

CONCLUSION

In this conclusion, we turn first to the analysis of the differences between Machen and McIntire. What lies underneath their differences? Machen was self-consciously Reformed and Presbyterian in outlook. And McIntire was broadly evangelical in theology but narrowly fundamentalist in posture. The confessionalism of the former was almost foreign to the latter, who had a tolerant attitude toward dispensationalism and stressed certain points of personal morality. Moreover, the denominational conservatism of Machen was incongruous with the interdenominational character of McIntire's fundamentalist ecclesiology.

Therefore, Machen differed from McIntire in his confessionalism and denominational loyalty. It can be said that they represent two traditions of American Presbyterianism respectively – one tradition of which was called New School in the nineteenth century; while the other was known as Old School in the nineteenth century. Yet Marsden claimed that the two traditions were not incompatible but were rather two approaches to the same tradition.³²⁶ One tradition he described:

The more subjective, less authoritarian, concept of Presbyterianism, closely associated with nineteenth century revivalism and twentieth century “fundamentalism” with their strong emphases on the visible signs of faith, especially a conversion “experience” and a “separated

³²⁶ Marsden, “Perspective,” 323. Cf. Hutchinson, *History*, 150-51.

life.”³²⁷

McIntire and his associates represented this tradition of the New School.

Marsden described the other tradition:

The more objective and authoritarian conception, closely associated with the European Reformed tradition with its strong emphasis on the place of the objective Standards and often associated with exacting scholarship.³²⁸

Machen and his associates represented this tradition of the Old School.

Also Marsden suggests a parallel between New School attitudes and those of twentieth-century fundamentalists by the career of McIntire. Three points can be enumerated for the specific program for which McIntire and his associates fought. First, they tolerated of the doctrine of dispensational premillennialism which the majority in the church considered incompatible with the Westminster Confession of Faith. Second, they continued to operate the Independent Board, rather than forming an official denominational mission board. Third, they adopted by the General Assembly a statement that total abstinence from all that may intoxicate is “the only true principle of temperance” – precisely the statement first adopted by the New School General Assembly of 1840.

Besides these programs there are some more characteristics which suggest a continuation of distinctly New School traditions within the fundamentalist wing of Presbyterianism. Among them are McIntire’s

³²⁷ Ibid.

³²⁸ Ibid.

claim to represent “American Presbyterianism” which is a former New School term, his avid anti-Communist patriotism, his zeal for revivalism and legalistic reforms, his emphasis on interdenominational cooperation, and his lack of concern for strict Presbyterian polity.³²⁹

Now to view the differences between Machen and McIntire from another perspective, it can be said that the former belongs to conservatism,³³⁰ and the latter fundamentalism.³³¹ Marsden advocates that it should be made clear that the anti-modernist movement in Presbyterianism was a coalition of both fundamentalists and conservatives.³³² And he states regarding the confusion arising from the use of the term “fundamentalist”:

Some of the confusion arises because the meaning of the term “Fundamentalist” has changed. Initially the term was used primarily to designate simply the organized opposition to Modernism. The contribution of Benjamin B. Warfield to the original *Fundamentals* ... is a clear example of the absence of any distinction between Fundamentalists and conservatives at the early stages of the movement. Beginning around the time of the Scopes trial in 1925 the term came increasingly to designate religious obscurantism, sawdust-trail revivalism, and oppressively strict moralism. Since about the 1930’s this later designation, usually

³²⁹ Marsden, “New School,” 309-11; Marsden, “New School Heritage,” 143-44.

³³⁰ In this context conservatism is defined as the tradition of American Presbyterian Church that follows the Old School tradition which can also be characterized as confessionalism.

³³¹ In this context fundamentalism is defined as the tradition of American Presbyterian Church that follows the New School tradition.

³³² Marsden, “New School Heritage,” 144.

derogatory, has become the overwhelmingly dominant one. It is therefore misleading to continue to use the term to designate the entire historical movement of organized opposition to Modernism.³³³

Because of this confusion deriving from the defining of the term “fundamentalist”, there was much debate regarding whether Machen was a fundamentalist or not as mentioned above. Also, Ahlstrom writes on the use of the term “fundamentalist”:

Accordingly I exclude Jonathan Edwards, Charles Hodge, and J. Gresham Machen as well as contemporary theologians like Van Til, Berkouwer, Carnell, *et al.*, who are frequently referred to as Fundamentalists, or even so refer to themselves. To my mind, a person is not a Fundamentalist if he speaks to the issues, is aware of the problems, is well-informed, and is in communication with those from whom he dissents.³³⁴

In contrast, McIntire did not deny but affirmed that he was a fundamentalist.³³⁵ He stated:

We are a fundamentalist. We are not ashamed of that word, and when people speak of us as a fundamentalist we own the word.... A fundamentalist is a Christian. He believes in the fundamentals of the faith which are under attack in this hour and have been for the

³³³ Ibid., 144-45.

³³⁴ Sydney E. Ahlstrom, “Continental Influence on American Christian Thought Since World War I,” *Church History*, XXVII, 3 (Sep. 1958), 271, note, as quoted in Marsden, “New School Heritage,” 145.

³³⁵ For the evaluation of others about McIntire, see Marsden, “New School,” 310-11; and Hutchinson, *History*, 265-66.

last fifty years.³³⁶

Therefore, it may be said that Machen took conservative positions, while McIntire took fundamentalist positions.

Third, the differences between Machen and McIntire should be viewed from the perspective of organizationism or movementism. McIntire was a very ambitious man. He may be said to have had the desire to control the organizations of the PCA, including the denomination itself. He criticized Machen and his associates. He called them a “machine.”³³⁷ McIntire’s concern was that the PCA, Westminster Seminary, and the Independent Board were all controlled by Machen and his associates. He complained in a letter to his friend that Machen was gaining too much power.³³⁸ In each of the three organizations – the PCA, Westminster Seminary, and the Independent Board – McIntire and his associates were “in a minority and had little hope of official sanction for their distinctive opinions. The best the minority could hope for was toleration. And often they felt that it was toleration without respect.”³³⁹ Yet Marsden also states that “it is often observed that subsequent history has indicated that Carl McIntire has never been content in any organization which he did not control.”³⁴⁰

Morton writes concerning the definition of the term “organizationism”:

³³⁶ McIntire, *Twentieth Century Reformation*, 4-5. Cf. *Christian Beacon* 2 (Apr. 29, 1937), 4.

³³⁷ *Christian Beacon* 1 (Nov. 5, 1936), 4.

³³⁸ Coray, *Silhouette*, 118.

³³⁹ Marsden, “Perspective,” 309.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 322.

The implementation of strategy requires organization and leadership. The requirement of loyalty to particular organizations and leaders as a test of Christian fellowship is organizationism, or the degradation of principles and ideals from a place of ultimacy to a subordinate position.... To regard constructive criticism of leaders and of their strategy as attacks upon “the cause” constitutes organizationistic movementism.³⁴¹

And Hutchinson explains the mentality of movementism and McIntire’s practice of movementism:

The mentality of movementism involves dedication to what is held to be a holy cause under divinely-appointed leadership, often narrowed down to one extremely gifted man.... Significant differences of opinion are looked upon with suspicion, and more and more of the originally enthusiastic adherents are alienated from the movement until finally only the slavish followers of the leadership remain.... There can be little doubt that movementism has vitiated the ministry of Carl McIntire who has looked upon himself as Dr. Machen’s successor; or that it has captivated the Twentieth Century Reformation Movement, so that to McIntire and his followers everything is viewed in terms of the Movement. Everything is subject to the organizational success of the Movement.³⁴²

Furthermore, Morton advocates that Machen also practiced

³⁴¹ Morton, “Origins,” 123-24.

³⁴² Hutchinson, *History*, 294-95.

organizationism or movementism. He states:

As a man of principle Machen opposed the organizationism of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. It is therefore somewhat surprising that there is evidence which indicates that Machen himself is the father of organizationistic movementism among the separatists. Representative of this evidence is that, for instance, from the “disruption” or reorganization of Westminster Theological Seminary early in 1936 and that provided in certain recollections of Machen by J. Oliver Buswell, Jr.³⁴³

According to Samuel G. Craig, a member of the Independent Board and the editor of *Christianity Today*, in January 1936, the “disruption” of Westminster Theological Seminary was precipitated by the Faculty action, in which an incipient organizationistic movementism played a role. Craig observed:

... it was a growing tendency on the part of certain of the Faculty and Trustees, after the Independent Board had been organized, to insist that the interests of the Seminary (and even the interests of Conservatism in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.) be identified in the first instance with those of the Independent Board and later with those of its offspring, the Presbyterian Constitutional Covenant Union – a tendency that culminated in the Faculty’s communication which is, in effect, a demand that the Seminary identify its interests with these two organizations, not indeed

³⁴³ Morton, “Origins,” 121-22.

officially but none the less really.³⁴⁴

And Morton states that Buswell provided insight into the nature of organizationistic movementism as Machen practiced it. Buswell said:

This turn is quite similar to the doctrines of prelacy. True, none of our Bible Presbyterian men would profess to believe in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, but nevertheless, in the case of the great Dr. Machen, there was a tendency on the part of his followers to regard him as a prelate (preferred) and to regard any disagreement with him of any kind whatsoever as a personal attack upon a God-given leader, and thus an attack upon the cause itself.³⁴⁵

And Morton gives more evidence of it.³⁴⁶ Therefore, it may be said that Machen also was imperfect in spirit of movementism.

Now we turn to the connection between the differences between Machen and McIntire and the division of the PCA in 1937. In the space of six months after Machen's death, all three institutions – the PCA, Westminster Seminary, and the Independent Board – were divided. Immediately following the Assembly in May, 1937, fourteen ministers and three elders withdrew to form the Bible Presbyterian Synod.³⁴⁷ The

³⁴⁴ Samuel G. Craig, "The Disruption of Westminster Seminary," *Christianity Today* (Feb. 1936), 194, as quoted in Morton, "Origins," 123-24.

³⁴⁵ Buswell, "An Open Letter of the 'Committee for True Presbyterianism,'" *The Bible Press* (Jul. 22, 1955), 10, as quoted in Morton, "Origins," 124.

³⁴⁶ Morton, "Origins," 125. Buswell said: "By letter and by personal conference I vigorously defended the right of Carl McIntire to publish his own paper in his own way. Finally Dr. Machen said to me, 'I had thought that it would be possible for you and me to belong to the same church, but now I see that it is impossible.' And he invited me to leave the Church!" Cf. *Christian Beacon* 1 (Nov. 5, 1936) 4; Buswell to Machen, Dec. 4, 1936, 2, Machen Archives; and Hutchinson, *History*, 295.

³⁴⁷ "Third General Assembly," *Presbyterian Guardian* 4 (June 26, 1937), 92-94.

majority of the denomination, which was to be called the Orthodox Presbyterian Church³⁴⁸ later, was faithful to Machen's position. This division was crucial for establishing the OPC's identity. By affirming its loyalty to Calvinism, Presbyterianism, and Christian liberty, it had preserved Machen's original vision for the denomination. Therefore it may be said that the differences between Machen and McIntire were fully reflected in the division of the PCA. The split resembled the 1837 division between Old and New School Presbyterians, in which similar issues – Calvinism, personal behavior, and interdenominational cooperation – motivated the Old School to expel New School Presbyterians who advocated revivalism and social reform.³⁴⁹ Mark A. Noll speaks regarding the significance of the 1937 division in relation to this matter:

The division of 1937 certainly helped clarify the self-identity of those who remained as the OPC. They were antiliberal and antipluralist with their departed brethren, but they were also Reformed in an Old School way not congenial to the mores or the doctrinal emphases of American fundamentalism. If the Westminster standards did not permit dispensationalism, neither would they. If the Bible did not condemn all drinking, neither would they.³⁵⁰

Moreover, Marsden admits that the contest for control of the Independent Board, raised by McIntire and his associates, was the most

³⁴⁸ Further reference to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church will be abbreviated to the OPC.

³⁴⁹ Marsden, "Perspective," 321-23; Mark A. Noll, "The Pea Beneath the Mattress – Orthodox Presbyterians in America," *The Reformed Journal* 36 (Oct. 1986), 11-16.

³⁵⁰ Noll, "Pea," 14.

important factor of the 1937 division.³⁵¹ Therefore, the matter of the relationship between Machen and McIntire, with Machen's death, can be regarded as an important factor of the division. And there were involved a crisis in leadership and personal antagonisms. Marsden writes regarding personal antagonisms raised by the matter of the Independent Board:

The emotion generated by the disruption of the institution which Machen had founded and strenuously defended was intense. Carl McIntire claimed that at one point in the meeting [of the Independent Board which met on May 31, 1937] one of the women associated with the Westminster group "turned to the majority of the Board and declared, 'The death of Dr. Machen is on your hands.' The Westminster group and other women nodded assent," added McIntire.³⁵²

Nevertheless, McIntire claimed that he was Machen's successor.³⁵³ He has been a champion for faith as a fundamentalist vigorously opposing liberalism. It should be pointed out that McIntire can claim to be Machen's successor in terms of opposition to modernism, defense of the inerrancy of the Bible, defense of the Biblical truth, the desire for the purity of the church, and so on.

Marsden argues that in America there are three meanings to being "Reformed": doctrinalist, culturalist, and pietist. The first group meant by the word "strict adherence to Christian doctrine as contained in the

³⁵¹ Marsden, "Perspective," 322.

³⁵² *Christian Beacon* 2 (Jun. 3, 1937), 5, as quoted in Marsden, "Perspective," 317.

³⁵³ Morton, "Origins," 128-29; Hutchinson, *History*, 265-66. Cf. Carl McIntire, "What Next?" *Christian Beacon* 2 (Jan. 14, 1937), 4.

infallible Scriptures and defined by the standards of the Westminster Assembly.” In the second community, a “Reformed” Christian is one who has a convinced view of the relationship of Christianity and culture. He is to “affirm the lordship of Christ over all reality, see Christian principles as applicable to all areas of life, and view every calling as sacred.” One trait of the third type of being “Reformed” is that “it is tolerant of diversity to the point of keeping close fellowship with persons of other traditions.” He continues:

The operative tests for fellowship among the Reformed in such communities are those of the broader American evangelical-pietist tradition – a certain style of emphasis on evangelism, personal devotions, Methodist mores, and openness in expressing one’s evangelical commitment. To be “Reformed” in this setting means to find in Reformed theology the most biblical and healthiest expression of evangelical piety.³⁵⁴

Marsden also states that “the supernaturalist or fundamentalist party among the Reformed included major elements of Old School or doctrinalist heritage as well as the successors to New School evangelicalism.”³⁵⁵

For over two decades the mainline churches in America such as the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the United Methodist Church, the Episcopal Church, and the United Church of Christ underwent serious membership

³⁵⁴ George M. Marsden, “Reformed and American,” in *Reformed Theology in America: A History of its Modern Development* ed. David F. Wells (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985), 1-3.

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 8-9.

declines. For example, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) lost over 1.2 million members from 1966 to 1987, and the membership of the United Methodist Church decreased from over 10.6 million in 1970 to under 9.2 million in 1986. Analysts note that one important reason for the decline is the nebulous doctrinal identity of the churches. In other words, the mainstream churches adopted a policy of doctrinal pluralism and blurred their theological identities in a quest for inclusiveness and relevance to the increasingly secular American culture. The roots of this nebulous doctrinal identity lie in the fundamentalist–modernist controversy of the 1920s. The churches in the 1920s chose to allow for diverse doctrinal views in order to preserve the unity of the church. Adherence to doctrinal pluralism has left the churches devoid of a clear theological voice, because the doctrinal diversity in the churches made it difficult for them to articulate clearly their beliefs.³⁵⁶

Also, many young adults left the churches of their parents into secular lifestyles due to the nebulous identity. Churches cannot hold their children when it is difficult for them to enunciate a clear statement of faith distinct from the vision and world-view of the culture.³⁵⁷ Longfield concedes that Machen was right in stressing the importance of doctrines by writing that “it appears that Machen’s fears about the secularization of the church without distinct doctrinal boundaries were well founded.” In the Presbyterian Church, the mainstream churches were determined to eschew

³⁵⁶ Longfield, *Presbyterian Controversy*, 3-4.

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 232.

theological discussion and accept doctrinal pluralism to further their mission. This solution worked for a time in encouraging the unity and vitality of the church. However, in the long run, it was an important reason for the current identity crisis of the church and helped to undermine the foundation of the church's mission to the world. And Longfield suggests that the contemporary mainstream churches affirm a normative middle theological position with clear boundaries. He states that "if the mainstream churches are to resolve their identity crises, they will have to do so on the basis of a biblical and creedal faith that is distinct from the values and norms of the surrounding culture."³⁵⁸

In relation to this, Harold J. Ockenga writes concerning the fundamentalist movement that "the movement was unable to crack social problems. The influence of fundamentalism was reduced to inconsequential splinter groups that had no great social prophetic message." He criticizes it that "there was no interest in the United Nations, in efforts for world peace, in the improvement of labor relations, or in the solving of the race conflict.... a basic indifference to human suffering and a silence concerning social injustices was noticeable."³⁵⁹ Furthermore, he states that neo-evangelicalism differed from liberalism by maintaining the doctrines of orthodoxy, which it held in common with the fundamentalist movement. Neo-evangelicalism found itself diverging from fundamentalism as well, by applying consistently Christian doctrine

³⁵⁸ Ibid., 234-35.

³⁵⁹ Harold J. Ockenga, "From Fundamentalism, Through New Evangelicalism, to Evangelicalism," in *Evangelical Roots: A Tribute to Wilbur Smith* ed. Kenneth S. Kantzer (New York: Thomas Nelson Inc., Publishers, 1978), 43.

to personal and social ethics.³⁶⁰

Therefore, the doctrinal aspect is very important, on the one hand, and the common theological features between Machen and McIntire belonging respectively to the Old and New School as “the two leading American patterns of being Reformed” should be more emphasized rather than stressing the differences between them.³⁶¹ Yet, on the other hand, the Christian church should not neglect fulfilling the social and cultural responsibility. In America, the Puritan commonwealth was the oldest major Reformed community which combined ideally strong elements of each of the above mentioned three types of doctrinalist, culturalist, and pietist.³⁶² Also, George Marsden states concerning the difference of the cultural view between the Old and New School:

The Old School was most characteristically doctrinalist, while the more innovative New School combined pietist revivalism with a culturalist emphasis, inherited from the Puritans, looking for a Christianization of American life.³⁶³

Especially, Machen is unique in this matter. He stood for the influence being exerted on society by ideas. So he emphasized the importance of doctrine. Through this way, he wanted to recover the traditional culture through reformation. He sought not only to preserve the Christian tradition, but also to address social and political issues through this way. In this aspect he is indeed unique among those

³⁶⁰ Ibid., 41.

³⁶¹ George Marsden, “Reformed and American,” 6-7.

³⁶² Ibid., 3-4.

³⁶³ Ibid., 6.

protagonists in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy. While the Reformed Presbyterians were fully committed to making America a Christian nation by both the power of reason and evangelical witness and social reform, Machen worried about doctrine and civil liberty. Although Machen held to the Calvinistic belief concerning the church's role in culture that the church was called to transform the culture, he severely limited his opportunities to influence church and culture by leaving the PCUSA and separating himself from the vast majority of Presbyterians.³⁶⁴

Also, being influenced by Thornwell, especially in terms of the doctrine of the spirituality of the church, he thought that secession was the honorable solution to the irreconcilable differences of principle. Once he judged that the PCUSA had become apostate, he worked for a way to establish a new church.³⁶⁵

However, in view of the successive developments of American church history in which is found the emergence of the evangelical movement, the importance of the common features that both Machen and McIntire share, including opposition to liberalism, should be emphasized. When considering the fact that such evangelical scholars as Gary Dorrien argue for the remaking of evangelical theology to broaden the constituency to include even Roman Catholicism, it is very obscure to determine the specific standard by which to judge whether one is the evangelical or the liberal.³⁶⁶ In fact, there are many progressive evangelicals who are

³⁶⁴ Longfield, *Presbyterian Controversy*, 224-30.

³⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 225.

³⁶⁶ Dorrien, *Remaking of Evangelical Theology*, 153-83.

difficult to distinguish them from liberals theologically or doctrinally. Therefore, at this juncture, the importance of the common doctrines in which Reformed and Presbyterian Christians share, as can be found in the case of the differences between Machen and McIntire, should be emphasized so that it may cover some minor differences to strive not only for the unity but for the purity of the church as well.

Stanley J. Grenz writes that “Bloesch’s characterization of the essence of the movement as doctrine plus experience is a step in the right direction. However, I would assert that we ought to place the two dimensions in the reverse order.”³⁶⁷ In other words, he stresses the importance of experience over doctrine. Yet it seems to be very dangerous. In light of Machen’s thought, it is a beginning (a step) into liberalism. Doctrine should be the foundation of experience. Doctrine should be the standard. If experience goes first before doctrine, it will lose the standard which can judge whether it is right experience or not. It is like Schleiermacher’s theology which argues that the source of religion is located in man’s feeling of absolute dependence on the eternal. However noble it may be, it cannot be right. If the evangelical movement does not give the first priority to traditional doctrines of historic Christianity, it will soon lose its proper characteristic.

Here we should consider the relationship between Reformed Theology and evangelicalism. Historically speaking, Reformed Theology

³⁶⁷ Stanley J. Grenz, *Revisioning Evangelical Theology: A Fresh Agenda for the 21st Century* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 30.

is derived from the Colloquy of Marburg (1529) in which was manifested the differences of thought between Martin Luther and Ulrich Zwingli, especially concerning the view of the Lord's Supper. The main characteristics of Reformed Theology are the centrality of God and Christocentricity. Especially its one important distinguishing feature is man's absolute dependence on God's sovereignty for salvation. Furthermore, it is characterized by pluriformity. It has possessed creative vitality sufficient to encompass diversity within an over-all consensus. As a result, various types of theology are included in it. Especially, Princeton Theology was a revival of Reformed Theology which occurred in the 19th century in America. Princeton Theology, spearheaded by Charles Hodge, B. B. Warfield and other Princetonians, followed and adapted the scholastic Calvinism of Francis Turretin.

Also, the churches that emerged from the German Reformation adopted the name *evangelisch* (evangelical) as a means of stressing Luther's emphasis on the gospel and in order to distinguish them from the Roman Catholic church. By virtue of this historical background, all Protestant churches may claim the term *evangelical*. Moreover, the Reformation heritage bequeathed to evangelicalism the great mottos: *sola Scriptura, sola gratia, sola fide*. As a result, the emphases on the authority of the Bible and the sole salvific work of Christ leading to salvation by grace through faith alone have characterized evangelicals wherever they have been found since the sixteenth century. Thus, evangelicalism is a much broader term than Reformed Theology. Within

its theological boundary are included Lutheranism, Arminianism, Pentecostalism, etc.

However, Grenz does not take into consideration that there were in American church history divisions caused by the Great Awakenings. Also, there were the Old Side in the 18th century, and the Old School in the 19th century, which exerted the great influence in the church and culture and society in general. Therefore, the American church history should be viewed not only from the perspective of evangelicalism, but also from the perspective of Reformed theology. Hence the importance of doctrine should be more emphasized in view of Grenz's viewpoint. In this regard, the causes of divisions which occurred in American church history need to be noted.

New evangelicalism share the orthodox doctrines with fundamentalists. Fundamentalists are the noble people. However, their strategy was wrong. Neo-evangelicals wanted to apply the biblical doctrine to personal and social ethics. Neo-evangelicals showed a willingness to face societal problems such as social injustice and racial conflict. Neo-evangelicalism is different from fundamentalism, liberalism, and neo-orthodoxy. However, today some people among neo-evangelicals abandoned some orthodox doctrines, especially biblical inerrancy. Thus conservative evangelicals do not use the name "neo-evangelical" any more to refer to themselves.³⁶⁸

In the Korean Presbyterian church, there were the fundamentalist-

³⁶⁸ Ockenga, "From Fundamentalism," 36-46.

liberal controversies in both the 1930s and the 1950s. And there were three tragic divisions in a decade because of the problems of Shinto shrine worship, liberal theology, and WCC in 1952, 1953 and 1959 respectively. Both Machen and McIntire had a great influence on the Korean Presbyterian church through the missionaries of the OPC and the BPC and through the Korean leaders of the church. Especially, Machen exerted an immeasurable influence through Hyung Nong Park and Yune Sun Park, two great theologians in terms of Reformed Theology, in particular the tradition of the old Princeton Theology.

There have been so many divisions which arose from issues less than those of apostasy in church history. Therefore, through these lessons of history, we are reminded to commit always to both purity and unity of the church in today's situation in which we are facing many false gospels or false religions. Edmund P. Clowney writes:

Christ calls his scattered sheep to the unity of his Spirit. We must heed his voice and buy up the opportunity. Spiritual revival for the church is revival by the Spirit of him of whom it was said, "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up" (John 2:17). To order the fellowship of the saints by the Word of Christ is to build the holy temple of the Lord and to edify the body of Christ. The riches of biblical revelation concerning the church come from the Lord who "loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle,

or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish”
(Eph. 5:25-27).

It is time for the true bride to hear the voice of the bridegroom. The path where he calls may seem impassible, blocked by the rubble of tradition and the walls of rebellion; but Christ calls his church. He will be answered, not in the weary tones of political opportunism, but in ardor of jealous love.³⁶⁹

³⁶⁹ Edmund P. Clowney, *The Doctrine of the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1969), 59-60.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources

MANUSCRIPTS

Machen Archives, Westminster Theological Seminary Library.

CHURCH RECORDS

A. The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

Digest of the Acts and Deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 2 vols., Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work, 1923.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1910, 1916, 1923-1936.

B. The Presbyterian Church of America

Minutes of the First General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America (Philadelphia, Jun. 11-14, 1936).

Minutes of the Second General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America (Philadelphia, Nov. 12-14, 1936).

Minutes of the Third General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America (Philadelphia, Jun. 1-4, 1937).

BOOKS

Ferm, Vergilius (ed.). *Contemporary American Theology*. 2 vols. New York: Round Table Press, 1932.

Machen, John Gresham. *The Origin of Paul's Religion*. New York: The Macmillan Company, [1921] 1936.

_____. *Christianity and Liberalism*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923.

_____. *What Is Faith?*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, [1925] 1946.

_____. *The Virgin Birth of Christ*. New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1932.

_____. *Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.* Philadelphia: Press of Allen, Lane & Scott, 1933.

_____. *The Christian Faith in the Modern World*. London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1936.

_____. *The Christian View of Man*. Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, [1937] 1984.

_____. *God Transcendent*. Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, [1949] 1982.

- _____. *What Is Christianity?*. ed. Ned B. Stonehouse,
Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951.
- _____. *Christianity and Culture*. Carlisle, PA: The
Banner of Truth Trust, 1969.
- _____. *Education, Christianity and the State*. ed. John W.
Robbins, Hobbs, New Mexico: The Trinity Foundation, [1987] 1995.
- McIntire, Carl. *Dr. Robert E. Speer, The Board of Foreign Missions of the
Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and Modernism*. Privately
printed. 1935.
- _____. *A Cloud of Witnesses*. Philadelphia: Pinebrook Press,
1938.
- _____. *The Rise of the Tyrant*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian
Beacon Press, 1945.
- _____. *Twentieth Century Reformation*. Collingswood, NJ:
Christian Beacon Press, 1946.
- _____. *Author of Liberty*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon
Press, 1946.
- _____. *For Such A Time As This*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian
Beacon Press, 1946.
- _____. *Modern Tower of Babel*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian
Beacon Press, 1949.
- _____. *The Truth about the Federal Council of Churches and the
Kingdom of God*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1950.
- _____. *The Testimony of Separation*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian

Beacon Press, 1952.

_____. *Bishop Oxnam, Prophet of Marx*. Collingswood, NJ:

Christian Beacon Press, 1953.

_____. *Better than Seven Sons*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian

Beacon Press, 1954.

_____. *Servants of Apostasy*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon
Press, 1955.

_____. *Outside the Gate*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon
Press, 1967.

_____. *The Death of a Church*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian
Beacon Press, 1967.

_____. *The New Bible, Revised Standard Version: Why Christians
Should Not Accept It*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press,
1969.

JOURNALS

Christian Beacon, ed. Carl McIntire, Collingswood, NJ, March 1936f.

The Presbyterian Guardian, ed. H. McAllister Griffiths, Philadelphia, Oct.
1935f. Vols. 1-4 (Oct. 1935-Dec. 1937).

Christianity Today, May, 1930-Dec. 1938.

The Presbyterian, 1920-1930.

TAPE

McIntire, Carl. "Twentieth Century Reformation Movement." Special Lecture at Faith Theological Seminary, Philadelphia: Westminster Media, Feb. 11, 1988.

Davis, D. Clair. "Separate from Unbelief." Special Lecture at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia: Westminster Media, 1980.

II. Secondary Sources

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Ahlstrom, Sydney E. *A Religious History of the American People*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

Allis, Oswald T. *Prophecy and the Church*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1945.

Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. *Baptist Battles: Social Change and Religious Conflict in the Southern Baptist Convention*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Austin, Alan K. "The History of Westminster Theological Seminary, 1929-1964." M.A. thesis, East Tennessee State University, 1965.

Barker, William S. "Subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith

- and Catechisms.” *Presbyterion* 10 (Spring and Fall, 1984): 1-19.
- _____. “A Response to Professor George Knight’s Article ‘Subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms.’” *Presbyterion* 10 (Spring and Fall 1984): 64-71.
- Barner, Randall and Fitzmier, John R. *The Presbyterians*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1994.
- Barr, James. *Fundamentalism*. London: SCM Press Ltd., [1977] 1981.
- Bass, Clarence B. *Backgrounds to Dispensationalism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960.
- Beale, David O. *In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism since 1850*. Greenville, SC: Unusual Publications, 1986.
- Borland, James A. “J. Gresham Machen: Valiant for Truth.” *Fundamentalist Journal* v. 2, No. 3, (1983): 32-33.
- Bozeman, Theodore D. *Protestants in an Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Antebellum American Religious Thought*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977.
- Bratt, James D. *Dutch Calvinism in Modern America: A History of a Conservative Subculture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- _____. “The Dutch Schools.” In *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development*, 115-32. Edited by David F. Wells. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997.
- Brereton, Virginia Lieson. *Training God’s Army: The American Bible School, 1880-1940*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990.

- Briggs, Charles A. *American Presbyterianism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.
- _____. "Revision of the Westminster Confession." *Andover Review* 13, no. 73 (January 1890): 45-68.
- _____. *The Authority of Holy Scripture: An Inaugural Address*. New York, 1891.
- Brown, A. J. *The Mastery of the Far East*. New York: Scribners, 1919.
- Bushnell, Horace. *Christian Nurture*. Grand Rapids: Baker, [1861] 1979.
- Buswell, J. Oliver, Jr. *The Christian Life*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House. 1937.
- Cairns, Earle E. *Christianity through the Centuries: A History of the Christian Church*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, [1954] 1981.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. ed. John T. McNeill. trans. Ford Lewis Battles. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.
- Carnell, Edward John. *The Case for Orthodox Theology*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.
- Carpenter, Joel A. *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Churchill, Robert K. *Lest We Forget*. Philadelphia: The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1986.
- Clark, Allen D. *A History of the Church in Korea*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, [1961] 1971.

- Clark, Donald N. *Christianity in Modern Korea*. New York: University Press of America, 1986.
- Clowney, Edmund P. "Toward a Biblical Doctrine of the Church." *Westminster Theological Journal* 31 (November 1968): 22-81.
- _____. *The Doctrine of the Church*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1969.
- _____. *Living in Christ's Church*. Philadelphia: Great Commission Publications, 1986.
- Cole, Stewart G. *The History of Fundamentalism*. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931.
- The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell*. 4 vols. Richmond, VA: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1881.
- The Committee on Publications of the Bible Presbyterian Church. *The Constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church*. Wilmington: The Committee on Publications of the Bible Presbyterian Church, 1946.
- The Confession of Faith*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.
- Conforti, Joseph A. *Samuel Hopkins and the New Divinity Movement*. Grand Rapids: Christian University Press, 1981.
- Conn, Harvie M. "Studies in the Theology of the Korean Presbyterian Church: An Historical Outline, Part I." *Westminster Theological Journal* 29 (November 1966): 24-57.
- _____. "Studies in the Theology of the Korean Presbyterian Church: An Historical Outline, Part II." *Westminster Theological Journal* 29 (May 1967): 136-78.

- _____. "Studies in the Theology of the Korean Presbyterian Church: An Historical Outline, Part III." *Westminster Theological Journal* 30 (November 1967): 24-49.
- _____. "Studies in the Theology of the Korean Presbyterian Church: An Historical Outline, Part IV." *Westminster Theological Journal* 30 (May 1968): 135-84.
- _____. *Contemporary World Theology*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1974.
- _____. ed. *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, a Challenge, a Debate*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Coray, Henry W. J. *Gresham Machen: A Silhouette*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1981.
- Dalhouse, Mark Taylor. *An Island in the Lake of Fire: Bob Jones University, Fundamentalism & the Separatist Movement*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1996.
- Davis, D. Clair. "Machen and Liberalism." In *Pressing Toward the Mark: Essays Commemorating Fifty Years of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church*. ed. Charles G. Dennison and Richard C. Gamble. Philadelphia: The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1986. 247-58.
- Dayton, Donald W. *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage*. Lombard, IL: Hendrickson Publishers, 1976.
- Dollar, George W. *A History of Fundamentalism in America*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1973.

- Dorrien, Gary. *The Remaking of Evangelical Theology*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
- Fosdick, Harry Emerson. "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" Reprinted in: *Christian Century* 39 (June 8, 1922): 713-17.
- _____. *The Modern Use of the Bible*. 1924. Reprint. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925.
- _____. *The Living of These Days*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1956.
- The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth*. 12 vols. Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company, 1910-1915; 4 vols. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.
- Furniss, Norman F. *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931*. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1954.
- Galbraith, John P. *Why the Orthodox Presbyterian Church?*. Philadelphia: The Committee on Christian Education of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1965.
- Gasper, Louis. *The Fundamentalist Movement: 1930-1956*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1963.
- Grenz, Stanley J. *Revisioning Evangelical Theology: A Fresh Agenda for the 21st Century*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Grenz, Stanley J. and Olson, Roger E. *20th-Century Theology: God and the World in a Transitional Age*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992.
- Griffiths, H. McAllister. *The Case for Compromise*. Collingswood, NJ:

- Christian Beacon Press, n.d.
- Handy, Robert T. *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities*. New York: Oxford University Press, [1971] 1984.
- _____. *Undermined Establishment: Church-State Relations in America, 1880-1920*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Hankins, Barry. *God's Rascal: J. Frank Norris & the Beginnings of Southern Fundamentalism*. Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996.
- Harden, Margaret G. Compiler. *A Brief History of the Bible Presbyterian Church: And Its Agencies*. 1967.
- Harris, Harriet A. *Fundamentalism and Evangelicals*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Hart, Darryl G. "The Princeton Mind in the Modern World and the Common Sense of J. Gresham Machen." *Westminster Theological Journal* 46 (1984): 1-25.
- _____. "‘Dr. Fundamentalism’: An Intellectual Biography of J. Gresham Machen, 1881-1937." Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1988.
- _____. *Defending the Faith: J. Gresham Machen and the Crisis of Conservative Protestantism in Modern America*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- _____. ed. *Reckoning with the Past: Historical Essays on American Evangelicalism from the Institute for the Study of American*

- Evangelicals*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.
- Hatch, Nathan O. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Headman, Wayne. "A Critical Evaluation of J. Gresham Machen." Th.M. thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1974.
- Herman, Douglas E. "Flooding the Kingdom: The Intellectual Development of Fundamentalism, 1930-1941." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio University, 1980.
- Hocking, William Ernest. ed. *Re-thinking Missions: A Laymen's Inquiry After One Hundred Years*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1932.
- Hodge, A. A. *The Confession of Faith*. London: The Banner of Truth Trust, [1869] 1961.
- _____. *The Life of Charles Hodge*. 1881. Reprint. New York: Arno Press & The New York Times, 1969.
- Hodge, Charles. *The Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Education, 1851.
- _____. *Systematic Theology*. 3 vols. 1871-1873. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- _____. *The Church and Its Polity*. London: T. Nelson, 1879.
- Hoffecker, W. Andrew. *Piety and the Princeton Theologians: Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, and Benjamin Warfield*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1981.

- Hofmeyr, J. W. and Pillay, Gerald J. eds. *A History of Christianity in South Africa*. Pretoria: HAUM Tertiary, 1994.
- Hong, Chi Mo. "Cha Choon Kim's Theology Viewed from the Perspective of Korean Conservative Theology." In *Piety and Scholarship: Essays Presented to the Rev. Yune Sun Park in Honor of His Fifty Years of Ministry* [in Korean]. ed. Chang In Kim, et. al. Seoul: Yung Eum Sa, 1987. 305-33.
- _____. "The Significance of Yune Sun Park's Theology in Korean Church History." In *The Life and Theology of Yune Sun Park* [in Korean]. ed. Hapdong Theological Seminary Press. Suwon: Hapdong Theological Seminary, 1995. 296-98.
- Hunter, James Davison. *American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandary of Modernity*. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, 1983.
- _____. *Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Hutchinson, George P. *The History Behind the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod*. Cherry Hill, NJ: Mack Publishing Co., 1974.
- Hutchison, William R. ed. *American Protestant Thought in the Liberal Era*. New York: University Press of America, 1968.
- _____. ed. *Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America, 1900-1960*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

- _____ . *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism*.
Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1992.
- The Institute of Korean Church History Studies. *A History of Korean Church*. 2 vols. Seoul: The Christian Literature Press, 1990.
- Kantzer, Kenneth S. ed. *Evangelical Roots: A Tribute to Wilbur Smith*.
Nashville and New York: Thomas Nelson Inc., Publishers, 1978.
- Kellogg, Edward L. *Lest We Forget*. Philadelphia: The Committee on
Christian Education of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, n.d.
- Kim, Ezra Kilsung. "J. Gresham Machen's Doctrine of the Church." Ph.D.
dissertation, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1992.
- Kim, John Euiwhan. "Theology of Hyung Nong Park." In *The Life and
Thought of Dr. Hyung Nong Park*. [in Korean] ed. Yong Kyu Park.
Seoul: Chongshin University Press, 1996.
- Kim, Ki Hong. "Presbyterian Conflict in the Early Twentieth Century:
Ecclesiology in the Princeton Tradition and the Emergence of
Presbyterian Fundamentalism." Ph.D. dissertation, Drew University.
Ann Arbor: U.M.I., 1983.
- Kraus, C. Norman. *Dispensationalism in America*. Richmond: John Knox
Press, 1958.
- Kuklick Bruce. *Churchmen and Philosophers: From Jonathan Edwards to
John Dewey*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Lippmann, Walter. *A Preface to Morals*. New York: The Macmillan
Company, 1926.
- Livingstone, William D. "The Princeton Apologetic as Exemplified by the

Work of Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield and J. G. Machen.” Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1948.

Loetscher, Lefferts A. *The Broadening Church*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954.

Longfield, Bradley J. *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Lovelace, Richard F. *Dynamics of Spiritual Life: An Evangelical Theology of Renewal*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1979.

Macartney, Clarence E. *The Making of a Minister*. Great Neck, New York: Channel Press, Inc., 1961.

McNeill, John T. *The History and Character of Calvinism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Marsden, George M. “The New School Presbyterian Mind: A Study of Theology in Mid-Nineteenth Century America.” Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1966.

_____ . “The New School Heritage and Presbyterian Fundamentalism.” *Westminster Theological Journal* v. 32, No. 2, (1970): 129-47.

_____ . *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth-Century America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

_____ . “J. Gresham Machen, History, and Truth.”

- Westminster Theological Journal* v. 42, No. 2, (1979): 157-75.
- _____. *Fundamentalism and American Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- _____. ed. *Evangelicalism and Modern America*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- _____. "Perspective on the Division of 1937." In *Pressing toward the Mark*, 295-328. eds. C. G. Dennison and R. C. Gamble. Philadelphia: The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1986.
- _____. *Reforming Fundamentalism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- _____. *Religion and American Culture*. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1990.
- _____. *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Marsden, Robert S. *The First Ten Years*. Philadelphia: The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, 1946.
- Mathews, Donald G. *Religion in the Old South*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Morton, Herbert D. "Origins of the Twentieth Century Reformation Movement." Th.M. thesis, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1967.
- Neuhaus, Richard John. and Cromartie, Michael. eds. *Piety and Politics: Evangelicals and Fundamentalists Confront the World*. Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1987.

- Nichols, Robert Hastings. "Fundamentalism in the Presbyterian Church."
The Journal of Religion v. 5, No. 1, (1925): 14-36.
- Noll, Mark A. ed. *The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921: Scripture, Science, and Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1983.
- Noll, Mark A., Marsden, George M. and Hatch, Nathan O. *The Search for Christian America*. Colorado Springs, CO: Helmers & Howard, Publishers, Inc., 1989.
- Noll, Mark A. *Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible in America*. Grand Rapids: Baker, [1986] 1991.
- _____. *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Packer, J. I. *Fundamentalism and the Word of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1958.
- Paik, L. George. *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea, 1832-1910*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1970.
- Park, Aaron Pyungchoon. "A Few Congratulatory Remarks Concerning the Opening of Dr. Henry Hyungnong Park's Memorial Lecture Series at Chong Shin Theological Seminary." *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 64. No. 3 (Fall 1997): 7, 9.
- Park, Hyung Nong. *Collected Writings of Dr. Hyung Nong Park* [in Korean]. 14 vols. Seoul: The Korean Institute of Christian Education, 1977.

- Piety and Scholarship: Essays Presented to the Rev. Yune Sun Park in Honor of His Fifty Years of Ministry* [in Korean]. ed. Chang In Kim, et. al. Seoul: Yung Eum Sa, 1987.
- Poythress, Vern S. *Understanding Dispensationalists*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987.
- Presbyterian Reunion: A Memorial Volume, 1837-1871*. New York: Lent & Co., 1871.
- Rausch, David A. *Fundamentalist-Evangelicals and Anti-Semitism*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993.
- Rian, Edwin H. *The Presbyterian Conflict*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1940.
- Roark, Dallas Morgan. "J. Gresham Machen and His Desire to Maintain a Doctrinally True Presbyterian Church." Ph.D. dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1963.
- Rosenberg, Ellen M. *The Southern Baptists: A Subculture in Transition*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1989.
- Roy, Ralph Lord. *Apostles of Discord*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953.
- Russell, Charles Allyn. *Voices of American Fundamentalism: Seven Biographical Studies*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.
- Ryrie, Charles C. *Dispensationalism*. Chicago: Moody Press, [1965] 1995.
- Sandeen, Ernest R. *The Origins of Fundamentalism: Toward a Historical Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- _____. *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

- Schaeffer, F. A. *Our System of Doctrine*. Philadelphia: The Publications Committee of the Bible Presbyterian Church, 1942.
- Scofield, C. I. ed. *The Scofield Reference Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1909.
- Selvidge, Marla J. ed. *Fundamentalism Today: What Makes It So Attractive?*. Elgin, IL: Brethren Press, 1984.
- Shearer, Roy E. *Wildfire: Church Growth in Korea*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966.
- Smith, H. Shelton, Handy, Robert T., and Loetscher, Lefferts A. *American Christianity: An Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents*. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960.
- Stevick, Daniel B. *Beyond Fundamentalism*. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1964.
- Stonehouse, Ned B. *J. Gresham Machen, a Biographical Memoir*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.
- Stroman, John Albert. "The American Council of Christian Churches: A Study of Its Origin, Leaders, and Characteristic Positions." Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1966.
- Sweet, Leonard I. ed. *The Evangelical Tradition in America*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1984.
- Thompson, M. Forst. *The Auburn Betrayal*. Philadelphia: The Committee on Christian Education of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, n.d.
- Trinterud, Leonard J. *The Forming of an American Tradition*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, [1949] 1970.

- Van Til, Cornelius. *The Case for Calvinism*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., [1963] 1979.
- _____. *The Defense of the Faith*. 1955; 3rd ed. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1967.
- _____. *An Introduction to Systematic Theology*. 1974. Reprint. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1982.
- Vander Stelt, John C. *Philosophy and Scripture: A Study in Old Princeton Westminster Theology*. Marlton, NJ: Mack Publishing Company, 1978.
- Wacker, Grant. "Augustus H. Strong: A Conservative Confrontation with History." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1978.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. and Hodge, A. A. "Inspiration." *Presbyterian Review* 2 (1881): 225-60.
- _____. *The Confession of Faith as Revised in 1903*. Richmond, VA: Whittet & Shepperson, 1904.
- _____. *Biblical and Theological Studies*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1952.
- _____. *Calvin and Augustine*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1952.
- _____. *Perfectionism*. 1932. Reprint. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1967.
- _____. *Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*. ed. Samuel G. Craig. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing

Company, 1968.

Selected Shorter Writings of Benjamin B. Warfield.

ed. John E. Meeter. 2 vols. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1970.

Watt, David H. *A Transforming Faith: Explorations of Twentieth-Century American Evangelicalism.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1991.

Wells, David F. ed. *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997.

Wells, David F. & Woodbridge, John D. eds. *The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing.* Grand Rapids: Baker, [1975] 1977.

White, William., Jr. *Van Til: Defender of the Faith: An Authorized Biography.* Nashville and New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1979.

Williams, Peter W. *America's Religions: Traditions and Cultures.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1990.

Willis, David. and Welker, Michael. eds. *Toward the Future of Reformed Theology: Tasks, Topics, Traditions.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Woodbridge, John D. *Biblical Authority: A Critique of the Rogers/McKim Proposal.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982.

Woodbridge, John D. and Balmer, Randall H. "The Princetonians and Biblical Authority: An Assessment of the Ernest Sandeen Proposal." In *Scripture and Truth.* ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge.

- Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983, 251-79.
- Woolley, Paul. *The Significance of J. Gresham Machen Today*. Nutley, NJ:
Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1977.
- Yang, Nak Heong. *Reformed Social Ethics and the Korean Church*. New
York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 1997.
- Yi, Mahn Yol. *Korean Christianity and the National Consciousness*. Seoul:
Gishik Sanubsa, 1991.