# **THE RELEANCE OF F. B. SRYGLEY TO CHURCHES OF CHRIST**

# **IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY, Part Two**

In the first part of this three part study of F.B. Srygley’s relevance to churches of Christ in the twenty-first century, attention was called to five of twelve reasons that, in my opinion, this man of God has relevance to those who are interested in New Testament Christianity today. First, he is a significant link between the early pioneers of the Restoration and those who continued this work in the twentieth century. Second, he was an implicit channel of the conservative tradition advanced by Alexander Campbell in the *Christian Baptist*. Third, he committed himself completely and resolutely to apostolic authority in every aspect of Christianity. Fourth, he felt called on to guard the perimeters of the ancient order. And fifth, he possessed a wholesome balance in his ability to steadfastly hold to the truth and oppose error with forbearance toward his erring brethren. In the last three of these, Srygley is an example for gospel preachers today. Now we continue our study with the next four of the reasons of Srygley’s relevance.

**Sixth, Srygley’s editorials touched almost all *contemporary controversies* (large and small), both in the Christian Church and among churches of Christ.** A synopsis of his editorials and other writings in the *Gospel Advocate* would suggest a catalog of the controversial issues, if not a mini-history of controversies, that arose during his lifetime. Some men wrote a lot on particular subjects, but his writings were broader than most in scope. The wide range of topics on which he expressed himself partly resulted from the fact that much that he wrote was prompted by letters and postal cards from readers and from clippings sent to him from various sources, usually with a request for his comments. He also read the religious papers that came to the *Advocate* office and drew items from them on which to launch his editorials. These often dealt with matters he thought were out of kilter with the word of God. Few things escaped his quick mind and ready pen.

Srygley enjoyed his role as counselor and delighted to give advice to his brethren and others, whether requested or volunteered. A good friend wrote him a letter in which he said, “I want advice.” Srygley replied: “When a man comes to me like that, he touches a weak point in my nature. It is a compliment that makes most of us purr like a house cat dozing before a warm fire on a long winter night.”1 One cannot read his editorials without gaining the impression that he dearly loved his work as a respected writer. He understood the role that circumstances, disposition, and aptitude had dealt him. He genuinely loved to explain Scriptures, answer critics, and solve problems. We would not say he loved a fight, being a non-combatant, but there are times when he seems to have relished the give and take of a verbal tussle. But whether he was fond of controversy or not, he saw a need for it and continually engaged in it. His lot was to fill that niche and he did it well. However, he managed to keep in good humor and to make his replies sparkle with wit. And he never allowed his total reliance on the Bible to make him dogmatic or to keep him from recognizing his own susceptibility to err in its interpretation and application.

F.B. Srygley engaged in major discussions about premillennial teaching and institutions. But he also took part in numerous controversies with denominationalists, progressive brethren in the Christian Church, and brethren in conservative churches of Christ. It is not within the scope of this study to review more than a few of these controversies, but we simply make a point of their variety. He dealt with the usually controversies with his denominational neighbors. With the Christian Church/Disciples of Christ brethren, he dealt with the main differences between them and the Bible, as he understood it. He also took notice of their further departures from the faith and the developing division then arising within that fellowship. With brethren in conservative churches of Christ, his shots were aimed mostly at things without divine authority.

Some issues seem to never die. The rebaptism controversy between the *Gospel Advocate* and the *Firm Foundation* had largely subsided when Srygley joined the staff of the *Advocate*. This was mainly because David Lipscomb said all he wanted to on the subject and quit writing about it. But as late as 1938, Srygley was asked what percent of the preachers held to “the rebaptism theory.” He said he had no way of knowing the answer to that question, but he doubted there were any brethren who believed in rebaptism. He said: “There is but one baptism and we are all agreed on that question. So it is not *rebaptism* with any of us—it is *baptism*…. I have an idea we all do about the same way—baptize those who want to be baptized and let the others alone who do not want to be baptized…. We might differ about what a man should know, or understand, about it before he can be scripturally baptized; but as to what we should *do* about it is another question.”2

During the later years of Srygley’s life, more churches of Christ began to hire preachers to work with them full time. Srygley seems to have had mixed feelings on that topic. That was not his practice and it had not been the practice generally among churches of Christ during the earlier years of his ministry. He saw the one-man pastor system as a major contributing factor in the digression in the latter part of the nineteenth century. This no doubt colored his thinking. While he did not object to “located preachers” or to their being paid a salary by the church, he nevertheless saw dangers in the practice and spoke against them from time to time. The developing “professionalism” of preachers and their tendency to “run the church” in place of the elders bothered him a great deal. I am not sure that we have yet successfully avoided the “professionalism” in preachers of which he warned.

Srygley opposed Christians participating in carnal warfare and took G.C. Brewer to task for given a patriotic speech before a veteran’s group in Nashville, in which the secular press said he offered to shed his blood for Americanism. All the editors of the *Advocate* and most of the principle writers up to his time strongly opposed Christians participating in combatant service. However, the owner of the *Advocate*, Leon McQuiddy, served in the military before he inherited the paper in 1924, and after the time of Srygley, the *Advocate* took a less militant attitude toward carnal warfare. It is my opinion that Srygley is unfairly pictured by Richard Hughes in *Reviving the Ancient Faith*, in his brief review of Srygley’s criticism of Brewer’s speech. It was not Brewer’s anti-Communist stand that aroused Srygley, although he thought gospel preachers should glorify Christ and the apostles instead of Americanism. It was rather Brewer’s offer to fight for it with a carnal sword. Brewer claimed that he was misrepresented in the press by a cub reporter, but some who heard the speech said the paper did not misrepresent him, and Srygley noted that Brewer failed to write a letter to the editor of the paper correcting any supposed misrepresentation. He thought Brewer might be trying to stand in one light before the public and another before his brethren.

**Seventh, F.B. Srygley probably had as clear an understanding of *the New Testament church*, as distinct from any semblance of denominationalism, as any man in modern times, unless it was his brother, F.D. Srygley.** F.B Srygley saw the New Testament church as being completely free from any artificial circumscription of a definable “brotherhood” based on any manmade standard. This does not mean that he was tolerant of everything Christians did, but he made his understanding of the church the basis for all he wrote about the subject. His awareness of the one true church also made it possible for him to write freely against denominational ideas and against attitudes that brethren held that tended toward denominationalism, sectarianism, or partyism. He was completely unfettered by any faction in the church in dealing forthrightly with all error, as he saw it. This aspect of his teaching should not be construed to mean that he in any sense endorsed denominationalism, but he recognized the fact that the collection described as “the churches of Christ” may not constitute all those whom God would include in his church. On the other hand, this concept kept him from arguing that the “churches of Christ”—in the sense of “us as a people” or “our brotherhood”—constitute the church of Christ on earth exclusively.

However, it is a mistake to think that Srygley was not striving for nondenomi-national Christianity, or that he in any sense considered churches of Christ with whom he was identified as a denomination, or a part of the one true church. What he was saying was that there is only one true church and that it is made up of all those who have obeyed the gospel wherever they may be. But because of the imperfectability of man, it is not possible for us claim exclusivity or to deny that there are Christians outside the realm of those whom we regard as “the churches of Christ.” This does not mean that he regarded such people as right with God or that they would be saved eternally. But Srygley was perfectly willing, as critical of people and as anxious for the old paths as he was, to leave that matter in the hands of God where it properly belongs.

Furthermore, his view of the New Testament church did not prevent him from marking those whom he regarded as false teachers or refusing to have fellowship with them. If this seems inconsistent, it is because I am not able to adequately convey his concept of the New Testament church. Actually, they are perfectly compatible and, in my judgment, in keeping with the teaching of Christ and the apostles. This reminds me of Srygley’s often-repeated comment that he would rather be right than to be consistent. However, in this case he seems to be right on both points.

Srygley’s understanding of the church figured in his strong objection to the use of the term “churches of Christ” to limit the scope of the Lord’s church to those whom some regarded as “our brethren,” meaning those generally identified with the non-instrumental, anti-missionary society churches. No one was stronger than Srygley in opposing these innovations or in marking those who adopted them, but none was firmer in insisting that we cannot circumscribe the church universal in such a manner. T.H. Etheridge, writing in the *Firm Foundation*, “took a dig” at Srygley for trying to correct an article in which he made a statement in this regard. Referring to what Etheridge had written regarding “celebrating Pentecost” on the Lord’s day, Srygley said: “Since I have seen this effort of my brother Etheridge on this question, I am better able to understand why he could not see the difference between ‘our brethren’ who decided to call themselves ‘the church of Christ’ thirty-five or forty years ago and the church of the New Testament, which is made up of all the saved.”3

A few years later, Srygley wrote: “I do not understand that ‘church’ was a specific name, but the church was the thing rather than the name…. It was, and it is, God’s church. It was Christ’s church, but it was called his church not to give it a name, but to tell what it was and whose church it was. I say, ‘This is my horse,’ but ‘horse’ is not his name. Horse is what he is. It distinguishes him from a cow, but ‘cow’ is not a specific name. The words ‘horse’ and ‘cow’ distinguish one animal from another. If I say, ‘This is my horse, and his name is Bill,’ then we all understand which was the specific name. Well, Christ never gave such a specific name to his church that I gave to my horse…. The words that are used in connection with the church are descriptive rather than specific. This is the reason our brethren who want a specific name are having so much trouble over the name…. I am more concerned about what the church is than I am about some specified name somebody has given it.”4

On another occasion, Srygley wrote: “It is hard to get the denominational idea out of the term ‘church of Christ’ when it is used to describe only a part of God’s children, and I do not know that we have any right to try to get it out…. The denomination idea is in our heads instead of in the words which Christ and the apostles used…. The older preachers use to say that there were so many ‘added to the one body.’ The ‘one body’ is as much a name for the church as the ‘church of Christ.’ One reason we have so much trouble about the name might be that we have a thing to name which is not in the Bible.”5

Another problem brethren often had in understanding the nature of the church related to its universal organization. “The New Testament church has no organization through which its members can work except the local congregation. Of course, much of the work of a Christian is, and of a right ought to be, individual work. To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, is pure, practical religion, and can be, or should be, done by individual Christians. Congregations are made up of individuals, and the whole congregation is benefited by the work of its members…. What is called the organization of the church, if there is such a thing, is exceedingly simple. The New Testament does not use the word ‘organize’ in connection with the planting of the truth in any locality. The church in the New Testament is represented as a building, but not as an organization.”6

“The only organization[s] that the apostles established were local churches. Each local church was a complete unit within itself. These churches were not tied together for any purpose…. There was no provision for organized mission work, except the organization of the local churches…. Every student of the New Testament knows that there is no organization in that book except the local church. I grant that the organization of a simple New Testament church looks rather meager to accomplish the work of saving the world, but it has never been tried very much.”7

In his study of the New Testament, Srygley found no means of circumscribing the church universal by any means that could be devised by man. “God alone knows all his children.”8 If this is true, how can any man or group of men identify all those today who belong to it? Srygley also found very little by way of organization in the local church. “The only organization contemplated in the New Testament is the local church, and there is not as much of that as some think. The only organization taught in that book is of the local church. Elders are recognized as leaders of the local congregation or church. They have no authority outside of that church. A local church and individual Christians might send a man or they might agree to support him and his family if he has one while he went under the authority of Christ, the head of the church; but they would have no scriptural right to form an organization with other churches to do anything. Such an organization would have all the earmarks of the society, and to put it under the eldership of a congregation would not change the marks. The authority of the eldership of a local church goes no further than that church. This kind of an organization [the fostering church], has all the evils of the missionary society and none of the safeguards that it *might* have.”9

Closely associated with the nature of the church are the questions about church membership and fellowship. In 1925, Srygley said: “I have been saying for many years that no man could give church membership. God alone gives it; but he gives it to all that obey him. Baptism is one of the conditions upon which God has promised admission into his church…. This has been taught through the Gospel Advocate continually for thirty-five years, to my certain knowledge.”10

In regard to fellowship, Srygley said: “No Christian should concern himself about being in fellowship with some individual, but he should be concerned about keeping himself in fellowship with the apostles, and he does that by teaching and practicing what the apostles taught. The apostles were in fellowship with Christ and God; and if we walk in the light of the teaching of the apostles, we will have fellowship with every one with whom we should have fellowship…. Under these conditions, if fellowship is broken, we do not have to break it. It is broken by those who get out of step with the apostles’ teaching. Strictly speaking, fellowship is not a condition but an attitude…. I am not concerned about getting into fellowship with some uninspired man, but I am still wrestling with the problem of remaining in fellowship with the apostles.”11

As to the perfection of the church, Srygley wrote: “Just how much error a church can have and not cease to be a church of Christ is more than I can tell. No one should knowingly teach or endorse any error; but as there are no infallible men in the church, except the inspired men, who must be there in their teaching, therefore there are no perfect churches of Christ, except in theory. God, I hope, will accept many of his children in heaven; but if he does, he will accept some imperfections.”12 F.D. Srygley said: “No church is at any time wholly free from [error that might lead to] apostasy.”13

**Eighth, Srygley’s work in “saving the church” from the ravages of *premillen-nialism*, in my judgment, is as significant as that of other man that took part in the controversy.** This takes nothing from the credit that is due Foy E. Wallace, Jr. in his fight against premillennialism as editor of the *Gospel Advocate* and in the following years until the issue was fairly well laid to rest among most churches of Christ. Srygley was active in exposing and opposing the doctrine and in controversy with its chief proponents and apologists. His opposition to premillennialism almost from its inception as a controversy within churches of Christ marks him as one of the foremost adversaries of the doctrine. He was one of the first men, if not the first, to publicly expose the significance of the doctrine and its danger to the church, especially in its teaching on the “future reign of Christ” and the “literal throne of David.” Due both to his insight into the doctrine and to his position as an editor of the *Gospel Advocate*, he probably had at least as much of a lasting influence in delivering many churches from its clutches as any other man.

Srygley was a witness to what happened between R.H. Boll and the *Gospel Advocate* owners and editors. While his name is not listed in the histories we have read, Srygley wrote about it on several occasions. He once said: “I was present in a conference with E.G. Sewell, F.W. Smith, J.C. McQuiddy, and Brother Boll. I heard Brother Sewell tenderly and in a fatherly way say to Brother Boll: ‘Robert, it can do no good to teach these questions; but, on the other hand, it will cause division and strife.’ Brother Boll’s reply was: ‘You can take your churches, and I will go out and establish other churches, in which I can preach this doctrine.’ We all sat silent for a time, and Brother Smith said: ‘We have no churches. They are not our churches, but churches of Christ.’ Brother Boll said: ‘I only meant the churches that you brethren have been instrumental in establishing and building up. I believe this doctrine and I must preach it.’ I said: ‘If you must preach it, I will preach against it, because it will cause division and strife. I do not know exactly what your peculiar doctrine is, but I can learn. I know enough about it to know that it makes the establishment of the kingdom after Christ comes again.”14

There was in the beginning of Boll’s premillennial teaching such reluctance on the part of brethren to deal firmly with matter that many churches of Christ in general were threatened with being engulfed in the doctrine, or at least in sympathy for its teachers. Had it not been for F.B. Srygley, Foy E. Wallace, Jr., R.L. Whiteside, and other such men who saw premillennialism’s threat to the New Testament Christianity, the doctrine may very well have permeated a majority of churches of Christ. Even when the opposition began in earnest, there were many brethren, including some connected with the *Advocate*, who did not want to mark R.H. Boll as a false teacher or to oppose his teaching. But many saw the necessity of open warfare on the speculative theory and no man was on the firing line in the battle earlier than the old warrior from Rock Creek and he was still standing against the doctrine when the Lord called him home. The battle was necessary if churches of Christ were to be saved from premillennialism, but both the proponents of premillennialism, and those who defended them, strenuously objected to the warfare. The opponents were thus forced to battle against the teachers of the doctrine, while fending off their own “friends” who were aiding the premillennial cause.

Srygley, like other *Advocate* editors, respected Boll personally, but when his writings on Revelation began to set forth uncertain sounds regarding the kingdom of Christ and Christ’s reign on David’s throne, Srygley became disturbed. It was actually an article by H.L. Olmstead in Boll’s *Word and Work* in 1915 that moved Srygley to openly challenge the teaching, particularly with regard to the kingdom of Christ and Christ’s reign on David’s throne. From that time through the remainder of his life, Srygley preached and wrote against the theory. Yet, he was not as vigorous in his opposition in the beginning as he became later. Although, when he began to fight the doctrine more resolutely and rebuked Boll by name in dealing with it, he sought to distinguish between the doctrine and the man.

With reference to using men of the past in show that brethren did not disfellowship those who taught elements of millennialism, Srygley said: “But the Word and Work does not quote from these brethren as authority on the teaching of the Bible, but only to show that they did not rise up in their day to ‘mark them’ or to ‘condemn them.’ Well, if they are not authority on the doctrine, why are they authority on ‘marking’ those that cause division? In other words, it appears that the Word and Work wants to use these good men that have gone to their reward when it suits it to use them. And is not the teaching of Paul when he says, ‘Mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them,’ doctrine? If not, what is it?”15

Srygley’s opposition to premillennialism was significant for several reasons. First, he was highly respected by thousands of Christians who regularly read his colorful and thoughtful editorials. Therefore, for him to speak out against the theory carried initial weight. He strongly supported and defended Wallace in his strong fight against the doc-trine. This may have been critical to Wallace’s stand because the owner of the *Gospel Advocate* was not keen on controversy and his reneging on a promise to rehire Wallace as editor after the death of John T. Hinds is attributed to Wallace’s combativeness. Some outstanding brethren, included fellow *Advocate* editor G.C. Brewer, opposed the Neal-Wallace debate, which Srygley attended, reported, and endorsed without reservation. He also defended Wallace when G.C. Brewer was critical of him on the Abilene Christian College lectures, ironically, in which Brewer took Wallace’s place on the program. It is doubtful that any man had the stature in the brotherhood and standing with the owner of the *Advocate* to continue the battle against premillennialism forcefully through its pages to the end of his life. In view of these and other factors that might be noted, I believe F.B. Srygley was fully as effective as Wallace in curbing the teaching and in chastening the apologists for the teaching premillennialism by R.H. Boll. After Wallace lost his place on the *Advocate*, the old warrior from Rock Creek continued the battle on its pages in a manner that showed the teaching in its true light.

**Ninth, Srygley foresaw, denounced, and gave almost prophetic warnings against the rise of *institutionalism*, which resulted in division after his death.** His view of the New Testament church left no room for any kind of an organization larger or other than the local congregation to do the collective work of the church. He viewed with apprehension the growth of so many institutions among the churches of Christ during the last decades of his life. “There seems to be an idea in the minds of some that when Christ built his church he did not build much, but left it to man to complete the institution by adding to it such human organizations as would complete the church and make its work effective…. One trouble that we might be able to see is that human organizations are liable to go wrong; in fact, most of them have gone wrong when they stood long enough; but when only one church is tied up with an institution, only one church will be injured by the failure of the institution. But when many are tied together, many are liable to be injured by such a failure.”16

There were several kinds of institutions that gave Srygley cause for concern, in addition to the missionary society. These included educational and benevolent institutions, religious foundations, and gospel papers. He defended the right of Christians to build and operate each of these, but he opposed the churches contributing to them from the treasury of the local church. He believed this to be unscriptural. The activating of other churches through the elders of a single church, which he called “the fostering or agency plan,” he opposed completely, seeing it as another way to have a missionary society. But in addition to the matter of scriptural authority, Srygley pointed out attitudes and activities connected with such arrangements, which he believed to be not only wrong in itself, but a danger to the autonomy of the local church.

The “fostering or agency plan” was so-called because the “fostering church” devised a plan for some activity, such as preaching the gospel in a foreign field, and sent out agents to “stir up zeal” among other churches for its support. Regarding this Srygley said: “If two or more churches put (money sent to a preacher in the field) into the hands of any kind of a board, though the board may be made up of the elders of one of the churches, we have a very nice beginning of a missionary society to try to take charge of the churches. Much of the missionary machinery of this country started exactly that way.”17 Later that year, he wrote: “Each church is independent of all other churches. I am not much impressed with this idea of one church *fostering* some missionary enterprise for some other church to support. Too much of this ‘fostering’ business has already been done ... Let the churches understand that they are independent organizations and they should not lose their identity in any outside organization.”18

“The agency plan with which the churches have been burdened is only an effort to have the same thing as the society. The name has been changed, but the thing is the same.... Who authorized the elders of a local church to establish the agency plan of raising money from all parts of the country to support missionary activities in what is called the ‘foreign fields’? Every church in the world has the same right that every other church has. If all the churches were to exercise this supposed right, agents would be so thick they would run over each other in their efforts to ‘stir up zeal.’”19

Some of Srygley’s views on Bible schools and papers were expressed in an exchange with Daniel Sommer. “I have never undertaken to defend the conduct of either the schools or the papers. I have never proposed to defend everything that these schools do, nor that the (Apostolic) Review does…. What I said was that a school that teaches the Bible and other things has no right to demand money from a church treasure, but neither has a religious paper…. The Apostolic Review is a human institution. It is not the church. The church was founded by Christ, A.D. 33. The Apostolic Review, as a ‘gospel paper,’ was founded by Ben Franklin, A.D. 1856. The latter is a human institution, but the former is a divine one…. Brethren have the same right to found a school in which the Bible is taught that Benjamin Franklin or the Sommers had to found a paper for a similar purpose.” This response was prompted when the *Apostolic Review* quoted Srygley as saying: “The Gospel Advocate very heartily accepts what Daniel Sommer says about these schools.” Srygley answered: “If I made that statement, it must have been that I accepted what he said about one thing only. I never saw the day, since I have known the family, that I could very heartily accept everything that any of them have said. In fact, no one of them has every accepted everything any of the others have said.”20

Srygley had no problem with the church taking care of orphans. He believed they have a duty to that end, but he thought they should be taken care of in their own community. It was the care and not the place that concerned him. “I think we put emphasis upon the wrong thing when we put it upon the place where the orphans are cared for, rather than upon the matter of caring for them ... I am convinced that it is the duty of churches and individual Christians to care for orphans. Many things are done by the church that are done by the individual members of the church…. If individual Christians … are willing to buy or build a house in which orphans can be housed, and employ help to care for and properly train them, I do not see any impropriety in their doing so. Caring for widows and orphans is a Christian duty, and, therefore, it is the duty of the church which is composed of Christians. Likewise teaching the word of God is a Christian duty, and it is, therefore, the duty of the church. But still, I think that a Christian or Christians can start a paper through which to teach the truth. The paper should not be made part of the church organization; neither should it be under the control of the churches. There is no organization of the churches by which papers, orphan homes, or anything else of the kind, can be controlled ...

“I believe that every objection that can be made against building or acquiring a house in which to rear and train orphan children can be made against the paper that is started through which to teach the word of God. One brother writes to me that these homes and schools are white elephants on the churches and it takes all the money the churches can raise to feed the white elephants. The churches are independent, and why does not the brother teach the churches that they are not compelled to feed the elephants. Let him teach the churches to feed and clothe the orphans, and if they know a better way than the white elephants, teach them to do it that way. Each church can have a little white elephant of its own, or do it in its own way. Do not jump on the elephant, but the feeders…. Orphan homes should be used as clearing houses to get family homes for children. Every church in the country should solve the problem itself by taking care of the orphans around it. Orphan homes may not be the best way to care for orphans, but they can be run in harmony with the New Testament teaching. I would not be afraid to say that orphan homes have the same scriptural right to exist, to care for orphans, that papers have to teach the word of God.

“Some one seems to think that the fact that orphan homes have a board makes them unscriptural; but if they are individual enterprises, like papers, this fact of itself would not make either unscriptural. What I said about not believing in orphan homes was said at a time when I feared there was an effort being made to thrust such things on the churches for support. This was settled at the time in a satisfactory way. I do not yet believe in homes or papers, being made church property. The New Testament church in its organization has no place for such things.”21

Srygley’s teaching on the care of orphans, the building of orphan homes, and the support of the same, to be understood, must be seen in the light of his understand of the church. He believed the church in its universal sense acted through individual members and that those religious duties that belong to individual members belong to the church *in that sense*. He felt that it was the duty of the local church and individuals to care for the orphans in their vicinity. He believed that individuals had the right to build and maintain homes in which to care for orphans. But he put them on the same basis as Bible schools and gospel papers—as individual enterprises. However, he did not believe that they should belong to the church, be under the church’s control, or be thrust upon the churches, as such, for their support. The limit to which a local church should have homes in which to care for orphans was at best limited to the local church.
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