

study under Dr MacRae. There were two reasons in particular for this. First, I wished to see demonstrated and to learn for myself how to approach problems with the Christian Faith. Second, I wished to learn how to show humility and love to men and women who cannot accept the Gospel of Jesus Christ because of insurmountable problems and doubts.

In my time of biblical skepticism I had a particular problem which those who tried to help me could not solve as I found the experience shattering. As I was being helped I said silently to myself concerning those who were reaching out to me: "You do not ask me what is my problem and where I am hurting because you are afraid. You just do not have an answer!" I wanted very much to tell someone where I hurt as a troubled intellectual. I wanted to get help and find the answers.

Karl Barth's reaction to the appeals and criticisms of his teachings by Orthodox evangelicals illustrates the point that I am trying to make. He, like several neo-orthodox theologians who followed in his steps, said to the Christians who approached him, "You do not love." Why did he do so? For the same reason that I did, while still in the throes of liberalism. If one really loves a liberal or a neo-orthodox, should there not be a desire to hear where that person is hurting? Such a person may be "crying in the dark". He has lost faith in the infallible, inerrant Bible and that hurts. He has acquired devastating intellectual problems (e.g., JEDP theory, and Formgeschichte) and philosophical problems (e.g., Kantian agnosticism, Hegelian dialectic, and many existential problems found in liberalism and neo-orthodoxy, and more recently liberation theology). And he could not solve any of these problems. It would be dishonest for him to ignore his problems and make a Kierkegaardian leap and accept Christ. Orthodox evangelicals did not listen to a Barth's cry when he tried to work out logically, for example, the consequences of assuming that God is timeless and spaceless. Barth and his neo-orthodox followers were honestly telling us, by their view of the Bible, what they saw as the logical consequence of assuming the timelessness and spacelessness of God. Yet many orthodox evangelicals refuse, even today, to accept the fact that logically their reasoning is unassailable. Someone will say: you have just raised a very difficult philosophical problem. We ourselves believe that God is timeless and spaceless. Several of the church fathers, such as Athanasius and Augustine, also believed God was timeless and spaceless, together with many modern Reformed theologians and others today. But at the same time we hold, as do such men, that God does speak directly to man. Over eleven hundred and fifty times in the Old Testament we read, "Thus saith the Lord." We see no contradiction therefore at this point!

What is the neo-orthodox response? I believe Barth and his followers will reply thus: "Not only do you not love us, but you throw the Bible in our faces. You refuse to stop and understand how we are hurting and why. And then you quote Scripture even though it does not solve the problem. If God is timeless and spaceless, then he is *totaliter aliter*, absolutely other than we are, and truth with him is also absolutely other because it is without the categories of time or space! Such truth cannot be communicated directly because man stamps the two categories of finitude upon all