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In *Arcadian Adventures with the Idle Rich*, Stephen Leacock satirises the
fictional Presbyterian Church of St. Osoph. Implicitly critiquing the
denomination’s reputation for fractiousness and austerity, he observes that
the congregation of St. Osoph’s is so thoroughly quarrelsome that it has
severed its ties to virtually every other Presbyterian group. St. Osoph’s,
Leacock irreverently elaborates,

seceded forty years ago from the original body to which it belonged,
and later on, with three other churches, it seceded from the group of
seceding congregations. Still later it fell into a difference with the
three other churches on the question of eternal punishment, the word
“eternal” not appearing to the elders of St. Osoph’s to designate a
sufficiently long period. The dispute ended in a secession which left
the church of St. Osoph practically isolated in a world of sin whose
approaching fate it neither denied nor deplored.2

Satirizing St. Osoph’s – and, by extension, the larger Presbyterian
community to which it belonged – was surely Leacock’s chief objective.
Yet it should not go unnoticed that his sketch also sheds considerable light
on the Presbyterian ethos of the day.3

Perhaps the most revealing aspect of Leacock’s account is his
depiction of the divisive tendency that beset this ill-tempered congrega-
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tion. The fragmented state of mid-nineteenth-century British North American Presbyterianism attests to the existence of such a predisposition. As a result of a litany of disputes – the most intractable of which pertained, predictably, to the immensely contentious church-state controversy – the denomination found itself divided into no fewer than eight autonomous sub-components, as well as several smaller groupings, which existed independent of the larger bodies. The splintering of British North American Presbyterianism can thus be seen as evidence of the fractious tendency displayed to such a seemingly absurd degree in Leacock’s St. Osoph’s.

It is hardly surprising, then, that accounts of the history of Presbyterianism in nineteenth-century Canada have tended to dwell on the deeply-ingrained pattern of intra-denominational conflict that preceded the establishment of the national Presbyterian Church in Canada in 1875. Investigations of the denomination’s formative era have devoted substantial attention to the supposed “spirit of separation” that was thought to be responsible for the scattering of Presbyterianism into the various Synods and smaller groupings to which I have already alluded. Such discussions are typically followed by an explanation as to how this notoriously quarrelsome assortment of subgroups eventually became engaged in a progressive “movement towards union” in which, according to the conventional account, anxieties were allayed, gaps were bridged, and, at length, union was achieved.

This pattern of reconciliation has traditionally been portrayed as the logical religious corollary to the political and economic maturation of the Canadian state. That is, discussions of the creation of a unified church that was coextensive with the confederated Canadian provinces are often intertwined with a misleading, teleological discourse on Canada’s transition from subordinate colony to self-sufficient nation. In privileging the endemic divisiveness that preceded the establishment of a national union, such an emphasis obscures the unity of thought that pervaded the denominational community throughout the pre-1875 era (the period with which I am chiefly concerned). Counteracting early Canadian Presbyterianism’s myriad schisms, this underlying conceptual cohesiveness bound together the denomination’s various subgroups.

The conventional colony-to-nation approach to the history of early Canadian Presbyterianism hinges on the notion that residual “overseas influences” were responsible for denominational fragmentation in the years prior to 1875. Such influences, moreover, are thought to have waned
as Presbyterianism’s constituent parts became more comfortably en-
sconced within the newly-minted dominion. Central to this process, 
according to the traditional account, was the inspiring example of 
Confederation. Mirroring the British North American provinces in their 
decision to enter into a national union, Presbyterianism’s subgroups have 
been portrayed as casting off the divisiveness of the pre-Confederation era. 
Instead, the argument runs, they enthusiastically embraced a nation-wide 
institution as a more effective mechanism for bringing about the 
Christianisation of Canadian society. The narrative typically unfolds as 
follows: colonial subservience gave way to national assertiveness, “old 
world” division gave way to “new world” unity, and the Presbyterian 
Church in Canada was born. 7  

The preceding critique is not meant to suggest that the emphasis 
placed by such scholars as Edmund H. Oliver, S.D. Clark, and H.H. Walsh 
on the indigenisation of Canadian Presbyterianism is wholly inaccurate. 
To deny the importance of this pattern would be both ungenerous and 
misleading – after all, the eventual realisation of a nation-wide Presbyte-
rian church inarguably involved the overcoming of significant, longstand-
ing obstacles. It seems evident, though, that a tendency to concentrate 
disproportionately on Presbyterianism’s institutional history – and in 
particular on the sloughing off of “old world” influences prior to the 
advent of a nation-wide union – has led to the emergence of a reductive 
conception of the denomination’s formative era that at best is incomplete, 
and that at worst neglects important aspects of its intellectual substance. 

In a 1993 address to members of the Canadian Historical Associa-
tion, Phillip Buckner urged his audience to jettison the increasingly 
outmoded notion that the formulation of a coherent Canadian identity was 
a “natural development” that entailed the total eradication of “all other 
loyalties.” 8 Rather than conceiving of Canadian nationalism as a “natural” 
phenomenon that permanently eclipsed British imperial fervour in the late 
nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, he advocated an alternative 
epistemological tack. In keeping with the pioneering works of J.G.A. 
Pocock, he recommended the adoption of a spatially vast, conceptually 
fluid approach that concerns itself with the elaborate, inter-connected web 
of commercial, ideological, and emotional circuits that constituted the 
amorphous, trans-oceanic British imperial world. 9 The implementation of 
such an interpretive model, Buckner reasoned, would neutralise the 
potentially distorting excesses of nationalist triumphalism, and would 
reassert the centrality of the “imperial experience” within English-
Consistent with Buckner’s recommendation, it seems that situating Canadian Presbyterianism’s foundational era within the context of a wider “British world” offers a refreshing alternative to the traditional depiction. In stressing the permeability of borders and the enduring, multi-sided significance of the British connection, such an approach represents a departure from the comparatively parochial institutional and national emphases that have hitherto dominated accounts of Canadian Presbyterianism’s formative epoch.

By applying such a framework to the denomination’s intellectual dimension it becomes apparent that, contrary to the indigenisation narrative, “old world” influences in fact played a seminal role in the formulation of a coherent, integrated Presbyterian self-conception. Indeed, I shall argue that for all of their apparent fractiousness the various subgroups that comprised the wider denominational community were, at bottom, tied together.

Conceiving of themselves as a “national” community analogous to the ancient Israelites, the Presbyterians succeeded in coalescing around a cluster of widely held beliefs. They saw themselves as endowed with a divinely sanctioned responsibility for the advancement of God’s providential design, through which the wicked would be punished and the righteous would be rewarded. This conviction dovetailed with their fierce attachment to the principles, institutions, and mystique of the British Empire. The Presbyterians also felt that they were bound together by the denomination’s distinctive form of church polity, which promoted a sense of communal inter-connectedness throughout the various subgroups. Flowing from this constellation of beliefs was a millennial sense of mission that reverberated throughout the denominational consciousness, and that extended well beyond the borders of British North America and the early Canadian dominion.

This paper takes as its central theme the synthesis of providentialism and British imperial enthusiasm that invigorated nineteenth-century Canadian Presbyterianism. It argues that this combination played an indispensable role in the shaping of a coherent denominational identity.

A consideration of providentialism as an overarching motif within the mental world of nineteenth-century Canadian Presbyterianism must begin with an exploration of its most salient traits. The Christian doctrine of providence maintains that the “sovereign God who creates is also the God who guides.” More precisely, providence – the notion of the
The unfolding of a divinely authored, foreordained design—is thought to consist of three irreducible elements: first, that God is the fount of creation; second, that God sustains, accompanies, and exercises authority over all that is in existence, and is thus intimately involved in the rhythms and phenomena that actuate and characterise both physical and historical change; and finally, that the fruits of both creation and change are infused with an unwavering, albeit frequently inscrutable, purpose that for all of its mystery will nevertheless assuredly be realised, culminating gloriously in the Christian millennium. The cosmos, the totality of history, the natural world in all its verdant complexity, and the inner-workings of human society—everything is accounted for. In short, then, the doctrine of providence amounts to nothing less than the awe-inspiring assertion that no aspect of God’s handiwork is exempt from divine guidance and oversight. Orthodoxy nineteenth-century Presbyterians placed a particularly heavy emphasis on God’s providential sovereignty. This tendency was born out in an abiding belief in the creator’s infinite authority. It was also evident in a corresponding conviction regarding humankind’s abject inability to merit salvation. Unlike contemporaneous Arminian theology, which reputedly held that saving faith in God stems from human free will, doctrinaire Presbyterians, steeped as they were in the stern tenets of Calvinism (of which more will be said), were unshakably insistent on God’s total omnipotence. They were equally convinced of the insufficiency of individual agency when it came to humanity’s deep-seated yearning for sanctification. Redemption, the Presbyterians reckoned, is entirely contingent on God’s graciousness, and not at all on the capricious whims of human beings who, left to their own devices, were thought to be both intrinsically and irredeemably corrupt in consequence of original sin’s indelible stigma.

“The one theory,” observed the Reverend Michael Willis, principal of Knox College, Toronto, in a barbed reference to Arminianism, conceitiously and presumptuously conceives of God’s graciousness as contingent on the will of “the sinner.” By contrast, churches rooted in the Calvinistic tradition were thought to afford “all the glory” to God. In Willis’ view, adherents of Calvinism attributed the extension of saving faith to “[th]e wonderful love of Him” who “in His infinite wisdom and mercy chose us not because we were holy or foreseen to be holy, but that we should be [made] holy and without blame before Him in love.”

Thus, when it came to the question of sanctification, zealous Presby-
terians such as Willis placed tremendous stress upon the indispensable
importance of the creator’s benevolent graciousness and none whatsoever
on human initiative. While they were by no means unique among Christian
denominations in focusing on the providential theme, the early Canadian
Presbyterian conception of God’s absolute sovereignty nonetheless
occupied a clearly-defined, unmistakably important position within the
denominational imagination.

In surveying the principal features of the early Canadian Presbyte-
rarian identity, the centrality of the determinative, superintending, all-
encompassing providential schema can scarcely be overstated. It furnished
the denominational community with an invigorating sense of destiny that
went a considerable distance in knitting together an otherwise unwieldy
variety of Presbyterian subgroups. A belief in God’s universal authority,
too, was fundamental to the denominational world-view. As a result,
arculations of the Presbyterians’ sense of distinctiveness and duty were
couched throughout the pre-1875 era in expressly providentialist terms.

The all-powerful hand of God was thought by the Presbyterians to
be everywhere apparent and ceaselessly at work. It followed that the
unfurling of the divine plan encompassed both painful, distressing
phenomena as well as that which was positive and gratifying. Indeed,
tumult and suffering were widely held to be punitive manifestations of
divine displeasure.

Punishment for sinfulness was meted out, in the Presbyterians’ view,
not only on an individual basis in which wayward sinners would suffer as
a result of their trespasses, but on a communal or “national” basis as well.
A critical mass of wrongdoing, in other words, could bring about the
chastisement of an entire community, and could be visited upon the
virtuous as well as the depraved. God’s vengeance could thus be applied
both individually and corporately – as punishment for the indiscretions and
offences of individual sinners as well as the communities in which they
lived.15

The pronounced extent to which nineteenth-century Presbyterians
viewed earthly misfortune as punishment meted out by God is evident in
the reaction of the congregation of St. Andrew’s Presbyterian Church in
York, Upper Canada to a cholera epidemic that afflicted that community
in the summer of 1832. Reacting to the crisis the church’s minister, the
Reverend William Rintoul, convened weekly meetings of the congrega-
tional session and broader church community in an effort to assuage
York’s suffering.
The meetings were designed to encourage prayer as well as “supplication to God” as a result of the severity of the “pestilential Disease,” which was thought by members of the congregation to have been brought on by widespread immorality. Church records indicate that they explicitly acknowledged the workings of God “in a judgement so marked as the present malady.” Accordingly, members of St. Andrew’s humbly appealed to God to bring the plague to an end, and pled for mercy for the community as well as the world at large for the entirety of its duration.

The notion that intense and/or pervasive sinfulness could elicit the wrath of God was by no means unorthodox. On the contrary, the anxieties evinced by the congregation of St. Andrew’s, York were entirely consonant with the Calvinistic ethos that underlay Presbyterian doctrine. For John Calvin, the uncompromising sixteenth-century theologian for whom the system is named, a preponderance of iniquity in a given community represented a pernicious moral miasma that, when left unchecked, led inevitably to the flouting of God’s laws. For Calvin, an inability to curb pernicious behaviours could spark a degenerative downward spiral in which the proliferation of vice and disorder would bring about potentially cataclysmic expressions of divine displeasure.

Within the context of sixteenth-century Geneva, which witnessed the vigorous, systematic implementation of Calvin’s various institutions and teachings, sin and crime were viewed as indistinguishable from one another. In a situation in which scriptural precepts and ordinances pervaded virtually every aspect of the socio-political order, any and all transgressions were invariably violations of the edicts of God. Secular and sacred laws in Calvin’s conception were eminently complementary and, indeed, inextricably interwoven. Civil legislation and the authority of earthly magistrates were therefore doubly important since, in addition to promoting stability in the secular sphere, they also served as a bulwark against impiety by enforcing godliness.

But where sinfulness could bring about expressions of God’s disappointment, divine approval could, in contrast, manifest itself in a nurturing paternalism that sought to reward righteousness and encourage further obedience. While God could punish sinful individuals and communities he could also exalt those who were righteous. In keeping with this notion, nineteenth-century Canadian Presbyterians conceived of themselves as enjoying a “special” providential status that was indicative of divine favour.
The Presbyterians’ sense of uniqueness was predicated upon the belief that they were an exceptional denomination tasked with an equally exceptional mission: namely, to facilitate civilization’s progress and to propagate as extensively as possible Christianity’s glad tidings. They saw themselves as a divinely favoured community analogous to the Old Testament Israelites – as a people, in other words, united to God by way of an unbreakable covenantal bond and imbued with a divinely ordained destiny that linked them indissolubly to the unfolding of the providential design. The Presbyterian “Zion,” they maintained, was endowed by God with an unmatched combination of piety, prudence, and fidelity, and was responsible for the advancement of the grand providential design.

Notwithstanding their numerous politico-religious differences, the early Canadian Presbyterians conceived of themselves as fitting neatly within a larger, trans-oceanic British “nation.” This national community transcended the arbitrary borders of political geography and united devout members of the denomination throughout the Empire in a spatially amorphous, conceptually coherent body. Under-girding the Presbyterian nation was an abiding sense of “loyalty to our Queen” and an equally ardent “attachment to our constitution.”

Indeed, a widespread sense of British imperial enthusiasm went a considerable distance in counteracting the ethnic differences, vast territorial distances, and institutional cleavages that separated early Canadian Presbyterianism’s various constituent parts. A celebratory mythology that centred on the superiority of British institutions and on the magnificence of the British Empire fostered an atmosphere of concord that ultimately overshadowed intra-denominational differences. A pervasive imperial zeal, in short, served to bind together an ethnically heterogeneous, geographically scattered, institutionally fragmented denomination.

Bolstering Presbyterian cohesiveness throughout this expansive community was the denomination’s distinctive form of church polity. This consisted of individual church courts, local presbyteries, regional synods and, at the national level, general assemblies. The denomination’s intricate governmental structure systematically promoted both social solidarity and liturgical uniformity throughout a multitude of Presbyterian subgroups. While rows concerning matters such as the church’s relationship to the state were undeniably frequent, the importance of principles such as communal cohesion, order, and doctrinal integrity were nevertheless, as a result of the denomination’s characteristic system of church polity, fervently upheld throughout the amorphous British Presbyterian commu-
In addition to providing an otherwise disparate, geographically diffuse assortment of Presbyterian subgroups with a nucleus of ideas around which to coalesce, this invigorating combination of providential favour, British imperial enthusiasm, and pan-Presbyterian inter-connectedness also infused the denomination with a dynamic sense of mission. By equipping the wider Presbyterian nation with a compelling conceptual synthesis of pride, prestige, cohesiveness, and virtue, it strengthened their belief in a unique communal responsibility for the advancement of God’s redemptive design.

It is important to recognise that convictions regarding the denomination’s providentially sanctioned destiny were propagated and amplified by way of a Presbyterian public sphere. Emanating from podiums and circulating through a plethora of religious newspapers as well as published lectures and addresses, the ideas and anxieties proffered by devout Presbyterians throughout nineteenth-century Canada constituted, in the aggregate, a vibrant discursive community. By weighing in on pressing issues and controversies, articulate Presbyterians made public their views, engaged in often vigorous debates, and contributed to the shaping of a fundamentally coherent Presbyterian sentiment that, in the event, cross-cut the denomination’s numerous institutional, regional, and politico-religious divisions.

The views of the elites in the pulpit, then, were not simply foisted onto the congregants in the pew. To be sure, educated, well-connected individuals invariably exerted disproportionate influence. This was especially true if they were in the position of delivering a sermon to a congregation rendered docile by a sense of reverence, intimidation, or some combination of the two. Despite this fact, the prevailing attitudes that percolated within the denominational community can best be understood not as the result of an arbitrary, “top-down” imposition, but as the product of a sustained, organic process of discussion, thought, and analysis.

This integrative public sphere brought together members of a politically fragmented, geographically dispersed denomination in a variety of discussion-oriented communities in which words and ideas intermingled and jostled for supremacy. Cumulatively, such communities acted as a deliberative forum through which concerns and convictions regarding a wide range of issues could be debated, negotiated, and eventually conveyed to a broader Presbyterian public.

Although disagreements over the degree to which the state should
involve itself in the affairs of the church continued to rankle, such discursive communities nevertheless played an important part in identifying and articulating the priorities of substantial swathes of the denominational membership. The sustained emphasis placed by Presbyterians on the denomination’s special providential status and on the glorious destiny of the British Empire was therefore not confined to the writings of an isolated, unrepresentative few. Rather, it was indicative of a broadly held belief – expressed by way of the denominational public sphere – that pervaded early Canadian Presbyterianism’s mental world.

As a result of the Presbyterians’ belief in the denomination’s divinely favoured status, conflicts such as Great Britain’s protracted struggle with revolutionary and Napoleonic France in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were viewed through a providential lens. In an 1814 sermon entitled “The Prosperity of the Church in Troublous Times,” the Nova Scotia Presbyterian minister and educator Thomas McCulloch enunciated an epic, millennial conception of history in which events such as the chaotic French revolution and Britain’s victory at the battle of Trafalgar were invested with cosmic significance. In McCulloch’s conception they served to definitively demonstrate that the British Empire was indeed the beneficiary of divine favour.

McCulloch asserted that the French Revolution, despite purporting to advocate such ennobling principles as liberty, equality, and fraternity, had in fact been predicated on “principles of infidelity.” More pointedly, he noted that beneath a veneer of enlightenment lurked an insidious radicalism that strove to undermine social stability. Owing to a seemingly unquenchable atheism, the proponents of such corrosive tenets sought, in particular, to do irreparable harm to Christianity, the vital bedrock of any virtuous, well-regulated polity. Britain, he asserted, was in contrast the sturdy, virtuous “bulwark” of western civilisation. Specifically, it was a beacon of virtue and piety, a defender of order and constitutional governance, and a steadfast opponent of the godless radicalism espoused by the French revolutionaries and their equally iniquitous sympathizers elsewhere in the world.

Accompanying this exalted status, McCulloch thundered, was a responsibility for spreading the light of civilization and Christianity to the wretched and benighted world over. “[O]ur native country,” he propounded, in reference to the widely dispersed British diaspora, is endowed with a special “duty” that transcends worldly considerations. For McCulloch, this sense of moral obligation found expression in a fervent
desire to see the gospels promulgated as widely and as energetically as possible. Convinced of the British Empire’s divinely authored destiny, he went as far as to posit that it was the indispensable instrument through which the regeneration of the world would achieved. Elaborating on this sentiment, he argued that the efforts of Britain’s Protestant evangelists—with the doctrinally unassailable Presbyterians inevitably in their vanguard—would precipitate the coming of the Christian millennium and, eventually, the establishment of a New Jerusalem.27

McCulloch expanded upon the Empire’s grand destiny by portraying British Protestantism as the universal locus of Christian righteousness and zeal. He stated that the intensification of evangelical fervour within the ranks of this uniquely righteous community foreshadowed the worldwide proliferation of the gospels as well as the Christian millennium itself. It was foreordained, he explained, that the revival of religious enthusiasm within the “commonwealth of Israel” would presage the dramatic expansion of the boundaries of the Christian “Zion.” Britain’s Protestant evangelists, under the auspices of an awesome superintending providence, were responsible in McCulloch’s view for nothing less than the redemption of the world, which in turn would precipitate the second coming of Christ.28

McCulloch’s concluding remarks aptly encapsulate both the essence of his vision and, more broadly, the sense of ardent providentialism that galvanized early Canadian Presbyterianism. “Labours in the name of the gospel,” he averred, elaborating on what for him was the symbiotic relationship between British imperialism and Protestant evangelism, will most assuredly “harmonize the affections of men,” draw together the various “nations” in a single “family of love,” and usher in the thousand-year reign of “universal goodness.”29

Nor were Presbyterian conceptions of the Empire’s special providential status limited solely to conflicts that bore immediately upon Britain and its array of imperial possessions. The revolutionary tumult that enveloped much of continental Europe in 1848, for example, was viewed as notably portentous despite the fact that it did not lead to formal, large-scale British involvement.

The surge in radicalism that issued in the toppling of monarchies in that year was seen as important for two principal reasons. First, the fact that the British Isles themselves were for the most part spared the upheaval that characterized the conflicts on the continent was construed as evidence of divine favour and protection (curiously, the “Young Ireland” rising and
mobilisation of the Chartists, both of which took place in 1848 were, either as a result of oversight or calculated omission, largely excluded from such discussions). Second, the turbulence of the era, consistent with the soaring declarations of McCulloch, was thought to signify the imminence of the Christian millennium.

Both themes were trumpeted in an essay published in the May 1848 edition of the *Ecclesiastical & Missionary Record*, a Canadian Presbyterian publication. An unnamed author employed the metaphor of an earthquake as an evocative means of emphasising the singular import of what was thought to be transpiring. No natural phenomenon is more “terrific” than the earthquake, the author stated. Those who are not devastated by it cannot help but acknowledge the comparative “impotency of man” and the “terribleness” of God’s punishments.

The tremors and rifts wrought by earthquakes were linked in the author’s conception to God’s absolute sovereignty over the universe. They were portrayed as indicative of his capacity for punishing sinful individuals as well as the communities in which they lived. Similarly, revolutions, as the earthquake’s political equivalent, were cast as punitive manifestations of divine disapproval as a result of the pervasiveness of worldly tyranny and corruption.

After portraying the era’s upheaval as an expression of divine judgement, the author moved on to a discussion of the significance of the era’s tumult in relation to the unfolding of the providential design. Integral to this conception was God’s benevolent preservation of Britain as a veritable oasis of peace and stability despite its close physical proximity to the revolutionary maelstrom. For the author, there could be no doubt as to whether an omnipotent superintending providence had prevented the transmission of the revolutionary contagion from continental Europe to Great Britain. “God has so ordered it,” the author confidently declared, that the chaotic spasms that were responsible for the overthrow of haughty “imperial thrones” on the continent failed to wreak comparable havoc among his favoured peoples in Britain.

Pivotaly, in addition to hobbling the monarchical “despotism” of such figures as France’s Louis-Philippe, the era’s instability was thought by the author to be symptomatic of the imminence of the glorious millennium and second coming of Christ. The “time of the end” was plainly drawing nigh. This was evident in the harsh judgements meted out by God on a series of “usurping and tyrannical potentates and states,” which in turn were seen as foreshadowing the glorious realisation of the
“Kingdom of the Prince of Peace” on earth.\textsuperscript{32} In bold, broad strokes, the author proceeded to sketch out the crucial sequence of events that would culminate in the triumphant thousand-year reign of the Son of God. The “despotisms and privileged castes” which had traditionally held sway over continental Europe must all be overturned so as to allow for the proliferation of gospel “truth,” the author asserted. “[Yea] and though ‘that worst of tyrants, an usurping crowd’” will for a time wield great power God’s chosen peoples should neither lose focus nor shrink from their responsibilities. For, “when darkness is deepest the morning light is approaching.” Thus, the article concluded, even “coming troubles” could be construed as anticipating the arrival of the “long wished-for millennial day.”\textsuperscript{33} Taken together, the author’s sentiments capture the fusion of providentialism and British imperial enthusiasm that invigorated Canadian Presbyterianism in the pre-1875 period.

Early Canadian Presbyterianism was by no means a monolithic entity. For the better part of the nineteenth century a seemingly irrepressible penchant for intra-denominational squabbling militated against the establishment of a single body. For evidence of this quarrelsome tendency one need look no further than the dizzying profusion of largely autonomous subgroups that existed prior to the establishment, in 1875, of the nation-wide Presbyterian Church in Canada.

Yet an investigation of the prevailing anxieties and aspirations that circulated within the denominational consciousness reveals that, divided as they may have been over issues such as the endlessly vexatious church-state question, Presbyterianism’s myriad constituent parts also shared considerable common ground. While the lack of institutional uniformity prior to 1875 is undeniable, when it came to the life of the mind the various subgroups succeeded in coalescing around a cluster of compelling, broadly held impulses and convictions.

Conceiving of themselves as part of an amorphous, trans-oceanic British nation, the early Canadian Presbyterians were, in the final analysis, tied together by a widespread belief in the incomparable greatness of the British Empire. Suffusing the denominational community, too, was a belief in Presbyterianism’s providentially ordained destiny, which manifested itself in a millennial sense of mission that transcended the boundaries of British North America and the early Canadian state. For Presbyterians, it seems that righteousness, in tandem with divine providence, was indeed the mainspring of national exaltation. Resounding throughout the denomination, this conviction played a vital role in the
forging of a coherent Presbyterian identity in nineteenth-century Canada.\textsuperscript{34}

\textit{Endnotes}

1. The first part of this paper’s title is drawn from Proverbs 14:34 (King James Version).
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