

Table Talk



News and Views of the Student Body of The Lutheran
Theological Seminary at Gettysburg.

Vol. VIII, No. 10

March 14, 1972

A. R. WENTZ LIBRARY

GETTYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

HELP!

A special laboratory course in oral interpretation, open to all students, will be offered on campus beginning with an organizational meeting on the evening of Tuesday, March 28, at 7:30 in room 205, Valentine Hall.

There will be five sessions, held once a week. Participants will practice reading aloud, with the goal of achieving more effective oral communication. This may, depending on the desires of the group, include reading liturgical material and passages from Scripture.

The course is non-credit and carries no charge. Mrs. Howard Bream will serve as instructor. She has taught similar courses at Waterloo Seminary, in Canada, and on this campus, in the dim past.

Students who wish to take the course are asked to preregister by leaving their name with Mary Miller in room 204 Valentine Hall, on or before Friday, March 24.

Remember: Table Talk cannot publish letters or articles of an opinionated nature unless the author attaches his/her name to the submission. Table Talk receives several such unsigned submissions each week.

Help us out: we want to publish your whatevers.

Also: it would be nice to have faculty-administration submissions of a provocative, academic, or artistic nature. The community beckons . . .

The community of Gettysburg is in desperate need of daytime Ambulance drivers and attendents. If interested contact Larry Miller or Denny Hall as soon as possible.

Want A Birthright Cheap?

Yes . . . you too could become head Jew of the coffee shop (no anti-Semitism intended). To maintain tradition, our peers suggest that the new manager be a hard-nosed tight wad who is conscientious, honest, slightly caustic, and basically a prick. Job requirements include book-keeping, advertising, purchasing and public relations. Qualifications, aside from the above, are that you qualify for the work-study program and can work odd hours. If interested, contact Randy Neubauer, Duane Michael, or Robert Eastlack by the end of March.

Signed: Isaac
(alias R. Eastlack)

In response to the last issue of Table Talk, Geoff Curtiss is doing a record hop for townies this Friday evening. All are invited to participate as hosts, helpers, and merry-makers.

About an excavation
a flock of bright red lanterns
has settled.

C. Reznikoff

(cont. next page)

Up Against the Hill
by G.S. Lenihan

The spur-in-the-side (inspiration) for this issue's article is the following letter I received from Ed Neiderhiser. Background information: Ed is presently an intern in Lindsborg, Kansas. Last year he was the editor of Table Talk.

February 26, 1972

An open letter to Greg Lenihan, editor (?), Table Talk.

I have sat by for six months; I have bitten my tongue and done a slow burn for half a year; but after your latest issue (Feb. 15) of Table Talk I can remain silent no longer.

Several of us worked very long and hard to make Table Talk a level-headed, responsible, and respected voice of the student body without jumping on the "hate authority figures" bandwagon, without personal slander, and without having to resort to the crudest of yellow journalism. Unfortunately I would be more than happy to have my name removed from the tradition that has resulted in your present editorship. What you write in an obviously failing attempt to be cool amounts to little more than patently de-humanizing drivel, the product of a "College Joe" ego-trip.

You may reply "Sour grapes;" you may self-righteouslessly cry "Sticks and stones;" you may write one of your marvelously clever snappy come-backs; you may do anything you like. But as long as your journalism continues its present course, you will remain the editor of an obscene publication.

A bit of growing up would not hurt.

Regretfully,

Ed Neiderhiser, Intern
Lindsborg, Kansas

Okay.

My first mental draft of a reply consisted of two words, seven letters. Second draft: simply "Sticks and stones . . . , sour grapes!" And finally, after squeezing what humor I could from the situation, I started drafting this reply.

What Ed has called into question is the whole validity of the present policy of Table Talk -- its style and aims. To begin with, perhaps I should state what I see these aims and this style to be. From there, we can assess the success and/or failure of the present editors to follow these guidelines. (Let me parenthetically add here that I speak for myself in this article, though I assume co-editor vonFrisch would concur on most points).

As I stated in the very first issue of this year's publication, I wanted to see Table Talk become more than a recording eye/ear of campus activities. Rather, I wanted to see it become the center of campus debate, and (yes!) a hotbed of social, political, and theological controversy, a vehicle for public opinion-testing, and a place for artistic expression.

Since Ed directed his letter to me personally, I want to take this time to publicize my OWN editorial guidelines. The major reason I write satirically (even sarcastically) is because that's the thing I do best. Straight journalism intrigues me, but I can't do it so well. In many ways, wittiness/irony/satire are easier. Easier because you're more liable to grab and hold a reader's attention when you're outrageous than when you're straight. Also, there is so little GOOD, straight journalism around these days, that there are few examples to learn from, and little interest kindled to search the GOOD examples out.

Up Against the Hill (cont.)

Anyways, that's why my articles are satiric.

Now, the greatest danger of satire is the danger of being misunderstood. Swift realized this when his "A Modest Proposal" was first published. Half the readers hated him for suggesting something as despicable as cannibalism (he suggested that the Irish eat their children during the potato famine), and the other half thought he had a brilliant idea. Oh well.

I have been waiting for some time to explain some factors BEHIND "Up Against the Hill." The following principles are the unstated presuppositions for my critical writing vs. the Greek Requirement, the Washington Program, the President's address to the junior class:

- 1) The object of the article has to merit (deserve) criticism.
- 2) I have to feel the object of the article can accept criticism without personal anguish or revenge reactions.
- 3) I have to feel motivated enough in the first place to BOTHER writing the article.
- and 4) I have to feel that the possibility for change as a result of the article is a genuine one.

So you see, I'm not totally without scruples. Since Ed seemed particularly incensed by the last "Up Against the Hill" column, let me explain that. I assume Ed was most upset about my treatment of the President's Address to the junior class. Now the simple fact of the matter is that Dr. Heiges made a very human, tactical error in that address. As a result, no students were "talked into" the Consortium, and perhaps a few were even "turned off" to it. The question for me became one of the President's dignity vs. the merits of the Consortium. Since Dr. Heiges has infinitely more going for him than his dignity, I chose to recover what attraction and merit of the Washington Program I could.

Regarding Gettysburg Seminary in general, I want to say these things. First, I like this place very much. Yes, there is room for some changes, but I think the Seminary is open to productive change. The administration is as just to we students as any administration I have ever seen. If Gettysburg wasn't all of these things, I probably wouldn't stay here.

You see, Ed, one of the things I like best about this place is that I can speak my mind and be dealt with fairly.

The very fact that you responded with your letter at all shows that Table Talk is not merely a trash-can filler. People are reading the publication, are thinking about it, are reacting to it. So far as the obscenity of the publication is concerned, anyone who wants their copy of Table Talk sent in a brown paper wrapper (to save embarrassment) may simply send some postage to cover the additional cost of mailing. (C'mon, Ed, I couldn't resist at least ONE of my patently "marvelously clever come-backs.")

There was an interesting side effect to this whole business that may prove interesting to somebody other than myself. One of my immediate reactions to Ed's letter was this: here is someone who doesn't appreciate my humor, even someone who thinks I'm immature and irresponsible. You see, it pleases me to please others. When I don't, it is disturbing.

And this whole thing may be a hang-up our Time. We all want to be personable. We don't like to offend. So when I read by Accident/Providence/Divine Interference the following fable by Ambrose Bierce, it cleared up some things for me.

(cont. next page)

Up Against the Hill (cont.)

The Man with No Enemies by Ambrose Bierce.

An Inoffensive Person walking in a public place was assaulted by a Stranger with a Club, and severely beaten.

When the Stranger with a Club was brought to trial, the complainant said to the Judge:

"I do not know why I was assaulted; I have not an enemy in the world."

"That," said the defendant, "is why I struck him."

"Let the prisoner be discharged," said the Judge; "a man who has no enemies has no friends. The courts are not for such."

Charismatic Cooking

"The steward tasted the water now turned to wine..."

John 2:9a.

As miracles go, this was really a rather simple one--the mere transformation of one substance into another. But due to the weakness of our faith, most of us have found that our attempts to change water into wine are fruitless; and the even simpler process of changing grape juice into wine has been thwarted by the use of preservatives (among other things). This has proven to be a great stumbling block to certain congregations. Recently discovering that the natural process of fermentation is not a device of the Devil, they now learn that they have enough grape juice to last for a decade (after all, how much does it take to fill those shot glasses four times a year?) and cry out "Must it all be wasted?" The answer has now been discovered by one of our fellow seminarians who has truly found the meaning of being a charismatic cook. It is hereby dedicated to those who need it most--the seniors destined to become pastors in the Central Pennsylvania Synod. (And if we hurry, it will be ready for Maundy Thursday!)

Grape Wine

Put 4 cups of sugar in a gallon glass jug. Add 1 level teaspoon of dry yeast. Add about 4 inches of water and shake well. Add 24 ounces (2 large cans) of frozen concentrated concord grape juice, thawed. Fill the jug with water. Place a 15¢ balloon over the mouth of the container. Ready in 3 weeks. Good luck!

Paul Xander
Larry L. McDaniel

Lest there be others making the same mistake as Mr. Lageman (Table Talk No. 9), no one is required to conduct any service at all "in order to graduate," not even in Liturgy class. As for permission to do services from other denominational traditions than the material sent out will see they need only to say they want to.

Robert W. Jenson, Chaplain

(ed. note: the above is worded exactly as it was submitted.)

(cont. next page)

Doggerel

A word of warning to VonFrisch: the tables could be turned at any time.
For instance:

One cannot deny vonFrisch's wit,
Or argue his use of common sense,
But only lament this fundamental split:
He's so often on the Other Side of the fence.
gsl.

Good Samaritan award of the week goes to Larry McDaniel and Jim Knowles. It has been noted; not to earn any sort of reward, but to bring something precious a little closer to reality . . .

"And I love you, Skip"
J.

Sub-
miss-
ions

for

The Two Comrades
(from C.S. Lewis)

next

issue of

Two men were arguing
bitterly.

T.T.

"There is no Devil!"
said the first.
"The most I will concede
is a psychological flaw
in the Mind of Modern Man."

due

March
24th.

"Not only is there a Devil"
countered the second
"but his realm is this Earth.
He is our Father
He our Ruler
He our Savior and Preserver."

Now between the two
stood a third party
the Devil himself
with a free arm to drape around
both his followers' shoulders
in a proud, comradely fashion.

gsl.

Staff

Co-editors;
Bob vonFrisch
Greg Lenihan
Sports Editor:
Frank Terhune
News Editor:
John Siegmund

Circulation:
Jack Nussen
Chuck Bergstressor
Contributors:
Larry McDaniel
Paul Xander
Ed Neiderhiser

It is almost common knowledge today that Abner Doubleday invented the game of baseball. However, recent insight into the matter coupled with the combination of recently acquired knowledge of Old Testament trivia, New Testament form criticism, and the ability to reflect hermeneutically have produced a new development: baseball was well-known in biblical times.

The earliest inference of this fantastic find comes from Gen. 12:8 where Abram "removed to the hill country east of Bethel, pitching..." In fact there exist many references to pitching alone in the Bible: Ex. 33:7, "Moses used to pitch at some distance away, outside..." The laws of the Israelites were indeed strict as to who could pitch. Num. 1:52, "people of Israel shall pitch," while Isa. 13:20, "the Arab shall not pitch." I Chron. 16:1 tells us that David pitched for the Ark of the Covenant (probably a team located near Bethlehem.) Finally Jeremiah tells us of a poor rookie who couldn't cut it in the biggies and for him the mound became a "mound of ruins" (49:2).

But the batters were not neglected either. There is not an overwhelming amount of material written concerning batters, probably because of an enlarged strike zone and high mound which would tend to give the pitcher an advantage. Ezekiel mentions "by the homer they shall be determined (45:11). Num. 11:32 relates to us the story of a powerful club in the desert region who "even the least of them gathered ten homers."

As in today's form of the sport, umpires play an important role. Job 9:33 laments that "there is no umpire between us." This reveals to us that only one umpire was used, most probably the one behind the plate for there are countless quotes referring to strikes and walks. Ps. 1:1 tells of a manager who was so elated to get anyone to first base that he said,

"Blessed is the man who walks..." Deut. 13:5 reveals that the intentional walk was in use, in case of divine inspiration only. "The Lord, your God, commanded you to walk..." Acts 7:24 tells of Moses (see par. 1) who was so mad that the previous batter had hit him hard that "he avenged him by striking the Egyptian." Anyone who remembers Sal Maglie or Don Drysdale can certainly appreciate that verse.

Finally, we move on to the structure of the game itself. Proof of the popularity of the game is given in Rev. 21:10 where 12,000 stadia are mentioned. (Anyone with even a slight background in Latin knows that the plural of stadium is stadia.) The field itself underwent several evolutionary steps. Originally, the game field was probably a pentagon. Ex. 26:37 cites five bases of bronze. Later in the same book, 36:36, we read of four bases of silver. But the overwhelming popularity that the game soon won caused players to change to bases of wood, Ex. 41:22, one cubit around, Ex. 43:17.

It is unknown as to how the press handled these events. No one knows whether Howard Cosell is really a reincarnation from the golden days. There is, however, evidence of many trades that were scrutinized. Ez. 28:5; Acts 19:27; Ez. 27:15; and Ex. 27:17 all bear credence to this fact.

The investigation has just recently begun. This field is wide open for employment. Any senior who doesn't as yet have a call and is interested in baseball, or any other sport for that matter, is asked to contact Casey Stengalowitz at Amazin' 9-YEAR. One thing is imperative for all those who are interested. It was mentioned to me to relay the following message from the man himself: "When you get near home, you gotta slide."

Frank Terhune