this out.

The Seminary opened its doors seventy-four years ago on the second floor of 42 North Fifth Street. The first floor of the building was used by the Lutheran Publication Society. However, a year later, in 1865, the purchase of a Seminary building at 212 Franklin Street was approved. The Franklin Street building, enlarged to accommodate sixty students in 1873, was used for twenty-four years. It was in these early years that the RULES which I have mentioned above were extant. Here are a few examples from a list of twenty-five:

"Any unprofitable expenditure of time is strictly forbidden.

"An unexceptionable friend of any Student may be permitted to take an occasional meal in the house, proper notice having been previously given to the Steward, on the payment of 25 cents for each meal, by the party inviting, who will be held responsible for the payment.

"To all Students boarding in the Seminary, the charge will be \$3.25 a week. Every Student shall pay \$2.00 a month for gas and fuel to the Treasurer of the Synod.... All Students shall have the privilege of having washing and mending done outside of the building; but they can have such work done in

the building for 37½ cents a week, if they so desire. In such cases they are expected to be considerate in the quantity offered.

"No blacking of boots or shoes will be permitted in the chambers or vestibules. Bursnes, blacking, etc., are to be kept and used either in the yard or in such suitable places as the Steward may provide. In every room three chairs are permitted.

"The house shall be closed regularly at 11:00 P.M. after which hour Students may be out only after having previously obtained special permission of the House Father. Students will devote the hours 8 to 12 A.M. and 2 to 6 P.M. to earnest study of lectures and recitations. These hours shall not be occupied by promenading the streets of the city, or by unprofitable conversation, or by paying or receiving visits.

"All attendance of places of amusement of a doubtful or sinful character, such as the Theatre, Circus, etc., visits to drinking saloons, etc., are strictly and unconditionally forbidden. The inordinate use of tobacco is also prohibited. No smoking is allowed during the hours from 8 to 12 A.M. and 2 to 6 P.M. Smoking in the Chapel, Lecture Rooms, Dining-hall is prohibited at all times, so also is smoking on the streets and highways of the city proper.

"No musical instrument, including the Cabinet Organ, shall be used in the building, except between the hours 12 to 2 and 6 to 9 P.M.

"Tardiness in appearing at devotional exercises as well as absence, shall by the Executive Committee be reported to the House-Father.

"The students shall be careful to keep their rooms in good order, and not to break furniture or deface the building, observing neatness and system in every respect.

"The Students of the Senior Class will, on the first Monday after the opening of the Seminary in the autumn, and on the first day of every

following month, elect by ballot an Executive Committee of three members of the Senior Class, which Committee elect their own chairman. This Committee shall endeavor to procure the observance of the RULES AND REGULATIONS of the Seminary.

"The design of the foregoing regulations is to assist the Students in the cultivation of a sound, earnest Christian character as well as to maintain the good order of the Seminary. The Faculty are happy in the conviction that the Students will heartily cherish among themselves such sincerity and earnestness in the spirit of the Gospel, as to render a cheerful and uniform obedience to the provisions of the Law."

Times have changed! Haven't they? And even then times were changing. For a considerable length of time the need for a new location was felt. In his "Philadelphia Seminary Biographical Record" Dr. Reed has made this entry for the year 1881, "The question of removal to secure more healthful conditions was discussed. Several deaths had occurred among the Students in previous years. The need for proper room for the Library and for a resident Professor was greatly felt."

In 1889, after many years of dreaming and planning, the Seminary moved to this present site where the dormitory had just been completed. In the past forty-nine years in Mt. Airy a number of buildings have been added: the Library, Chapel, Refectory, Heating Plant, Graduate Hall, and eight dwellings for the President and the Faculty. In considerable part this has been made possible by the generosity of individuals. All of us are benefitting by it.

ANTISEMITISM OR JUDEOPHILISM?

An honest man pays his debts; and if he can, he pays those of his father. Christians of today have debts to pay—some of their own making, some made by their fathers. In America we owe debts of Christian love to the Jew among others. But some, perhaps unconsciously, are adding to that debt, rather than decreasing the lump sum. In preaching that centers around the cross and the crucifixion the Jew is naturally involved. And it has been on this very question that so large a debt has been made by Christians, and some hint that the debt is still on the increase. Referring to the way in which some religious teachers describe the crucifixion and the Jew, Dr. Moehlman of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, wrote in 1933: "The excellent ethical teaching given the youth of the United States by Public Education is sometimes nullified by one-half hour instruction in such a religious education class." (C. H. Moehlman: The Christian-Jewish Tragedy, p. 18). Is the Jew today still suffering as he did in the past because we regard him as a Christ-killer? Does your attitude show antisemitism, or Judeophilism?

Some of us do not realize the way in which the Jew has suffered at the hands of nominal Christians during the Christian era. At the time of the Crusades thousands of Jews along the Rhine and in France and elsewhere were killed by the soldiers of the cross because they were "murderers of our dear Lord." The Inquisition was used against Jews just as against heretics. During the past generation, before the Revolution in Russia, Good Friday was a day of terror for all Russian Jews, for on this day the priests led the simple peasants to avenge the death of the Son of God. And while today the religious element is not always so evident in the persecution of the Jews,

in the background it still is the moving cause. For it was religious hatred that forced the Jews into ghettos, closed various occupations to them, excluded them from universities—in short, the Jews are to a large extent what they are today because Christians of the past have made them so. And the plea now is to show an exceptionally great love to the Jew that the debt of hate in the past might be wiped out.

To show this love we must handle with care the sorest of spots in the relation of Christians with Jews—the crucifixion. Some would have us omit the teaching of the cross, but that is impossible; some would have us declare that the Gospels were worked over after 70 A.D. and made anti-semitic (and that they are therefore not historical) but this we do not believe; some would remind us of the colonies of Jews on three continents at the time of the crucifixion, who knew nothing of Jesus and His work and were not responsible for His death; some remind us that it was the leaders of the Jews, and the Roman governor and soldiers who played the leading parts. But the only way to be true to the accounts, Christ and yourself, is to put the emphasis where it belongs—Christ came to put man in the right relationship with the Heavenly Father, to overcome sin; it was sin that led Jesus to the cross, and sin still leads Him there. Such preaching of the cross does not accuse the Jews only, but indicts all mankind. This, then, is the first step in paying the debt to the Jew.

The second step is gaining an honest appreciation of the Jew. Unfortunately, Luther in the closing years of his life turned with wrath against the Jews, although in his earlier life he had sided with them. But some have dared to love the Jews; Prof. Franz Delitzsch wrote to Hebrew readers: "If, as I hope, you know me as a Christian scholar who is a friend of Israel...." And we have reason to be proud of our Jewish brethren. Here in

Philadelphia we may boast of Eaym Salomon, who deserves perhaps as much praise as Robert Morris, for he gave all he had to the support of the Revolution, and died penniless. That we know so little about outstanding Jews may cause us to neglect them, and fail to appreciate their contribution to America.

If you would know more about this whole presentation read such books as (in our library):

Basil Mathews: The Jew and the World Ferment (1935)

Lee J. Levinger: A History of the Jews in the United States (1930)

Max Hunterberg: The Crucified Jew (1927)

C. H. Moehlman: The Christian-Jewish Tragedy (1933)

H. G. Ebelow: A Jewish View of Jesus (1920)

And finally say with the Slav statesman, President Masaryk: "He who looks up to Jesus as his Master cannot be anti-Semitic. You must be either one thing or the other, and if you are a Christian you cannot be an anti-Semite."

THE LAST SUPPER

"The Lord's Supper was instituted by Christ on the night in which He was betrayed, while He sat with His disciples in the upper room after eating the Passover with them." (Quoted from "The Christian Faith" p. 347, by Joseph Stump). Many churchmen and students of the N.T. now consider this sentence only partially true. They would agree that the Lord's Supper was instituted by Christ, and that He ate it with the disciples in the upper room. But the rest of the sentence is misleading. It will not be my purpose here to defend either side. I want however to present a few of the propositions contra Stump. They begin of course with the assumption that the Lord's Supper was a weekly meal called the Kiddush.

If the Passover had begun on "the night in which He was betrayed" our Lord could not have been tried and executed that day, for it was against the law of the Jews to hold a trial or execution during the Passover. But the Supper took place according to Jewish reckoning on the same day as the trial and crucifixion. This alone is really sufficient to prove that it was a pre-passover meal that our Lord shared with His disciples, and not the Passover proper. It is not unnatural to find it called the Passover in the narratives, for here it is closely associated with the Passover, and indicates the time of the year our Lord suffered. It would be clear enough to a Jewish reader what was meant.

Further, the character of the Last Supper was fundamentally different from that of the Passover. A table of some of these characteristics will show that:

The Passover

The Last Supper

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1) A family festival. | 1) A group of male friends with a Rabbi. |
| 2) Pascal Lamb offered. | 2) No offering. |
| 3) Unleavened bread, alimos, used. | 3) Leavened bread, artos, used. |
| 4) Several cups used. | 4) One cup used. |
| 5) Exodus narrative read. | 5) Religious discussion with prayer and psalm singing. |
| 6) An annual celebration. | 6) A weekly celebration, in preparation for the Sabbath. |
| 7) Observed by all Jews. | 7) Observed only in messianic circles. |

As I have suggested more characteristics could be listed. Tradition also will add to them. The very title "Last Supper" is derived from the fact that the Lord and His disciples partook of the Kiddush on the eve of every Sabbath. This was their last

meal together. One of them would betray Him and leave the circle. And the Lord Himself would not drink the wine again until He drink it new with them in His Father's Kingdom.

There is a further point of relation to the subsequent history of the Eucharist. From the beginning the Lord's Supper was celebrated frequently. A weekly celebration was becoming the settled practice. This subsequent practice clearly shows that the disciples understood from our Lord's words and actions that they were to celebrate the Eucharist frequently. This would have been unlikely if the Last Supper had been a yearly Passover and not the weekly Kiddush.

Now in order to keep my promise to defend neither side, I should balance the paper with as many propositions pro Stump, and I should add, others. But I believe that these "others" would gladly think up the propositions themselves.

RETROSPECT

Needed: a "Mt. Airy spirit." Looking back over the past three years, the writer deems this a cardinal need of the seminary. The spirit of an institution is at once the most indefinable and yet the most distinctive thing about the institution. On some campuses it is lively and red-blooded; on others it is slumbering. The latter seems to be the case unhappily at Mt. Airy. We do not have what might be called an animated "esprit de corps." To put it bluntly, in many matters we are lethargic, if not actually dead.

What are the evidences? For one thing, innovations on campus that deserve a response are being killed by indifference. The Seminarian, back to the wall, is struggling to keep alive, although it has real possibilities. The Inter-seminary Movement is having to buck a steady

undertow of unconcern. For another thing, worthy appeals for real need meet with discouraging inertia. The Father Eeyer support of an Indian parish and the Chinese student relief appeal are cases in point. And still another evidence of the lack of a live campus spirit is the prevalence of unbecoming episodes in student life. Upon mention of one such episode, a student was heard to remark, "The student body ought to take a stand against that sort of thing." But the student body does not "take stands" here; it only watches, nods, and blinks. We have no dominant, unifying Mt. Airy spirit.

The reasons for such a situation are many. They need not be cited. Certainly no individuals are to blame; we all feel a responsibility. The writer is conscious of as grave shortcomings along this line as anyone. It is not his intention at all to criticize, but rather to consider some constructive means whereby such a desirable spirit might be built up. To be sure, such a spirit, like happiness, does not come by seeking it directly. It is a by-product, and the following suggestions for attaining it are with this fact in mind.

One method that could contribute to such a spirit would be for us to assume some project which would draw us outside of ourselves. Such a project might be along the line of community betterment. It might be with the co-operation and guidance of the Philadelphia Inner Mission Society. Each year a different objective might be set up, or the project might be big enough to command our support through many years. But whatever form it may take, it should be a work that is totally our responsibility, under our direction, employing our personal efforts and resources. If we were to get behind such a cause that were wholly our own, there would tend to spring up a unifying, aggressive spirit here on our campus.

The point might be made that we have such a project in the parish we support in India. It is true that this work ought to rally us, but the bare fact is that it does not. This may be due to the fact that it requires only our financial support and does not give the opportunity to contributing personal effort and assuming personal responsibility, as a community work would do. Also, we cannot watch its progress, as we could that of a nearby project. It is not "ours" in every sense of the word. However, all this is not for one minute to advocate discontinuance of the Father Heyer Society work. Rather, it is to add to it. The situation now is not that the India work is exhausting our resources; instead, for reasons to be deplored, it is not commanding them. If we could build up a stronger campus spirit by throwing ourselves behind a local project at personal sacrifice, there is every reason to believe that our India parish would not go begging for support. At least, this plan would go far in turning our gaze outward rather than, as it now is, inward, and that is what Mt. Airy needs.

Another suggestion for building a Mt. Airy spirit is that we have a definite ideal continually before us. Let that ideal be that here on this campus we shall build up the most Christ-like of all Christian communities. Why not? Here, if anywhere, one would expect that. Answer may be made that already this is the ideal of most if not all of us, personally. True, but as an ideal, it is not projected before the group. It should be publicized among us and made a specific objective so that we have it before us not as a vague desire, but as a definite group consciousness operating at all times. Then, anything that did not meet these standards would receive group condemnation. Not only would such a conscious ideal here give us a running start into the ministry, but it would invigorate our campus spirit and set a challenge

before us. Of course, this may be branded as an idealistic dream, nice but fanciful; yet to dismiss it simply with that is to do it a manifest injustice.

Still another brief suggestion for a more robust campus spirit is that there be more gatherings of the students as a whole outside of classrooms and chapel, in the form of social affairs, or meetings, or forums. It is amazing how much our student life is compartmentalized in dormitory, refectory, and classroom, despite the fact that we live so closely. It is equally amazing how the conviviality of informal contacts under different environment can build up a comraderie that no other device can approximate.

At all events, the need for a live campus spirit at Mt. Airy is patent. The suggestions here offered are just suggestions — no more — to try to meet this need. There is a wealth of latent energy and enthusiasm among us that is just waiting the cause that will call it forth. At present, however, much of it is being shunted off through other channels and finding expression in ways that are not always constructive. There is no reason why an aggressive campus spirit could not send Mt. Airy further forward in the position she ought to occupy. The heart of the matter, therefore, is this: "Mt. Airy, wake up!"