

UNITING A BROKEN NATION:
A STUDY OF THE UNIFICATION DEVICES EMPLOYED BY ANTEBELLUM BAPTIST MINISTERS
IN THE AMERICAN SLAVERY DEBATE

BY

CATHERINE COELHO

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Communication

May 2012

Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Approved By:

Margaret Zulick, Ph.D., Advisor

Jarrold Atchison, Ph.D., Chair

Mary Foskett, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iv
Chapter 1: Setting the Scene	1
Chapter 2: Shaping the Argument	21
Chapter 3: Seeking the Truth	36
Chapter 4: Sharing the Message	48
Appendix	
A. Apostles' Creed	57
B. List of Fuller and Wayland's letters	58
C. Copy of last letter published in the <i>Christian Reflector</i>	59
Works Cited	61
Curriculum Vitae	67

History and circumstance have endowed Americans with a heritage rich in themes of counterpoint. They began to appear quite early in our history—as soon as paleface confronted redskin. An East-West (or Home-and-Frontier) counterpoint appeared before the North-South variation developed, just as there was a White-Red before there was a White-Black variation. The Old Settler-Immigrant counterpoint turned up about as soon as the second wave of immigrants landed. The Protestant-Catholic and the Gentile-Jewish themes were not long in following.

What America has lacked in the way of overt class conflict she has made up in indigenous tension of her own peculiar heritage... It is hoped... that we have not contributed to the ways in which history has permitted counterpoint to “disintegrate into mere contradiction.”

—C. Vann Woodward, *American Counterpoint*

Abstract

This thesis explores the unification devices employed by two antebellum Baptist ministers in the American slavery debate. By analyzing the published correspondence between Rev. Francis Wayland of New England and Rev. Richard Fuller of South Carolina it is noted that their focus on charity throughout their debate allows them to effectively promote and demonstrate unity to a fragmented national audience. It becomes clear that their reliance on charity, much akin to Augustine's rule of charity, is the fundamental tool that allows the men to harmonize otherwise irreconcilable differences. Specifically identified in this study are the men's similar biblically-based argumentative strategies, their interpretive reliance on charity, and their explicit incorporation of charity into their correspondence with one another and their audience. Granting significance to these identifications are the parallel connections made between antebellum arguments and contemporary religious-political debates which continually beget national and religious dissonance.

Chapter 1: Setting the Scene

In 1865, when Lincoln stated, “Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other,” he was referring to the northern states and the southern states. However, he might as well have been referring to the northern and southern sectors of the Baptist church—sectors which permanently split in 1845 over the religious slavery debate.

The Baptist church, like many other organizations existing in the antebellum period, demonstrated its fair share of internal discord. Ministers on either side of the Mason-Dixon Line raised themselves to their pulpits and passionately proclaimed the biblically-based “truth” about slavery—yet their truths did not seem to equate. The general reaction to this sectionalism and disagreement was varied; some Baptists vehemently denounced the views of their counterparts, while others demonstrated a more “gracious spirit” (see Baker 81-84, McKibbens 175-176). The former instigated further sectionalism while the latter promoted unity and amendment.

Two of the more gracious-spirited Baptist ministers were Richard Fuller of South Carolina and Francis Wayland of New England. Like other ministers of their represented regions, both men founded their slavery positions on the Bible. Both men claimed interpretive validity. Both men believed “all parts of Scripture were equally channels of truth” (Shanks 132). And, like others, both men derived from the Bible opposing positions on slavery. Distinguishing Fuller and Wayland from other men, however, is the manner in which they debated this divergence—not with vehemence or dogmatism, but with a model sense of graciousness and a guiding sense of charity.

In the following pages I present a case study of the published 1845 correspondence between Richard Fuller and Francis Wayland—a correspondence through which they amiably but passionately explicate their opposite positions on slavery. I argue that, despite the obvious differences between proslavery Fuller and antislavery Wayland, both men are able to exhibit and promote a much-needed sense of unity to a very estranged national audience—a sense which they rely upon to resolve the slavery debate and heal the nation. To make this argument I highlight 1) the men’s similar biblically-based argumentative strategies and their 2) explicit and 3) implicit reliance on charity as a guiding rhetorical principle.

As a lens for these demonstrations I employ Augustine’s rule of charity. While Fuller and Wayland may not have consciously been aware of their connection to Augustine, it is evident that their rhetoric both relies on and promotes an ethos of charity akin to the charitable theory of interpretation that Augustine developed in the fourth and fifth centuries. In the course of this study I demonstrate that Augustine’s theory is as applicable to American religious rhetoric and debate as it was to fourth century European studies of scripture.

Rationale

Currently, there is not a civil war literally being fought in our backyards. This is true. Turn to any news media, however, and the dissonance of the American populace will loudly and glaringly announce itself. Perfectly exemplifying the many facets over which Americans are in disagreement is a recent controversy surrounding several lines published by Family Leader, an organization devoted to the promotion of the traditional

family. In July of 2011 Family Leader stated: “Slavery had a disastrous impact on African-American families, yet sadly a child born into slavery in 1860 was more likely to be raised by his mother and father in a two-parent household than was an African-American baby born after the election of the USA’s first African-American President” (Haberman). Although this statement was meant to induce conversation over the issue of traditional versus nontraditional households, it triggered outbursts from a much broader audience. While debate obviously ensued between both sides of the marriage debate, historians, liberals and conservatives, minority groups, and church groups all had something (different) to say in response. The result was a cacophony of rejoinders from proponents and opponents of a multitude of issues that were tangentially related to Family Leader and its statement—an instant demonstration of the many ongoing debates in American society and politics.

Yet, perhaps most interesting about this statement is not only its response rate but the fact that, in defense of the assumedly biblically-based institution of traditional marriage, the organization brings up another once biblically-based institution—slavery. It seems that even now, one hundred and fifty years later, Americans are *still* debating over the role the Bible should directly play in the secular world *and* how it should be interpreted. Just as proslavery and antislavery activists pulled from scripture to defend their arguments, so too do we see present-day Christians making secular claims which they have founded on biblical text. Although Americans are no longer divided over the issue of slavery, other more current controversies (especially those potentially entailing direct biblical arguments like gay marriage, abortion, and euthanasia) have the nation’s

populace in a similar state of division. By understanding the historical parallels of American disunity, we may better approach the dividing issues of today.

Like ourselves, Fuller and Wayland lived in an era riddled with disharmony and rising religious controversy. Yet, despite these troubles and their own personal differences, in their published correspondence with one another Fuller and Wayland are able to persuasively present a model of collaboration and unity. On account of this, the examination of their antebellum religious arguments for and against slavery will be enlightening, significant, and useful to present-day readers on immediate, historical and rhetorical levels.

On the immediate level I clarify how Fuller and Wayland both demonstrate an exemplary manner in which religious leaders can and should handle issues of controversy that divide churches and nations. Specifically, I highlight the men's exemplary rhetorical methods and the manners in which they benevolently consider their subject, one another, and their audiences.

On the historical level, this examination implicitly highlights the parallels between antebellum and twenty-first century religious-political controversies. As has been illustrated in this section, America's history with civil disunity is far from over. Thus it is important to understand our past so that we might approach the present and the future with more wisdom and understanding of underlying historical areas of tension.

Lastly, the rhetorical significance of this study is twofold. Firstly, it is significant because it delves anew into the ancient yet current subject of biblical hermeneutics. Once studied by Augustine in the fourth century, the area of biblical interpretation is

still quite relevant and necessary to study (as illustrated by certain religious-political activists among others). Secondly, this examination of the Fuller-Wayland correspondence provides the opportunity to see how rhetoric alone can create a sense of unity within a divided community or even nation. Although Fuller and Wayland may not have stopped the war, or even the Baptist schism, their rhetoric certainly won them the respect of varying audience members from all corners of the nation (McKibbens 179 and 184). A century and a half later, their letters still effectively demonstrate one method of approaching a heated debate and working toward its resolution.

Literature Review

In the decades leading up to the Civil War, the political sphere was not the only field in which disharmony resonated; the religious arena was similarly experiencing dissonance and growing sectionalism (see Forbes). Perhaps one of the most affected denominations was the Baptist church. As the slavery debate gained attention, so too did underlying inconsistencies among Baptists churches in the North and South. As these differences drew attention, residents from both sides of the Mason-Dixon Line began to speak up.

In the early antebellum period, however, southern churches presented virtually no form of apologia regarding slavery; thus, “they were truly taken by surprise by the abolitionists’ postal campaign of 1835” (Tise 208). They were not prepared with defensive arguments simply because they had never needed them; slavery was simply an institution “[taken] for granted” by nearly all European settlers (Harrill 163). Even northern churches were surprisingly quiet on the issue right up until a “religious

impulse” and “sectional crusade against the South” came rushing to life in the thirties (McKivigan 6). The reason for this initial paucity? From a strictly historical perspective the answer is that despite “considerable differences in theology, polity, and demographic makeup, northern churches shared a proslavery heritage. With the exception of only a few pietistic sects, such as the Society of Friends or the Quakers, northern churches in the colonial era had displayed a high degree of toleration toward the institution in both the North and the South” (McKivigan 7). Prior to the swift rise of abolition, southern churches maintained amiable relations with their northern counterparts. As religious ideologies in the north began to change, however, southern churches suddenly found themselves in a defensive position.

Within some denominations, northern counterparts left it up to their southern halves to explain or resolve the slavery issue on their own. Others regarded slavery as “a secular matter toward which religious bodies should remain neutral” (McKivigan 8). Still others “acknowledged slavery as an evil institution and believed that the [southern] churches should support gradualistic programs, such as colonization, and later, nonextensionism, to end it” (8). Many of these differences depended on the particular ministers’ denominational affiliation, regional setting, and seminarian education (for more on early American religious education and preaching see: Brown and Edwards). Within the Baptist denomination, however, a *particularly* strong rift was felt between the northern and southern halves.

In the years between the Revolution and the Civil War, the unity of the Baptist church was fragile; “Baptists tended to be very individualistic, and their church polity

encouraged it" (McKibbens 158). While, on the one hand, such independence enabled the denomination to spread far and wide through individual churches, it simultaneously crippled collaboration within the larger church body (158). Just as the church finally began to become somewhat firmly unified through joint foreign missions efforts which were largely led by southern minister Richard Fuller, the spirit of abolition took hold of the northern churches and created sectional division once again (see McKibbens 158-167 and Wentz 76-78).

Interestingly enough, while some Baptist church leaders passionately condemned the views of their counterparts with "harsh words from pulpits both North and South" or with clear-cut biblical "statistics" (respectively, see Brookes and Stringfellow), a handful of ministers chose instead to exhibit empathy and even warmth toward one another (McKibbens 176). Northerner Francis Wayland and Southerner Richard Fuller are two such men. Considered moderates in the viewpoints of their respective regions, Wayland and Fuller were both simultaneously widely respected and scrutinized by the Baptist community. Their efforts to understand both sides of the (religious) slavery debate earned them the ears of the entire nation. Although the two men positioned themselves on different sides of the issue, the holistic concern they jointly expressed for all persons involved with the institution of slavery (slaves, slaveholders, supporters and abolitionists alike) increased their authority and credibility and thus amplified their ability to persuade (or at least affect) discordant audiences.

Francis Wayland

The “gracious spirit” of Francis Wayland demonstrated itself through his general disposition, his teaching, and his preaching (McKibbens 176). His behavior and writings attest to the fact that, more than anything, he sought to avoid or amend disharmony whenever possible. In 1835, when abolitionism was just on the rise, Wayland, then president of Brown University, banned any written or oral class discussion relating to slavery—not because the issue was not important, but because its discussion would only generate “further controversy” and general discord (Van Broekhoven 196-197; for more on the general antebellum religious slavery debate see Abrose, Fox-Genovese, and Shanks). Although the pressing nature of the issue eventually forced him to write and speak about slavery, above all Wayland valued and worked for peace and unity within the Baptist church. His focus on collaboration and his call for mutual compassion and understanding underscored his ethos as a speaker and enabled him to exert “a great influence upon the moral attitude of Northern Baptists toward their Southern counterparts” (McKibbens 180).

Despite (or perhaps because of) Wayland’s initial silence on slavery he was arguably “the most widely read moral philosopher of his generation” (Van Broekhoven 197). His overarching humility combined with his presidency at Brown, his ministry at the First Baptist Church of Boston, the national publication of several of his speeches, and, most importantly, the publication of his book *Elements of Moral Science* (which was even widely read and used in southern schools, although they skipped over the slavery portion) all contributed to his national acclaim as a prominent Baptist leader (Van Boekhoven 199, McGibbens 176-178). His “recognition that the people of the North

were far from guiltless” earned him the attention of his Northern audience and the appreciation of his Southern audience (McKibbens 180-1). Demonstrating his broad perspective, in a letter “to his sister he wrote, ‘There has been, I think, too much confessing other people’s sins, and not enough confessing our own’” (181). Although Wayland clearly maintained an antislavery position, he made a point to approach the debate holistically.

In 1844, with the support of the northern and the respect of the southern Baptists, Wayland set out to ascertain the absolute, bottom-line truth regarding the issue of slavery. After reading a short published defense of slavery written by fellow Baptist-minister Richard Fuller, Wayland took initiative to write a series of newspaper-published letters to Fuller and engage in an amiable but serious debate in order to “throw any light upon this difficult subject... [and] perform an acceptable service, both to the Church of Christ, and to our beloved country” (Fuller-Wayland 13). Published as a book shortly thereafter in 1845, the correspondence offered members of both sides of the slavery debate a window from which to view and understand their opponent’s perspective (Whitney “Pt. 1”).

Richard Fuller

Richard Fuller, like Wayland, was all too aware of the growing tensions within the Baptist church long before the Southern Baptist Church branched off. Because Fuller spent the first several decades of his ministry uniting the denomination through foreign mission projects, it was much to his chagrin that a schism emerged over the church’s inability to reconcile the controversial issue of slavery within their ideology. Although he

was equally concerned with the well-being of the entire Baptist church, Fuller's proceedings and relationship with the slavery issue were vastly different from Wayland's. Whereas Wayland attempted to objectively (and quietly) study and judge the institution from afar, "Fuller inherited several hundred slaves and had to deal with the moral implications from firsthand experience" (McGibbens 182). Wayland spoke and preached on slavery no more than necessary, while Fuller approached the topic with great fervor.

That Fuller felt called to preach and, specifically, to tackle the question of slavery was apparent in his homilies. His preaching, described by one listener as "logic on fire" and earning him the nickname "Prince of Preachers," evidenced both his religious piety and his pre-ministry legal training (Cuthbert 133, 33-55, "A Brief History"). His "natural eloquence," firsthand experience with slavery, and dedication to "preaching Jesus" made him an excellent leading preacher and orator (McGibbens 183, Whitney "part 2"). Like Wayland, he loved the Baptist "denomination and worked for it, but [unlike Wayland] preaching was Richard Fuller's first love in the ministry and it was to this work that he gave his best and longest hours" (Whitney "part 2").

The eloquence and passion that Fuller imbued his sermons with "appealed to the least educated slave as well as the cultured planter;" he quickly became nationally recognized and was invited to speak beyond his hometown of Beaufort, South Carolina in other parts of the south as well as the north (McGibbens 183). Fuller so affected his audiences, that after one particularly famous sermon given before the Triennial Convention in Baltimore in 1841 an adamant abolitionist reportedly went up to Fuller,

threw his arms around him and exclaimed “‘Brother Fuller, I love you’ ... As they stood there, weeping, and embracing each other, it was as if Jesus had come in and said, ‘Peace, be still’” (Cuthbert 181). The love, compassion, and overall “enlightened and genuine Christian character” that Fuller emitted were evident to all and ardently recorded in church records, letters, and his biography (Nettles, Cuthbert, McGibbens).

When Fuller moved to the Eutaw Baptist Church of Baltimore in 1847 his appeal to a diverse audience was only augmented. Now positioned in a border state, it was as if he were in the front lines of the slavery debate all throughout the late antebellum period and into the Civil War. His ability to captivate an audience did not go wasted. Although during the Civil War Fuller “continued his allegiance to the United States,” he “was one of a committee that introduced resolution of sympathy for the Confederacy” (McKibbens 184). Thus, “he maintained his influence in both sections of the country” (184). He sought to reconcile political and religious sectional divides and repeatedly lamented the extremist viewpoints of both the North and South.

Fuller’s initial defense of slavery which was published in the *Christian Reflector* evidences his underlying intent to heal political and religious sectionalism. He concludes this first letter “in the charity of the gospel, and with all respect,” and it is quite clear that these words are more than a mere formality. Throughout his subsequent correspondence with Wayland, the earnestness with which he seeks the truth and attempts to understand the other’s viewpoint marks his letter with sincerity and draws the appeal of a diverse readership. Amid an intense debate over slavery, “his letters to Francis Wayland were as gracious and kind as were Wayland’s to him... [thus,

exemplifying] how great and good men could differ, and differ in love” (McGibbens 184). The ideology of charity that both men implicitly imbued in their writing and exemplified in their actions ultimately became the uniting factor of their correspondence and leadership. Although, in their letters, they are unable to absolutely conclude or solve the slavery debate, they do present a path to resolution. Despite their differences and the influence of the times, both ministers implicitly demonstrate that at the heart of the debate’s resolution there is neither a single focus on biblical truth nor absolute truth, but on charity.

Theory: Augustine’s Rule of Charity

That the slavery debate was intensified, not mollified, by its religious underpinnings should come as no surprise; the Bible tends to lend itself to debate. As such, the study and application of biblical hermeneutics has existed almost as long as the Bible itself. Not long after the Council of Nicea (325 A.D.) decided upon the texts of the Bible, Saint Augustine of Hippo (354 – 430 A.D.) theorized about various modes of interpretation, specifically about interpretations of biblical passages. From within his multifaceted work *De doctrina Christiana* surfaces a theory of interpretation known as the rule of charity—one of his many tools for teaching scripture to students (see Press).

Based largely on scripture itself, Augustine’s theory accounts for biblical incongruences, chronological variances, and even interpretive multiplicity. Although Fuller and Wayland do not outwardly (or even consciously) apply Augustine’s rule of charity as a means of interpreting scripture, their seemingly incongruent biblical interpretations are indeed explainable in light of the rule of charity. It becomes

apparent, through Augustine, that the very cause of the men's division (their biblical *interpretations* of slavery) is also their uniting factor; though they do not see eye to eye about slavery, their similar (charitable) approaches to the debate yield a path to unity. In noting their similarities and the implied rhetorical significance, the lasting importance and relevance of Augustine's theory is illuminated.

While Augustine's rule of charity may not have been commonly emphasized throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, society members, and particularly educated ministers, were at least well aware of humanitarian arguments that promoted benevolence toward all mankind—something akin to Augustine's rule of charity. It was this rise of "humanitarianism [that] spawned movements to build almshouses, reform prisons, eliminate judicial torture, end capital punishment, and, most famously, abolish slavery" (Abruzzo 1). Among many reasons for society's shift toward charity was the "slow transformation in moral thinking about the meaning of pain; the deliberate infliction of pain began to spark moral outrage" (2). Like Augustine, many people of the antebellum era sought to approach their actions and relationships benevolently (McKibbens 159-161). Not surprisingly, though, proslavery and antislavery advocates' ideas of benevolence (or charity) greatly differed despite their purportedly shared intentions.

The potential variance of intended benevolence is, however, accounted for principally in Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* and somewhat in his *Confessiones* (see Paffenroth, and Troup's *Temporality*). And while neither Fuller nor Wayland ever call upon Augustine's work to illuminate the source of their incongruences, in retrospect it is

clear that the rule of charity both explains their differences and aids their arguments. Simultaneously at work to strengthen the ministers' rhetoric is what Augustine and other early Christians referred to as the rule of faith. Although only indirectly relating to Fuller and Wayland's letters, the rule of faith does inadvertently serve to ground their arguments and, again, unite the two men in a shared background.

If the rule of charity is the cornerstone of Augustine's writings, then the rule of faith is the grout cementing it in place. Explained largely in Augustine's *Confessions* and in *De doctrina Christiana*, the *regula fidei* "functions as an interpretive device in which the Christian faith [is] easily summarized for the purpose of resolving theological and exegetical questions" (Liftin 89). The "rule of faith," for Augustine, was a shorthand exegesis or explanatory conclusion for particular religious issues and was "basically identical to the baptismal creed" one accepts upon their initial acceptance into the Church (Liftin 88, Eichenseer, see also appendix a). Employed in debates and studies, the bottom line of the *regula fidei* is that "One's belief in God continues to be inferentially grounded on faith. Evidence merely functions to discriminate between competing claims to authority and establish the veridicality and reasonableness of the authority of the Christian Scriptures and church" (Beilby 27).

That said, when Augustine delves into problems of interpretation and the implementation of the rule of charity, the underlying understanding is that his hermeneutical arguments, evidences, and conclusions are all held together and preceded by faith—faith in the Christian doctrine and faith in God. While this study will not principally deal with the rule of faith, it is important to acknowledge its fundamental

connection to Augustine's rule of charity and, subsequently, the shared religious foundation that Fuller and Wayland bring to their slavery debate.

Although Augustine's rule of faith permeates his writing, undeniably the rule of charity is *the* "distinctive concept that permeates Augustine's corpus, guiding his philosophy, doctrine, and rhetoric" (Troup "Rhetorical" 54). The rule of charity is developed in piecemeal fashion throughout much of his writing, but it is in *De doctrina* that we find the fundamental framework of the theory (for coverage of Augustine's other works on charity see Troup "Rhetorical" and Eden). Although in most of Augustine's writing his theory on charity explicitly deals with the interpretation of the Bible, it is not difficult to see how "Augustine's rhetoric is useful for theory and interpretation outside the walls of the church" (Troup "Rhetorical" 45, see also Robertson). In fact, the generic altruistic framework of Augustine's rule of charity allows the hermeneutical theory to lend itself to more general (and current) humanitarian subjects.

True, Augustine's theory principally works through interpretations of ancient scripture. However, by merely shifting his interpretative focus and concern to more actively involve present-day humanity, Augustine provides a means of recontextualizing ancient interpreted text to be relevant while simultaneously upholding its original significance. He honors the "author's design" while allowing for "the gracious and bountiful gift" of interpretive multiplicity in order to keep biblical texts relevant to present-day issues (Bakhtin 57-65, *De doctrina* 3.85). He states that text should "be understood not only historically and literally but also figuratively and prophetically, and

interpreted according to the aim of love, whether it be love of God or love of one's neighbor, or both" (*De doctrina* 3.48). Under such conditions one may concurrently understand *and apply* multiple meanings that are both temporally relevant and authoritatively acceptable.

To determine such interpretations Augustine explains that (when reading scripture or, loosely, any text) one should first determine whether the message is intended to be literal or figurative—the most important and most complex step. Not surprisingly, distinction between the two is at the root of many biblically-based debates over slavery. While many slavery advocates pull for literal interpretations of New Testament passages, opponents of slavery push for figurative understandings of principle-teaching biblical text (see Fuller-Wayland debate). As an unbiased interpreter—at least, one not wrapped up in the antebellum slavery debate—Augustine insists that the interpreter must not allow his reading to become subjective. He warns: "If [men's] minds are taken over by a particular prejudice, people consider as figurative anything that scripture asserts to the contrary" (*De doctrina* 3.36). Rather, one must be open to scripture's meaning and objectively determine whether a passage is to be read as literal or figurative.

To make this distinction Augustine applies the rule of charity. He states: "Anything in the divine discourse that cannot be related either to good morals or to the true faith should be taken as figurative" (*De doctrina* 3.33). Reversely, "If the message is clear [and congruent with the faith], it should not be treated as figurative and related to something else" (3.39, see also 3. 54). Thus, clear from the onset is the notion that

Augustine “upholds the literal over the figurative reading whenever the former provides an interpretation in keeping with charity” (Eden 59).

In addition to these rules, Augustine clarifies that it is also the responsibility of the interpreter to ensure his reading is as close as possible to the Holy Spirit’s intended meaning (or in Bakhtin’s terms, the author’s design—be it however generative) (3.84). He states, one “may reach that meaning or carve out from the words another meaning which does not run counter to the faith, using the evidence of any other passage of the divine utterances” (3.84). Of course, this may produce a variety of interpretations which, so long as they uphold charity, are welcome. In *Confessiones* Augustine defends this multiplicity on the basis that “truth manifest in temporal contexts *necessarily* produces *multiple* true interpretations... [Because] Truth itself demands true interpretations *in time* and dissolves a simple equation of intention and meaning” (Troup 53-54, emphasis added; see *Confessions* 12.33.43).

That multiple *valid* interpretations may exist is not problematic because they all work in the same direction. As Augustine surmises in book one of *De doctrina*: “the fulfillment and end of the law and all the divine scriptures is to love” (1.85). Interpreted with care and benevolence in mind, no interpretation can be wrong. He warns, however, that, “anyone who thinks that he has understood the divine scriptures or any part of them, but cannot by his understanding build up this double love of God and neighbor, has not yet succeeded in understanding them” (1.86, see also Baer). Additionally important to note is that “anyone who derives from [scripture] an idea which is useful for supporting this love but fails to say what the writer demonstrably

meant in the passage has not made a fatal error, and is certainly not a liar [but is misled]" (1.86-88). While interpretations may vary, they still must comply with the author's (in this case God's) fundamental implication. This, of course, underscores the importance of recognizing the difference between figurative and literal biblical passages—a key part of many antebellum slavery arguments, including Fuller and Wayland's.

Overview

In the subsequent chapters I will focus on three aspects of Fuller and Wayland's 1845 correspondence to make the argument that, despite the obvious differences between them, both men are able to exhibit and promote a much-needed sense of unity to a very estranged national audience—a sense which they rely upon to both resolve the slavery debate and heal the nation. First, I highlight the men's similar biblically-based argumentative strategies. I show that when attempting to disclose a universal and absolute answer to the slavery problem, the argumentative strategies they employ are logical and biblically-based—thus allowing a diverse audience (from both sides of the debate) to understand and respect their points. Second, I demonstrate the men's explicit reliance on charity as a guiding persuasive principle. Although the ministers do not refer to Augustine's interpretive rule of charity, it is very clear that both men interpret biblical passages with love, compassion, and the wellbeing of others in mind—as is taught by Augustine. Lastly, I disclose Fuller and Wayland's implicit reliance on charity as a guiding principle in their correspondence with one another and their concern for their audience. Through these latter two analyses I show that the ethos of

charity the men rely upon and promote rhetorically strengthens their individual and collective messages.

All three examinations, combined, support my claim that, though they may not have successfully concluded the slavery debate, Fuller and Wayland *did* successfully promote and personally exhibit unity to a devastatingly estranged audience. In doing so, Fuller and Wayland, despite their differences, together harmoniously served as leaders at a time when such models of benevolence and cooperation were greatly needed.

“Never before, I presume, has the defence of slavery on Christian principles been so ably conducted. Never before, I think, has any thing been written so admirably calculated to make a favorable impression on those who hold the opposite opinions.”

—Francis Wayland, 226

Chapter 2: Shaping the Argument

In 1844, when Francis Wayland and Richard Fuller first began their quest to reach and reveal to the public an absolute truth regarding slavery, they were unaware that the very same pursuit would ultimately beget a civil war. With striking vigor and admirable goodwill the men shared and evaluated one another’s viewpoints in an effort to reconcile Northern and Southern attitudes on slavery. To reduce the slavery debate to absolute truth, the men relied upon argumentative strategies that removed manipulative rhetoric from the debate and gave way to impartiality and credibility. More specifically, Fuller and Wayland employed the use of traditional dialectics and the Bible so as to appeal to the public’s sense of logic and religion.

The incorporation of both of these appeals is crucial given “that evangelical Christianity and Enlightenment liberalism have constituted two of the most influential movements in America” (Forbes 68). Of course, one need not be reminded that “the two forces have [also often] existed in a state of tension or outright conflict” (68). Thus, Fuller and Wayland are careful to incorporate logic and religion in a manner that takes advantage of their individual attributes and harmonizes their points of contention. By taking a dialectical approach to the scriptural justification of their viewpoints—by

logically assessing religious beliefs—Fuller and Wayland strengthen their appeal to a broad readership.

The men's incorporation of dialectics and the Bible, though it suits their audience, is all the more appropriate when one takes into account their didactic and deductive goal, which Wayland states in his initial letter to Fuller: "I fully believe that you, equally with myself, desire to arrive at the truth on this question. If by the kind and fraternal exhibition of our views we can throw any light upon this difficult subject, we shall, I am sure, perform an acceptable service, both to the Church of Christ, and our beloved country" (13). Unlike others who endeavored to prove their position on slavery, Fuller and Wayland acknowledge their goal not as rhetorically defending their position, but as didactically determining and illuminating the truth.

They identify this endeavor as both their duty as Christian leaders and their responsibility as American citizens; by reducing the slavery debate to absolute truth they are catering to the charity of all—working toward the wellbeing of their nation and their fellow countrymen. In his concluding letter to Fuller, Wayland states:

We make our own laws. Every citizen who exercises the right of suffrage, is himself responsible for every law that is made, unless he has put forth his full constitutional power to prevent it. Hence, a grave responsibility rests upon every Christian citizen in respect to the laws by which he is governed. If he favor, or if he do not constitutionally resist, laws at variance with the gospel which he professes, he is responsible to God for all the wrong which these laws create.

(105-106, original emphasis)

This national and religious responsibility rested on their shoulders as Wayland and Fuller approached their correspondence. Their sincere goal of dutifully determining the righteousness of the laws and beliefs with which they live was an undertaking that left no room for libel, manipulation, or dogmatic rhetoric.

What is interesting about the men's overall intended impartiality is that their series of letters actually began with a single *one-sided* letter Fuller submitted to the *Christian Reflector* at the request of the editor. In the letter Fuller very simply summarizes his Southern proslavery viewpoints without attempting to incorporate any Northern arguments for the main reason that he had not yet heard any. He explains that of all the speeches "at Philadelphia"¹ not one of them was a cohesive logical argument:

When even moderate men, and men seemingly very kind and calm in private, mounted the rostrum and felt the oratorical afflatus, we invariably heard, not arguments, but denunciations of this sort; we were sure to have eternal changes rung on the moral evil of slavery, the sin of slavery, the abominable guilt of slavery,—to be told that the ineffable horrors of slavery did not admit of discussion, and to be seriously asked what article of the decalogue slavery does not violate. (1-2)

¹ Here I can only assume that Fuller is referring to the 1844 Triennial Convention of the Baptist Denomination, which took place in Philadelphia—the city being the Baptist Foreign Mission's national headquarters until the Southern members split off in 1845. Instigating this split was the 1844 request for and subsequent refusal of missionary ordination to a Georgia member on the grounds that he was a slaveholder (Baker "Southern"). Fuller alludes to this 1844 conflict on numerous occasions including in the footnote on page 133 and on page 161.

It should also be noted that by this time Philadelphia had thoroughly established itself as an enduring antislavery powerhouse, largely beginning with its accommodation of twenty of the twenty-four Antislavery Conventions held between 1794 and 1828 (Geffen 264).

Here and elsewhere Fuller asserts (and Wayland concedes) that the North, and certainly the abolitionists, had failed to provide *clear* and *thorough* explanations of their arguments against slavery (see also 13-15, 20). Furthermore, he asserts that the issue had yet to be explored in a manner void of manipulative or acerbic rhetoric. For Wayland—a man who spent the majority of his life avoiding controversy—this glaring absence was too unacceptable to ignore, especially since Fuller had made several references to Wayland’s previous writing (see 4, 5, 10). Thus, in November of 1844 Wayland found himself called to provide Fuller and his Southern counterparts with a clear, logical, and calm account of his antislavery perspective so as to ultimately answer the single question “is slavery a moral evil?” (33).

With their didactic goal in mind and their open attitudes in check, Fuller and Wayland penned a series of public letters to one another. Aware of the high emotions and manipulative rhetoric that previously characterized the slavery debate, Fuller and Wayland advance a clean and clear perspective on the issue. Everything from the organization of the letter series to the examples included within individual paragraphs is noticeably tailored to provide readers with a clear understanding of both sides of the slavery debate *and* to work toward an absolute truth. The men intentionally avoid rhetorical judgments throughout their deductive correspondence, and instead employ dialectical strategies to obtain truth. More specifically, Fuller and Wayland rely upon repeated division and subdivision to unpack the morality of slavery, and then upon syllogisms and analogies to illuminate smaller points.

Fuller's original November 7, 1844 letter to the editor of the *Christian Reflector* was a mere short synopsis of his proslavery viewpoints, so it was Wayland who (initiated their correspondence and) ultimately decided how to divide his responses and direct their discussion of slavery. It was imperative that each letter be relatively short and self-contained, not crossing too much into the subsequent letter given the gap of seven days between the letters' weekly publication in the *Christian Reflector* (a small four-paneled newspaper run in Boston by the Baptist denomination from 1838-1848) ("About"). With such as the case, Wayland divided his letters so as to first decipher the actual question at hand (What is slavery?), next to deduce what it potentially violates (morality, human rights), then to examine the question from the Old and New Testaments, and finally to assert his discussion's bearing on his readers. Fuller's subsequent letters, in turn, are organized and divided in a similar fashion, containing direct answers to Wayland's posed assertions (see appendix B, for a detailed list of the letters).

The breakdown of these letters, as straightforward as it may seem, is significant because the letters' division and organization is the first demonstration of the men's dialectical approach. Fuller and Wayland divide the massive slavery debate in a manner that allows them to tackle it in readable and semi-conclusive portions, all the while maintaining the interest of their readership. There is an argument to be made that their letters did, in fact, appeal to the audience given their regular appearance on and occupation of a sizeable portion of the second page panel of the *Christian Reflector*. Moreover, when the final letter in the series was published it was on the front page, a section reserved for particularly noteworthy articles (see appendix c for page display).

Thus evidenced is that the men's basic structure and organization of their letters, among other dialectical elements, did indeed appeal to their audience and effectively break down the large question of slavery.

To ensure that even the minutest arguments were thoroughly explained, careful division continues within each of the individual letters. It would, however, take countless hours and pages to exhibit every example of the men's repeated division and subdivision, and doing so would be unnecessarily excessive. Every single letter within the series displays similar dissection, organization, and explanation, so it is sufficient enough to highlight the dialectics of a single letter, representing the whole. I have chosen to do so using Wayland's sixth letter to Fuller, the letter encompassing an examination of the New Testament's position on slavery, for several reasons. First, Wayland set the dialectical tone and organization pattern of the discussion, so it is proper that one of his letters should be used as the example. Second, his sixth letter includes *all* the particular dialectical strategies that I wish to highlight—strategies which are otherwise scattered throughout the men's other letters. Lastly, because the subject of his sixth letter is the New Testament it provides ample examples of how Wayland relies not only on dialectics to establish truth, but also on biblical authority to appeal to his audience.

Wayland's sixth letter begins with a syllogism, thus setting the dialectical tone and organization of the subsequent paragraphs. Here and elsewhere Wayland employs syllogisms in his letters, which are often set apart from the surrounding sentences in the paragraph and broken down into premises (e.g. 51, 52). On numerous occasions Fuller

responds to Wayland's syllogisms (e.g. 181) and, in addition, he advances his own (e.g. 182). These syllogisms effectively allow the men to illustrate the arguments of both sides in a clear-cut manner, void of rhetorical flourishes and entanglements. Given the familiarity with which the men's letters were written Wayland felt it necessary to apologize for the implementation of such a formal tool (54). Yet he defends his decision by explaining, "I have thought that thus I could present the points at issue with greater distinctness than seemed possible in any other" (54).

In Wayland's sixth letter he demonstrates the clarifying quality of syllogisms; after alluding to his previous (fifth-letter) demonstration of the Old Testament's provision of "nothing more than the permission of slavery... exclusively to the Jews," Wayland asserts that if the Bible provides the allowance of slavery in the southern states then the "defence of slavery is narrowed down to the limits of the New Testament" (an enthymeme in itself) (77). A subsequent syllogism allows him to clarify the hypothetical significance of such a biblical defense. He poses:

The New Testament was not given, like the Mosaic law, to one people, but to the whole race; not for one period, but for all time. If, therefore, it tolerates slavery really and truly—if this is the doctrine of our Saviour, it justifies this institution to all men; and Pagans, Christians, and Mohammedans who have united in abolishing it, have greatly erred in supposing it to be at variance with the clearest principles either of natural justice or of Christian duty. (78)

It is the minor premise of this syllogism that Wayland sets out to deny in the unfolding letter.

His biblical denunciation of slavery in this letter is divided into three stages: (1) an exhibition of every single New Testament reference to slavery, (2) an examination of whether the New Testament allows even the most basic concept of slavery, and (3) an explanation of the Bible's condemnation of slavery. Within the first section of his letter, Wayland literally separates, numbers, and quotes every verse referencing slavery,² although he does not copy down the parables that refer to servitude since "the object of these parables is to enforce some duty which had no respect to slavery, [and therefore] no one will for a moment pretend that this sort of allusion has any bearing upon the question" (78).

Wayland divides the verses into two categories, those addressing servants and those addressing masters, and within each subsection he interprets their combined intended significance. Of the first category, he suggests the verses teach "patience, meekness, fidelity, and charity—duties which are obligatory *on Christians towards all men*, and of course towards masters" (81 emphasis added). From the second category of verses, those that by Southern accounts sanction the institution of slavery, he concludes that the verses "simply inculcate on masters the duty of treating the slave as he himself would wish to be treated; and of allowing to him suitable means of subsistence. And that is all" (82). By listing every New Testament verse referencing slavery Wayland demonstrates to his audience that he is *holistically* examining the scriptural argument on slavery; he is not cherry-picking his biblical support, but rather

² As Fuller points out in his fifth letter, Wayland fails to include reference to 1 Corinthians 7:18-22, which addresses slaves and masters alike. While the verse does not alter Wayland's argument, that Fuller calls attention to the omission is important to note because it highlights his devotion to *thoroughly* examining the question of slavery. For the complete list of verses see footnotes 3 and 6.

taking into account all passages, regardless of their apparent proslavery or antislavery message.

Delving even further into the New Testament verses, Wayland pauses the onward march of his exhibition to examine whether the two verses³ within the second category, those addressing masters, do indeed “grant a universal permission to establish and maintain [slavery] everywhere and at all times” (83). He explains that if those two verses allow for the men’s previously-established definition of slavery—that they allow for (a) one man to control another and (b) one to use all means necessary to ensure perpetuity—then the verses also infer one has the right to “the means necessary for getting it” (the conclusion of yet another enthymeme) (83). It is at this point in the letter that Wayland employs one of his many analogies to provide absolute clarity of his argument. He poses:

Suppose that a foreign foe should land an overwhelming force on your shores, for the sake of reducing the State of South Carolina to bondage; would not the language of every man, because he is a man, be, “Give me liberty or give me death!” And do you suppose that the apostolic precept respecting masters and slaves was intended to stifle this first and strongest aspiration of a human soul? Suppose that such an enemy should establish this authority, and reduce you to servitude, it would be your duty as men, and especially as Christians, to be kind, charitable, and forbearing; to avoid lying, purloining, and deceit. But would it not

³ These verses are found on page 82 and read: “Ephesians vi.8: ‘And ye masters, do the same thing unto them, forbearing threatening, knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him.’ ...Colossians iv.1: ‘Masters, render to your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.’”

be a most cruel mockery to plead the apostolic precepts on this subject in justification of the tyranny and oppression under which you were crushed? Now, strong as this case may seem, I think it is put fairly. For we are always to remember that a New Testament rule is a universal rule. It was not made for the Northern or the Southern States, for white men or for black men, but for all men. And hence the precept which would justify slavery in one case, would justify it equally in all similar cases. (84-85)

By here employing an analogy Wayland is able to put his argument into perspective for his Southern readers, who are well aware of the biblical calls for Christian behavior but have potentially not fully comprehended all implications of such teachings—specifically not the implications relating to their own hypothetical enforcement into servitude or submission to tyrannical rule. With the conclusion of this analogy Wayland asserts his argument that the New Testament verses do not, in fact, tolerate slavery, but rather they “were given for the sake of correcting its abuses” (85).

After clarifying this first assertion and setting the stage for his later argument that the Bible actually *condemns* slavery, Wayland transitions into the second section of his letter, his examination of whether or not the Bible allows for even the most basic concept of slavery, void of potential abuses. Here he again relies on division, syllogisms, and analogies to explicate and reinforce his points. He begins with a long list of negative details regarding the status quo of Roman slavery at the time of Christ, including specifics like, “In Delos alone, 10,000 slaves were sometimes bought and sold in a single day,” “the master had the power of life and death over the slave,” “[slaves] were

exposed to the most unrelenting barbarity,” etc. (see 86-87). Like all other lists in Fuller and Wayland’s letters, this list is set apart from the surrounding paragraphs and is numbered for emphasis and ease. By listing, numbering, and bulleting certain points (which the men do well over ten times throughout their correspondence), Fuller and Wayland are able to effectively call attention to a particular breakdown of ideas; this is especially true when one recalls that their letters were published in long skinny columns of a newspaper and that any sort of numeration visually stood out to the reader. In the case of Wayland’s list of facts on Roman slavery, effectively highlighted is the sheer volume and brutality of slavery in the apostolic era.

Wayland highlights these brutal statistics so as to juxtapose them to his supposition; he poses that *if* the New Testament verses allowed for slavery in the main, they did so “with all these facts in sight” (87). Given his original syllogism on the universal application of Biblical passages he concludes then that if the New Testament upholds slavery then “All [of the Roman facts are], therefore, permitted to us and to all men, on the sanction of inspiration (which is the conclusion of another syllogism). What is more, *if* this holds true then the Bible, the text that leads millions of men and women’s lives, “falls infinitely below the Declaration of American Independence” (88). In this syllogism within his larger syllogism we see Wayland appealing not only to his readers’ sense of logic and religious convictions, but also their patriotic pride. He points out that if the Bible, the world’s most important religious text, upholds slavery then it is potentially morally inferior to a simple legal document and, furthermore, that it contradicts the founding principles of the American nation. Asserted, then, is Wayland’s

second point that the New Testament cannot allow for even slavery in the main, without violating basic notions of religion (and American politics).

Upon arriving at this assertion Wayland has more or less thoroughly addressed whether the Bible *allows for* slavery. He has divided the notion of New Testament slavery support into two smaller concepts and effectively reduced them until clear truths are revealed. In clarifying the New Testament slavery passages Wayland has both explained his antislavery biblical interpretation *and* addressed common proslavery arguments, which Fuller alluded to in his initial letter. Given this progress Wayland embarks on the third and final section of his letter: his explanation of the Bible's *condemnation* of slavery. In these remaining six pages of his letter, Wayland establishes *what* the Bible's position is regarding slavery and *how* it asserts this message. Although he briefly touches on it here, it is in his seventh letter that Wayland thoroughly explains *why* the Bible uses its particular method of instruction.

To summarize his last few points on slavery's scriptural condemnation is relatively easy because Wayland reserves the majority of his subdivision and in-depth analysis for the subsequent letter. In short, Wayland asserts that "the New Testament contains no *precept* prohibitory of slavery... [because] It has, in my opinion, prohibited it in a manner far more emphatic than could have been done by any precept" (89). Given the "moral darkness of the heathen world," "effulgent truths" in the form of principles were slowly poured forth by the gospel to slowly be learned by the people (92). In defense of the slow implementation of these principles (for Fuller had previously stated

that if slavery were a sin it would have been directly and immediately condemned in the Bible), Wayland offers the following analogy:

You may give your child, if he were approaching to years of discretion, permission to do an act, while you inculcate upon him principles which forbid it, for the sake of teaching him to be governed by principles rather than by direct enactment. In such a case you would expect him to obey the principle, and not avail himself of the permission. So in the present instance, were the permission proved, we, as moral creatures of God, would be bound by the principles which controlled it. (93-94)

The inclusion of this analogy, as with the others, is significant because it allows the readers (specifically those who might otherwise oppose his viewpoints) to relate to and even agree with his particular point. Although Southern readers may still hold fast to their belief that the Bible explicitly sanctions slavery, they are at least able to begin to see the rationale behind biblically-based antislavery arguments.

This last analogy essentially concludes Wayland's sixth letter, although it is clear that his discussion of the New Testament's inculcation methods does continue in the subsequent letter published a week later. Even though his entire New Testament argument is not yet fully concluded, in this sixth letter Wayland's division of his preliminary proofs clearly explains his points and sets up his argumentative justification. Readers, both Northern and Southern, have been exposed to *clean* and *logical* examinations and explanations of scriptural antislavery arguments.

Within this letter, Wayland's employment of analogies, syllogisms, and constant division, fully supports his and Fuller's avowed intention of throwing "any light upon this difficult subject" (2). Here and elsewhere Wayland and Fuller's devotion to exhaustively and logically dissecting the scriptural arguments on slavery demonstrates that they have in mind, not victory, but the mutual understanding and settlement upon a clear and absolute truth (138). Their constant division and subdivision of concepts and their ready use of syllogisms and analogies show their enduring desire to conclude the issue in a manner that persuasively affects the reader, not with rhetoric or manipulative language, but with clarity and truth.

By relying upon basic argumentative strategies—division, syllogisms, and analogies—Wayland and Fuller do their best to create a collection of letters in which slavery is holistically and impartially examined without the entanglement of rhetoric. Their comingling of logical and biblically-based arguments speaks to their concern for each other, their readership, and the nation. While there are obvious strategic advantages to incorporating the Bible into any nineteenth century debate, in Wayland and Fuller's case their dual approach demonstrates their driving sense of religious duty—their intrinsic desire to determine and advance the will of God for the betterment of humanity. In Christian terms, to promote the true will of God *is* to practice charity; in their attempt to deduce the truth of slavery Fuller and Wayland clearly practiced and promoted charity. Their argumentative strategies, however, are not the only aspect of their discourse that promotes charity. As will be highlighted in the following chapters, the men both explicitly and implicitly promote and practice charity through their biblical

interpretations, their words, and their actions, and they thereby endeavor to sooth the disharmony heard along the Mason Dixon.

“The fulfillment and end of the law and all the divine scriptures is to love.”

—Saint Augustine, *De doctrina* 1.85

Chapter 3: Seeking the Truth

Because the United States was born out of Christianity, many of the laws and values of its people are a direct reflection of their once strictly Bible-based beliefs and lifestyles (see Wentz 27-32). That said, in the years leading up to the Civil War interpretations of the Bible played a fundamental role in the political, social, and religious arguments of people from the north *and* the south. From this trend Fuller and Wayland are not exempt. In fact, six of their fifteen originally published letters are devoted *solely* to discussing their biblical interpretive variances. Yet despite their many points of contention, a complete examination of their scriptural interpretations reveals that both men interpret the Bible through the same lens—through a lens of charity. Otherwise irreconcilable, Fuller and Wayland’s bipolar conclusions regarding slavery as derived from the Old and New Testaments are explained in light of Augustine’s rule of charity.

As previously mentioned in the introduction, Augustine’s rule of charity consists of two basic premises to which all valid interpretations must adhere. First, an interpretation must be able “to be understood not only historically and literally but also figuratively and prophetically” (*De doctrina* 3.48). Second, a passage must be “interpreted according to the aim of love, whether it be love of God or love of one’s neighbor, or both” (3.48). Given these conditions, one begins to see room for interpretive multiplicity, but Augustine is not yet finished.

The rule of charity also entails two steps one must take to correctly interpret scripture. The first is to determine whether a passage is meant as literal or figurative. He maintains that “if the message is clear” and congruent with the faith then it should be interpreted literally, and that this mode of interpretation should trump the latter whenever it is “in keeping with charity” (3.39, see also 3.54 and Eden 59). Conversely, Augustine holds that one should interpret scripture figuratively whenever the passage “cannot be related either to good morals or to the true faith” (3.33). Unfortunately for Fuller and Wayland (and antebellum America), Augustine does not mention *exactly* how one should interpret a passage that arguably is incongruent with the faith *and* cannot be related back to good morals (e.g. seemingly proslavery passages).

The second step Augustine advances does, however, provide some assistance; Augustine insists that it is the responsibility of the interpreter to ensure his reading is as close as possible to the Holy Spirit’s intended meaning (3.84). Of course, as Fuller and Wayland demonstrate in their correspondence, it is not always easy to deduce exactly what God’s words mean. However, throughout his explanation of the rule of charity, Augustine repeats the idea that varying interpretations of the same passage are fully acceptable and valid, so long as they adhere to the basic principles he first laid out. This allowance of multiplicity is based on the idea that the varied versions *will all work in the same direction*—a key concept when understanding the interpretive differences that ultimately stumped the deductions of Fuller and Wayland.

Largely considered the more literal interpreter of the two, Fuller advances arguments which incorporate biblical interpretations that explain God’s direct and

explicit allowance for slavery on the basis that the system is charitably run. Wayland, on the other hand, upholds biblical interpretations that explain God's *indirect* denunciation of slavery on account of charity—charity on behalf of the victims and charity on behalf of the abusers who, as Jesus explained “know not what they do” (Luke 23:34). Before explicating how these two seemingly incongruent readings may be reconciled in light of charity, it is first necessary to plainly clarify the men's individual biblical interpretations.

The root of the men's interpretive differences lies in the Old Testament and the fact that the Hebrews—including Abraham—maintained slaves under God's watch. The many passages relating to the regulation of slavery are found principally in the Pentateuch, or the first five books of the Bible⁴. Here God instructs his people on the consequences of certain actions (e.g. committing adultery with a female slave or physically harming a slave) and the manner in which other actions should be made (e.g. buying, selling, and emancipating slaves). Given the direct nature in which these regulations are stated, slavery opponents like Wayland tend toward a very different interpretation of the passages than that of slavery proponents like Fuller.

In short, slavery proponents like Fuller maintain the straightforward belief that “The Old Testament did sanction slavery... the system itself” but that it condemns “the abuses of slavery” (3, 4). Fuller derives support of this argument from many passages including one from the book of Exodus which commands: “And if a man smite the eye of his servant, or the eye of his maid, that it perish; he shall let him go free for his eye's

⁴ Some references include the following: On the 10th commandment: Exodus 20:17, Deuteronomy 5:21; On abusing slaves: Exodus 21:20-27; On emancipating slaves: Exodus 21: 1-7, Leviticus 25:44-53, Deuteronomy 15:12-18; On buying and selling slaves: Exodus 21:8; On sexual activities with slaves: Leviticus 19:20-22.

sake. And if he smite out his manservant's tooth, or his maidservant's tooth; he shall let him go free for his tooth's sake" (Ex 21:26-27). Fuller argues that this and other precepts set by God suggest the system of slavery itself is acceptable, but its abuses must not be overlooked. (Of course with this assertion comes his implied argument that what God sanctions for the Hebrews he sanctions for all men of all times—a point which Wayland later contests, as previously discussed in chapter two.)

This foundational argument, that the crime "is not slaveholding, but cruelty," is additionally supported by Fuller in a number of ways (8). Firstly, he points out the fact that not a single verse in the Bible directly condemns the institution, which it would do if slavery were a sin, just as the Bible explicitly "denounces all other prominent forms of sin" (213, 8). Secondly, Fuller importantly notes that the Bible does not contradict itself when one assumes the (direct proslavery) precepts of the Old Testament *work together* with the apostolic teachings of the New Testament to correct the abuses of slavery (8). Unlike with prominent antislavery biblical interpretations, Fuller argues that with this read the Old and New Testaments are congruent.

Perhaps, however, the most significant support of Fuller's proslavery biblical interpretation is his assertion that Jesus and his apostles treated social distinctions as irrelevant to the faith and declared that one can fulfill the will of God in any position—slave or free, gentile or Jew (189-190). The inclusion of this notion allows Fuller to suggest that the status of being a slave or holding slaves is not a moral issue (assuming it does not entail the mistreatment of others) and is certainly not a sin.

Fuller bases these ideas on a biblical passage that Wayland failed to mention in his list of slavery-related verses. He reminds Wayland in his fifth response letter that 1 Corinthians 7: 18-22 states:

‘Is any man called,’ says the apostle, ‘being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is he called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised.

Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God. Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. *Art thou called being a servant? care not for it;* but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord’s freeman: likewise, also, he that is called, being free, is Christ’s servant.’

(189-190 original italics)

With this verse Fuller establishes his argument that “the true spirit of the gospel, instead of interfering with social relations, should cause the believer to soar above them; and that the advantages and disadvantages of all earthly conditions ought to be forgotten and swallowed up in the thought of those transports and raptures to which he is hastening” (190). The implied emphasis here is on man’s first and foremost mission: “Thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might” (Deut 6:5).

While Wayland certainly agrees with Fuller’s overall emphasis on serving God, his interpretation of how bondmen and freemen should meet that command is drastically different. To present his read of the Bible Wayland first deals with the Old Testament and refutes two basic proslavery ideas: (1) What God sanctions to the

Hebrews he sanctions to all and (2) God sanctioned slavery among the Hebrews. In dealing with the first proposition Wayland pauses to contemplate the various implications of the word “sanction.” Rather than signifying to not forbid, or to “approve or command” (which, he argues, are implications without biblical foundation on 52-54), Wayland suggests that the proper way to describe the Old Testament’s presentation of slavery is to quote Jesus and say that Moses/God “permitted”⁵ slavery “because of the hardness of their [the Israelites’] hearts, or their untractable disposition” (56).

As such, Wayland argues that God certainly did not sanction or authorize slavery to all people of all times. Rather, he merely permitted certain circumstances but also provided precepts (and later principles) that would lead to gradual enlightenment and the eventual abolition of all slavery (57). Wayland asserts that this supposition is correct because the same mode of inculcation was also used to address other evils committed by the Hebrews, such as Polygamy and divorce, which “had since to a great degree ceased, at the time of the coming of Christ” (58). Given this plan of gradual enlightenment, Wayland asserts that when God provided the regulation of slavery in the Old Testament, he surely did not intend that those rules be applied to and slavery be permitted across all (future) ages.

Strengthening this notion of gradual enlightenment is Wayland’s argument that this pattern of inculcation continues on through the New Testament, “in a manner far more emphatic” through the many principles taught by Jesus and his apostles (89). Like

⁵ Wayland reminds his readers that in Matthew 19:3-9 Jesus is questioned by the Pharisees about the Mosaic law on divorce and responds “Moses indeed, because of your *untractable disposition*, permitted you to divorce your wives” (56 original italics).

Fuller, Wayland's entire biblical slavery argument relies on both Testaments, but his interpretation of the passages concludes that the Jesus and the apostles indirectly taught that "slavery is forbidden" (106). Although he does concede to Fuller's point that the New Testament does clearly and directly refer to on-going practices of slavery,⁶ he maintains that the surrounding principles Jesus teaches imply that those practices should end. Of the many principles taught in the New Testament, Wayland continually emphasizes benevolence, respect, charity, and love. Unlike the men's discussion of Old Testament slavery-related passages, however, Wayland and Fuller do not often quote specific New Testament principles that support their arguments, beyond the basic commandment to love God and one's neighbor. Rather, it is assumed that their readers already have an understanding of such teachings.

As the men justify their respective biblical arguments on slavery, it becomes increasingly clear that the underlying question that validates (or invalidates) both their arguments is whether or not it is against the principles taught by God to, very simply, own a slave. Both Fuller and Wayland assess this question logically and biblically; Fuller answering in the negative and Wayland answering in the positive. Initially, one would think that both men cannot be right; that one man has erred in his interpretation of the Bible and its precepts and principles. From an Augustinian perspective, however, I argue that their differences can be explained and their answers even accommodated.

⁶ Wayland's list of New Testament slavery-related verses is found in his sixth letter and includes: Eph 6:5-8, Col 3:22-25, 1 Tim 6:1-5, Titus 2:9-10, 1 Peter 2:18-23, and Col 4:1.

It should be noted that Wayland only includes those that *directly* refer to slaves and masters, and omits verses which can be *interpreted* to refer to slavery (and subsequently may support the biblical proslavery argument), such as 1 Cor 6:19-20, which reads: "What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's."

Following the hermeneutical guidelines advanced by Augustine, we see that Fuller and Wayland's interpretations of scripture, both Old and New, meet his validity requirements; Fuller and Wayland's interpretations of the passages are applicable historically, literally, figuratively, and prophetically and they maintain an "aim of love" for both God and one's neighbor (assuming slavery is void of abuses and that social distinctions are not of moral concern) (*De doctrina* 3.48). In addition, Fuller and Wayland take the appropriate steps to follow the intentions of the Holy Spirit and to determine whether the passages to which they refer should be read literally or figuratively. Both men argue the intended messages are clear and congruent with the faith—that the advanced implications do abide by good morals and the teachings of the overall Bible. Is it possible, then, that both men could be right?

To answer this question one must look further into how Fuller contextualizes and conditions his proslavery justification. First and foremost it is important to note that under all circumstances he stresses that the end-goal of every individual's life and all the relationships established therein is to love God and love one another. He argues that this goal *can* be achieved even in the institution of slavery so long as those in authority positions act in a Christian manner at all times. Of such optimism he asks, "And does not that charity which 'hopeth all things and believeth all things,' demand of him the hope and belief, that a brother, whom he knows to be a Christian, is 'putting forth his authority for good and not for evil?'" (155). In a situation where authority figures were in check of their actions and used their position and power responsibly and

benevolently, Fuller argues slavery would be constantly under amelioration and no worse than despotism (155).

This amelioration which Fuller occasionally directly and indirectly mentions (and clearly believes in) is a crucial component of his biblical justification of slavery given that he maintains the Bible certainly does not allow for the abuses of slavery seen throughout history, including in colonial and antebellum America. As means of example, Fuller discusses how he himself manages his own slaves under a system which redresses many of the grievances of the opponents of slavery:

With reference to my own servants, their condition is as good as I can make it. They are placed under a contract, which no instrument of writing could make more sacred. By this contract they, on their part, perform not one half the work done by free laborers;⁷ and I, on my part, am bound to employ a missionary to teach and catechize them and their children; to provide them with a home, and clothes, and provisions, and fuel, and land to plant for themselves; to pay all medical bills; to guaranty to them all the profits of their skill and labor, in their own time; to protect them as a guardian; and to administer to the wants of the children, and of those that are sick, and infirm, and aged. (222)

Fuller's personal system of slavery takes into account nearly every abuse condemned by the Bible's teachings and by northern slavery opponents. As to the accusation that the system still limits the freedom of the slaves, he reminds the reader that such relational structures are labeled as irrelevant in the Bible (see 189-190 and 1 Corinthians 7:18-22).

⁷ Recall that at this time (1845) the movement involving the installment and revision of American labor laws had yet to gain full momentum.

Further still, he notes that such restrictions are no different than a parent's governance over a child or a government's restrictions over women and children (141, 148). From a strictly biblical standpoint, then, it does seem to be the case that a properly ameliorated system of slavery (one that continually adjusts for any developing abuses) could potentially be permitted to be in accordance with all Christian teachings.

To suppose that every single slaveholder in the south would uphold and implement all Christian teachings into their own system of slavery is another issue entirely. While Fuller may, potentially, possess a valid biblical proslavery argument by interpreting scripture through a lens of charity (and subsequently applying it to his life), the idea that all other slaveholders would follow his suit is inarguably idealist. Wayland points out this reality: "You and I know full well the character which the word of God attributes to fallen human nature. We have all been taught how insufferably arrogant and cruel the mind of man becomes, when intrusted with irresponsible power" (112). In short, Wayland contends that human nature at one time or another will give way to corruption, and those in the position of slaves will fall victim to others' shortcomings.

Thus the men's differences are solidified; Wayland holds that the Bible shows it is our Christian duty to eliminate slavery, while Fuller holds that the Bible shows it is our Christian duty to ameliorate slavery (as the basic system itself is biblically permissible) (see 157). From an Augustinian hermeneutical perspective both men's interpretations of the Bible are, in fact, permissible. Allowance for this multiplicity is based upon the fact that both interpretations of scripture work in the same direction; they both advance the love of God and the love of one's neighbor. Of course, in retrospect it is quite easy to

say that Fuller's advancement of charity is idealist and gradual while Wayland's advancement of charity is realistic and immediate. Nonetheless, both men's interpretations and implementations of the Bible's teachings achieve the same goal.

As the Civil War dictated, Wayland's interpretation of the Bible has been marked by history as the "true" biblical read on slavery. Yet Augustine shows that charity and God's will can be played out in a multitude of ways. Were Fuller's interpretation to prevail there is no doubt that the abuses of slavery so lamented by northerners and slaves would have been redressed. Fuller himself contends that "it is neither possible nor proper to perpetuate slavery" given its potential danger (252, see also 243-244, 157, 163). Thus it is clear that, had Fuller's read of the Bible succeeded and been accepted by both sides, gradual amelioration would have evolved the institution of slavery until the relationships it posed were merely titles—perhaps until the designation of "slave" were no different than the designation of "farmhand."

Such suppositions are allowed on the basis of charity—on the idea that the "fulfillment and end" of Fuller and Wayland's arguments "is to love" (*De doctrina* 1.85). Given this shared direction and end it only makes sense that Fuller and Wayland could not conclusively decide who was right and who was wrong; they both were right. Through their dissention over biblical text the men demonstrate *the uniting quality of charity*; they illuminate how varied interpretations of the Bible can coincide *and* how dissenting men can agree. And while these demonstrations speak to Fuller and Wayland's ethos as debaters, they more importantly speak to their ethos as leaders. Through their reliance on charity as a guiding persuasive principle Fuller and Wayland

gain both authority and credibility. It remains to be seen, however, how their implicit promotion of charity through their words and actions solidifies their rhetorical strength.

“I am willing to make greater sacrifices than any abolitionist has made or would make, if the cause of true humanity would thus be advanced.”

—Richard Fuller, 128

Chapter 4: Sharing the Message

For fifteen consecutive weeks—from November 7, 1844 to February 27, 1845—Fuller and Wayland paused their work and set aside their local pastoral duties to devote time to the resolution of the slavery debate and the healing of the nation. For fifteen weeks Fuller and Wayland engaged in lengthy and weighty correspondence as they sought truth. For fifteen weeks the men led the nation through their living and written examples of charity. Their model leadership, discipleship, and citizenship overtly evidence themselves through the men’s personal discourse and their concern for their audience. Writing with more than common decorum, Fuller and Wayland exhibit and promote charity, and subsequently unity, toward one another and their estranged national audience.

In the nineteenth century letter-writing was a very common practice accompanied, of course, with volumes of books on proper style and composition. Although many related handbooks were published, the books’ messages are all fairly similar and standard, offering such advice as: “it is necessary to endeavor to make our style clear, precise, elegant, and appropriate for all subjects,” “The name should be written so that it can be read easily, and politeness requires that some title should be added to it,” “A letter is like a nosegay; the thoughts should be well assorted,” and “In all your conversations, forbear to sacrifice truth to considerations of civility or respect;

avoid the same fault in your letters” (Louis 174, Houghton 296, 323, 324). While abundance of these and other peculiar rules is interesting to note within Fuller and Wayland’s letters (which always exhibit superb etiquette), it is all the more fascinating to see how their letters surpass the simple decorum guidelines of their time (for more guides see also Cox, Bloomfield-Moor, and Sherwood).

True, Wayland and Fuller follow the proper protocol of correspondence, addressing each letter “To the Rev. [Richard Fuller or Francis Wayland] D. D.” and following up with a friendly salutation of “My dear Brother.” The rich content of their letters, however, evidences that the linguistic relationship which they share is founded upon more than just etiquette, but rather upon a genuine sense of charity and love for one another. The men’s charity is perfectly exhibited in their manner of correspondence as well as in their overt concern for their audience. Within the first category, the men’s genuine acknowledgement of their own faults and their openness toward one another’s words demonstrate their promotion of and reliance on charity in their own personal lives.

On the one hand, acknowledging one’s own faults or weaknesses before they are called out is a common discursive procedure. In Wayland and Fuller’s case, however, doing so is a seemingly deliberate attempt to, not defend themselves, but open themselves to one another. In order to demonstrate their willingness to cooperate and listen, Fuller and Wayland needed to demonstrate their ability to holistically understand the situation at hand—including the faults of their own respective sides. One such

example is seen in Wayland's response to Fuller's complaint regarding the Philadelphia speeches (see first footnote):

The abolition press has, I believe, from the beginning, too commonly indulged in exaggerated statement, in violent denunciation, and in coarse and lacerating invective. At our late Missionary Convention in Philadelphia, I heard many things from men who claim to be the exclusive friends of the slave, which pained me more than I can express. It seemed to me that the spirit which many of them manifested was very different from the spirit of Christ. I also cheerfully bear testimony to the general courtesy, the Christian urbanity, and the calmness under provocation, which, in a remarkable degree, characterized the conduct of the members from the South. (13-14)

In similar style, Fuller begins the first of his response letters by declaring willingness to accept correction so long as betterment is obtained. He states: "Peace and truth are all I seek, and if in this discussion my argument be refuted, I shall be well content, provided peace and truth are secured" (126). Acknowledging their own faults, as Wayland and Fuller do throughout their letters, is the first step in demonstrating how dissenting debaters can embrace charity and cooperate with one another to better serve the need.

In addition to this step, Wayland and Fuller pen their letters and express their viewpoints with openness toward and consideration of the other's point of view. They are mindful that their goal is not to win the debate, but to establish understanding and, hopefully, common ground. For example, Wayland exemplifies this openness when he speaks (with accuracy) of Fuller's charitable writing: "The warm spirit of philanthropy

which pervades every part of your argument must melt away every prejudice by which it could be resisted; while the love to God and the reverence for his word which are everywhere so apparent, must, I am sure, give you a place in the affections of every true disciple of our common Lord" (226). By maintaining a focus on charity and shared-understanding Fuller and Wayland demonstrate the ability to peacefully and compassionately make progress in a difficult and otherwise heated debate.

Beyond their shared "warm spirit" (for Wayland too demonstrates such a quality), receptiveness is also witnessed in the manner in which the men mull over one another's points and compare and fit them with their own. In one such case, after responding to Wayland's assertion that slavery in the main is not permitted by the Bible, Fuller attempts to reveal a middle-ground on which both men can agree that the ultimate duty is to "the instruction, moral and intellectual, of the slave" just as is our duty toward one another (157). Following this Fuller speaks toward their own eventual tread upon middle-ground: "We should thus, too, be reconciled, not only with each other, but with the Scriptures, and you be relieved from the laborious, up-hill, Sisy-phus-task⁸, of overcoming the word of God" (158). This final emphasis on cooperation is not a late development, but rather, a point the men emphasize from the onset of their correspondence. In the very first letter Fuller states: "On these topics [slavery etc.] Christians throughout the land ought to communicate in the spirit of love, and combine their prayers and co-operations" (7). Seeking reconciliation, or middle-ground, then,

⁸ Refers to the mythological god who eternally endeavored to roll a boulder uphill.

may justly be labeled the third manner in which Fuller and Wayland promote charity within their personal discourse as means of healing the surrounding society.

The men's emphasis on cooperation culminates in the final letter Wayland writes to Fuller. Although only included in the book collection and not published in the *Christian Reflector*, Wayland's summative letter of their final points of agreement concludes their correspondence on a note of progress, improvement and concord. Even though they do not arrive at an absolute truth regarding the morality of slavery, the men do present a display of mutual and holistic understanding and respect which hitherto was missing from the general slavery debate. Wayland attributes this (unprecedented) cooperation to their charitable treatment of the subject matter and one another: "if we have been enabled without bitterness to express our views to each other on a subject which is so liable to arouse the worst passions of our fallen nature, let us ascribe it all to that love of God shed abroad in our hearts, which teaches us to treat as a brother every disciple of our common Lord, though he may embrace opinions in many respects differing from our own" (253-354). Here, as elsewhere, the reader is reminded that the bottomline of the Christian faith and life is to love and to serve, which is exactly what Fuller and Wayland attempt to do and promote through their correspondence.

While it highlights their charitable approach to one another, this final letter in the series also demonstrates Fuller and Wayland's promotion of charity through their concern for their audience's understanding. In this letter the men's emphasis on clarity and truth is at its peak; in case the previous letters were not clear enough, Wayland

provides this last letter to “sum up the whole” and “enumerate the points of agreement” (251). As in the previous chapters, Wayland here lists out the articles in plain didactic fashion.⁹ And, as has been previously shown, here and elsewhere the men’s concern for the reader’s complete understanding of both sides of the debate evidences their desire to relieve tensions and promote unity. Their constant presentations of reduced ideas and lists, analogies, and syllogisms demonstrate their desire not only to deduce the truth but to present their deductions in as clear and comprehensible manner as possible, thus allowing readers from both sides to holistically see and understand the arguments made. Among many reasons, the implied basic purpose of this clarity being that with mutual understanding comes mutual respect and the willingness to collaborate to find common ground and an eventual resolution.

Although Fuller may not have written his initial letter to the editor of the *Christian Reflector* with the intention of having any great or noble impact on the nation, the Baptist community, or even his readership, the quest for truth that ensued between him and Wayland ultimately exhibits his intrinsic concern for those around him. It should come as no great surprise that the word charity appears in the men’s correspondence over twenty-five times; both Fuller and Wayland constantly demonstrate, explicitly and implicitly, that their effort to holistically illuminate the arguments on slavery is so that “peace and truth” may be secured (126). In doing so Fuller and Wayland have in mind the wellbeing of the nation, their communities, the

⁹ For sake of curiosity and conclusion the men’s points of agreement are as follows: (1) That holding slaves is not necessarily a guilt, (2) That slaves are “entitled to the same privileges, intellectual, moral, and domestic, as any other man,” (3) That slaveholders hold the duty of providing for the “intellectual, moral, social, and domestic” needs of the slaves and (4) That “it is neither *possible* nor *proper* to perpetuate” slavery (251-252).

Baptist church, the slaves, the slaveholders, and all the other tangentially related parties. Wayland and Fuller were well aware of the truth Abraham Lincoln would so eloquently state several years later: “a house divided against itself cannot stand” (Lincoln “House”). By laboring to establish shared understanding and universal truth the men endeavored to care for their “house” and all the people therein.

Limiting the healing effect that Wayland and Fuller could have on others was the fact that their correspondence was literally separated into different panels of paper which were distributed across a four month period. Although individually powerful to be sure, their dissection of the slavery debate has a stronger presentation when read all at once—when the complete collection of letters is accessible and the reader may clearly see *all* their points together. Thus, the men’s final exhibition of charity is their decision to publish their series of letters in a book that could be distributed and shared throughout their respective regions. Published in 1845 in Boston the book achieved notable success. Evidencing its acceptance and effectiveness is the fact that by 1860 at least six editions of the text had been released. What is more, unlike most of the pro and antislavery pamphlets and booklets from the antebellum era, Fuller and Wayland’s book is *still* in print. Indeed three different editions have been published in the last decade including a 2008 Mercer University Press unedited edition which was printed with the intention of sharing “an enduring example of how interested individuals can publicly debate issues of national import without impugning the other’s character” (xii). This and the other reproductions attest the longevity and enduring relevance of Fuller and Wayland’s discourse and their *continued* promotion of charity.

Conclusions

The focus on charity that Fuller and Wayland employ throughout their correspondence and their examination of scripture molds their rhetoric into a model of benevolent leadership. Even at their points of contention they effectively express no tension (see 204). Rather than angrily asserting their positions, the men acknowledge their differences and subtly imply that there is yet hope they may achieve eventual accord through continued prayer and love and respect of one another (204). This example of leadership that they weekly displayed to the readers of the *Christian Reflector* and later to the many readers of their book, was certainly much needed in the years leading up to the Civil War as high emotions and heated debates increasingly inundated the political, social, and religious scenes.

The respect and forbearance that Fuller and Wayland display as a result of their charitable outlook also call attention to the uniting quality of their rhetoric. As their letters make clear, prior to their correspondence a complete logical and scriptural explanation of both sides of the slavery debate had yet to be given. Instead, both sides attacked each other with vicious rhetoric—without a genuine attempt to cooperate and understand the opposing viewpoints (1-2, 14-15). The words of Fuller and Wayland show how such cooperation can occur, and occur successfully. Although difficult to achieve within a divided community or nation, the procurement of such collaboration and unity is key to addressing difficult social, political, and religious issues. Without unity common ground and resolution cannot be found; “A house divided against itself cannot

stand,” as the Baptist church demonstrated in 1845 and the United States confirmed in 1861 (Lincoln “House”).

The call of conscience that Fuller and Wayland shared—their longing for unity—is equally pertinent to today’s society. It does not require much imagination to identify the many parallels between the political-religious controversies of the antebellum period and those of the twenty-first century. Issues from both eras elicit dissenting cries from the populace and cause political turmoil (and often deadlock) in both government *and* church leaderships. Issues as large as abortion legality and as specific as birth control health care coverage easily become major points of contention when little is done to collaborate, to unite, to find a solution that has charity at its core. Yet the path to these issues’ resolution is at our fingertips, though it may not be easy, or even quick. When we begin to understand each other’s viewpoints, to interpret issues through a lens of charity, and to establish common ground (however little) our points of contention will progressively fade away. The discourse of Fuller and Wayland testifies support of this path and provides a model from which to begin.

I began this study with a quote from C. Woodward’s book *American Counterpoint*; perhaps nowhere else has the reality of the American situation been so eloquently stated. We Americans have a history of differences—differences of race, differences of belief, differences of opinion—thanks to our immigrant beginnings. With this diversity comes a certain aesthetic of beauty, like that of a full orchestra. We live together, we work together, we play together. It is our duty to one another, then, to constantly strive toward harmony. We are entitled to our differences and we praise our

individuality, yet, as Fuller and Wayland suggest, we must not become dogmatic in our ways; we must not let our differing opinions and beliefs completely divide our nation, our communities, and our churches. Above all, we must take care that our combined melodies, our counterpoints, do not “disintegrate into mere contradiction” (11).

Appendix A

According to the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, The Apostles' Creed "is so called because it is rightly considered to be a faithful summary of the apostles' faith. It is the ancient baptismal symbol of the Church of Rome" (194). The creed, which is traditionally used at baptisms and at other times of faith reflection, consists of the following twelve articles:

1. I believe in God, the Father almighty, creator of heaven and earth.
2. I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord.
3. He was conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary.
4. He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried.
5. He descended to the dead. On the third day he rose again.
6. He ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father.
7. He will come again to judge the living and the dead.
8. I believe in the Holy Spirit,
9. the holy catholic Church, the communion of saints,
10. the forgiveness of sins,
11. the resurrection of the body,
12. and life everlasting

Amen.

Appendix B

The following letters were all included in the 1845 bound publication of Fuller and Wayland's letters. I have included the date of the letters' original publication¹⁰ in the *Christian Reflector* except for the final concluding letter written by Francis Wayland; this letter was never printed in the newspaper, but rather was written very shortly before the bound collection was published so as "to offer some explanations which seemed to be necessary, and also to present more clearly the bearing of the one argument upon the other, so that the points of agreement and difference might be rendered more manifest" (Fuller-Wayland iv).

7 Nov. 1844 **Letter to the Editor:** Richard Fuller to the Editor of the *Christian Reflector*

Francis Wayland's Letters to Richard Fuller

14 Nov. 1844 **Letter I:** Errors on both sides
 21 Nov. 1844 **Letter II:** Definition of Slavery—Two meanings of the terms Moral Evil—Slavery as a violation of Human Rights
 28 Nov. 1844 **Letter III:** The hold of Slaves does not necessarily involve guilt—Principles by which the innocence or guilt is to be determined
 5 Dec. 1844 **Letter IV:** Examination of the Argument in favor of slavery from the Old Testament
 12 Dec. 1844 **Letter V:** The Doctrine of Expediency
 19 Dec. 1844 **Letter VI:** The Argument in favor of Slavery from the New Testament
 26 Dec. 1844 **Letter VII:** The method of prohibiting Slavery in the New Testament—Principle and permission
 2 Jan. 1845 **Letter VIII:** The duties devolving on Christian Slaveholders

Richard Fuller's Letters to Francis Wayland

23 Jan. 1845 **Letter I:** The Southern States not answerable for the existence of Domestic Slavery
 30 Jan. 1845 **Letter II:** Slavery is not to be confounded with the abuses of Slavery
 6 Feb. 1845 **Letter III:** Slavery proper, no violation of right—Analogy with civil government—Despotism—Comparison of the condition of Slaves with that of laborers in other countries
 13 Feb. 1845 **Letter IV:** The Argument from the Old Testament
 20 Feb. 1845 **Letter V:** The Argument from the New Testament
 27 Feb. 1845 **Letter VI:** The mode of teaching by principle in this case at variance with the character of God—The practice of the primitive Church

 1845 **Concluding Letter:** Francis Wayland to Richard Fuller

¹⁰ Publication dates and the following newspaper image retrieved through ProQuest database.

Works Cited

- "A Brief History." *The Baptist Church of Beaufort*. The Baptist Church of Beaufort, 2011. Web. 18 Jul. 2011.
- "About Christian Reflector." *Chronicling America*. Library of Congress, n.d. Web. 20 Jan. 2012.
- Abruzzo, Margaret. *Polemical Pain*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.
- Ambrose, Douglas. "Proslavery Christianity in Early National Virginia." *Religion and the Antebellum Debate over Slavery*. Ed. John R. McKivigan and Mitchell Snay. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1998. 35-67.
- Augustine. *Confessions*. New York, NY: Penguin Books, 1961.
- Augustine. *On Christian Teaching*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Baer, Helmut David. "The Fruit of Charity: Using the Neighbor in *De doctrina christiana*." *Journal of Religious Ethics* 24.1 (Spr. 1996): 47-64. *ATLA Religion*. Web. 19 Jan. 2012.
- Baker, Robert A. *Relations Between Northern and Southern Baptists*. New York, NY: Arno Press, 1980.
- Baker, Robert A. "Southern Baptist Beginnings." *Baptist History and Heritage Society*. Baptist History and Heritage Society. 1979. Web. 27 Jan 2012.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984.

Beilby, James. "The Relationship Between Faith and Evidence in St. Augustine." *Sophia*

41.1 (May 2002): 19-32. *ProQuest Religion*. Web. 19 Jan. 2012.

Bloomfield-Moor, Clara Sophia. *Sensible Etiquette for the Best Society*. Philadelphia:

Porter & Coates, 1878.

Brookes, Iveson L. *A defence of southern slavery against the attacks of Henry Clay and*

Alex'r Campbell. Hamburg, SC: Robinson and Carlisle, 1851.

Brookes, Iveson L. *A defence of the South against the reproaches and incroachments of*

the North. Hamburg, SC: Republican Office, 1850.

Brown, William Adams. "A Century of Theological Education and after." *The Journal of*

Religion 6.4 (Jul. 1926): 363-383. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Sept. 2011.

Catechism of the Catholic Church. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1995.

Cox, Edward William. *The Arts of Writing, Reading, and Speaking, in Letters to a Law*

Student. London: John Crockford, 1863.

Christian Reflector. 7 Nov. 1844 – 27 Feb. 1845. *ProQuest*. Web. 10 Feb. 2012.

Cuthbert, J. H. *Life of Richard Fuller, D.D.* New York, NY: Sheldon and Company, 1878.

Eden, Kathy. "The Rhetorical Tradition and Augustinian Hermeneutics in *De doctrina*

Christiana. Rhetorica 8.1 (Winter 1990): 45-63. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Mar. 2011.

Edwards Jr., O. C. *A History of Preaching*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2004.

Eichenseer, P. Caelestis. *Das Symbolum apostolicum beim heiligen Augustinus: mit*

Berücksichtigung des dogmengeschichtlichen Zusammenhangs. Germany: St.

Ottilien, 1960.

- Forbes, Robert P. "Slavery and the Evangelical Enlightenment." *Religion and the Antebellum Debate over Slavery*. Ed. John R. McKivigan and Mitchell Snay. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1998. 68-106.
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth and Eugene D. Genovese. "The Divine Sanction of Social Order: Religious Foundations of the Southern Slaveholders' World View." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 55.2 (Summer 1987): 211-233. *JSTOR*. 15 Apr. 2011.
- Fuller, Richard. "Letter VI. To the Rev. Francis Wayland D. D." *Christian Reflector* 27 Feb. 1845: 1-2. *ProQuest*. Web. 10 Feb. 2012.
- Fuller, Richard and Francis Wayland. *Domestic Slavery Considered as a Spiritual Institution*. New York: Lewis Colby, 1845.
- Fuller, Richard and Francis Wayland. *Domestic Slavery Considered as a Spiritual Institution*. Ed. Nathan Finn and Keith Harper. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2008.
- Geffen, Elizabeth M. "William Henry Furness: Philadelphia Antislavery Preacher." *The Historical Society of Pennsylvania* 82.3 (Jul. 1958): 259-292. *JSTOR*. ZSR Library, Wake Forest University. 15 Apr. 2011.
- Haberman, Maggie. "Conservative group backtracks on marriage pledge slavery language." *Politico* 11 July 2011. Web. 7 Oct. 2011.
- Harrill, J. Albert. "The Use of the New Testament in the American Slave Controversy: A Case History in the Hermeneutical Tension between Biblical Criticism and

- Christian Moral Debate." *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* 10.2 (summer 2000): 149-186. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Sept. 2011.
- Houghton, Walter Raleigh. *American Etiquette and Rules of Politeness*. New York: Rand McNally & Company, 1889.
- Lincoln, Abraham. "A House Divided." Springfield, IL. 16 Jun. 1858.
- Lincoln, Abraham. "Second Inaugural Address." Washington DC. 4 Mar. 1865.
- Litfin, Bryan M. "The Rule of Faith in Augustine." *Pro Ecclesia* 14.1 (Winter 2005): 85-101. *ATLA Religion*. Web. 19 Jan. 2012.
- McKibbens Jr., Thomas R. *The Forgotten Heritage: A Lineage of Great Baptist Preaching*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1986.
- McKivigan, John R. and Mitchel Snay. "Introduction: Religion and the Problem of Slavery in Antebellum America." *Religion and the Antebellum Debate over Slavery*. E d. John R. McKivigan and Mitchell Snay. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1998. 1-32.
- Nettles, Tom. "A Biographical Sketch of Richard Fuller." *Founders Ministries*. The Founders Ministries, n.d. Web. 18 Jul. 2011.
- Paffenroth, Kim and Robert P. Kennedy, ed. *A Reader's Companion to Augustine's Confessions*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.
- Press, Gerald. "The Subject and Structure of Augustine's "De Doctrina Christiana." *Augustinian Studies* 11 (1980): 99-124. Interlibrary Loan. ZSR Library, Wake Forest University. 13 Oct. 2011.

- Robertson, D.W. Jr. "The Doctrine of Charity in Mediaeval Literary Gardens." *Speculum* 26.1 (Jan. 1951): 24-49. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Oct. 2011.
- Louis, S.L. and John A. Ruth. *Decorum*. Chicago: Union Publishing House/Acme Publishing House, 1883.
- Shanks, Caroline. "The Biblical Anti-Slavery Argument of the Decade 1830-1840." *The Journal of Negro History* 16.2 (Apr. 1931): 132-157. *JSTOR*. 13 Apr. 2011.
- Sherwood, Mary Elizabeth Wilson. *Manners and Social Usages*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1884.
- Stringfellow D.D., Thornton. *Scriptural and Statistical Views in Favor of Slavery*. Richmond, VA: J.W. Randolph, 1856. *Internet Archive*. Web. 19 Jul. 2011.
- "The Holy Bible: King James Version." BibleGateway Zondervan Corporation. n.d. Web. 3 Feb 2012.
- Tise, Larry E. *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1840*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1987.
- Troup, Calvin L. "Rhetorical Interpretation in Augustine's *Confessions*." *Journal of Communication and Religion* 24.1 (Mar 2001): 43-67. *Communication Mass Media Complete*. Web. 16 Sep. 2011.
- Troup, Calvin L. *Temporality, Eternity, and Wisdom*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1999.
- Van Broekhoven, Deborah Bingham. "Suffering with Slaveholders: The Limits of Francis Wayland's Antislavery Witness." *Religion and the Antebellum Debate over*

Slavery. Ed. John R. McKivigan and Mitchell Snay. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1998. 196-220.

Wentz, Richard E. *Religion in the New World*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1990.

Whitney, Don. "Richard Fuller, Pt. 1—A Biographical Sketch." *The Founders Journal* 7 (Winter 1992). Founders Ministries, n.d. Web. 18 Jul. 2011.

Whitney, Don. "Richard Fuller, Pt. 2—His Preaching." *The Founders Journal* 8 (Spring 1992). Founders Ministries, n.d. Web. 18 Jul. 2011.

Woodward, C. Vann. *American Counterpoint: Slavery and Racism in the North-South Dialogue*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company: 1971.

CATHERINE LORELEI COELHO

Permanent Contact:
Felicitous12@yahoo.com

EDUCATION

- MA** Wake Forest University, Communication May 2012
Thesis: "Uniting a Broken Nation: A Study of the Unification Devices Employed by Antebellum Baptist Ministers in the Slavery Debate"
Advisor: Dr. Margaret Zulick
GPA: 4.0
- BA** Wake Forest University, Communication May 2010
Graduated magna cum laude
Honors Thesis: "Advanced Public Speaking and Speechwriting"
Double major in English, Minor in Spanish
Overall GPA: 3.628, Major GPA: 3.949

AWARDS, RECOGNITIONS, AND PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

- Full Assistantship** 2010 – 2012
Department of Communication, Wake Forest University
- Awarded for academic merit and promise in the field
- New Venture Seed Grant (\$400)** 2011
Center for Innovation, Creativity, and Entrepreneurship, WFU
- Granted in recognition of clear entrepreneurial spirit and potential
 - Used to found the Great American Writers' Camp, LLC
- Senior Colloquium Nominee** 2010
Office of the Dean, WFU
- Nominated in recognition of academic merit, community leadership, and notable public speaking ability
- Dean's List** 2006 – 2010
Office of the Dean, WFU
- Awarded for academic merit
- Lambda Pi Eta Communication Honor Society** 2009 – 2010
- Inducted into honor society in recognition of academic merit within the major
 - Served as Secretary (Fall 2009 – Spring 2010)
- Carolinas Communication Association** 2011 – Present
- Attend and present at the annual conference
 - Network and share research with other regional communication scholars

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Master of Arts Communication Thesis, Wake Forest University 2011 – 2012

Advisor: Dr. Margaret Zulick

- Studied rhetorical unification strategies of two antebellum proslavery and antislavery ministers
- Argued the ministers' implicit and explicit reliance on Augustine's rule of charity served to promote unity to a disjointed audience and nation
- Related argument to present day American dissonance and need for unity

Bachelor of Arts Communication Honors Thesis, WFU 2010

Advisor: Dr. Margaret Zulick

- Researched current advanced public speaking pedagogical trends in higher education communication departments
- Designed hybrid advanced public speaking and speechwriting course
- Highlighted decline of public speaking courses (basic and advanced) and need for their resurrection

Communication Development Research Practicum, Charlotte, NC 2009

Research Assistant of Dr. Marina Krcmar of WFU

- Conducted research to determine the learning value of "educational" DVDs as compared to live interaction
- Tested over 50 infants and toddlers for learned word and object recognition
- Coded and prepared data collected for analysis

WORK EXPERIENCE

Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC

Dept of Communication: Head Teaching Assistant - Public Speaking 2010 – Present

- Lead instruction of two public speaking labs under guidance of head lecturer
- Train incoming teaching assistants and familiarize them with curriculum and instruction methods
- Aid students in their speechwriting and presentations, both in and out of class
- Determine in-class assignment and participation grades and collaborate with professor on final grades

Student Athlete Services: Tutor

2011

- Assist undergraduate athletes through their communication readings and concepts
- Ensure all assignments are completed on time and in accordance with set guidelines

Wake Forest University Stores: Student Sales Associate 2006 – 2010

- Student Employee of the Year: 2010

- Student Employee of the month: November 2009, February 2009 and November 2007
- Assist managers in maintaining store visual appeal, marketing products, and serving customers

Great American Writers' Camp, LLC, Winston-Salem, NC

Camp Owner/Director

2011 –

Present

- Created summer camp for students in grades 5-8 to foster creativity and hone their abilities to write and speak for a public audience
- Secure and manage camp publicity, budget, curriculum, assistants, and students
- Design and update website (theGAWC.weebly.com)
- Develop creative thinking and writing curriculum and schedule
- Engage students in interactive lessons that motivate and inspire them to write and develop a unique style

Self-Employed, Winston-Salem, NC & Modesto, CA

Private Tutor

2010 –

Present

- Coach students in grades 5-12 in the fields of writing and public speaking
- Improve and advance academic writing, creative writing, college application essays, etc.

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Journal Papers in Review

Coelho, Catherine. "Book Review: *The Faithful Citizen*." Submitted to: *Quarterly Journal of Speech*.

Conference Papers

(Peer-Reviewed)

Coelho, Catherine. "A Semiotic Combat against 'Awful Billboard Blight.'" Presented at: Carolinas Communication Association Conference, Oct. 1, 2011.

- Top Graduate Papers Panel
- Currently revising paper for journal submission

Coelho, Catherine. "Making Sense of Contradiction: A Study of Early American Proslavery and Antislavery Sermons." Will present at: Southern States Communication Association Conference. Apr. 19, 2012.

Conference Papers in Progress

Coelho, Catherine. "The Potential of Visual Epideictic Rhetoric: A Case Study of Unfulfillment." Will submit to 2013 NCA convention and *Communication Education*.

LANGUAGES

English: Fluent

Spanish: Proficient (written and spoken)

Portuguese: Working knowledge (written)