Introduction

This book tells the story of Kentucky in the era of the American Civil War. It explains how a slaveholding state that remained with the Union during the conflict, which claimed a long-standing and variegated antislavery tradition before the war, came to see itself as part of the Confederate project after the fact. This book is about the role of conservative evangelical Protestant theology in driving the course of American political and cultural history in nineteenth-century America. It is also a book about the great slavery debates of that century: it tracks the fate of gradual emancipationism and the vitality of proslavery belief from 1830 to 1880. But because of the centrality of white Kentucky believers in defining the contours of argument about slavery in the United States, this book's purview and argument address a great deal more than what happened within the boundaries of one state. The argument is straightforward: to fail to understand the significance of conservative evangelical theology or Kentucky is to fail to understand the American struggle over slavery and abolition more broadly.

After the American Revolution, the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 defined the territory north of the Ohio River as free soil, whereas lands to the south retained slavery. That division would profoundly shape the region up to the Civil War. Early American migrants into the Ohio Valley came from a variety of ideological persuasions, and they held conflicting views about the place slavery should occupy in the American nation. That conflict never waned: the region remained contested ground throughout the nineteenth century. Six hundred sixty-four miles of the Ohio River touched both the slave soil of Kentucky and the free soil of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois – the longest of any slave state/free state border. The river's physical fluidity highlighted the range of ideological positions on slavery that marked the region – it was as much the Lower North as it was the Upper South. Given the close proximity of slavery

to freedom, the Ohio Valley became a key locus of the contest over the slavery question.[1]

In Kentucky – a slave state on the border – religious believers on each side of the debate came into direct contact with one another as nowhere else. They constructed arguments designed to provoke responses from their opponents and, in turn, shaped the arguments of the other side. The Ohio Valley, more broadly, fostered a rhetorical environment on the slavery question that allowed for a considerable degree of nuance in the antebellum era. But the close contact between pro- and antislavery forces did not make the Bluegrass State any more moderate on the most contentious issue of the day. Antebellum Kentucky was not a "middle ground" that produced an idealized and fantastical version of liberal toleration. Rather, it was a battleground where the drama of the American struggle over slavery and freedom played out in sharp relief.

Kentucky was not simply the ideological middle, nor was it merely the geographical middle of the antebellum United States: it stood at the center of the nineteenth-century American debate over race, slavery, and abolition. In Kentucky, deeply held opinions about slavery's future met one another head on; they were challenged, sharpened, and refined by this collision. In this way, proslavery thought and abolitionism were mutually constitutive. Conservative white Kentuckians' dialogue with black and white abolitionists in their midst – or nearby on the other side of the Ohio River – over the merits of slavery, which took place against a shared backdrop of evangelical religion, thus frequently defined the debate over race and abolition narrowly in terms of "orthodoxy." And that theological move constrained each side's visions of slavery's future.

Abolitionism and proslavery thought were by no means rigid polarities, but rather were ideological constructs created as the result of back-and-forth argumentation over time. As antislavery and proslavery actors came to understand one another, they did not reach social harmony. Rather, they created further discord. Because of the rhetorical and discursive confines in which it took place, the debate over slavery strengthened the theologies of both slavery and white supremacy. Kentucky thus shows both the potentialities and limitations of public discourse on race and slavery. Placing both sides of that discourse together in a single study clarifies why abolitionism was so contested and why even those who sympathized with it did not go further than they did.

One of the more vexing problems in American history has been explicating the nineteenth-century relationship between slavery and Christianity. Although the literature on this problem is vast, it is really only in the last several decades that the most important advances have been made toward understanding the role of religion before the Civil War in shaping ideas about slavery. A growing number of scholars have demonstrated in different ways the centrality of

[1] For a perceptive book that reaches a different conclusion about the significance of the Ohio River in shaping the slavery debates, see Matthew Salafia, *Slavery's Borderland: Freedom and Bondage along the Ohio River* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

theological considerations in political and economic debates about slavery. Much of the public argument over the nature of slavery that occurred from 1830 to 1860 was evangelical in nature and stemmed from a debate over the authority and role of the Bible. Proslavery Protestants in the antebellum South, the literature suggests, affirmed a commonsense, literalist biblical sanction for slaveholding, which approved, in their language, "slavery in the abstract." Combined with a relatively pessimistic outlook about the abilities of humans to effect social change on their own apart from divine action, an idea that drew from a thoroughgoing conception of humanity's innate sinfulness, proslavery believers embraced a fundamentally conservative worldview. Abolitionists, by contrast, adopted a broader interpretive scheme – anathema to the literalists – and concluded that the "spirit" of Scripture denounced slavery, in spite of its literal word. This version of "Bible politics," as historian James Brewer Stewart has called it, led abolitionists to emphasize a postmillennial view of their faith, where the earthly millennial reign of Christ might be ushered into the here-and-now through determined human work to destroy all forms of sin in this life – of which slavery was a major constitutive element. Slavery, in other words, presented a theological impasse by the late antebellum period. Both sides held deeply religious views on the issue, and both sides claimed a Christian mandate – but they believed different things. Because of differing core interpretive principles, both proslavery and abolitionist believers saw their opponents as fundamentally and hopelessly lost.[2]

[2] William Sumner Jenkins' foundational chapter, "Moral Philosophy of Slavery" in *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935), 200–41, in many ways set the agenda for future scholars looking at the debate over slavery as a debate about the nature of Christianity and the role Christian doctrine should play in shaping society. More recent historians have extended Jenkins' work much further. Some of the most significant examples include, but are certainly not limited to, Mitchell Snay, *Gospel of Disunion: Religion and Separatism in the Antebellum South* (1993; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); the collected essays in John R. McKivigan and Snay, eds., *Religion and the Antebellum Debate over Slavery* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998); Mark A. Noll, *America's God, From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 367–401; Eugene D. Genovese, *"Slavery Ordained of God": The Southern Slaveholders' View of Biblical History and Modern Politics* (Gettysburg, PA: Gettysburg College, 1985); Elizabeth Fox-Genovese 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 (Summer 1987), 211–33; Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholders' Worldview* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 505–65; Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *Slavery in White in Black: Class and Race in the Southern Slaveholders' New World Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *Fatal Self-Deception: Slaveholding Paternalism in the Old South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); E. Brooks Holifield, *Theology in America: Christian Thought from the Age of the Puritans to the Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 494–504; John Patrick Daly, *When Slavery Was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery, and the Causes of the Civil War* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2002); Charles F. Irons, *The Origins of Proslavery Christianity: White and Black Evangelicals in Colonial and Antebellum Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008);

Much debate turned, in other words, not simply on contrasting accounts of how to read the Bible but also on competing visions of what the Bible said about how Christians should engage the political and social order. For more conservative believers, their political theology led them to argue that the affairs of church and state were to be kept entirely separate. And because slavery was a spiritual institution as much as a political one, it meant that antislavery believers erred grievously in agitating that question. Certainly James Henley Thornwell (1812–62), the South's leading proslavery cleric before the Civil War, spoke for many religious southerners – and even many in the North – when he described the debate as a fight between "Christianity and Atheism," with "the progress of humanity the stake."[3]

Such heated rhetoric, however, masked a much more complicated relationship between slavery and Christianity in the United States. Southern proslavery divines made much of the biblical warrant for slavery, but many notable and otherwise antislavery ministers in the North – such as Presbyterian Charles Hodge (1797–1878), Baptist Francis Wayland (1796–1865), and Congregationalist Moses Stuart (1780–1852) – also conceded the biblical imprimatur for slavery. Such concessions did not mean that antislavery clergy rejected the narrow proslavery biblical argument, but rather that they distinguished between ancient and American slavery. Although some antislavery activists, such as Boston's William Lloyd Garrison (1805–79), argued from a radical perspective that a higher human law demanded the Bible be rejected for its endorsement of slavery, more moderate antislavery religious voices held to biblical authority yet attempted to show how the slavery in Scripture differed greatly from American slavery. Not only did the American system refuse to recognize such biblical concepts as the Jubilee year – in Mosaic Law, when all slaves were set free every seven years – or allow for marriage between slaves but also, most significantly, biblical slavery also was not based on racist power relations. American slavery clearly was.[4]

Certainly the southern religious proslavery elite did their part to defend the peculiar institution. They maintained a commonsense understanding of their own racial superiority. When applied to a commonsense reading of Holy

and Molly Oshatz, *Slavery and Sin: The Fight against Slavery and the Rise of Liberal Protestantism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). On "Bible politics" in abolitionism, see James Brewer Stewart, "Reconsidering the Abolitionists in an Age of Fundamentalist Politics," *Journal of the Early Republic* 26 (Spring 2006): 1–23.

[3] James Henley Thornwell, "The Christian Doctrine of Slavery," in *The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell*, eds. John B. Adger and John L. Girardeau, 4 vols. (1873; Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1974), 4:406.

[4] Noll, *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis*, 31–50; and Noll, *America's God*, 386–401. See also J. Albert Harrill, "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* 10 (Summer 2000): 149–86; and Holifield, *Theology in America*, 494–504.

Scripture, the Bible affirmed what southern white Christians already wanted to believe it said about American race-based slavery.[5]

   Yet the proslavery argument held the capacity to question American slavery. Even in the years after 1830, where historians have traditionally pointed to a shift in southern attitudes from ambivalence about slaveholding to decisive support for the practice, southern theologians wrote that slavery as it was practiced in America needed reformation. They did not doubt that God had established the master–slave relationship as foundational for Christian society. But the holy sanction of "slavery in the abstract" did not suggest to southern divines that slavery as practiced below the Mason and Dixon line or the Ohio River was necessarily beyond reproach. The proslavery clergy frequently lamented what they saw as slavery's abuses and excesses – whether to decry the domestic slave trade that destroyed families, to denounce the prohibition against slave marriage, or to disparage a system that made slave literacy illegal – though never its racist foundation. If they were opposed to antislavery measures, if they were unwilling to say that slavery itself was sinful, the proslavery clergy remained hopeful that American slavery could become more equitable and more just – more Christian. Southern divines saw American slavery as a flawed system that needed to be brought into conformity with an identifiably Christian standard.[6]

   That southern ministers recognized weaknesses in the American slave system suggests that the traditional historical emphasis on a hardened, rigid religious proslavery ideology has been exaggerated. Among much of the southern evangelical population, there was no clean shift from a "necessary evil" to a "positive good" view of the peculiar institution. That process was hard-fought and long in development.[7]

---

5   Stephen R. Haynes, *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 126. On the creation of a distinctive southern evangelicalism centered around slavery, see Donald G. Mathews, *Religion in the Old South* (Chicago: University Press of Chicago, 1977), 136–84; John B. Boles, "Evangelical Protestantism in the Old South: From Religious Dissent to Cultural Dominance," in *Religion in the South*, ed. Charles Reagan Wilson (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1985), 13–34; and Boles, *The Irony of Southern Religion* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 3–36.

6   See Kenneth Moore Startup, *The Root of All Evil: The Protestant Clergy and the Economic Mind of the Old South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997), 67–77; and Eugene D. Genovese, *A Consuming Fire: The Fall of the Confederacy in the Mind of the White Christian South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998), 3–33. For a classic statement that posits 1830 as a stark period divide on southern attitudes toward slavery, see Anne C. Loveland, *Southern Evangelicals and the Social Order, 1800–1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980).

7   As Charles Irons has put it in his study on Virginia evangelicals, "Post-Revolutionary evangelical leaders did not arrest any religious momentum for abolition because no real momentum ever existed." See Irons, *Origins of Proslavery Christianity*, 57. For a detailed description of how evangelical proslavery was neither situated in language of "necessary evil" nor "positive good," see Daly, *When Slavery Was Called Freedom*, 30–56.

The American South, moreover, held no monolithic opinion on slavery's merits. Although the Confederate States of America would appear in 1861 dedicated to the proposition that African American slaves should be held in perpetuity, that political project was no inevitability – and some of the South's most dedicated slaveholders refused to join when it came together. To be sure, regional location played a role in shaping clergy attitudes toward slavery. Especially outside the Lower South, public sentiment never completely crystallized in favor of slavery. The Middle South – including states such as Virginia, Tennessee, and North Carolina – retained pockets of antislavery dissent up to the Civil War. And in the Border South, where geography dictated forms of agriculture that were not conducive to large chattel labor forces and where long state borders touched free soil, the discomfort with slavery was magnified. In Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri, a degree of antislavery sentiment persisted throughout the antebellum period.[8]

Slavery had existed in Kentucky since its earliest days, and more Kentuckians per capita owned slaves by 1850 than did whites in any other slaveholding state except Georgia or Virginia. But instead of the dominant planter class that would mark most other southern states, Kentucky possessed a widespread middle class of slaveholders who owned five slaves or fewer. On the eve of the Civil War in 1860, Kentucky's population was more than 1.1 million, with just more than 225,000 slaves – slightly less than 20 percent of the total population. The state sat too far north to grow cotton, sugar, or other crops that were traditionally grown using large numbers of enslaved laborers. Even the state's largest hemp and tobacco farms were not comparable in size to the giant plantations farther south, and just over fifty Kentucky farms claimed more than fifty slaves.[9] Although these factors did not serve to make slavery more "mild" in Kentucky compared with the rest of the South, as historians once thought, they did make the Commonwealth both a more volatile and a more receptive

---

[8] For a cogent description of the differences between these "Souths" and regional attitudes toward slavery, see William W. Freehling, *The Road To Disunion*, vol. 1: *Secessionists at Bay, 1776–1854* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 17–19. For a dated, but incredibly valuable study of the persistence of antislavery views in Virginia churches, see Patricia Hickin, "'Situation Ethics' and Antislavery Attitudes in the Virginia Churches," in *America: The Middle Period: Essays in Honor of Bernard Mayo*, ed. John B. Boles (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1973), 188–215.

[9] On the nature of the Kentucky slave economy and agriculture, see Ivan E. McDougle, *Slavery in Kentucky, 1792–1865* (1918; New York: Arno Press, 1970), 26–9; J. Winston Coleman, *Slavery Times in Kentucky* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1940), 41–7; James C. Klotter, *The Breckinridges of Kentucky* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1986), 63–5; Lowell H. Harrison and Klotter, *A New History of Kentucky* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1997), 133–8, 168–9; Marion B. Lucas, *A History of Blacks in Kentucky*, vol. 1, *From Slavery to Segregation* (Frankfort: Kentucky Historical Society, 1992); and Gary R. Matthews, "Beleaguered Loyalties: Kentucky Unionism," in *Sister States, Enemy States: The Civil War in Kentucky and Tennessee*, eds. Kent T. Dollar, Larry H. Whiteaker, and W. Calvin Dickinson (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2009), 16–18.

arena for antislavery thought. It meant that controversial opinions would be heard, measured, and judged.[10]

As time went on and debate grew more constrained, conservative antislavery activists in Kentucky came to make common cause with their proslavery opponents. Though one side rejected slavery and the other endorsed it, the two groups both affirmed a threefold, profoundly religious, conservative argument on slavery that remained a fixture in the thought of white Kentuckians through the antebellum era and, indeed, persisted throughout the Civil War and Reconstruction. First, the Commonwealth's religious whites, overwhelmingly evangelical in affiliation, affirmed slavery as a divinely mandated, biblically sanctioned institution for the ordering of society – at least as an abstract social formulation. Second, Kentucky's religiously conservative whites drew on the broad cultural belief in white supremacy, which they also saw as ordained by the Christian God. Third, they collectively rejected abolitionism for its ostensible radicalism, which Kentucky whites believed challenged divine dictums and threatened the racial order. Emancipationism suggested a gradual end to slavery, whereas abolitionism meant an immediate end. Taken as a whole, this tripartite argument ultimately led Kentucky's conservative white believers to one obvious conclusion: abolitionists were heretics.

That understanding shaped the world of ecclesiastical politics in the 1830s and 1840s, where white Kentucky's gradual emancipationists played central roles in the founding of theologically conservative, proslavery evangelical

[10] Ivan McDougle, *Slavery in Kentucky*, 73, 77, 78, wrote in 1918 that most Kentucky slaves "seem to have been content in their condition" and that "personal interest in a slave and his welfare took precedence over merely his economic value to the owner." McDougle partially qualified his assessment by acknowledging, "life among the slaves of Kentucky was not by any means a path of roses." J. Winston Coleman, *Slavery Times in Kentucky*, vii, claimed in 1940 that Kentucky had the "mildest form" of slavery, "better than in any other state, with the possible exception of Maryland or Virginia," and certainly a more mitigated form than the Deep South's "proverbially harder" chattel version. Lowell Harrison and James Klotter accept a qualified version of Coleman's view. They highlight the racist dimension of slavery but state nonetheless, "Relative mildness was no excuse for the existence of slavery, but a slave in Kentucky probably received somewhat better treatment than a slave in Mississippi or Alabama." See Harrison and Klotter, *New History of Kentucky*, 174. For a challenge to this line of reasoning, see Lucas, *History of Blacks in Kentucky*, 42–50. More recently, Harold Tallant has argued contrary to Coleman that Kentucky slavery was in fact harsher than slavery farther south. Although the types of labor may have differentiated Kentucky slavery from its practice elsewhere, the Commonwealth's many small farms and widespread middle class of slaveholders meant that the enslaved operated in close proximity to their masters, which meant constant contact with whites and a high degree of unfreedom. See Harold D. Tallant, *Evil Necessity: Slavery and Political Culture in Antebellum Kentucky* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2003), 62–5. For a reappraisal of Coleman that remains critical of the "mildness" thesis but that also emphasizes the historiographical importance of *Slavery Times in Kentucky* for its description of the "darker side" of slavery, see John David Smith, "'To hue the line and let the chips fall where they may': J. Winston Coleman's *Slavery Times in Kentucky* Reconsidered," *Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 103 (Autumn 2005): 691–726.

denominations in the South. Whether in the 1837 division of the Presbyterian Church into Old and New Schools or the 1845 creations of the Southern Baptist Convention and Methodist Episcopal Church, South, white Kentuckians were critical figures. Yet many of these same southern denominational leaders in Kentucky who sided theologically with proslavery Christians continued to cling to their gradual emancipationism.

What had been accomplished in the churches by 1845 – the emergence of sectional bodies hinging on the slavery question – remained contested in broader political affairs. White Kentuckians may have roundly avowed slavery for their churches, but civic life was another matter, still up for debate. By the middle decades of the nineteenth century, public support in Kentucky for slavery was on the rise, and the political power of the slaveholding class was increasing. Some evangelical whites in the Commonwealth agitated in the late 1840s for a revised state constitution that would slowly kill off slavery. But when that new state constitution was overwhelmingly approved by popular vote in 1850, it strengthened the rights of slaveholders and guaranteed slavery's survival well into the future. Still, even though the influence of conservative antislavery advocates waned in the state after 1850, a small minority continued to work against slavery through the years until the beginning of the Civil War.[11]

This complex approach to the slavery question did not necessarily make the Bluegrass State unusual in the antebellum United States. Instead, Kentucky's nineteenth-century history can be read as representing a series of critical issues concerning the nation. Overwhelmingly, the dominant religious tradition in nineteenth-century Kentucky, as in the United States as a whole, was evangelical Protestantism. Evangelical churches were the most significant voluntary organizations in Civil War–era America, both in terms of popular adherence and political clout. Roughly 40 percent of the national population held some sort of evangelical affiliation by the mid-1850s. Connected by networks of faith and facilitated by its ability to harness a burgeoning print culture, nineteenth-century evangelicalism became a powerful national presence. Moreover, if evangelicalism's nineteenth-century national hegemony has not been lost on historians, south of the Mason-Dixon line and the Ohio River the evangelical presence was even more pronounced, visible, and culturally powerful. As the table below enumerates, in mid-nineteenth-century Kentucky, white evangelicals accounted for nearly 60 percent of the state's total population, but more than 70 percent of its white population.[12]

[11] On Kentucky's constitutional debates of 1849–50, see Harrison and Klotter, *New History of Kentucky*, 117–19; and Tallant, *Evil Necessity*, 151–60.

[12] See Richard Carwardine, *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 44, who has memorably called evangelicalism the "largest, and most formidable, subculture" in antebellum America. See also C. C. Goen, *Broken Churches, Broken Nation: The Coming of the American Civil War* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985), 55–6; and Candy Gunther Brown, *The Word in the World: Evangelical Writing, Publishing, and Reading in America, 1789–1880* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

For the estimated percentages in Kentucky for the purposes of this study, Christian Churches (followers of the Campbellite/Restorationist movement), Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians counted as evangelical: these were the largest and most prominent denominations in the state. In 1860, Kentucky's Baptists claimed nearly 95,000 members, Methodists numbered nearly 57,000, and Presbyterians counted roughly 10,000 on their rolls. Membership figures for the Christian Churches are harder to determine for 1860, but they claimed more than 41,000 members in 1846 and it is plausible to estimate that there were more than 50,000 members by 1860. By no means, however, did these four ecclesiastical traditions represent all – or the only – evangelicals in nineteenth-century America. Outside of Kentucky and the South, Congregationalists, Reformed Christians, Lutherans, and Episcopalians exhibited evangelical traits.[13]

Membership numbers are suggestive, but they vastly undercount the number of religious adherents in nineteenth-century America. Due to relatively restrictive membership standards, most churches saw many more regular church attendees – perhaps double or triple the number – than actual members. As a result, ascertaining the actual number of Christian adherents in the period is highly imprecise. Most careful historians of American religion tend to rely on the U.S. Census's tally of church seating capacity (called "accommodations" in the Census), but currently lack effective ways of determining just how many people considered themselves active faith practitioners in the period.[14]

Understanding these statistical problems, it is nevertheless possible to make a few comparative points that suggest the popular influence of Christianity in Kentucky. In 1860 the Masons had only slightly more members (10,319 by an 1858 count) than there were seats in Kentucky's twenty-five – statistically insignificant – Episcopal churches (9,940). The same year, all the Masons in Kentucky could not have filled the Methodist pews of Louisville's Jefferson County, in whose twenty-two churches sat 11,700 parishioners. If every man in the Bluegrass State who voted for governor in 1871 (215,172) or 1875 (224,262) – or president in 1872 (191,552) or 1876 (259,614) – had proceeded to sit down in a local Baptist church, there would have been seats to spare. Meanwhile, every Methodist, Christian, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Lutheran, and Roman Catholic church would have sat empty. Using church membership numbers alone, in 1870 there were more Baptists (121,728) and Methodists (77,517) than there were people attending school (181,225). The

---

[13] See J. H. Spencer, *A History of Kentucky Baptists: From 1769 to 1885*, 2 vols. (Cincinnati: J. R. Baumes, 1885), 1:722; and Lewis Collins and Richard H. Collins, *History of Kentucky*, 2 vols. (Covington, KY: Collins, 1874), 1:425–6, 456, 459.

[14] See George C. Rable, *God's Almost Chosen Peoples: A Religious History of the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 11–12. For an elucidation of this problem as it applies to antebellum Virginia, see Irons, *Origins of Proslavery Christianity*, 3–10.

Kentucky Church Accommodations and General Population Statistics,
1850–1870[15]

	1850	1860	1870
Baptist	291,855	267,860	288,936
Christian Churches	46,340	104,980	141,585
Cumberland Presbyterian*	n/a	31,335	n/a
Episcopal	7,050	9,940	15,800
Jewish	600	n/a	n/a
Lutheran	2,850	5,400	1,650
Methodist	169,060	228,100	244,918
Presbyterian	99,106	67,440	100,750
Roman Catholic	24,240	44,820	72,550
United Presbyterian*	n/a	400	n/a
Total Evangelical Accommodations	606,361	700,115	776,189
Total Church Accommodations	671,053	778,025	876,439
Total Slave Population	210,981	225,483	n/a
Total Free Colored Population	10,011	10,684	n/a
Total African American Population[†]	220,992	236,167	222,210
Total White Population	761,413	919,484	1,098,692
Total Free Population	771,424	930,201	n/a
Total Population	982,405	1,155,684	1,321,011
Total Church Accommodations as Percentage of Total Population	68.3	67.3	66.3
Total Evangelical Church Accommodations as Percentage of Total Population	61.7	60.6	58.8
Total Church Accommodations as Percentage of White Population	88.1	84.6	79.8
Total Evangelical Church Accommodations as Percentage of White Population	79.6	76.1	70.6

* Cumberland and United Presbyterians only appear in the 1860 U.S. Census. They were included in the general "Presbyterian" category in 1850 and 1870.

† Total African American population for 1850 and 1860 represents the sum of the "slave" and "free colored" populations given by the U.S. Census.

[15] Population and church accommodation (termed "sittings" in the 1870 census) figures taken from the 1850, 1860, and 1870 U.S. Census reports. These are the only decades in the period considered by this study – 1830 to 1880 – when the U.S. Census recorded data on religious adherence. See *Seventh Census of the United States, 1850*; *Eighth Census of the United States, 1860*; *Ninth Census of the United States, 1870*; all accessed at Historical Census Browser, University of Virginia, Geospatial and Statistical Data Center: http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/collections/stats/histcensus/index.html.