

1 Of special interest for our purposes is [the recent blog post by Michael Allen at the Gospel Coalition](#) (retrieved September 8, 2016). Allen's piece exemplifies the characteristic appreciation of Karl Barth's theology today which stands in stark contrast to the critical disposition of Reformed theologians of the mid-20th century.

2 Mark Thompson, "Witness to the Word: On Barth's Doctrine of Scripture," in eds. David Gibson and Daniel Strange *Engaging with Barth: Contemporary Evangelical Critiques* (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 173.

3 Alister McGrath, "Karl Barth's Doctrine of Justification from an Evangelical Perspective," in Sung Wook Chung, ed., *Karl Barth and Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 172.

4 Kevin Vanhoozer, "A Person of the Book? Barth on Biblical Authority and Interpretation," in Sung Wook Chung, ed., *Karl Barth and Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 28.

5 *Ibid.*, 30.

6 For a very different appraisal of Van Til's work on Barth see John Muether, *Cornelius Van Til: Reformed Apologist and Churchman* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2008), 119-147. Muether is judicious and balanced recognizing Van Til's shortcomings as a writer but also showing his philosophical acumen in evaluating modern theology. Not as judicious or balanced, however, is Bruce L. McCormack, "Afterword: Reflections on Van Til's Critique of Barth," in Bruce L. McCormack and Clifford B. Anderson, eds., *Karl Barth and American Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2011), 366-80.

7 D.G. Hart, "Beyond the Battle for the Bible: What American Protestants Missed About Van Til's Critique of Barth," in *Karl Barth and American Evangelicalism*, 42-70. Hart further contends that there is something crucial neo-evangelicals missed about Van Til's critique: and that is the fact that he is defending a distinctly historical – and churchly – confessionally Reformed theology. Like the fundamentalists in Machen's day, the neo-evangelicals were content enough to allow Van Til to do the heavy intellectual lifting and critiquing, but they were not about to follow him in his distinctly Presbyterian and Reformed ecclesial context. See also, Gavin Ortlund in "Wholly Other or Wholly Given Over? What Van Til Missed in His Criticism of Barth," *Presbyterion* 35.1 (2009): 35-52. It is also of interest to note that – despite Barth's strong opposition to "neo-Protestantism" – recent scholarship on Barth's theology shows a great deal of affinity between the Basel Professor and Schleiermacher. See Bruce L. McCormack, *Orthodox and Modern: Studies in the Theology of Karl Barth* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2009), 21- 88 and also Matthias Gockel, *Barth and Schleiermacher on the Doctrine of Election* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006). If these studies

are at all accurate we are left with very good reasons to believe that Van Til had sound theological grounds – as opposed to merely institutional reasons - for connecting Barthianism and liberalism.

8 Cornelius Van Til, “The Karl Barth Theology Or The New Transcendentalism,” *Christianity Today* 1.10 (1931): 13.

9 Cornelius Van Til, *Defense of the Faith*, ed. K. Scott Oliphint (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2008), 396. 10 *Ibid.*, 329; see also Van Til's *Karl Barth and Evangelicalism* (Philadelphia, PA: P&R, 1964), 18.

11 *Defense of the Faith*, 151.

12 Cornelius Van Til, *The New Modernism: An Appraisal of the Theology of Barth and Brunner* (Philadelphia: P&R, 1946), vii-viii. The emphasis is mine.

13 McCormack, *Orthodox and Modern*, 12. The emphasis is mine. See also Jones, *The Humanity of Christ*, 7 and 20; and Michael S. Horton, “A Stony Jar: The Legacy of Karl Barth for Evangelical Theology,” in David Gibson and Daniel Strange, eds. *Engaging with Barth: Contemporary Evangelical Critiques* (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 350. This is an important point missed by Ortlund, “Wholly Other,” 43-46. He takes Barth's criticisms of liberalism – mostly from his earlier writings – out of the context of his broader work as his thought developed.

14 John E. Hare, “Karl Barth, American Evangelicals and Kant,” in *Karl Barth and American Evangelicalism*, 74. Whether or not Van Til got Kant right – and as for us, we think he did – is another matter to be taken up at another time. Suffice it to say that this question is further confused by McCormack's misunderstanding of Van Til interpretation of Kant's epistemology; see, “Afterword,” 368-72. For our purposes here, we can summarize Van Til's understanding of Kant – and with Kant, all modern philosophy and theology – by saying that the German philosopher denies the role of the direct revelation of God in epistemology. And it is this same fundamental presupposition that Van Til also sees driving Barth's thought. Whether or not Van Til is correct about Kant's denial of direct revelation is really besides the point here. The real question of significance is whether or not Van Til was correct to say that the difference between Barth and historic (Reformed) Christianity is that Barth denied direct revelation. And that is exactly where Van Til and Barth have their fundamental disagreement, as even McCormack himself recognizes; “Afterword,” 372.

15 This understanding of Barth's relation to Chalcedon (i.e., basic discontinuity) is corroborated by Bruce McCormack in his *Orthodox and Modern*, 201-33; also Jones, *The Humanity of Christ*, 18-38. However, it should be noted that the McCormack-Jones interpretation is not a consensus. For an example of a contrary position see George Hunsinger, “Karl Barth's Christology: Its Basic Chalcedonian Character,” in John Webster, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to*

*Karl Barth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 127-42; also in *Disruptive Grace* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 131-47. For a critique of Hunsinger's position, see Jones, *The Humanity of Christ*, 18-37. For an overview of the relation between Chalcedon and modern theology in general see David F. Wells' remarkable – and still relevant - evangelical Christology in, *The Person of Christ*, 7-8. Although, it should be noted, Wells sees Barth and Chalcedon as being in basic continuity (e.g., see p. 155).

16 “Karl Barth on Chalcedon,” 149. See also, *Who Do You Say That I Am?*, 89.

17 “Karl Barth on Chalcedon,” 151.

18 *Ibid.*, 152-3. See also *The New Modernism*, 103; 157-59 and *Christianity and Barthianism*, 37-42.

19 *Ibid.*, 155. Emphasis is mine.

20 *Karl Barth and Evangelicalism*, 20

21 *Ibid.*, 19.

22 “Karl Barth on Chalcedon,” 156. Again, Bruce L. McCormack seems to corroborate Van Til's interpretation at this point in *Orthodox and Modern*, 185-6.

23 Van Til, “Karl Barth on Chalcedon,” 157.

24 Cornelius Van Til, *Barth's Christology* (Philadelphia: P&R, 1962), 11.

25 *Idem.*