Richardson’s Utopian Vision in Sir Charles Grandison

In this chapter I will connect everything that has been said in the previous chapters concerning the thoughts of Cheyne, Law, Boehme, the Quakers, Bourignon, Guyon and the Moravians with Sir Charles Grandison, Richardson’s magnum opus. To achieve my purpose I will frequently refer to Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison. As we go along we will see how Sir Charles Grandison is the mediator and healer. He is the Comforter depicted as conspicuously absent in Ecclesiastes 4:1. Life without a comforter, so Ecclesiastes writes, is miserable for the persecuted and oppressed:

So I returned, and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun:
and beheld the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter;
and on the side of their oppressors there was power, but they had no comforter.527

Though absent in Clarissa, the Comforter is present in Sir Charles Grandison. Clarissa is concerned with oppression and persecution and a breach of harmony as a result of the clash between the freedom of (Clarissa’s) conscience and authority (represented by Clarissa’s family), which caused Clarissa to fall into the hands of the libertine Lovelace,528 who equally denies Clarissa her freedom of conscience. However, we find that Richardson’s main objective in

527 Richardson’s admiration for Ecclesiastes appears in his letter written to Lady Bradshaigh in 1753, in which he suggests that he “could perhaps employ his time better in collecting the wisdom of past times than in writing novels.” Richardson added that, as a trial, he had classed “under particular Heads”, alphabetically, the Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, the Books of Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus, and called the collection “Simplicity the True Sublime”; though not with a view to publish it. Those books, he wrote, were a “treasure of morality”. (Cf. John Carroll, Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson, Oxford, 1964, pp. 221-222). Richardson’s use of the word sublime is interesting in that it differs so much from Edmund Burke’s theory of the sublime, as distinct from beauty, with its emphasis on terror. Burke argued that “whatever is fitted in any sort to excite the ideas of pain, and danger ... or operates in a manner analogous to terror, is a source of the sublime; that is, it is productive of the strongest emotion which the mind is capable of feeling.” Cf. Edmund Burke, Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful, 1757. Burke associated obscurity, power, darkness, etc. with the sublime, and delicacy, smoothness and light with beauty. These categories are reminiscent of Boehme’s perception of darkness (wrath) and light (love).

528 For the definition of “libertine”, see footnote 414.
Sir Charles Grandison is to convey a message of harmony through the attraction of like-minded individuals who show “Love and Benevolence” towards God and one another. Sir Charles’s quest for harmony will put an end to persecution and oppression. Harriet writes to her cousin Lucy that it is the modest Sir Charles Grandison rather than the libertine, whom women should seek in marriage:

Sir Charles Grandison ... is the man, ye modest, ye tender-hearted fair ones, whom ye should seek to intitle to your vows: Not the lewd, the obscene libertine, foul Harpy, son of Riot, and of Erebus, glorying in his wickedness, triumphing in your weakness, and seeking by storm to win an heart that ought to shrink at his approach. Shall not Like cleave to Like? (III. 39)

Caught between Scylla and Charybdis, there was no escape for Clarissa. Mediators there were none. On a literal level Clarissa is a bleak story indeed. However, on the anagogical level it was not, for Clarissa, the soul, returns to its origin, God. Clarissa’s journey to God is complete when she attains knowledge of Him, or “Illumination”. Through the metaphor of a pilgrimage it becomes clear that Clarissa is fulfilling a destiny, obeying an imperative need. Her story represents the homeward journey of her spirit, made possible because of the mutual attraction between the spark of the soul and the Fount from which it came forth. The frequent references to the Song of Songs in Clarissa come as no surprise to those familiar with mysticism, for the mystics loved the Song of Songs. In it they saw reflected the most secret experiences of their soul, secrets of which those who are not mystics are not supposed to speak, symbolized and suggested, veiled in a “merciful” mist.

When Clarissa has reached the final stage, or Illumination, as the Bride of Christ, she is the passive Bride, who becomes a source, a parent of the fresh, active, spiritual life. Richardson may have decided that, by means of a visionary novel, he could inspire his readers and restore hope of better times. Hence, Richardson wrote Sir Charles Grandison as a sequel to Clarissa. Though Clarissa pursued a quest for freedom of conscience and choice, which ulti-

529 Philosophical Principles, Part I, p. 50.
530 Evelyn Underhill wrote: “The great saints who adopted and elaborated this symbolism, applying it to their pure and ardent passion for the Absolute, were destitute of the prurient imagination which their modern commentators too often possess. They were essentially pure of heart; and when they “saw God” they were so far from confusing that unearthly vision with the products of morbid sexuality, that the dangerous nature of the imagery which they employed did not occur to them: ... Thus for St. Bernard, throughout his deeply mystical sermons on the Song of Songs, the Divine Word is the Bridegroom, the human soul is the Bride ... We find images which indeed have ... been sensuous; but which are here anointed and ordained to a holy office, carried up, transmuted, and endowed with a radiant purity, an intense and spiritual life.” In the Cantica Canticorum Sir Bernard writes “Let Him kiss me with the kisses of his Mouth”. Who is it speaks these words? It is the Bride. Who is the Bride? It is the Soul thirsting for God.” According to Underhill there is no need to try to find a pathological explanation of this. (Cf. Evelyn Underhill, Mysticism, (1911), London, 16th ed. 1948, pp. 137-138).
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mately failed, yet she achieved illumination as a result of which came the active Mediator, the Inner light or Holy Spirit, Sir Charles Grandison.\textsuperscript{531} In that role he represents the Paraclete, the advocate or Comforter, the one come to aid and support others.

I believe that the explanation of the name “Grandison” is as follows. He is not merely God or the grand Son of God. Nor is he the returned Jesus walking in an earthly paradise. Sir Charles Grandison is the living emblem of the Holy Ghost (or Holy Spirit), the Inner Light, represented by a dove in the imprints used for \textit{Sir Charles Grandison}, volumes I, III, IV and VI (plate XVIII).

The dove also appears in the imprint used for the third part of Cheyne’s \textit{The English Malady} (Plate XIX).\textsuperscript{532} Sir Charles can be seen as the third person of the Trinity, the “grand(i)son” of God, the third generation, or emanation, of God. In that role Sir Charles introduces the Third Age of the Holy Ghost, within

\textsuperscript{531} See for the composition of \textit{Sir Charles Grandison}, Eaves and Kimpel, Op. cit., pp. 368-386. Eaves and Kimpel write on p. 367 that “one can ... say that Richardson had considered a new novel before 1749 ... and that by early 1750 he was seriously considering the idea.” A short history of the publication history of \textit{Sir Charles Grandison} is appropriate here to provide the background for the version edited by Jocelyn Harris which I will be using for this study. The first edition of seven volumes appeared during 1753 and 1754. The first four volumes were published on November 13, 1753, the next two volumes on December 11, 1753, and the seventh and last volume on March 14, 1754. The second edition was printed simultaneously with the first. The third edition of the complete seven volumes was published on March 19, 1754. A year after Richardson’s death the fourth edition appeared in 1762. In 1810 a “new edition” was published by Mrs Barbauld (cf. William Merritt Sale, Jr., \textit{Samuel Richardson: A Bibliographical Record of his Literary Career with Historical Notes}, 1969, pp. xvii-xviii and 65-76). Harris chose the first edition as the text for her edition of \textit{Sir Charles Grandison} which was published in 1972 (it is now out of print, but there is a reprint of \textit{The History of Sir Charles Grandison} in seven volumes by Library Binding (Bowker, U.S.), October 1999. In Harris’s edition we find Volumes I and II in part 1, volumes III-V in part 2 and volumes VI and VII in part 3.

\textsuperscript{532} Plate XIX from \textit{The English Malady}, p. 267.
world history, spreading righteousness and tolerance, not just in England but in the world. For it is Sir Charles’s sister Charlotte who had prayed that God would make her brother’s power as large as his heart, for then the whole world would benefit either by his bounty or his example (II. 382).

Sir Charles Grandison as the Holy Ghost
The appearance of the dove in the imprint of several volumes of Sir Charles Grandison is striking, for it is the symbol for the Holy Ghost. Boehme described “God the Holy Ghost” as the third Person in the "holy Deity", proceeding from the Father and the Son, and as such “the holy moving spring or fountain of joy in the whole Father”. Boehme added that the Holy Ghost is a “pleasant, meek, quiet wind, or whispering Breath, or still voice,” whom we can only describe by using “a similitude”, for the “Spirit cannot be written down, being no Creature, but the moving, flowing, boyling power of God” (Aurora, 3:62-64; 70-71).

As I have shown earlier, Richardson left clues in his works to help readers to become “carvers” of his text. I therefore believe that we should interpret the following scene as equating Sir Charles with the Holy Ghost. At one point Sir Charles, as a ghost, visits Mrs Shirley, a visit which Harriet describes in her letter dated 20 September:

Do you know what is become of your brother? My grandmamma Shirley has seen his Ghost: and talked with it near an hour; and then it vanished. Be not surprised. .... I am still in amaze at the account my grandmamma gives us of its appearance, discourse, and vanishing! Nor was the dear parent in a resverie. It happened in the middle of the afternoon, all in broad day. Thus she tells it: “I was sitting ... in my own drawing-room ... when, in came James, to whom it first appeared, and told me, that a gentleman desired to be introduced to me. .... I gave orders for his admittance; and in came, to appearance, one of the handsomest men I ever saw in my life, in a riding-dress. It was a courteous Ghost; It saluted me, or at least I thought it did. .... Contrary to the manner of ghosts, it spoke first. (VI. 15) (Italics are mine)

533 In the “Contents of this Book” (i.e. Aurora) Boehme explains the title as “a secret Mystery, concealed from the wise and prudent of this world, which themselves shall shortly be sensible: but to those which read this book in singleness of heart, with a desire after the holy Spirit, who place their hope onely in God, it will not be a hidden secret, but a manifest knowledge.” He adds that “if Mr Critic, which qualifieth or worketh with his wit in the fierce quality, gets this book into his hand, he will oppose it, as there is always a Stirring and Opposition between the Kingdom of Heaven and the Kingdom of Hell.” Boehme sums up the attitude of the critic, who first “will say that I ascend too high into the Deity, which is not a meet thing for me to do.” Then the critic will say “that I boast of the holy Spirit, and that I had more need to live accordingly, and make demonstration of it by wondrous Works or Miracles.” Thirdly, the critic will accuse him of not being “learned enough”. The critic will also be “much offended by the “simplicity of the Author”- (Aurora, pp. 25 ff). See also footnote 150.
As I have mentioned above, we may explain Grandison’s name as follows. Grand(i)son or grandson points at the third generation or third emanation of the Ternary or Trinity, i.e. the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. If we accept this analogy, then Grandison, as the image of the Holy Ghost, may be seen to represent Fiore’s and Boehme’s Third Age of the Holy Ghost.\footnote{See pp. 3 and 4 as well as pp. 172 and 173 above. In his letter to Byrom dated 1741, Cheyne mentioned the “latter days” and the “Holy Spirit” in the following context: “If a person whom I admire so much as I do Mr. Law rejects [the works of Marsay] (though we are promised in the latter days more and fuller lights, and that the Holy Spirit promised shall lead us into all truth), I will so far give up [these works] so as not to propagate them with that blind zeal I might do otherwise.” (Cf. Henry Talon, Selections from the Journals & Papers of John Byrom, Poet-Diarist-Shorthand Writer 1691-1763, London, 1950, p. 212).}

For the purpose of this study in which I argue that, on the anagogical level, Sir Charles Grandison represents the Holy Ghost, we will concentrate on Sir Charles Grandison’s activities as Comforter and Mediator, introducing the Third Age of the Lily in which reigns freedom of conscience and love. In this role the Holy Ghost Sir Charles was to complete the teachings of Christ as well as unlock God’s last Revelation before the end of time, gathering the remnant to be saved. As I have shown in chapter 6, this age, within history, would then be followed by the (second) arrival of Christ and the millennium, beyond history. Richardson’s vision is based on Boehme’s writings in which the latter expressed a longing for a new Reformation, the Lilienzeit. Condemning all war and strife, Boehme wrote that war and contention arise “out of the nature and property of the dark world”, which produces in human beings “pride, covetousness, envy and anger”. These are the four elements of the dark world, in which, according to Boehme, the devils and all evil creatures live; and these four elements cause war (Mysterium Magnum, 38:7).

Boehme most strongly condemns religious wars, especially those waged only about “Churches and Church matters”, in which people murder one another and destroy land and people “in their self-will”. For, so Boehme argues, these war-mongers do not intend to seek God’s honour, but only their own honour, might, authority, and power, and “thereby fatten the ox, viz. the belly-god”. And he quotes the Old Testament Patriarch Jacob who said: “Cursed be their anger, for it is vehement and fierce, and their wrath, for it is raging” (Mysterium Magnum, 76:35).

Richardson wrote Sir Charles Grandison as a vision, but also as a warning, and asked his readers to be carvers of his text, reminiscent of Boehme’s words that the reader “may behold himself in this looking-glass [mirror] both within and without, and find what and who he is.” Boehme added that every reader, whether he was good or evil, would profit by his works, but he warned that “with glosses and self-wit none shall apprehend [his work] in its own ground.” Yet, it might “embrace the real seeker” and create him much profit and joy, and it might “even be helpful to him in all natural things, provided he applies himself right,” because “it is now a time of seeking; for a lily blossoms upon...
the mountains and valleys in all the ends of the earth" (Signatura Rerum, 16:40).535

Sir Charles’s objective is to achieve unity of faith among Christians of various theological and cultural backgrounds, a unity which is made possible by the dwelling of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the believers. This spiritual bond, which so often appears absent, will be the basis for a genuinely ecumenical encounter between Christians of different denominations. Moreover, Christ’s Church is to be based on Catholicity: a Church without external qualifications or differentiations.

The Trinity in Unity and the Sun of Righteousness

However, Sir Charles does not only represent the Holy Ghost. He is also the image of the Trinity as exemplified by Boehme and by Cheyne in the Philosophical Principles in which he described the “Holy and undivided Trinity” (the Holy Ternary) and explained that it is impossible that the Son should be without the Father, or the Father without the Son, or both without the Holy Ghost.536 The Son, so Cheyne argued, is necessarily and eternally begotten of the Father, and the Holy Ghost necessarily proceeds from both.537

Richardson and Cheyne were both fascinated with the concept of the Trinity in Unity, represented as the sun and its beams.538 Sir Charles is Cheyne’s “Sun of Righteousness”, the pattern and archetype of “our material Sun”, who sends forth his “enlightening and enlivening Beams on all the System of created intelligent Beings”; as such he is, according to Cheyne, “that Light which enlightens every Man that cometh into the World.”539 Richardson must have thought of Cheyne’s words when he compared Sir Charles with the sun, for he writes that Sir Charles’s face is shaped as “a fine oval”, overspread with “a manly sunniness”. Richardson adds that his eyes are of “sparkling intelligence” (I. 181). In Volume II Richardson compares Sir Charles with a sunbeam when he writes “a sun-beam is not more penetrating” (II. 361-362), and later Harriet compares his “superior excellence” with sunshine (II. 375). There are many similar examples throughout Sir Charles Grandison.

Richardson’s Ecumenical or Philadelphian Vision

Richardson seems to have been caught by the “Tropenlehre” (tropoi paideias) which Zinzendorf had worked out: God fulfils Himself in many ways.540 For Sir

535 See for more references to a lily, the Epistles, letter 42:44, 47; and the Signatura Rerum, 7:32 (“for the rose in the time of the lily shall blossom in May when the winter is past, for the blindness to the wicked, and for light to the seeing”).
536 Philosophical Principles, Part II, pp. 78-80.
537 Ibid., p. 82.
538 I have shown earlier that Richardson used an imprint depicting the sun as the image of the deity in works by Cheyne and Law printed in 1740 and 1756 (see plate XIV).
539 Philosophical Principles, Part II, p. 112. See also footnote 234 above.
Charles Grandison is concerned not only with the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church, but with other dispensations as well. We recognize the concept of the “ecclesiolae”, which the Moravians aimed at, or Spener’s “centres of fellowship” (his Collegia Pietatis), which promoted that Christianity was not only about abstruse doctrines, but the practice of a transforming way of life. Following Boehme, Zinzendorf’s aim was to realize a “philadelphischen Gemeinschaft”, which he, however, on purpose linked with Spener. He wrote:


In 1721 Zinzendorf wrote to his grandmother:

Ich kann nach meiner wenigen Einsicht in die Oeconomie Gottes anders nicht schliessen, als dass es in der Tat wahr sei, dass Gott mich Unwü rdigen zu einem Werkzeug und Mitarbeiter in seiner philadelphischen Gemeine versehen habe.542

Just as in Sir Charles Grandison’s little community, or “family of love”, so in Spener and Zinzendorf’s plan good works had their legitimate place, as the outward expression of faith: faith is the sun and good works are its rays.543 This is all in accordance with Zinzendorf’s “Tropenlehre”. Interesting is also a letter of Sir Charles in which he explains that “The Church of God ... will be collected from the sincerely pious of all communions” (V. 616). In allegorical usage collecting or harvesting represents the end of the age, as we find it depicted in the Book of Revelation:

And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle, and reap: for the time is come for thee to reap; for the harvest of the earth is ripe. (Rev. 14:15)

This collecting of the sincerely pious of all communions is exactly what Sir Charles is trying to achieve.

Now let us turn to Sir Charles Grandison in which the main protagonists are Sir Charles Grandison, Harriet Byron, and the Italian Clementina della Porretta.544 In his relation with these two women Sir Charles represents the

541 Geschichte des Pietismus: Der Pietismus im 18. Jahrhundert, Band 2, Göttingen, 1995, pp. 18, 90 (footnote 78). See also p. 120 above.
542 Ibid., p. 90 (footnote 78).
544 The novel starts with cousin Lucy Selby’s letter to Harriet written on January 10 and ends with Harriet’s letter to Mrs Shirley dated July 4 the next year. Another conspicuous date is that of the
Trinity in Unity, while Harriet and Clementina represent the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church respectively. Women have often been used as images of the Church and its relationship to Christ, for instance in the admonition to husbands to love their wives “as Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it” (Ephesians, 5:25-32).

Reading Sir Charles Grandison anagogically helps to explain the problem of Sir Charles’s love for both women, and dispels the criticism that Sir Charles Grandison contained a plea for polygamy. Sir Charles realizes his difficult position and asks “Can I do justice to the merits of both, and yet not appear to be divided by a double love? (VI. 10-11). Harriet describes Sir Charles as a handsome man “in the bloom of youth” of whom his sister might very well say that “if he married, he would break half a score hearts” (I. 138). On the anagogical level it refers to the many dispensations or Churches who all claim an equal interest in God. This seems to explain Charlotte Grandison’s statement that Sir Charles is not a great self-denier and, moreover, a “great admirer of handsome women” (I. 182).

The issues of the freedom of conscience and the right to choose are introduced when the reader is informed about the various men who are in love with Harriet. Regarding the question of marriage we are told that “the approbation of ... Harriet must first be gained, and then [the family’s] consent is ready” (I. 11). Harriet’s godfather Mr Deane, a lawyer, holds the same view that Harriet must choose for herself: “All motions of this kind must come first from her” (I. 11). It is this freedom of conscience which was denied to Clarissa. Harriet is irritated at the various lovers and she cannot bear to think of their dangling after her wherever she goes: “These men, were we to give them importance with us, would be greater infringers of our natural freedom than the most severe Parents; and for their own sakes” (I. 15).

Harriet very much dislikes Sir Hargrave Pollexfen, the most aggressive of her lovers, and she tells her cousin Lucy that even if Sir Hargrave were “king of one half of the globe” she would not marry him (I. 64). A few days later, on February 8, Sir Hargrave visits Harriet and proposes to her. When she tells him she cannot “encourage his addresses”, he furiously asks her whatever can be her objection. Her answer is important in that it again refers to her right of free choice. She argues that we do not, and indeed cannot, all like the same person. Even though she has heard people say that women are very capricious, she says that there is “something (we cannot always say what) that attracts or disgusts us”. In other words, Sir Hargrave simply does not hit “her fancy” (I. 84). Harriet reiterates that she is a free person, and therefore she does not have to answer every question that may be put to her by those to whom she is not accountable (I. 84).

545 Discussing a future husband for Charlotte, Sir Charles stresses that she has a free will and is not accountable to anyone: “You should be entirely mistress of your own conduct and actions. It would have been ungenerous in me, to have supposed you accountable to me. ... Do not imagine marriage between Harriet and Sir Charles which takes place on Thursday, November 16.
Sir Hargrave’s behaviour becomes more and more obsessive and when Harriet comments upon his morals he gets angry. She writes to Lucy Selby that his “menacing airs and abrupt departure” terrified her and she compares him with a madman. She shudders at the thought that she might have been “drawn in by his professions of love, and by 8000 L. a year” and have married him. And then, too late, she would have found herself miserable, “yoked with a tyrant and a madman” (I. 97).

It is at the masquerade which is to take place on February 16 that things really become ugly. Masquerades were considered by many, among whom Richardson himself, to be diversions of the utmost depravity, because people, disguising themselves, are not what they seem. Harriet tells us in Letter XXII that their dresses are ready:

Mr. Reeves is to be a hermit; Mrs. Reeves a Nun; Lady Betty a Lady Abbess: But I by no means like mine, because of its gaudiness: The very thing I was afraid of. They call it the dress of an Arcadian Princess: But it falls not in with any of my notions of the Pastoral dress of Arcadia. ... I wish the night were over. I dare say, it will be the last diversion of this kind I ever shall be at; for I never had any notion of Masquerades. (I. 115-116)

Sir Hargrave succeeds in abducting her from the masquerade and tries to force her into a secret marriage. On his way to his elder sister Caroline’s house at Colnebrook, Sir Charles Grandison rescues Harriet. Caroline, Lady L. since her recent marriage with Lord L., greets Harriet with the words “thrice welcome to this house, and to me” (I. 132). Charlotte Grandison, the younger sister, is also at Colnebrook. It is she who later will tell Mr Reeves that they “are a family of love ... we are true brothers and sisters” (I. 133). Harriet is received as a third sister by Sir Charles, who tells her that he will think of “yesterday” as one of the happiest days of his life and that he is sorry that their acquaintance had begun so much at Harriet’s cost. Yet he wants her to turn this “evil appearance into a real good”, because as he has two sisters, he now me capable of laying such a load on your free will. (II. 402) ... You are absolutely your own mistress.” (II. 408)

Richardson uses the word “thrice” on more occasions and it is, perhaps, a reference to Hermes Trismegistus, who exercised a profound influence on Boehme. See also Sir Charles Grandison, II. 283. It is also found in Clarissa.

The “Family of Love”, referred to in Sir Charles Grandison (I.133 and III.201), is reminiscent of the “Familists”, members of a sect called the “Family of Love” or “Familia Caritatis”, founded by Henry Nicholas (or Hendrik Nicolaes) in 1540. The Familists believed in the Inner Light and the birth of Christ in their own souls. Nicholas came from a devout Roman Catholic family and briefly joined the Anabaptists. At an early age he began to have visions. He was deeply influenced by the Theologia Germanica and the sixteenth-century German humanist and radical reformer, Sebastian Franck. Though the Familists rejected the services and sacraments of the official Churches, they were advised by Nicholas to conform outwardly to the religion of the State. He believed that he was sent to preach a new reign of love, which superseded the dispensation introduced by Christ. Nicholas’s books were widely read by the Quakers and the English admirers of Boehme. (Cf. Alastair Hamilton, The Family of Love, Cambridge, 1981.)
Richardson’s views in this matter concur with Law’s and may even have influenced him. For Law wrote several years later in An Humble, Earnest, and Affectionate Address to the Clergy published in 1761: “Can the Duelist, who had rather sheathe his Sword in the Bowels of his Brother than stifle that which he calls an Affront, can he be said to have this Mark of his belonging to Christ? And may not he, that is called his SECOND, more justly be said to be second to none in the Love of human Murder? Now what is the Difference between the haughty Duelist with his provided second, meeting his Adversary with Sword and Pistol behind a Hedge or a House, and two Kingdoms with their high-spirited Regiments slaughtering one another in the Field of Battle? It is the Difference that is between the Murder of one Man and the Murder of an hundred thousand.” (Cf. Law, Works, Vol. IX, p. 84).
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has three: “and shall [he] not then have reason to rejoice in the event that has made so lovely an addition to [his] family” (I. 144). Sir Charles will explain to Mr Reeves that “like minds will be intimate at first sight” (I. 147).

The details of Harriet’s rescue are given with special attention to the fact that Sir Charles refuses to draw his own sword even though Sir Hargrave had his sword drawn and raked Sir Charles’s shoulder with it. Sir Charles describes how he wrenched Sir Hargrave’s sword from him, snapped it and flung the two pieces over his head, admitting that, because Sir Hargrave’s mouth and face were very bloody, he might have hurt him with the pommel of his sword (I. 140). Later we are told that Sir Hargrave wants revenge (I. 196), because he had lost three front teeth in the struggle (I. 200). But Sir Charles refuses a duel, explaining that he only draws his sword in his own defence, when no other means could defend him, though he admits that he could never bear a “designed” insult, since he is “naturally passionate”. And yet Sir Charles realizes that people may accuse him of cowardice. However, he hopes that “his spirit is in general too well known for any one to insult him on such an imputation”, for he does not live “to the world”, but to himself, to “the monitor” within him. He explains that there are many bad customs that he “grieves for”, but none so much as that of “premeditated duelling” and he wonders “how many fatherless, brotherless, sonless families have mourned all their lives the unhappy resort to this dreadful practice.” He believes that a man who “defies his fellow-creature into the field, in a private quarrel, must first defy his God; and what are his hopes, but to be a murderer?” (I. 206).548

Sir Charles’s explicit mentioning that he lived “to himself, to the monitor within” concurs with Sparrow’s admonition in Boehme’s XL Questions: “Let [the soul] listen, in its heart and Conscience, inwardly to that Teacher, which it shall find there, who is God himself”. While staying at Colnebrook Harriet is told by his sister Charlotte that Sir Charles lived to himself, and to his own heart; and that though he had “the happiness to please everybody, yet he made the judgment of approbation of this world matter but of second consideration.”549 She adds that her brother was not misled either by false glory or false shame (I. 182).

548 Richardson’s views in this matter concur with Law’s and may even have influenced him. For Law wrote several years later in An Humble, Earnest, and Affectionate Address to the Clergy published in 1761: “Can the Duelist, who had rather sheathe his Sword in the Bowels of his Brother than stifle that which he calls an Affront, can he be said to have this Mark of his belonging to Christ? And may not he, that is called his SECOND, more justly be said to be second to none in the Love of human Murder? Now what is the Difference between the haughty Duelist with his provided second, meeting his Adversary with Sword and Pistol behind a Hedge or a House, and two Kingdoms with their high-spirited Regiments slaughtering one another in the Field of Battle? It is the Difference that is between the Murder of one Man and the Murder of an hundred thousand.” (Cf. Law, Works, Vol. IX, p. 84).

549 Cf. also Clarissa: I would ... answer for myself to myself, in the first place; to [Lovelace], and to the world, in the second only. Principles that are in my mind; that I found there; implanted, no doubt, by the first gracious Planter: which therefore impel me ... to act up to them” (Clarissa, II. 306).
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Nature and freedom are important issues in Sir Charles Grandison. Sir Charles much appreciates natural ways of life which for instance appears from the fact that his horses are not docked, an example often derided by modern critics. He explains that their tails are only tied up when they are on the road, because the tails of these “noble animals are not only a natural ornament, but are of real use to defend them from the vexatious insects that in summer are so apt to annoy them”, and that this was why he would not deprive his cattle of a “defence, which nature gave them” (I. 183).

On the issue of equality of men and women, an issue which recurs throughout Sir Charles Grandison, Harriet refers to the (male) argument that women do not know themselves nor their own hearts. But, asks Harriet, if men and women are brothers and sisters, then surely the same accusation should apply to men? She does not understand why the sister of the same parents should be accused of being sillier, unsteadier or more absurd and impertinent than her brother. She also believes that there is equality of intelligence between men and women:

> There is not … so much difference in the genius of the two sexes as the proud ones among [the men] are apt to imagine; especially when you draw comparisons from equal degrees in both. … O Mr Walden, take care of yourself, if ever again you and I meet at Lady Betty’s. … I have often heard my grandfather observe, that men of truly great and brave spirits are most tender and merciful; and that, on the contrary, men of base and low minds are cruel, tyrannical, insolent, where-ever they have power. (I. 193)

In Volume II we find that the problem between Sir Charles and Sir Hargrave is still not yet resolved and that Sir Hargrave wants his revenge. However, Sir Charles refuses a duel for he will not “for an adversary’s sake, or [his] own be defied into a cool and premeditated vengeance” (II. 242). When asked about the laws of honour by Mr Bagenhall, Sir Charles answers that he owns no laws, except those of God and his own Country (II. 242). Nevertheless, he promises to have breakfast with Sir Hargrave the next morning at his house in Cavendish Square. Henry Cotes will make short-hand notes (II. 247-268) of the meeting which is to take place on March 2nd. To be present are also Mr Solomon Merceda, a Jew, and Mr John Jordan. There is much moralizing in this part of the novel, but there is also a witty exchange between Mr Bagenhall, a

---

550 Mr Walden and Harriet had had a discussion on the merits and demerits of a university training. Mr Walden had argued that “No man … in [his] humble opinion … can be well-grounded in any branch of learning, who has not been at one of our famous Universities (I. 47). Harriet had disagreed stating that “The world … [she had] heard called an University. But in [her] humble opinion, neither a learned, nor what is called a fine education, has any other value than as each tends to improve the morals of men, and to make them wise and good. … And are not women … one half in number, tho’ not perhaps in value, of the human species? - Would it not be a pity … if the knowledge that is to be obtained in a lesser University should make a man despise what is to be acquired in the greater, in which that knowledge was principally intended to make him useful? (I. 49).
Roman Catholic, and the Jewish Mr Merceda. Referring admiringly to Sir Charles, Mr Bagenhall says:

Mr. Bag. See what a Christian can do, Merceda. After this, will you remain a Jew?
Mr. Mer. Let me see such another Christian, and I will give you an answer. (II. 254)

In this scene we find another example of Richardson’s exasperation with the various dispensations when Mr Bagenhall says he is a Catholic:

Mr. Bag. But, Sir Charles, you despise no man, I am sure, for differing from you in opinion. I am a Catholic -
Sir Ch. A Roman Catholic - No religion teaches a man evil. I honour every man who lives up to what he professes.
Mr. Bag. But that is not the case with me, I doubt.
Mr. Mer. That is out of doubt, Bagenhall.
Mr. Jord. The truth is, Mr. Bagenhall has found his conveniences in changing. He was brought up a Protestant. These dispensations, Mr. Bagenhall. (II. 266)

The result of the meeting is that Sir Hargrave grudgingly accepts that he will not have his duel, but he insists that he will not give up Harriet.

Then on March 7 Harriet returns to Colnebrook to stay for a longer period. During this time Harriet is told everything she needs to know about the Grandison family. The character of Sir Charles’s father, Sir Thomas Grandison, is described as a rake and a libertine. The fine poetical vein which he liked to cultivate instantly makes him suspect in Harriet’s mind (and in Richardson’s), for she writes that she has heard her grandfather say, that to be a poet requires “an heated imagination, which often runs away with the judgment” (II. 311). Lady Grandison, his admirable and highly respected wife, had brought him a huge fortune which he squandered away on horses and racing. However, we are informed that it was her own choice to marry him and that all her friends consented “because it was her choice” (II. 311). An unfortunate choice though, for Harriet tells us that Lady Grandison’s “eye and her ear had certainly misled her”. Lady Grandison had tried at the beginning of their marriage to engage his “companionableness”, for she was fond of her husband. However, once Sir Thomas had shown her everywhere, “and she began to find herself in circumstances”, he gave way to his “predominant byas”; after a while he was only rarely at home in the summer, and in the winter he spent at least four months in “the diversions of this great town; and was the common patron of all the performers, whether at plays, operas, or concerts” (II. 311-312). The reference to Sir Thomas’s predominant “byas” is reminiscent of the two eyes of
the soul described in the *Theologia Germanica*.\(^{551}\)

In another scene describing the uncharitable behaviour of Sir Thomas towards his two daughters we find criticism of those readers who had asked Richardson to have the libertine Lovelace and Clarissa married, for Harriet writes to Lucy that “rakish men” do not make good husbands or good fathers, and not even good brothers, because “the narrow-hearted creatures centre all their delight in themselves.” Harriet pities the women who, “taken in by their specious airs, vows, protestations”, become the “abject properties of such wretches”. She adds that only “the vulgar and the inconsiderate” could say that a reformed rake would make the best husband (II. 342).

There is some authorial intrusion here, reminiscent of Law’s reaction to Mandeville’s *Fable of the Bees*, that cynical defence of licentious behaviour which was discussed earlier.\(^{552}\) Richardson has Harriet comment to Lucy that these were the words of the “rakish, the keeping father”, who tried to justify his private vices by general reflections on women: “and thus are wickedness and libertinism called a knowledge of the world, a knowledge of human nature”. Harriet refers to Swift, who, she writes, “for often painting a dunghill, and for his abominable Yahoo story”, was complimented with this knowledge. But she hopes that the character of human nature is not to be taken “from the overflowings of such dirty imaginations” (II. 348).

As to the specific issue of equality between men and women, discussed above in a different context,\(^{553}\) Sir Charles comments that his sisters have an *equitable*, if not a *legal* right to their father’s estate. And he criticizes the “customary preferences given to men as men; tho’ given for the sake of pride, perhaps, rather than natural justice.” He blames “tyrant custom” both for making a daughter change “her name in marriage”, and for giving to the son, “for the sake of name only”, the parents’ estate (II. 398). Harriet herself uses the word “tyrant-custom” when she comments on the equality between men and women, at least where “love” is concerned, for men and women, she believes, are very much alike, if we were to put “custom, tyrant-custom” out of the way. At least in cases where the heart is concerned, Harriet knows that “the meaning of the one [might] be generally guessed at by that of the other” (II. 425).

In Volume III we are told about the charitable projects Sir Charles is involved in both in England and abroad. As he tells Dr Bartlett, his primary concern is to give “little fortunes to young maidens in marriage with honest men of their own degree”, as a result of which they might “begin the world ... with some hope of success” (III. 11). He asks Dr Bartlett’s assistance and wants him to make enquiries for objects that are worthy of this project. These include “the industrious poor, of all persuasions”, as well as those people reduced in circumstances by age, infirmity or accident, and “those who labour under incurable maladies”. He targets young men and women who are capa-

---

\(^{551}\) See p. 95 above.

\(^{552}\) See p. 135 above.

\(^{553}\) See p. 188 above.
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Tolerance and universal harmony is again expressed in a letter by Mr Deane to Mrs Selby in which Mr Deane refers to Dr Bartlett’s saying that Sir Charles does not regard seas as obstacles, considering all nations as joined on the same continent, nor did Mr Deane doubt that if Sir Charles felt called upon, he would undertake a journey to “Constantinople or Pekin”, with as little difficulty as some others would to Land’s End (III. 30).

Where Sir Charles talks about “magnetism” to Dr Bartlett he is very reminiscent of Boehme, for he argues that there is a kind of magnetism in goodness: “Bad people will indeed find out bad people, and confederate with them”, so as to “keep one another in countenance”, but they are bound together by a “rope of sand”, whereas trust, confidence, love, sympathy, and a “reciprocation of beneficent actions”, twist a cord tying “good men to good men”, which cannot be easily broken (III. 45). Harriet describes to Lucy on March 21 Dr Bartlett’s remarks on Sir Charles Grandison’s goodness. Dr Bartlett had said that Sir Charles was a “general Philanthropist”, whose delight is in doing good. But even more so, it was Sir Charles’s “glory” to mend the hearts of men and women (III. 61).

Sir Charles’s objective, then, is to spread righteousness to men and women as a friend or a brother influenced by the Inner Light so as to bring those who accept his guidance into unity with God and one another. This was characteristic of, but not exclusive to, for instance the Quakers, and we also witness this attitude among the Moravian Brethren, with whom, as we have seen earlier, Richardson had contacts. According to Harriet, Sir Charles is the “the Friend of Mankind” and as such much more glorious a character than any “Conqueror of Nations” (III. 69-70).

The Italian Scene: A Flashback

In Volume III Sir Charles tells Harriet what happened to him during the years he was “obliged” to live abroad, from the age of seventeen to twenty-five. The details he leaves to Dr Bartlett to fill in at a later time. He describes his meeting with the Italian family della Porretta, who live at Bologna and Urbino, and who have a pedigree which goes back to Roman princes (III. 119). He met them through their son Jeronymo, whose life he had saved. The family are so grateful that they consider him a fourth brother. He is asked to teach English to Jeronymo and one of his brothers, who is a bishop. The only sister, Clementina, is hardly ever absent from these lessons. She calls him her tutor and shows a greater proficiency than her two brothers. Richardson’s great appreciation for Milton shows when Sir Charles tells Harriet that Milton’s works were well-

---
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known to the Italian Porrettas, because of Milton’s friendship with “a learned nobleman of their country” (III. 122).

The Porrettas want to reward him for saving Jeronymo’s life and Jeronymo’s own suggestion is that if he married Clementina he would become a relation to that (very rich and noble) family. Though there are some obstacles between him and Clementina to be overcome, the difference of religion will be the main problem, which Sir Charles realizes almost immediately. The Porrettas are all staunch Roman Catholics, and Sir Charles had already recognized the fact that Clementina was “remarkably stedfast [sic]”, so much so that the family had only with the utmost difficulty been able to keep her from entering a convent (III. 124).

We are also informed as to the time when Sir Charles was in Italy. Sir Charles describes the reaction of the Italians on hearing about the Jacobite revolt in Scotland of 1745, “now so happily appeased”. He tells Harriet that hardly anything else was talked of in Italy, especially about the progress and the “supposed certainty of success of the young invader”. Many people, including the moderate Porrettas, spoke to him about the events, much to his dismay: “I had a good deal of this kind of spirit to contend with”, especially since the Italians were convinced that success of the rebels would lead to the restoration of the “Catholic religion”. And Sir Charles describes how Clementina in particular pleased herself with the thought that then “her heretic tutor would take refuge in the bosom of his holy mother, the church”. Moreover, Clementina “delighted to say things of this nature in the language [he] was teaching her, and which, by this time, she spoke very intelligibly” (III. 124). All this became too much for him to bear, and he therefore decided, like Pietro Giannone, to leave Italy for a while to go to Vienna.555

The Porrettas’ main objections to a marriage between the two are “religion and country”. Clementina becomes melancholy and her parents consult physicians who all conclude that her illness is due to love, which Clementina vehemently denies (III. 126). After Sir Charles has left Italy, her illness grows worse: she starts talking to herself and again expresses her desire to take the veil. She asks her mother’s forgiveness, but she wants to be “God’s child, as well as yours”, in other words, she wants to become a nun (III. 127).

Sir Charles blamed her confessor Father Marescotti who had filled her mind with such fears which had affected her head. Clementina had told Sir Charles that her confessor was a good man, but severe, and that he was afraid of Sir Charles, because the latter had “almost” persuaded Clementina to think charitably of people of “different persuasions” as a result of his “noble charity for all mankind”. Even though Sir Charles is a heretic, Clementina admits that this charity “carries an appearance of true Christian goodness in it”, so much so that, though Protestants “will persecute one another”, Clementina is convinced that Sir Charles would not be one of those (III. 154).

555 See p. 30 above.
In order to restore Clementina’s health the family decide to indulge her every wish and by common consent they ask Sir Charles to return to Italy so that they can discuss the terms upon which a marriage can take place between him and Clementina. However, the main obstacles of religion and country are not so easily solved. Sir Charles was expected to make a formal renunciation of his religion, and to settle in Italy. Only once every two or three years would he be allowed to go to England, if so wished, for two or three months. And as a visit of curiosity, once in her life, if Clementina desired to do so, Sir Charles could take her with him, for a time to be limited by the Porrettas (III. 129).

Extremely distressed by these conditions, especially when Clementina urged him “for his soul’s sake, to embrace the doctrines of her holy mother, the church” (III. 130), Sir Charles had to reject the terms, because, as he put it, he was entirely satisfied in his own faith. Moreover, he had “insuperable objections” to the one he was asked to “embrace”. He also loved his country: were not his God and his country to be the sacrifice, if he complied, he asked himself. And so he tried to find a compromise, for he had grown fond of Clementina by then:

I laboured, I studied for a compromise. I must have been unjust to Clementina’s merit, and to my own Character, had she not been dear to me. And indeed I beheld graces in her then, that I had before resolved to shut my eyes against; her Rank next to princely; her Fortune high as her rank; Religion; Country: all so many obstacles that had appeared to me insuperable, removed by themselves; and no apprehension left of a breach of the laws of hospitality, which had, till now, made me struggle to behold one of the most amiable and noble-minded of women with indifference. (III. 130)

The compromise entailed that Sir Charles would alternatively live one year in Italy and one year in England, if Clementina would live there with him. If not, then he would pass only three months of every year in England. He proposed to leave her entirely free as to religion; and in case of any children, the daughters would be educated in Clementina’s faith, and the sons in Sir Charles’s: “a condition to which his Holiness himself, it was presumed, would not refuse his sanction, as there were precedents for it” (III. 130).

Unfortunately, though Clementina would have consented, her father and her two brothers, the General and the Bishop, would not. Her mother had remained neutral, and Jeronymo was as much in favour of the match as ever before. In the end, Sir Charles was requested to leave Bologna without being allowed to take leave of Clementina (III. 131).

Protestant Nunneries
Since both Clarissa and Clementina seem to prefer the “single life” over mar-

556 The marriage of Charles I and Henrietta Maria.
riage, it is important to address the issue of Protestant Nunneries as proposed by Sir Charles. The idea of such establishments suggests Moravian influence. Commenting on unhappy marriages to Sir Charles and Dr Bartlett, Harriet’s cousin Mrs Reeves says:

I believe in England many a poor girl goes up the hill with a companion she would little care for, if the state of a single woman were not here so peculiarly unprovided and helpless: For girls of slender fortunes, if they have been genteelly brought up, how can they, when family-connexion are dissolved, support themselves? A man can rise in a profession, and if he acquires wealth in trade, can get above it, and be respected. A woman is looked upon as demeaning herself, if she gains a maintenance by her needle, or by domestic attendance on a superior; and without them where has she a retreat? (IV. 355)

Sir Charles is delighted with these remarks and elaborates on Dr Bartlett’s and his own plan to improve the situation of unmarried women. They have a scheme in mind the name of which would make “many a Lady start”. In fact they want to establish “Protestant Nunneries” in every county, in which single women of small or no fortunes could live with “all manner of freedom”, under such regulations no “modest or good woman” would refuse. Moreover, she would be allowed to quit whenever she pleased (IV. 355). Dr Bartlett adds that such Protestant Nunneries should also be open to wives in the absence of their husbands as well as to widows.

Sir Charles further explains that the governesses or matrons of such an establishment would have to be women of family, of “unblameable characters” and noted equally for their “prudence, good-nature, and gentleness of manners”. He hoped that the attendants for the slighter services would be young girls of the honest industrious poor (IV. 355). According to Dr Bartlett such establishments with women of unblemished reputation, employing themselves according to their abilities, “supported genteelly, some at more, some at less expense to the foundation”, might become a “national good”. They would be seminaries “for good wives”, attaining a reputation for virtue in an age given up to luxury, extravagance, and “amusements little less than riotous” (IV. 355).

Though there may be a connection between the above scheme and Mary Astell’s Serious Proposal to Ladies, in which she proposed to erect monasteries for women as an institution “to fit women to do the greatest good in the world”, it is certainly also reminiscent of the Moravian Single Sisters’ Houses which formed part of the Moravian settlements.\textsuperscript{557} There are more similarities between Zinzendorf and Sir Charles Grandison. In his own particular style Ronald Knox writes:

Richardson’s Utopian Vision in Sir Charles Grandison

The trouble about Zinzendorf was that he was too polite; he went about preaching a doctrine of Live-and-let-live which was to unite the Christianities, yet always with the conviction that he had found a more excellent way destined to supersede the older models. .... Herrnhut was to eighteenth-century Protestantism much what Moscow is to twentieth-century Socialism; you feared to accept its alliance. 558

In addition to “Protestant Nunneries”, Sir Charles also has a scheme for a “Hospital for Female Penitents”, for women who had been “drawn in and betrayed by the perfidy of men”. He explains that, by the cruelty of the world, but “principally by that of their own Sex”, these women found themselves unable to recover “the path of virtue” (IV. 356). We know that Richardson generously contributed to the Magdalen House, a real “Hospital for Female Penitents”, and became one of its governors. 559

Sir Charles discusses the subject of Protestant Nunneries with Clementina, whom he wants to dissuade from going into a Catholic convent. He explains to Clementina that he is not totally opposed to “such foundations”, even though he is a Protestant. He adds that he even wished them to be in England. However, he stresses that he would not oblige nuns to remain in there forever: “Let them have liberty, at the end of every two or three years, to renew their vows, or otherwise, by the consent of friends.” He is no great advocate of the celibate life of the clergy, a life which is “an indispensable law of your church”. Yet he mentions the case of a Cardinal, “Ferdinand of Medicis”, who had been allowed to marry. Family reasons, Sir Charles explained, were in that case allowed to play a major role. And he asks Clementina whether people in convents were more pious than they would be out of them (VI. 9).

The Italian Scene: The Present

Almost a year has gone by since Sir Charles was asked by the Porrettas to leave Italy. Now, however, he is confronted with a new dilemma, for the family have asked him to return to Bologna, on account of Clementina’s deteriorating health. 560 Sir Charles applies for support and understanding from Harriet with whom he has fallen in love: “And now, madam, said he, a tenderness so speaking in his eyes ... What shall I say? I cannot tell what I should say.” He knows that Harriet “can pity him” as well as the “noble Clementina”. He explains that it is honour that forbids him to propose to Harriet, and honour that equally bids him to go to Italy, for he cannot be “unjust, ungenerous - selfish!” (III. 132).

And so Sir Charles sets out for Italy. Writing an account of this story to Lucy, Harriet admits to her jealousy: “Love is a narrower of the heart”, but at the same time she feels deep compassion for Clementina. The accusation of

559 See p. 106 above.
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“narrowness of the heart” equally applies to Clementina, and is one which, on the allegorical level, is directed at both the Church of England and the Catholic Church. For Clementina had accused Sir Charles of being a heretic. She had called him a “Mahometan”, a man of another religion. In her eyes Sir Charles was a man obstinate in his errors. Important is her remark that he had never told her he loved her. Moreover, he was a man of “inferior degree”, who was absolutely dependent upon his father’s bounty, a father living to the height of his estate. So “pride, dignity of birth, duty, religion”, everything is against a marriage between them (III. 169).

The reference to Islam is interesting in connection with Boehme’s remarks in the Aurora. For Boehme indignantly asks those who boast that they are Christians and pretend that they know the light, why they did “not walk therein”. And Boehme enquires further: “Dost thou think the name will make thee holy?” adding that “many a Jew, Turk, and Heathen will sooner enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, who had indeed their lamps well trimmed and furnished, than thou who boastest” (Aurora, 11:50).

Boehme continues in the same vein, asking his readers to “leave off [their] contentions” and to stop shedding innocent blood, nor to lay waste countries and cities, merely “to fulfill the devils will”. On the contrary, he asks them to put on “the Helmet of Peace, girt [themselves] with Love one to another, and practice Meeknesse.” He wants them to accept “the different forms of one another”, and not to kindle “the Wrath-fire”, but to live in meekness, chastity, friendliness and purity, for “then [they] shall be and live ALL in God” (Aurora, 22:41).

The English and Protestant Mrs Beaumont, a minor character, defends Sir Charles against Clementina’s accusations. Mrs Beaumont calls him a man of honour in every sense of the word. If moral rectitude, if practical religion would be lost in the rest of the world, she argues, it would be found in him. She adds that Sir Charles is courted by the best, the wisest, the most eminent men, wherever he goes; and that he does good without distinction of religion, sects, or nation (III. 169). Rejoicing in their “common root”, Sir Charles is the embodiment of Boehme’s vision, a friend of all mankind, a promotor of universal harmony, and like Cheyne, above all “the Varieties of Opinions, Sects,

561 Clementina’s comparison of Sir Charles with Muhammad is interesting since one of Zinzendorf’s bitterest enemies, Professor Johann Leonhard Fröreisen equally compared Zinzendorf with Muhammad in many publications and described the “Herrnhutertum“ as the “grössten Schandfleck” (cf. Friedhelm Ackva, “Der Pietismus in Hessen, in der Pfalz, im Elsass und in Baden“, in Der Pietismus im 18. Jahrhundert, ed. Martin Brecht., Volume 2, p. 216).
562 These words are reminiscent of Cheyne, see p. 67 above.
563 This made Sparrow write in “His Preface to the Reader” (B) in the Aurora that no one should boast that he was born not among “the heathens”, but among those that were “outwardly called Jewes of old, or Christians now, or of the Church of Rome, or Protestants, or of the Reformed Religion, or Presbyterians, Independents, Separatists, Seekers or Perfectionists.” For though they might think themselves better than the heathen, their lives and fruits did not exceed the lives and fruits of the heathen and these would rise up in judgment against them.
Disputes, and Controversies. The Porrettas are afraid of Sir Charles’s influence over Clementina. Once married to him, they fear that she would want to become a Protestant, which, according to them, would result in the loss of her precious soul. Clementina’s brother Jeronymo is quite upset at the uncompromising attitude of his family, for he wonders whether there is such an irreconcilable difference between the two religions (III.187).

The comparison between Clementina and Clarissa’s situation is obvious: in both cases the respective families are stiff and rigid. However, there is one important difference. Whereas in Clarissa Mrs Norton explains to Clarissa that “have gone so far that they know not how to recede” (Clarissa, IV.192), in Sir Charles Grandison it is Sir Charles who, as mediator and healer, asks the Porrettas to have “clemency” with their Clementina, which incidentally explains her name. Such clemency is finally achieved in the last Volume of the novel and it is for this reason that Volume VII is important, and should not be considered as superfluous.

In Volume V we learn that the Porrettas are now convinced that the only way to restore Clementina’s health is to comply with every wish of her heart (V. 529). However, they still fear that she will be “perverted” by Sir Charles’s religion, since he continues to refuse to become a Catholic, not even for appearance sake. When the Porrettas refer to Henry IV of France and others, Sir Charles answers that such men may have had less difficulty in changing their religion, because they were never strict in the practice of it in the first place: “They who can allow themselves in some deviations, may in others”. Though not wanting to boast of his own virtue, Sir Charles explains that it has always been his aim to be uniform, words once again reminiscent of Cheyne. He was “too well satisfied” with his own religion to have any doubts. Otherwise, he tells them, he would surely be influenced by the wishes of friends whom he valued so much and whose motives were the result of

564 See p. 60 above.
565 These lines are very reminiscent of the ones in Macbeth, where Macbeth reflects upon his crimes and says “I am in blood/ Stepped in so far that, should I wade no more, / Returning were as tedious as go o’er” (Macbeth, III.iv.136). As I have shown earlier, Richardson very much appreciated the “natural” talent of Shakespeare. We find many references to his plays throughout Sir Charles Grandison. Apart from the direct reference to Hamlet, there is the depiction of Clementina’s melancholy in which she strongly resembles Ophelia. Settling the Danby inheritance in an earlier scene, Sir Charles’s behaviour suggests a strong criticism of King Lear’s attitude towards his three daughters (I. 447). He wants parents to be indulgent towards their children (also in money matters), but they should... do nothing inconvenient to [themselves], or that is not strictly right by [their] other children (I. 454).
566 Lois Chaber refers to Anna Laetita Barbauld who said that Richardson had continued the story a whole volume beyond the proper termination, the marriage of its hero (which takes place in Volume VI), and Chaber adds that this judgment has been endorsed by most modern critics. (Lois A. Chaber, “Sir Charles Grandison and the Human Prospect”, in New Essays on Samuel Richardson, ed. Albert J. Rivero, London, 1996).
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their own piety and their concern for his “everlasting” welfare (V. 530).

Sir Charles, however, has no objection to Father Marescotti as Clementina’s spiritual director, if she should be his wife, but he does insist that Father Marescotti will confine his pious cares only to those who are Catholic and that he will not discuss “disputable points” with the servants, tenants, or neighbours, in a country where a different religion is established (V. 531). The Porrettas object to this reasoning and argue that, though the English complain loudly of persecution from the Catholic church, it is the Catholics who suffer in England (V. 531). As to their fears that Sir Charles may behave less generously to Catholic servants he retorts he has always been attended by Catholic servants while travelling and that they have never had any reason to complain of want of kindness from him. He explains that “we Protestants” do not confine salvation “within the pale of our own church”, whereas Catholics do, as a result of which they have therefore an argument for their zeal in endeavouring to make proselytes that Protestants do not have. Hence, Sir Charles concludes that generally speaking, a Catholic servant may live “more happily with a Protestant master, than a Protestant servant with a Catholic master”, adding that if his servants live up to their own professions, they shall be “indulged with all reasonable opportunities of pursuing the dictates of their own consciences.” Sir Charles believes that “a truly religious servant, of whatever persuasion, cannot be a bad one” (V. 532). Assuming that every man’s religion is his own affair, Sir Charles shows by his words that it does not concern, and indeed should not alarm, one’s neighbours. Here is another plea for tolerance and freedom of conscience within certain bounds in so far that the freedom of one person does not infringe upon the freedom of another.

Upon meeting with Sir Charles alone, Clementina is very nervous. She cannot speak, for “her heart is too big for its prison” (V. 563). Sir Charles offers himself on the same terms as before and repeats them again:

I am encouraged to hope you will be mine. You are to have your confessor. ..
Father Marescotti will do me the honour of attending you in that function. His piety, his zeal and my own charity for all those who differ from me in opinion, my honour so solemnly engaged to the family who condescend to entrust me with their dearest pledge, will be your security. (V. 563)

Clementina, however, worried as ever about his soul, will not give up and once again asks him whether he will not reconsider to become a Catholic (V. 563). She then gives him a paper and leaves him. He is astonished at the contents in which she tries to explain the clash between her heart and her duty, as well as her continued concern for Sir Charles’s lost soul. She refers to her loss of reason, which is only just returning. But first and foremost, she wants him, whose soul is obstinate and perverse, to stop harassing her. The paper reads as follows:
O THOU whom my heart best loveth, forgive me! ... My duty calls upon me one way: my heart resists my duty, and tempts me not to perform it: Do thou, O God, support me in the arduous struggle! Let it not, as once before, overthrow my reason; my but just-returning reason. ... My Tutor, my Brother, my Friend! O most beloved and best of men! seek me not in marriage! ... Thy SOUL was ever most dear to Clementina. ... And is not that SOUL, thought I, to be saved? Dear obstinate, and perverse! And shall I bind my Soul to a Soul allied to perdition? That so dearly loves that Soul, as hardly to wish to be separated from it in its future lot. O thou most amiable of men! How can I be sure, that, were I thine, thou wouldst not draw me after thee, by Love, by sweetness of Manners, by condescending Goodness? (V. 564)

Clementina further explains that she once thought a heretic the worst of beings, but now has been led by his amiable piety and his universal charity to all his fellow creatures to think more favourably of heretics (V. 564). She also expresses her doubts as to whether he really loves her or merely feels compassion for her, even though her pride makes her think that he does love her. Yet she fears his behaviour towards her is rather owing to his “generosity, compassion and nobleness”. Since it is in his power to hold her fast or to set her free, she asks him to make some other woman happy (V. 565).

Clementina reiterates her wish to enter into a convent. Imploring everyone around her, she asks for permission “still to be God’s child, the spouse of my Redeemer only”, for that is what she wants to be. She wishes to spend the rest of her life in a “place consecrated to [God’s] glory”, to pray for them all and for the “conversion and happiness of the man, whose soul [her] soul loveth, and ever must love.” Referring to the estate left to her by her two grandfathers (reminiscent of Clarissa), she tells Sir Charles that “this portion of the world” is nothing compared with her soul’s “everlasting welfare”. She does not mind at all should this estate pass to her “cruel cousin Laurana” and, referring to the horrible treatment she suffered at the hands of Laurana, Clementina wonders whether she shall not have a great revenge by giving Laurana this worldly estate (V. 566). Calling Sir Charles Grandison “divine, almost divine, Philanthropist” (V. 566), she asks forgiveness for her refusal to marry him.

Clementina is convinced that God has laid his hand upon her (V. 573). Fearing a relapse of her health, Sir Charles is not so convinced and calls her in his letter to Dr Bartlett a “noble Enthusiast”. Still fighting for Sir Charles’s soul she continues to ask him to convert on every occasion they meet. Sir Charles summarizes the situation neatly when he tells the Porrettas:

I need not tell you ... what a zealous Catholic she is. She early wished me to be one: And had I not thought myself obliged in honour, because of the confidence placed in me by the whole family, to decline the subject, our particular

568 See p. 81 above.
conversations, when she favoured me with the name of tutor, would have gen-
ernally taken that turn. Her unhappy illness was owing to her zeal for religion,
and to her concealing her struggles on that account. She never hinted at mar-
riage in her resveries. She was still solicitous for the SOUL of the man she
wished to proselyte; and declared herself ready to lay down her life, could she
have effected that favourite wish of her heart. (V. 585-586)

However, Sir Charles decides to make one last effort to persuade her to marry
him, because he believes that “from female delicacy, she may, perhaps, expect
to be argued with, and to be persuaded”. He thinks that, as a man and as her
admirer, he should “remove her scruples” before he can finally give up (V. 587).

But Clementina does not want to be persuaded “for the sake of her own
peace of mind “(V. 592). Sir Charles’s frustration shows when the words “nar-
row zeal” and “sweet enthusiast” crop up. Even so, he insists in another con-
versation with the Porrettas, who by now had rather have her married to
Grandison than in a convent, that conscience has a higher claim than filial du-
ty: “What plea can a parent make use of”, he asks them, but that of “filial
duty?”. And he adds that “where the child can plead conscience”, ought filial
duty then to be insisted on (V. 595). He advises the family to give her full time
to “consider and reconsider” the case.

Clementina now for the last time wants to hear from Sir Charles that he
will not become a Catholic and then she will believe him. Exasperated, Sir
Charles asks her whether she has considered the inequality in the case
between them, for he does not ask her to change her principles. He adds that
she is “only afraid of her own perseverance”, but is left her own freedom, as
well as her confessor to “strengthen and confirm” her. Yet she asks of him an
actual change against his convictions, a condition which he considers quite
unequal. He admonishes Clementina: “dearest Lady Clementina! Can you, can
you (your mind great and generous in every other case) insist upon a condition
so unequal? Be great throughout” (V. 597). When she again refers him to her
letter, he calls her “despotic” and “not impartial”. Asked by the Marchioness to
calm her daughter, because her soul is “wrought up to too high a pitch” he
retorts that he must first try to “quiet his own” (V. 597). Clementina then con-
firms her resolution not to marry him. The scene is upsetting to both, as
appears from the following:

God give you, Sir, and me too, ease of mind. But I find my head overstrained.
It is bound round as with a cord, I think, putting her hands to each side of it,
for a moment - You must leave me, Sir. But if you will see me to-morrow morn-
ing, and tell me whither you intend to go, and what you intend to do, I shall
be obliged to you. Cannot we walk together, Sir, as brother and sister? Or as
tutor and pupil? - Those were happy days! Let us try to recover them. She put
her hand to her forehead, as apprehensive of disorder; and looked discom-
posed. I bowed to both Ladies, in silence; retired; and, without endeavouring
to see any-body else, went to my lodgings. (V. 598)

Clementina’s complaints about the state of her “overstrained” head are reminiscent of Clarissa’s accusation that the Harlowes and Lovelace had “killed her head”.569

When Clementina adheres to her resolution not to marry him, Sir Charles is finally able to return to England. Her last wish is that he should marry some other woman as soon as possible and that then, perhaps, she will be allowed to visit him and his wife in England (V. 630). Her parting words to him are:

God preserve thee and convert thee, best of Protestants, and worthiest of men! Guide thy footsteps, and bless thee in thy future and better lot! But if the woman, whom thou shalt distinguish by thy choice, loves thee not, person and mind, as well as she before thee, she deserves thee not. (V. 637)

Sir Charles answers that he will resign to her will, even admiring her for it, and wishes that their friendship may last. Almost prophetically, he expresses the hope that they “may know each other hereafter” in a place where all is “harmony and love” and where no difference in opinion can sunder, as now, persons otherwise formed to promote each other’s happiness” (V. 637).

In a letter to Jeronymo Sir Charles now admits that there is an English woman, “beautiful as an Angel”, whom he could have loved, “and only her, of all the women he had ever beheld,” if he had never known Clementina. It is this English woman whom he loves “with a flame as pure as the heart of Clementina, or as her own heart, can boast”. He explains how Clementina’s distressed mind affected him and that he blamed her sufferings to her love for him. At the time he thought her a “first Love” and he felt that, though the difficulties seemed insuperable, he ought “in honour, in gratitude” not to make his addresses to any other woman, till the destiny of Clementina was fixed. His problem was to do “justice to the merits of both, and yet not appear to be divided by a double love” (VI. 10-11).

If we consider Clementina and Harriet once again on the mystical level as representing the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England respectively, we see Sir Charles (God, the Trinity in Unity)570 loving the Roman Catholic Church as a first love. She rejected him, however, out of the misguided perception that his soul was lost. Her intolerance is contrasted with the tolerance of the Church of England which allows of a possibility for the salvation of souls outside its own pale (V. 616). As Clementina herself admitted, she was “in the midst of briars and thorns” and asked Sir Charles to lend her his “extricating hand” so as “to conduct her into the smooth and pleasant path” (V. 612).

569 See pp. 70 and 71 above.
570 See p. 183 above.
Up to now, he has not been successful, but we will see that, together with Harriet, Sir Charles, as the Healer, will in the end succeed.

**The English Scene**

Volumes VI and VII are set in England. Free of his obligations to Clementina, Sir Charles immediately returns home and proposes to Harriet. There is a huge difference between Sir Charles’s tormented visits to Clementina and the happy ones to Harriet and her family, apparent from the following scene as described by Harriet to Charlotte in which the former seems to have retrieved a bit of her old spirit:

Lucy, Nancy, and my two cousin Holles’s, came and spread, two and two, the other seats of the bow-window ... with their vast hoops; undoubtedly, because they saw Sir Charles coming to us. It is difficult, whispered I to my aunt (petulant enough), to get him one moment to one’s self. My cousin James (Silly youth! thought I) stopp’d him in his way to me; but Sir Charles would not long be stop’d: He led the interrupter towards us; and a seat not being at hand, while the young Ladies were making a bustle to give him a place between them (tossing their hoops above their shoulders on one side) and my cousin James was hastening to bring him a chair; he threw himself at the feet of my aunt and me, making the floor his seat. (VI. 92)

Compared to his restrained behaviour towards Clementina, Sir Charles’s passion for Harriet makes him almost human. In fact, his passionate behaviour seems almost too much for Harriet, who asks herself whether she is a prude, an occasion which allows Richardson to elaborate on the origin of the word itself, for Harriet explains that it has a bad connotation and is as much abused as the word “puritan”:

He clasped me in his arms with an ardor - that displeased me not - on reflex-ion. .... I held out the hand he held not in his. .... He received it as a token of favour; kissed it with ardor; ... again pressed my cheek with his lips. .... Was he not too free? Am I a prude, [Charlotte]? In the odious sense of the abused word, I am sure, I am not: But in the best sense, as derived from prudence, and used in opposition to a word that denotes a worse character, I own myself one of those who would wish to restore it to its natural respectable signification, for the sake of virtue; which .... is in danger of suffering by the abuse of it; as Religion once did, by that of the word Puritan. (VI. 101)

Although Harriet is fairly happy, she does not feel overconfident and she cannot help herself thinking of Clementina all the time. Upon the occasion of Sir Charles giving her expensive jewelry, she reflects that “the jewel of jewels” is his heart, which makes her think of Clementina, as if her conscience tells her that she has stolen Sir Charles from Clementina:
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Something here, in my inmost bosom [Is it Conscience?] strike [sic] me, as if it said, Ah Harriet! - Triumph not; rejoice not! Check the overflowings of thy grateful heart! - Art thou not an invader of another’s rights? (VI. 137)

And on another occasion when Sir Charles is again rather passionate, she compares his behaviour towards her with that shown previously towards Clementina, a comparison which she acknowledges to be caused by her own jealousy:

My dear Miss Byron, let you and me withdraw. ... And he hurried me off. The surprize made me appear more reluctant than I was in my heart. Every one was pleased with his air and manner; and by this means he relieved himself from subjects with which he seemed not delighted, and obtained an opportunity to get me to himself ... Hurrying me into the Cedar-parlour; I am jealous, my Love, said he; putting his arm round me; You seemed loth to retire with me. Forgive me: But thus I punish you, whenever you give me cause: And ... he downright kissed me - My lip; and not my cheek - and in so fervent a way.571 ... Before I could recollect myself, he withdrew his arm; and, resuming his usual respectful air, it would have made me look affected, had I then taken notice of it. But I don’t remember any instance of the like freedom used to Lady Clementina. (VI. 142)

Their taking off together was because uncle Selby had shown himself less than generous towards what he called “schismatics”. It is another opportunity for Richardson to express through Sir Charles and the wise Mrs Shirley (“happy, thrice happy woman, ... who shall be considered as a partaker of [Sir Charles’s] goodness”, VI. 140), his own ecumenical dream. Mr Milbourne, minister of a Dissenting congregation in the neighbourhood, and a Dr Curtis are visiting at Selby-house. They are good friends by the mediation of Mrs Shirley (due to “her cheerful piety and her wisdom”). Harriet tells us that Sir Charles admired both men greatly and that he was free and easy with them, but attentive, as expecting “entertainment and instruction from them, and leading each of them to give it in his own way” (VI. 140-141). After Mr Milbourne and Dr Curtis have left, Sir Charles comments that he wanted no other proof “of their being good men, than they gave by their charity, and friendship to each other” (VI. 141).

571 That Richardson did not want Sir Charles to appear cold and asexual (which has been the complaint of many critics), may appear from Sir Charles’s impatience on his wedding day for Harriet to retire and his disappointment when she returns. In Charlotte’s words: “[Harriet] returned to company. The Bridegroom was looking out for us. My dearest Life, said he, Are you returned? - I thought - There he stopt. ... About Eleven, Mrs. Selby, unobserved, withdrew with the Bride. The Bride-maids ... waited on her to her chamber; saluted her, and returned to company. ... I then rushed down-stairs, and into the company. My brother instantly addressed me - My Harriet, whispered he, with impatience, returns not this night. You will see Mrs. Selby, I presume, by-and-by, returned I. He took his seat ... to avoid joining in the dances. His eye was continually turned to the door” (VI. 236-337).
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But uncle Selby does not agree at all with Sir Charles. In a letter to Charlotte, Harriet writes that her uncle is a zealous man “for the Church”, criticizing people whom he calls schismatics, but that Sir Charles had warned uncle Selby to refrain from “prescribing to tender consciences”. He reminds uncle Selby that they both had been abroad in countries where he and uncle Selby were seen as worse than schismatics, and they would not have liked to be “prescribed to, or compelled, in articles for which [they] were only answerable to the common Father of [them] all”. To this uncle Selby responds that he believes “if the truth were known” Sir Charles was “of the mind of that King of Egypt”, who said that he looked upon the diversity of religions in his kingdom with as much pleasure as he did on the diversity of flowers in his garden. To this accusation Sir Charles retorts that he did not “remember the name of that King of Egypt”, but that he most certainly did not share that opinion, for he would not, if he were a king, take pleasure in such a diversity. However, he adds that as the examples of kings were important, he would make his own behaviour as faultless as he could to let his people see the excellence of his persuasion, and his “uniform practical adherence” to it; instead of discouraging erroneous ones by “unjustifiable severity”. In Sir Charles’s view religious zeal usually was “a fiery thing” and he explains that he would “as soon quarrel with a man for his Face, as for his Religion” words once again reminiscent of Cheyne. Sir Charles concludes that a good man, if not over-heated by zeal, would always be a good man whatever his faith and as such should be entitled to their esteem as a fellow-creature. (VI. 141)

Sir Charles’s words do not convince uncle Selby, who asks Sir Charles what he thought of the Methodists: “What think you of the Methodists! Say you love ‘em; and, and, and, adds-dines, you shall not be my nephew” (VI. 141). Realizing that a continuation of the discussion is useless, Sir Charles finally resorts to the only attitude that had worked on a previous occasion with Lady Beauchamp and turns the whole argument into a jest: “You now, my dear Mr. Selby, make me afraid of you”. For such a “menace” was “the only one” that could make Sir Charles “temporize” (VI. 141). In the end Mrs Shirley steps in and rebukes uncle Selby, while Sir Charles saves the situation further by taking Harriet’s hand and asking uncle Selby to allow him to “make [his] advantage of uncle Selby’s unkindness” so as to withdraw with Harriet, out of “com-

572 See p. 67 above.
573 On April 12 Harriet was still trying to find fault with Sir Charles and, believing she had come upon one in his behaviour towards Lady Beauchamp, she writes to Lucy: “You will see him in a new light; and as a man whom there is no resisting, when he resolves to carry a point. But it absolutely convinces me, of what indeed I before suspected, that he has not an high opinion of our sex in general: And this I will put down as a blot in his character. He treats us, in Lady Beauchamp, as perverse humoursome babies, loving power, yet not knowing how to use it” (IV. 272). Sir Charles later explains to Lady Beauchamp that he treats all angry people as children (IV. 273), but that he is not used to making differences between men or women (IV. 278). He explains his behaviour to Lady Beauchamp as follows: “I was desirous either of turning the Lady’s displeasure into a jest, or of diverting it from the first object, in order to make her play with it, till she had lost it” (IV. 280).
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passion to Mr. Selby” and not to hear him “chidden” by the ladies present (VI. 141-142).

The Role of Dreams
Yet all is not well for Sir Charles in England. Mr Greville, another aggressive lover of Harriet’s, has challenged him to a duel (VI. 49 and 71). Greville’s threats are the cause of Harriet’s first dream described to Charlotte in her letter of October 27. Harriet writes what “shocking, wandering dreams” she had, which troubled her severely: “The terror they gave me, several times awakened me; but still, as I closed my eyes, I fell into them again”. Harriet did not know where these “ideal vagaries” came from, but she does know they cause her “pain or pleasure”, according to their “hue or complexion”, or rather according to her own (VI. 148).

The vision of a coming age of liberty as expressed in Sir Charles Grandison is something quite different from the dreams caused by external incidents. Cheyne felt that all dreaming is “imperfect and confused thinking.” He recognized various degrees of dreams between sound sleep and being awake: “conscious regular thinking and not thinking at all” are the two extremes. According to him as we incline to “waking or to sound sleep” we dream more or less, and our dreams are more wild, extravagant and confused, or more rational and consistent. Cheyne’s views are similar to those of the great medieval dream-interpretor Macrobius who distinguished between five main types of dreams:

There is the enigmatic dream, in Greek oneiros, in Latin somnium; second, there is the prophetic vision, in Greek horoma, in Latin visio; third, there is the oracular dream, in Greek chrematismos, in Latin oraculum; fourth, there is the nightmare, in Greek enypnion, in Latin insomnium; and last, the apparition, in Greek phantasma, which Cicero, when he has occasion to use the word, calls visium.

Harriet’s dream is of the nightmare type, and, according to Macrobius, not worth interpreting, because it has no prophetic significance. Nightmares are caused by physical or mental distress, as in Harriet’s case, or as Ecclesiastes says: “For a dream cometh through the multitude of business” (5:3). Harriet’s dream is a classic example in which we find the standard phenomena of fusion, blending and double-meaning (or “condensation” and “displacement”). Harriet describes the first part of her dream as follows:

574 “Enquiry into the Causes of Dreams”, in the Gentleman’s Magazine, XXIV, (1754), 36.
575 Macrobius, Commentary on The Dream of Scipio, transl. William Harris Stahl, New York, 1952, pp. 87-88. Richardson may have known The Dream of Scipio, a portion of the lost sixth book of Cicero’s Republic in which Cicero combines both dream and the consultation of spirits, for he mentions Cicero in Volume VI, p. 249: “You know what the past and present ages have owed, and what all future will owe, to Homer, Aristotle, Virgil, Cicero.”
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Such contradictory vagaries never did I know in my slumbers. Incoherencies of incoherence! - For example - I was married to the best of men: I was not married: I was rejected with scorn, as a presumptuous creature. I sought to hide myself in holes and corners. I was dragged out of a subterraneous cavern, which the sea had made when it once broke bounds, and seemed the dwelling of howling and conflicting winds; and when I expected to be punished for my audaciousness, and for repining at my lot, I was turned into an Angel of light; stars of diamonds, like a glory, encompassing my head. A dear little baby was put into my arms. Once it was Lucy’s; another time it was Emily’s; and at another time Lady Clementina’s! I was fond of it beyond expression. (VI. 148)

We see the shifting of the meaning of certain keywords, and we recognize her fears, her jealousy, her longings.

In the second part of her dream Harriet shows her fear that Sir Charles does not love her, and she makes a plea for divorce reminiscent of Milton. For now she dreams that she was married to Sir Charles, but that he did not love her. Mrs Shirley and her aunt beg him on their knees and with tears “to love their child”. They plead with him that Harriet’s love for him was of long standing and had begun “in gratitude”. He was the only man she had ever loved. Harriet describes how she wept in her dream, so much so that her face was wet with her real tears, as a result of which she woke up only to fall asleep again, continuing her distressing dream.

Sir Charles again appears in her dream, upbraiding her for being the cause of his not having Clementina. Sternly he says he thought her a much better creature than she proved to be, even though Harriet “in [her] own heart” felt that she had not changed much. Falling down at his feet she calls it her misfortune that he could not love her. She would not say it was his fault, for “Love and Hatred are not always in one’s power”. If he really did not love her, then he could and should divorce her, for she did not “desire to fasten herself” on a man who could not love her: “Let me be divorced from you, Sir, ... you shall be at liberty to assign any cause for the separation, but crime”. And she promises never to marry again, though he would be free (VI. 148-149).

Still Harriet’s dream continues, though differently. In this third part of her dream we hear about her fears for Sir Charles’s life. She describes that now Sir Charles loved her deeply, but when he approached her, or she him, he always became a ghost, evading her. Scenes change from England to Italy and vice versa. Italy, she thought, was a dreary wild place, covered with snow and frost; England, on the contrary, was a glorious country, gilded with a sun not too hot. The air was “perfumed with odours, wafted by the most balmy Zephyrs from orange-trees, citrons, myrtles, and jasmines.” In Italy she dreamt that Jeronymo’s wounds were healed, only to break out again afresh. Mr. Lowther, the physician, was obliged to flee the country for reasons Harriet did

See p. 181 above.
not know. She thought there was a fourth brother ("taking part with the cruel Laurana"), who was killed by Clementina’s brother, the general. Father Marescotti was “at one time a martyr for his religion; at another a Cardinal; and talked of for Pope”. But what was most shocking, Harriet writes to Charlotte, and which terrified her so much that she woke up in a horror which put an end to all her “resveries”, she dreamt that Sir Charles was assassinated by Greville (VI. 149).

Even though Harriet admits to the impact such dreams can have, she has, fortunately, enough common sense to explain away her dreams as merely “fleeting shadows of the night”. They are no more than “dreams, illusions of the working mind, fettered and debased as it is by the organs through which it conveys its confined powers to the grosser matter, body, then sleeping, inactive, as in the shades of death”. And yet Harriet concedes that she is “strongly impressed by them”, and tries to interpret them, even though “when reason is broad awake” it tells her that it is weakness to be disturbed by them. She recognizes that superstition is, more or less, in every mind “a natural defect”:

Happily poised is that mind, which, on the one hand, is too strong to be affected by the slavish fears it brings with it; and, on the other, runs not into the contrary extreme, Scepticism, the parent of infidelity. (VI. 149)

But Charlotte simply dismisses Harriet’s dreams, admonishing her never to let foolish dreams “claim a moment” of Harriet’s attention, for “imminent as seemed the danger, your superstition made it more dreadful to you than otherwise it would have been.” Charlotte reminds Harriet that she has a mind superior to such foibles: “Act up to its native dignity, and let not the follies of your nurses, in your infantile state, be carried into your maturer age, to deprecate your womanly reason” (VI. 197). Discussing the subject later with Sir Charles, Charlotte appeals to him: “Will you, my brother, allow of superstitious observances, prognostics, omens, dreams?” (VI. 242).

Harriet’s dreaming about Greville killing Sir Charles may have been caused by Greville’s earlier threats to Sir Charles, as well as by the rumour Harriet had heard of Greville having planned another attack on Sir Charles. These fears, however, contribute to Harriet’s finally deciding to set a date for the marriage, and in her letter to Charlotte dated November 6 Harriet promises to fix the wedding day if Sir Charles returns alive from a short visit to Sir Beauchamp and Sir Hargrave, who are both very ill: “Hand and Heart I will be [his], if [Sir Charles] require it, to-morrow morning!” (VI. 177). And when Sir Charles unexpectedly returns the next day, safe and sound, she throws herself

---

577 These dreams are similar to those Charlotte had about robbers upon hearing of Harriet’s adventures (I. 136) and to Clementina’s dream caused by her fears that Sir Charles had been killed by her family (“I had a horrid dream last night ... I thought I stumbled over the body of a dead man”, III. 241). There are also Aunt Eleanor’s dreams: “seas crossed, rivers forded – dangers escaped by the help of angels and saints” (V. 654).
in his arms, no more “punctilio”, and sets the date for Thursday, November 16 (VI. 191). On the wedding-day Sir Charles again refers to their forming a “family of love” when he wonders why the ladies “sequester” themselves from the company. And he asks whether they are not “all of a Family to-day?” (VI. 231).

The next day, when the festivities are over, Charlotte is asked whether there was another man like her brother. She answers that Sir Charles is most likely to resemble “him, who has an unbounded charity, and universal benevolence”, and who, “imitating the Divinity, regards the heart, rather than the head” much more than rank or fortune, even if it were “princely”. However, she explains that Sir Charles is not a leveller, but thinks that rank or degree entitles a man to respect, at least if he is not utterly unworthy of both (VI. 241). This text reinforces Richardson’s preoccupation in Sir Charles Grandison with such concepts as charity, universal benevolence, God and the heart as well as the head.

The Grand Finale

In the seventh and last volume of Sir Charles Grandison Richardson connects the Italian and English stories. It is in this volume, undoubtedly the most important one of the seven, that we see Richardson’s ecumenical, Philadelphian vision finally come to fruition. It is also in this volume that we shall see, according to Richardson, that there is no difference between science and the essence of Christianity. For Sir Charles, the Inner Light, equally admires science and scientific progress.

We are informed of Sir Charles and Harriet’s plans to set out for London first and from there “with all of [them]” (VII. 263) to go on to Grandison Hall. When they arrive there (VII. 268), we get a detailed description of the house. One of the first things Sir Charles does is to show Harriet his mother’s cabinet and present her with the keys, suggesting that in there she could deposit her letters and correspondence, which he would very much like to see if she would allow it. Yet he reminds her that it would be entirely her own choice, for he wanted her “whole heart” to be in “the grant of favours of this kind” (VII. 269-270). Again we find the stress upon the concept of “choice” which Sir Charles, or the Holy Spirit, is to promote.

This scene is counterpart to the one in Clarissa which gives us the extreme measures the cunning Lovelace resorts to in order to pry into Clarissa’s correspondence with Miss Howe. He uses her maid Dorcas to get to her letters:

Dorcas has transcribed for me the whole letter of Miss Howe ... of which before I had only extracts. She found no other letter added to that parcel: but this,

578 See footnote 406 above.
579 See p. 154 ff. above.
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and that which I copied myself ... last Sunday while she was at church ... are enough for me. ... Dorcas tells me that her lady has been removing her papers from the mahogany chest into a wainscot box, which held her linen, and which she put into her dark closet. We have no key of that at present. No doubt but all her letters, previous to those I have come at, are in that box. Dorcas is uneasy upon it: yet hopes that her lady does not suspect her; for she is sure that she laid in everything as she found it. (II. 434)

We get a glimpse of Sir Charles’s study in which he has collected books on science as well as all sorts of instruments for geographical, astronomical and other scientific observations (VII. 271). There is also a servants library in three classes. The first class of books are related to divinity and morality. The second class is concerned with “housewifry”, and the third consists of history, “true” adventures, voyages, and “innocent amusements”. Organization is important, for the classes are marked on the cases with I, II, III, with the same on the back of each book, “the more readily to place and replace them, as a book is taken out for use”. We are even told that they are bound in buff for strength (VII. 286). The gardener keeps his own books in a little house in the garden, but according to Mrs Curson, the housekeeper, her master “was himself a Library of gardening, ordering the greater articles by his own taste” (VII. 286).

In Mrs Curson’s apartment Harriet sees a glass-case filled with “physical matters”. Asked what it is for, Mrs Curzon aswers that it contains “all the useful drugs in medicine”. She further informs Harriet that since his last return to England Sir Charles has employed a skilful apothecary, whom he pays for his drugs. It is this gentleman who “dispenses physic to all his tenants”, also to those who are not able to pay for advice. Moreover, no one is ever sent away, not even those who are not his tenants, when recommended by Dr Bartlett (VII. 286). Mrs Curson adds that there is also a surgeon on the estate who lives in a house within five miles of Grandison Hall, almost in the middle of the estate, and who pays no rent. Educated by an “eminent surgeon of one of the London hospitals”, this “very worthy” young man attends Sir Charles’s tenants, but also “every casualty that happens within distance”, when no other surgeon is available (VII. 286).

As has been noted, Grandison Hall was built in the form of an H. Lucy describes it as a large and convenient house, situated in a spacious park which has several fine avenues leading to it (VII. 272). The lanes towards the house in the form of an H (the Word, or breathing of the Trinity of God) are reminiscent of Zinzendorf’s Tropenlehre in which he had elaborated the idea that “God fulfils Himself in many ways”, with the different churches merely preparing the world for the Kingdom of God. The house and its surroundings is also reminiscent of the new Jerusalem depicted in the Book of Revelation by John:

580 See p. 154 above.
And I saw a new heaven and a new earth. ... And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. ... And he carried me away in the spirit ... and shewed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God. ... Her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal. ... And the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass. ... And the twelve gates were twelve pearls, every several gate was of one pearl: and the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass. And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it, for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it. ... And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into it. And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life. (Rev. 21:1-27)

We read that the gardens and lawn are as boundless as the mind of Sir Charles, and as free and open as his countenance. A description follows of a winding stream on the north side of the park, almost a river, abounding with trout and other fish. A “noble cascade” tumbles down its foaming waters from a rock. The park has big trees, which, so we are told, must therefore have been planted by the “ancestors of the excellent owner”, whose views are geared to “open and enlarge many fine prospects”. Sir Charles likes to preserve as much as possible the plantations of his ancestors, and particularly thinks it a kind of impiety to fell a tree that was planted by his father. Again we read that the park has wonderful “prospects”, for it is bounded only by sunk fences: “the eye is carried to views that have no bounds” (VII. 272-273). The mentioning of “prospects” and “views” which have “no bounds” or are “boundless” may refer to the Age of the Holy Ghost during which period Cheyne’s “Elect” and Bourignon’s “ambassadors and prophets” may be gathered in the “last age of the world”, all regenerated into God’s spirit. The “ancestors” may refer to the Father and the Son (the Old and New Testament) out of whom the Holy Ghost evolved, and the “tree” may refer to the fact that the many dispensations are mere branches of the same tree. All of these concepts are reminiscent of Boehme.

Lucy then goes on to describe the orchard which was planted in a “natural slope” with the higher fruit-trees, such as pears, in a semi-circular row, followed by the apples at a small distance, to be again followed by cherries, plums, apricots, etc. (VII. 273). The description of the river and the trees again is reminiscent of the Book of Revelation:

And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out
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of the throne of God and of the Lamb. .... On either side of river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month, and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. And there shall be no more curse. (Rev. 22:1-3)

It is then to this house and its parks that the desperate Clementina decides to flee. Her flight was caused by her fear of having to decide whether or not to get married (the clash between authority or duty and conscience), for her “heart” was still very “averse to a married life”. She hates the efforts by her family to persuade her to a marriage she does not want to enter into: “Persuasion, cruel persuasion! A kneeling father, a sighing mother; generous, but entreating brothers”. And now she has decided to flee Italy to find “asylum” in England (VII. 326). When Sir Charles hears she has arrived in London, he immediately sets out for the capital in search of her (VII. 331). He explains his reasons to Harriet:

My dearest Harriet, said he, encircling my waist, will not, cannot doubt the continuance of my tenderest Love. I am equally surprised and disturbed at the step taken. .... She is ... desolate and unprotected. You can pity equally her unhappy friends. They are following her: They are all good: They mean well. Yet over-persuasion, as you lately observed, in such a case as hers, is a degree of persecution. (VII. 329)

Sir Charles must help her, because he considers the “over-persuasion” of her family a form of persecution. Harriet asks him to give Clementina protection and to consider herself as a “strengthener, not a weakener” of Sir Charles.

Sir Charles finds Clementina in London where she has been staying for the last ten days. Acting as “mediator” he promises Clementina to “prevail” upon her parents and friends to leave her absolutely free to choose her “own state”, without using either compulsion or persuasion. But he asks her to leave her suitor, Count of Belvedere, some hope (VII. 338). Sir Charles is never depicted as the Judge. In his dealings with his father’s mistress, Mrs Oldham, he combined mercy as well as justice and wanted to be seen as a friend (I. 364-365). When discussing the Captain Anderson affair with Charlotte, he answers Charlotte’s question as to who should be the judge that it must be her own heart (I. 397). He refers to the final judgment in the scene on old maids:

We must ... throw merit in one scale, demerit in the other; and if the former weigh down the latter, we must in charity pronounce to the person’s advantage. So it is humbly hoped we shall be finally judged ourselves: who is faultless? (II. 428)

The same attitude is found when Dr Bartlett explains to Harriet Sir Charles’s
“stewardship” of his estates. Dr Bartlett depicts Sir Charles as a man who pays attention to even the minutest things, for nothing escapes his attention. He sets about repairs the moment they become necessary. Moreover, he does everything to improve the estate, so that his is the best estate in the country. His tenants are well looked after and he instructs his “master-workmen” to do “justice to the tenants as well as to him”, and even to throw the turn of the scale in his tenants’ favour. For they are not only his workmen, but also his “friends” and he does not want to be “both judge and party” (VII. 287-288).

Returning to our discussion of Clementina in London we find that, quite wisely, both on the literal and mystical level, Harriet decides to come to London too, arriving March 1 (VII. 351). Perhaps it is here that their marriage resembles Zinzendorf’s “Streiterehe” with his first wife. Summing up Clementina to Mrs Shirley, Harriet shows a combination of (human) dimness and (divine) astuteness:

The woman who, from motives of Religion, having the heart of a Sir Charles Grandison in her hand, loving him above all earthly creatures, and all her friends consenting, could refuse him her vows, must be, in that act, the greatest, the most magnanimous, of women.

For we may ask ourselves whether the zealous Clementina was indeed “the greatest, the most magnanimous, of women”. And Harriet rightly wonders whether “the noble Lady” would have acted the way she did, if she had not been stimulated by that “glorious Enthusiasm, of which her disturbed imagination had shewn some previous tokens”. The very same enthusiasm which, Harriet reminds us, had given in the past, when “rightly directed”, “the palm of martyrdom to Saints” (VII. 351).

Upon meeting Clementina for the first time, Harriet is confirmed in what she suspected. Even though that now she has seen Clementina, Harriet loves her even more, she at times sees a “wildish cast” in Clementina’s eyes, which reminds her that Clementina’s head had been disturbed (VII. 353). Yet Harriet strongly disapproves of people trying to control Clementina only because she is a woman and to treat her as if she had no will of her own, whereas Harriet thinks Clementina is probably smarter than her self-willed brothers:

Why, taking advantage of her Sex, is such a person to be controuled, and treat...
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ed as if she were not to have a will; when she has an understanding, perhaps, superior to that of either of her wilful brothers? (VII. 353)

In the above we recognize Miss Howe speaking to Clarissa on the insolence and cruelty of Clarissa’s arrogant brother John and evil sister Arabella:

Your insolent brother - what has he to do to control you? Were it me [I wish it were for one month, and no more] I’d show him the difference. I would be in my own mansion, pursuing my charming schemes and making all around me happy. I would set up my own chariot. I would visit them when they deserved it. (Clarissa, I. 125)

Miss Howe tells Clarissa that if her brother and sister would give themselves airs, she would let them know that she was their sister, and not their servant. And if that was not enough, she would “shut [her] gates against them and bid them go and be company for each other” (Clarissa, I. 125).

Returning to Clementina, she explains her own behaviour to Harriet as follows:

I was ever a perverse creature! Whatever I set my heart upon, I was uneasy, till I had compassed it. My pride, and my perverseness, have cost me dear. But of late I have been more perverse than ever. My heart ran upon coming to England. I could think of nothing till I came. I have tried that experiment. I am sick of it. I do not like England, now I see I cannot be unmolested here. But my favourite for years, was another project. That filled my mind, and helped me to make the sacrifice I did. - And here I am come to almost the only country in Europe, which could render my darling wish impracticable. Why went I not to France? I had with me sufficient to have obtained my admission into any order of nuns: And had I been once professed! - I will get away still, I think. Befriend me, my sister! (VII. 359)

Her “pride and perversity”, indeed her heart, had caused her to come to England, a step she now thoroughly regrets, because there are no convents in England. To find those, she realizes, too late, she should have gone to France. Clementina acknowledges to Harriet that she is a zealous Catholic and reminds Harriet of the Roman Catholic doctrine of merits. She explains that she would have laid down her life to save Sir Charles’s soul, but now that he has continued unconverted, she hopes that God will be merciful to Sir Charles, and to Harriet too for that matter (VII. 361). Harriet does not doubt that this will be the case, for “Mercy is the darling attribute of the Almighty. He is the God of all men.”

583 See Clarissa (IV. 120-121) for a “meditation on mercy” in which we read “Why will ye break a leaf driven to and fro? Why will ye pursue the dry stubble? Why will ye write bitter words against
different nations of the world, though of different persuasions, did not really consider themselves as the creatures of one God “the Sovereign of a thousand worlds” (VII. 367).

In the trail of Clementina, Jeronymo and the whole family arrive on March 12 accompanied by the Count of Belvedere (VII. 364). Sir Charles asks Harriet to assure Clementina that (contrary to Clarissa’s family) she will find everyone of her friends determined to do all in their power to make her happy. Resentment is not in their nature, for they “breathe nothing but Reconciliation and Love” (VII. 369).

Everyone of Clementina’s family are invited to stay with Sir Charles at Grosvenor Square. Harriet asks her grandmother Shirley to pray for the “poor Clementina”, but also for a happy reconciliation. Moreover, Harriet expresses her hope that “tranquility of mind” may be restored to this noble family, a tranquility “so necessary to that of your dear Sir Charles, and [herself]” (VII. 373).

Sir Charles enters into negotiations with the Porrettas and Clementina. A list is drawn up by Sir Charles which contains the conditions to be agreed upon by both parties: Clementina has to give up all aspirations to enter into a convent; she is free to choose her own way of life and to use the profits of the estate bequeathed to her by her grandfathers, if she wants to. She can choose her own servants as well as her confessor with her parents having the “negative preserved” while she continues to live with them; the Count of Belvedere is to discontinue his addresses to her; her family will stop persuading her to marry any man whatever, with her parents preserving the right to propose, but not to urge (VII. 374-375). Until an agreement has been reached, Clementina will not allow the family to see her. Her mother wants to speed up the process, because she is afraid of the consequences to Clementina’s physical and mental health.

Clementina is upset at the condition she should give up her “scheme, [her] darling scheme” (VII. 377) for the sake of which she rejected Sir Charles. However, Harriet urges her to meet her parents one fourth of the way. The family is ready to accept the plan “most cheerfully” (VII. 378) and Harriet beseeches Clementina not to refuse the offered olive-branch (VII. 379). They finally agree and meet again for the first time on March 28 (VII. 382). The Bishop promises not to mention one word of what happened in the past, for nobody was at fault. He affirms that they are all happy once more: “happy on the con-
ditions prescribed to both by this friend of mankind in general, and of our family in particular” (VII. 383).

Jeronymo is overcome with joy. He describes Sir Charles as his ever noble, his venerable brother and promises that “every article of my Grandison’s plan” shall be carried out. Moreover, he is sure that Sir Charles and his family shall accompany the Porrettas to Italy, for they shall be all “one family” (VII. 383). And Mrs Beaumont, who is also present, adds that they came over to heal Clementina’s wounded mind (reminiscent of Cheyne) and that everyone is happy since they now understand one another much better than before “the absence” (VII. 383).

Next Sir Charles and Harriet invite the Porrettas to Grandison Hall (VII. 394). More guests arrive with Caroline and Lord L., and Charlotte and Lord G. coming as soon as they can (VII. 409). Harriet calls Sir Charles “the Soul of us all” (VII. 409) and there is harmony all around in “their noble circle” (VII. 410). She writes to Mrs Shirley that, except at certain devotional hours of retirement, they seem all to be of one faith. They only discuss points “in which all good Christians are agreed” and never mention controversial religious subjects. Harriet adds that Mrs Shirley, who has “a true catholic charity for the worthy of all persuasions”, would be delighted to see the affectionate behaviour of the two clergymen towards each other. For they are always together, walking or riding out; or when inside in their own apartments, reading or talking together. This, Harriet believes, must show to Clementina that “charitable and great minds”, however differing in some essential articles of religion, might “mingle hearts and love”; and Sir Charles’s “catholicism” must equally convince Clementina that she might have been happy with him, while keeping her own faith (VII. 410).

Harriet compares her grandmother’s “true catholic charity for the worthy of all persuasions” with Sir Charles’s “catholicism” and we are reminded of Byrom’s poem “A Catholic Christian’s Dying Speech”, in which he had written:

Join’d, tho’ of this divided Church, in Heart,
To what is good in every other Part;
Whatever is well-pleasing in God’s Sight,
In any Church, with that I wou’d unite;
Praying that ev’ry Church may have its Saints,
And rise to the Perfection that it wants.586

There are, however, still some problems with Clementina, who cannot let go of her dream to enter into a convent. When the subject of her grandfather’s estate comes up, an estate which was to go to Laurana if Clementina did not
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marry. Clementina says to Sir Charles that “the motive which may allowably have weight with my friends, ought not to have principal weight with me”. She asks him: “Is it not setting an earthly estate against my immortal soul?” (VII. 431). Sir Charles does not agree with her, for he is convinced that she does not have to follow Christ and become a martyr (Clarissa had fulfilled that task in the earlier Second Age of the World). Living now in the Third Age of the Holy Spirit he believes that she has virtues which cannot be exerted in a convent. On the contrary, Clementina should take the opportunity to display them for the good of other people. Sir Charles is quick to add that he does not argue as a Protestant, for the most zealous Catholic, if “unprejudiced, circumstanced as you are, must hold the same ideas” (VII. 431).

When the Porrettas receive the welcome news that Laurana is dead, there is no more need for them to urge Clementina to marry the Count of Belvedere, since the estate will now automatically revert to the eldest son if Clementina has no children (VII. 446). Clementina shows Harriet her arguments for and against marrying which she has set down in two opposite columns (VII. 448). Finally, on May 25, she writes a letter in which she promises to submit to her family’s wishes not to enter a convent:

How did my whole soul aspire after the veil! - Insuperable obstacles having arisen against the union of your child with one exalted man, how averse was I to enter into a covenant with any other! ... The Chevalier Grandison has since convinced me, by generous and condescending reasonings, that I could not, in duty to the will of my two grandfathers, and in justice to my elder brother and his descendants, renew my wishes after the cloister. I submit. (VII. 448)

She further observes that she had always recognized the Count’s merits, but wants a year respite to consider the state of her head and heart (VII. 449) during which time she will leave the Count absolutely free. She promises that her parents’ wishes and her own duty and conscience will be her guides. However, she reiterates that opposition has its roots in importunity and warns that, at the moment, she has no notion she will ever be able to make them happy (VII. 452).

Now that all problems are resolved the Porrettas, according to a plan Clementina had laid down at the request of her family, decide to leave in a month’s time, except for Jeronymo, who will stay behind to try the English baths in the hope that they will contribute to improve his health (VII. 453). Walking in the garden, Clementina and Harriet are joined by Sir Charles. Commenting on where they are standing, Sir Charles says:

Sweet sisters! Lovely friends ... Let me mark this blessed spot with my eye; looking around him: then on [Harriet]; ... Friendship ... will make at pleasure a safe bridge over the narrow seas; it will cut an easy passage thro’ rocks and moun-
tains, and make England and Italy one country. Kindred souls are always near.
(VII. 454)

He promises that a little temple will be built on that very spot, consecrated to
their triple friendship, which will be called after Clementina (VII. 455). The
above references to “kindred souls” and “triple friendship” as well as the per-
ception of (the Church of) England and (the Roman Catholic) Italy as “one
country”, clearly shows the influence of Boehme’s quest for universal harmo-
ny, with the Church as a spiritual society where every member is governed by
the Spirit of God. Sir Charles’s Family of Love are they “that are Christ’s at his
coming. Then cometh the end”.
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