When we present God’s holy law,
And arguments from scripture draw;
Objectors say, to pick a flaw,
“It’s Jewish.”

Though at the first Jehovah blessed
And sanctified His day of rest;
The same belief is still expressed—
“It’s Jewish.”

Though with the world this rest began,
And thence through all the scriptures ran,
And Jesus said “’Twas made for man”—
“It’s Jewish.”

Though not with Jewish rites, which passed,
But with the moral law ‘twas classed
Which must endure while time shall last—
“It’s Jewish.”

Though the disciples, Luke and Paul,
Continue still this rest to call
The “Sabbath-day,” this answers all—
“It’s Jewish.”

The gospel teacher’s plain expression,
That “Sin is of the law transgression,”
Seems not to make the least impression—
“It’s Jewish.”

They love the rest of man’s invention,
But if Jehovah’s day we mention
This puts an end to all contention—
“It’s Jewish.”

O ye who thus God’s day abuse,
Simply because ’twas kept by Jews,
The Saviour, too, you must refuse—
He’s Jewish.

Thus the apostles, too, must fall;
For Andrew, Peter, James, and Paul,
And Thomas, Matthew, John, and all
Were Jewish.

But when old Earth shall pass away,
And be renewed—the Sabbath day
Honored by all—none then will say,
“It’s Jewish.”

And while Eternity’s glad days
Roll on and on with ceaseless rays,
The theme will be Jehovah’s praise,
And that in universal lays—
Not Jewish.

Printed in part on the front page of
the October 21, 1851 Review & Herald.
Final four verses, courtesy of Raymond F. Cottrell.

In this issue: Meet ROSWELL FENNER COTTRELL, a former Seventh Day Baptist who
accepted and tirelessly preached the third angel’s message.
Making Us a Name
by Fred Bischoff

Was it wrong to incorporate legally, to adopt a name by which the government and the world could recognize the believers in present truth as a corporate body, and by which property could be held and insured? Was such a move an alliance with “Babylon,” rejecting God’s principles for those of His enemy?

In the discussion that took place in the Review and Herald, R. F. Cottrell was a key participant. In his initial arguments against church order, (reprinted RH, April 26, 1860.) Cottrell suggested there were two choices; when, in fact, there were three. The two choices he suggested on page 180 were:

(1) To incorporate, to “make us a name, lies at the foundation of Babylon.”
—To do so would result in having a “name with the two-horned beast,” (Rev. 13, referring to the United States of America.)
—The Sabbatarian Adventists could be accused of looking, “...to the civil arm for aid and protection.”(akin to “spiritual fornication of Babylon with the kings of the earth.”)
—It was not right “for any believer to strike hands [sign a contract] with insurance companies at all.”

(2) Not to incorporate, to “do our duty and trust Him to take care of His own.”
—“The church...need not trust in...worldly capitalists to insure...property.”
—May we “get the victory over the beast, his image, and the number of his name,” he urged.

This blurring of the issues by R.F.C. into two choices, created confusion. Note the three actual choices and the spiritual underpinnings of each position:

(1) To incorporate—with a mind set of trusting in the things of this world rather than in God, being “of this world” (John 17:11,14); settling down as full residents.
—Referring to worldly protestant sects, James White said, “The professed church of Christ has left the arm of her true husband, and now leans on the strong arm of the law. She seeks protection, and to be nourished by the corrupt governments of the world....” RH, April 26, 1860, p. 181. Here he quoted an eight-year old article.

—“To come down from the high vocation of the Christian, bury the cross of present truth out of sight, and seek the friendship of the world would be spiritual adultery.” Ibid.

Since name denotes character, to “make us a name” would be to adopt principles of character that are not God’s, but our own—principles of darkness—with no attempt to follow God. Babel here is being our own god, with no attempt to be religious, or with an attempt to wed our religion to the state, resulting in confusion and disunity. This is spiritually akin to “works of the flesh.”

(2) To incorporate—with a heart focused on God, but wise to deal with the realities of this world without violating principle in the least; to be “in the world”, but not “of the world,” as faithful stewards. Ellen White counseled, “Stewards of God can by faithful, judicious management keep their business in this world square, exact and straight.” Testimony No. 5. in IT, p. 200.

James White said, “Will not the question be asked, ‘Who hath required this at your hand [Isa. 1:12]?” RH, April 26, 1860, p. 181.

“It is our duty to conform to the laws of the land necessary to the faithful performance of our stewardship, as long as human laws do not oppose the divine law.” Ibid.

He also believed the Lord guided through the gift given to Ellen. “Testimony No. 5 called our attention to the subject of holding church property legally.” Ibid., p. 180.

Ellen White emphasized, “Order must be observed, and there must be union in maintaining order, or Satan will take the advantage.” (IT, p. 210.)

God has principles of character that He desires to give; we take a name that God gives; not one we make ourselves. This position rejects the very foundation of Babylon. The individual and corporate heart focus is on God, actively seeking His will and doing it out of a heart response to the revelation of His will. This removes confusion and disunity and is spiritually akin to “works of faith.”

(3) Not to incorporate—“not in this world”—to withdraw in ways that are unnecessary and damaging, which R.F.C. advocated as “duty”:

continued on page seven
The Three Persecuting Powers

On Patmos' lonely island the loved disciple saw
Three notable oppressors with saints proclaiming war;
The first, the great red dragon, with features fierce and rare,
The Pagan superstition erecting everywhere.

But after some few ages the dragon's power grew weak,
His votaries forsook him, the living God to seek,
So feigned he too conversion, and lo, the beast uprose,
With all his Papal terror, truth's progress to oppose.

The ancient Pagan images, its doctrines and its laws,
Were now entitled Christian, to help his hellish cause;
'Twas thus the wily serpent pursued his artful plan,
And ages upon ages the blood of martyrs ran.

But two and forty months was all the time allowed the beast,
And ere the period ended, so had his strength decreased,
His days of rule were shortened, his power to call for blood,
The earth had open'd her mouth for saints and swallowed up the flood.

And yet there is another to act upon the stage,
Through whom the same old serpent will manifest his rage;
A beast which though he outwardly was lamb-like,
Fair and mild,
Spake like the Pagan dragon, ferocious, loud and wild.

Though all men are made equal, so holds he in his creed,
The slaves from out their bondage must nevermore be freed;
And though in things religious all men are to be free,
It means, when laws divine with human laws agree.

Once empires, thrones and kingdoms with Papacy made bold,
To slay the host of martyrs with cruelties untold;
But now a fair republic, a Protestant so mild,
Usurps the dangerous power, and with the same runs wild.

The old red Pagan dragon turned Papist on the day
He saw that Christian doctrines were like to bear the sway;
He seizes on the Scriptures and keeps them all unseen,
And offers for a stipend to tell what they must mean.

At length from out its prison the Bible has been freed,
And loudly now is heralded as Protestants' sole creed;
The cry is now, 'The Bible, the Bible, that alone—
Come drink from the pure fountain that flows from out the throne.'

High hope is widely cherished, the Bible has been freed!
And now 'tis thought that Satan is overcome indeed—
He sees that mere profession is but an azure gauze,
And lo, he now espouses with Protestants their cause.

The Bible, scattered broadcast, is laid upon the shelf,
And man is seldom met with who reads it for himself,
And though some few, like Timothy, have read it from their youth,
Tradition still is followed instead of living truth.

The last great persecution is drawing on because
Some few will heed the Bible, and keep its righteous laws,
While others, the great masses professing still the same,
Hold on to Papal errors and all their groundless claim.

The battle soon is coming, choose now while yet ye may,
The Bible and its precepts and Jesus to obey;
Soon closes up probation—then will the dragon rage,
And battle with the remnant most cruel will he wage.

But short shall be the conflict, victorious the saints,
Redeemed from all oppression, and freed from all complaints,
With shouts and songs celestial, triumphant will they sing
The praises and the victories of Jesus Christ their King.

Roswell Fenner Cottrell 1814-1892
by Marlene Steiweg

It was 1178 in southeastern France. Pope Alexander the Third had issued a decree calling upon all the faithful to help silence the heretics. Included in the long list of heretics were “...the Albigensians, Catharins, Patarins, ... Aragonese, Navarrese, Basques, [and] Cotterells.” The Pope promised remission of sins and freedom from any oaths or treaties with the heretics, and urged, “...to confiscate the heretics’ goods, reduce them to slavery, and put to death all who were unwilling to be converted.” This decree resulted in terrible suffering to those who would not relent their faith. John Cotterell, “…one of the very few survivors...escaped into northern France,” and eventually settled in England. [Cotterell, which meant Cottage dwellers, was later changed to “Cottrell.”]

In 1638 Nicholas Cottrell, one of John’s descendants, settled in Rhode Island just two years after it was founded. He was a Seventh Day Baptist who sought freedom to worship according to his conscience.

Six generations later, on January 17, 1814, Roswell Fenner Cottrell was born in Brookfield, New York. When he was 19 years old, his family moved to Mill Grove, New York. There he met, courted, and married Cathrane Harvey, and taught public school for ten years. They had three boys, Willet, Frank, and James Uriah (for Uriah Smith), and a daughter, Nancy. Two of his descendants known also as R. F. C., are James’s son, Roy Franklin, the missionary to China; and grandson, Raymond, former book editor of the Review.

R. F. C.’s father, John, taught his children to keep the seventh-day Sabbath, though “Years before...this family had left the Seventh Day Baptists over the question of the immortality of the soul and other teachings...A good-sized group grew up...called ‘Cottrellites.’”

When the Millerites were preaching about the second advent of Christ, R. F. C. was thirty years old. He had always believed in the personal coming of Christ; but did not trust in the Millerite preaching. “I saw the proclaimers of the advent in darkness in regard to the commandments of God, and bowing to an institution of the Papacy,” He explained, “…this was the reason I did not believe.”

But, when “…Elder Rhodes and Joseph Bates came preaching the definite message, explaining the truth of the heavenly sanctuary and the judgment hour that began in 1844, and lifting up the standard of ‘the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus,’ setting forth the great system of the advent faith in the framework of prophecy fulfilled,” Roswell, his father, and brother, John were interested. They made a nine-month investigation of the

TIME LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1814</th>
<th>1833</th>
<th>1844</th>
<th>1850</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was born.</td>
<td>Married Cathrane Harvey.</td>
<td>Moved with his family to Mill Grove, NY.</td>
<td>Rejected Millerite Message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moved with his family to Mill Grove, NY. Rejected Millerite Message. Was tent-master in NY.
doctrine, and wholeheartedly accepted the message. Roswell testified, "I believe with all my heart, [the message]... was from Heaven..."7

Before long, Elder J. N. Loughborough held the first tent meetings in the State of New York on John’s land. Roswell joined this evangelistic thrust of the sabbatarian adventists as “tentmaster.” Through the years he often worked as tentmaster, and preached at the meetings from time to time. He once preached, through an interpreter, to a group of Seneca Indians.

Cottrell wrote extensively for the Review and other publications of the church. Between August, 1854 and July, 1855, he wrote a series of Bible lessons much like those used for Sabbath School, including doctrines like “the law of God...the faith of Jesus...the falling stars of 1833...national troubles, widespread perplexities, war talk, and...the three messages of Revelation 14.”8 This series was published weekly in the Youth’s Instructor, and, in 1855, as a book called, “The Bible Class.”

When the Review and Herald was moved to Battle Creek in 1855, Elder Cottrell was named one of its five corresponding editors. He contributed articles of profound, yet practical, reasoning from the Scriptures. His favorite subjects were the seventh-day sabbath, the sanctuary and conditional immortality, with titles like, The Mark of the Beast, The Two-Horned Beast, The Sanctuary, Spiritualism, and The Nature and Destiny of Man. In 1858 he wrote an 11-page introduction to Spiritual Gifts, Volume I, by Ellen White, affirming his belief in the Spirit of Prophecy.

R. F. C. was also an accomplished poet. Many of his poems were published in the Review, and several were set to music and included in the 1941 and 1985 church hymnals. His poems, like the two reprinted in this issue, greatly inspired the advent believers. (See pages 1 and 3.)

In the late fifties, when James White and other leaders were discussing the need for church organization, several letters Cottrell wrote were published in the Review under the heading, “Making Us a Name.” Calmly and seriously he reasoned against “…spiritual fornication of Babylon with the kings of the earth.”9 The publication of these letters increased opposition to organization and created division on the issue among Review readers.

Ellen G. White rebuked Cottrell in Testimony #6, for his position on organization. When Elder Cottrell realized that his comments had created a spirit of division and insubordination, he wrote, “I hope that no one will join my party, for when they have severed themselves from the body and look about for me, they will not find me there, for by the grace of God, I shall be found with the body. I do not believe in popery; neither do I believe in anarchy; but in Bible order, discipline, and government in the church of God.”10

On May 12, 1861, the Review and Herald printed a letter of apology in which Cottrell acknowledged that he had not considered the matter prayerfully before speaking up. Later, when church organization and a church name were voted, R. F. C. “…swung into line, and kept his place as a strong supporter of the cause.”11

R. F. C. often traveled, sometimes moving his family close to where he found openings to preach. This way he could attend to his writing at home where he had access to his books. Other times, brethren provided him temporary lodging. Referring to the latter arrangement, he said, “I thank God, and all his dear people who have kindly provided me a little place for a temporary home.”12 He prayed, “May I never be left to apostatize from the truth, and pervert the gift of God and the contributions of His people, by turning to fight against Him and His cause.”13

continued on page six
The extent of Adventist indebtedness to Seventh Day Baptists for an understanding of the Sabbath is evident from the constant use made of Seventh Day Baptist publications, especially their Sabbath Tract Series, during the early years of the church.

On page 7 of Volume I, Number I, of The Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald (November, 1850) appeared the editorial note: "We call special attention of the brethren to the articles, in this number from the publications of the Seventh-day Baptists [sic]. They are clear, comprehensive, and irrefutable. We intend to enrich the columns of the Review and Herald, with extracts from their excellent works on the Sabbath."

We also design to get out a large pamphlet, containing the same material from their publications, that we publish in this paper. Such a work, judiciously circulated, will certainly do a great amount of good.

The first number of the Review contains four such reprints, which fill 124 of its 166 column inches, fully three fourths of the space. The second issue, in December, contains one Seventh Day Baptist article on the Sabbath, and one each by J. N. Andrews and Joseph Bates. The twelve issues of volume 1 devoted 769 column inches to the Sabbath, or 38.5 percent of the space. Of this, 399 column inches were from Seventh Day Baptist sources and 370 by Adventist authors, or 20 and 18.5 percent of the total, respectively. This clearly reflects the extent to which pioneer Adventists were indebted to the Seventh Day Baptists for their understanding of the Sabbath.

On the front page of Number 6 is a poem of seven stanzas, "It's Jewish," in defense of the Sabbath, by former Seventh Day Baptist, Roswell Fenner Cottrell. At the same time Cottrell had sent Review editor James White a copy of an eight-page tract he had written about the Sabbath--A Letter to the Disciples of the Lord. Of this tract James White wrote in the same issue of the Review: "We think it is very good, and hope to be able to publish it entire, soon." It appeared two weeks later in Number 8, six months before the author became an Adventist. Over the next forty years Cottrell contributed 1,692 articles and other items to the paper and was listed as a member of the original "Publishing Committee," with J. N. Andrews and Uriah Smith, and later as a "corresponding editor." Many of his articles dealt with the Sabbath, which ever remained a precious treasure to him. Repeatedly, through the columns of the Review, he appealed to his "dear" former Seventh Day Baptist "brethren" to espouse the Advent hope, as he had done.—


To James White this was "A blind conscientiousness, unenlightened by the word of God." RH, April 26, 1860, p. 180. It was "... dangerous to leave with the Lord what He has left with us, and thus sit down upon the stool of doing little, or nothing." RH, April 5, 1860, p. 152.

Ellen White declared, "God was displeased with the slack, loose manner in which many of His professed people conduct their worldly business." IT., p. 200.

James White reasoned, "There are altogether too many brakemen along for the benefit of the train. How much better it would be if all would walk with God, so they could keep pace with His opening providence, as He is leading out a people for the last great work." RH, April 26, 1860, p. 182.

Cottrell's letters in the Review produced, "... a scattering influence," according to Ellen, that would "... lead minds to wrong conclusions," and "... encourage many in their slack ideas of managing matters relating to the cause of God. She "... saw that in temporal matters Brother B. [R. F. Cottrell] was too easy and negligent. He has lacked energy, considering it a virtue to leave to the Lord that which the Lord has left to him." IT., pp. 211, 212.

This position is an attempt to be godly, on our own, following our own mistaken principles. To "make us a name" would here be the effort to weave our own robe of righteousness—an impossibility, which could be either vigorous legalism or passive pietism, both being "our works" with a religious appearance. Babel here is being our own god, with an attempt to be religious. This results in confusion and disunity, and is spiritually akin to "works of law."

The choice that the body of believers actually faced was not between organizing or not organizing. It was not that to organize was of Babylon and not to organize was ideal. There was a godly alternative to both the error of too much rigid control (the hierarchy of Babylon or popery), and that of too much slackness (independent congregationalism or anarchy). That third choice which God was holding out to the scattered believers in present truth was "Bible order, discipline and government in the church of God," just what R. F. Cottrell declared in a profound statement he made in the Review, May 3, 1860, p. 188. Desiring to clarify his spirit, though still unconvincing that his position was in error, he also stated the two ditches to avoid at this point, "division or insubordination," and expressed his commitment to press together. Ibid.

James White proposed "... the simplest form of organization possible, that would secure the object." RH, June 19, 1860, p. 86. He urged believers to "become united upon a plan upon which we as a people can act." Ibid. Italics supplied.

In the Review, September 11, 1860, on p. 136, J. N. Andrews, U. Smith, J. H. Waggoner, and J. White, invited believers to a "... a General Conference at Battle Creek, to commence on sixth-day, at 6 p.m., September 28, 1860." R. F. Cottrell sent a letter to the conference proposing a congregational form of government, which was not adopted. The leaders adopted a constitution for the publishing association, the first official, legal entity of the church as a whole, and on Monday, October 1, 1860, they chose a church name—"Seventh-day Adventist." RH, October 23, 1860, p. 179.

Perhaps R. F. Cottrell felt opposed to "making us a name" because of "... undue prejudice against church names," which he believed promoted "... the sectarianism of the present day." RH, June 5, 1860, p. 20. This is one of the most important issues he leaves with Seventh-day Adventists today. If this movement under God is His last call for honest seekers of truth to unite on the platform of Scripture, and if He despises party spirit (see Gal. 5:20, RSV); then the godly unity that is to bind us together must display none of the sectarian spirit now evident in the Seventh-day Adventist church. While recognizing the corporate and denominational nature of this church that God has raised up, we must also admit to and abandon the "us-versus-them" mentality that leads us to feel more pious than our fellow Christians who have not yet joined us, or to feel superior to any other human being whose understanding of present truth we so readily judge as erroneous.— •
S.D.A. CHURCH ORGANIZATION
WHY AND HOW

Shortly after October 22, 1844, many adventists thought church organization was a form of ecclesiastical depotism. They kept no list of baptized members, and had no system of finance. Ministers were supported by voluntary donations. But, as the small group of sabbatarian adventists grew, it became evident that some form of organization was necessary. How God led as the Seventh-day Adventist church was organized is briefly outlined below:

1853: Ministerial cards were issued, signed by leading elders.
1854: James White wrote on Gospel Order in the Review, identifying the need for organization.
1858: A Bible Class led by J.N. Andrews recommended “systematic benevolence” on the tithing principle. The plan was adopted by the Conference Jan. 26, 1859, (See RH, Feb. 6, 1859,) resulting in a fund for paying ministers, but with no one to receive and administer it.
1860: Organization was debated by R.F.C., J.W. & others in the Review.
1860, September 26-October 1: A General meeting was held with representatives from five states. They voted to legally organize a publishing association and, chose a church name—“Seventh-day Adventist.” (See 1T., 224.)
1861, May 3: The S.D.A Publishing Association was organized.
1861, October: The Michigan conference organized, and during the next two years developed an initial operational pattern.
1861, October 6: Seven leading ministers met in Battle Creek and recommended a church covenant for properly organizing churches.
1863, May 20-23: Michigan State Conference united with other states in the FIRST General Conference, in which they adopted a constitution with nine articles and elected the first G.C. president.

Ellen White wrote, “Unless the churches are so organized that they can carry out and enforce order, they have nothing to hope for in the future; they must scatter into fragments. . . . If ministers of God would unitedly take their position, and maintain it with decision, there would be a uniting influence among the flock of God. Separating bars would be broken to fragments . . . there would be a power and strength in the ranks of Sabbathkeepers far exceeding anything we have yet witnessed.” 1T., 270, 271.

This counsel was true then and is of even greater importance today as the last solemn events of earth’s history approach in thundertones. Church order and discipline will unite and embue with power: its lack will divide and weaken.— • MS