

among liberal seminaries and liberal groups. To many people it has seemed like a return to orthodoxy. Its followers use language which is very similar to that of evangelical Christians, yet usually they mean something entirely different by their words. In any case, it does not really mean much when they seem to adopt evangelical views because they have a fundamental basic view which renders it all of little ^{account} count. The basic view is that ~~the~~ man actually can know practically nothing ~~about~~ of real fact about God. According to this view there are two phases of existence, according to the Barthians. There is this side in which we are and there is the other side in which God is. We can never say anything with actual knowledge about ~~the~~ facts about "the other side." The other side sometimes breaks through into this side and this is apt to occur when we are reading the Bible but we do not get from the Bible ~~the~~ real facts that we can state about the other side. According to the followers of neo-orthodoxy it is possible to accept certain parts of the Bible and reject others. The Bible is no longer an authority. Man is the authority. This Barthianism has taken over the bulk of our old-line theological seminaries. It is being preached in many of our great pulpits today. It is actually no nearer to true Christianity than the old-fashioned liberalism was and yet its words are much more deceptive. Its followers are extremely devoted to the writings of Soren Kirkegaard and many of them are interested in quoting his works in making translations and carefully studying what he has said.

This

~~There~~ is a third great stream of influence that has come from Kirkegaard.

What a difference there is between these three streams of influence from this one man. "If the trumpet shall give an uncertain sound who shall prepare himself for the battle" (look this up in the concordance, get the exact reference and quote it precisely.) The followers of Kirkegaard ~~had~~ ^{have} prepared themselves for the battle all right but there are three different battles being waged and no two of them really can stand together at all. Nobody knows exactly where Kirkegaard really did stand or where he would stand if he were living today. His influence is great but its various portions ^(detach from) ~~attack~~ ^{attack (?)} one another.

How different is the case of the great recent Scandinavian writer David