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Introduction

Between 1740 and 1754 Samuel Richardson, a busy and successful printer in London, wrote three novels which were to have a major impact on European literature. Possibly as a result of the prevalent tendency of feminist1 and Freudian critics to secularize eighteenth-century texts and to deny any spiritual meaning to them, Richardson has most often been accused of having an obsession with sex, which has led, in the second half of the twentieth century to an avalanche of Freudian criticism, beyond the scope of this study. It will suffice to refer to a succinct summary of the main Freudian readings up to 1971 as found in the impressive biography of Richardson by Eaves and Kimpel.2 Later Freudian criticism is more or less a repetition of what had been said before, as is evident from Keymer’s discussion of Pierre Choderlos de Laclos’s *Les Liaisons dangereuses* (1782), in which certain critics who perceive a link between Richardson and Laclos argue that letters are a tool in the hands of manipulative writers so as to control the manipulated reader, rather than an exploration of the soul.3 Equally revealing is Keymer’s examination of certain critics who hold that the moralist Richardson is no more than a pervert.4 Such links and interpretations were rarely made in early criticism.

It is my objective, therefore, to carry out an investigation into English religious and philosophical thought during the first half of the eighteenth century focussing on Richardson, on his second novel *Clarissa* but especially on his third and last novel *Sir Charles Grandison*, which he considered to be his *magnum opus*. As we progress it will become clear how the mystically inclined George Cheyne, a Newtonian physician and Behmenist, was the link

---

1 Though feminist criticism acquired a distinct identity in the late 1960s and 1970s with the publication of various works, I will only mention *The Madwoman in the Attic* (1979) by Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar in which references to Richardson are especially to be found on pp. 317-318, 321 and 620.

2 Duncan T.C. Eaves, Ben D. Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson: A Biography*, Oxford, 1971, pp. 257-264, 519, 601. Some of the more important earlier critics who resorted to a Freudian reading are Ian Watt, Dorothy Van Ghent, A.D. McKillop, Leslie Fiedler, V.S. Pritchett, Morris Golden, Frederick C. Green, Mario Praz. Well-known are the views of S.T. Coleridge (“His mind is so very vile, so oozy, so hypocritical, praise-mad, canting, envious, concupiscent”, p. 1) and D.H. Lawrence (“Richardson’s calico purity and his underclothing excitement”, p. 519).
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between certain seventeenth-century ideas as expressed by Boehme, the Quakers, Fénelon, Poiret, and those found in William Law’s works, especially after 1735, as well as in Richardson’s last two novels. Cheyne’s works clearly show that certain Enlightenment objectives were mixed with the late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century counter-movement of mystical or radical Pietism with its emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men. This led to a confrontation between the defenders of Light and the defenders of Enlightenment.

In Germany a decisive moment in the development of the Pietist movement was the publication in 1675 of P.J. Spener’s *Pia Desideria*, a set of six proposals for restoring true religion. As a result the word “Pietist”, as a nickname, came into use. Pietism became a movement with its emphasis on the inner or inward Light, was heir to the mystical tradition. The latter, with its emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men, was an important movement, not only because it affected many similar movements, such as John Wesley’s Methodism, but also because, as we shall see, it influenced Samuel Richardson.

I will discuss the “spiritual” Samuel Richardson and show that ultimately Richardson’s goal was to convey a message of love and universal harmony deduced from the ideas of Cheyne and Law, as well as directly and indirectly from the theosophical system of Jacob Boehme, who deeply influenced the radical pietist movement especially. In both *Clarissa* and in *Sir Charles Grandison* we see the influence of “theosophy”, denoting knowledge of divine things. Theosophy was revived in the seventeenth century in both Latin and vernacular forms to denote the kind of speculation based on intuitive knowledge, which is found in the Jewish Kabbalah. Hostility to Kabbalah greatly increased in the eighteenth and later centuries. The term “theosophy” is often applied to the system of Boehme, the “Teutonic Philosopher”. Gershom Scholem defines theosophy as a mystical doctrine purporting to perceive and describe the workings of God:

5 As a result the word “Pietist”, as a nickname, came into use. Pietism became a movement within Protestantism which concentrated on the “practice of piety”, rooted in inner experience and expressing itself in a life of religious commitment.

6 Roughly we can distinguish between mainstream Lutheran and Reformed Pietism and radical Pietism. The latter, with its emphasis on the inner or inward Light, was heir to the mystical tradition. Within the circle of radical Pietism we sometimes find millenarian expectations, and more or less unorthodox doctrines.

7 The adjective “spiritual” is used here to refer to Richardson’s subjective practice and experience of his religion. The word spiritualitas first appeared in the fifth century. It refers to the quality of life which should result from the spiritual gifts (according to Paul: “the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good”, 1 Cor. 12:7), imparted to all who believe in Christ. Some of the spiritual gifts listed at 1 Cor. 12:8-10 are of a more extraordinary character and include healing and prophecy, but, according to Paul, charity is the greatest of all the spiritual gifts (1 Cor. 13:13). From the twelfth century onwards a narrowing of the word spiritualitas and of related expressions such as “spiritual life” occurred. “Spiritual life” came to be regarded as more or less identical with interior religion. Meditation and mysticism (a loving union with God or an experiential knowledge of God) are considered to be major factors in spirituality.
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By the term I mean that which was generally meant before the term became a label for modern pseudo-religion, i.e. theosophy signifies a mystical doctrine, or school of thought, which purports to perceive and describe the mysterious workings of the Divinity. … Theosophy postulates a kind of divine emanation whereby God abandoning his self-contained repose, awakens to mysterious life. … Theosophists in this sense were Jacob Boehme and William Blake.⁸

Boehme’s theosophy was called Behmenism in England. Among the first to give an outline of the spread of Behmenism in England during the seventeenth century was R.M. Jones, who pointed at the relation between the Quakers and Boehme.⁹ The chief representative of English Behmenism in the eighteenth century was William Law, who had been introduced to Boehme’s work by George Cheyne.

Though Pamela is not really relevant to my discussion of the spiritual side of Richardson, we find that his second and third novel have a great deal to offer in this respect. I will show how Clarissa can be viewed as a transition towards Sir Charles Grandison, Richardson’s third and last novel, in which he expressed his vision of love and harmony most clearly and explicitly. I will explore Sir Charles Grandison in some detail in the last chapter of this study.

A Tripartite Division of Richardson’s Novels

We can trace the organic growth of Richardson’s spiritual thought by interpreting his three novels, Pamela, Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison analogically, representing three stages, or ages: the First Age of the Father (Old Testament or Law), the Second Age of the Son (New Testament or Grace), and the Third Age of the Holy Spirit (Love). The latter Age was to prepare for the end of world history, the second coming of Christ and the millennium, beyond world history. This division of world history in three stages, where each “age” is dominated by a powerful force or figure, had been developed by the twelfth-century mystic Joachim of Fiore.¹⁰ Joachim’s vision continued to captivate the

---

⁸ Gershom G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, New York, 1941, p. 206. Theosophy is found in the works of the sixth-century Christian Neoplatonist and mystical theologian Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite. The aim of his works was the union of the whole created order with God. In the Mystical Theology he describes the ascent of the soul to union with God, a union which is the final stage of a process of purification, illumination and perfection. Several medieval mystics such as Meister Eckhart and John Tauler were deeply influenced by these works.


¹⁰ For various valuable studies of Fiore, see Marjorie Reeves and Beatrice Hirsch-Reisch, The Figurai of Joachim of Fiore, Oxford, 1972. In Joachim of Fiore in Christian Thought: Essays on the Influence of the Calabrian Prophet, 2 vols., New York, 1975, Delno C. West states that there is lit-
imagination of many people throughout the later Medieval and Renaissance period. Boehme’s dream of “peacefully reconciling order with freedom”\(^\text{11}\) is expressed in his vision of the *Lilienzeit* or the Age of the Holy Spirit, resembling Fiore’s Age of the Holy Spirit to which Fiore also referred as the Age of the Lily.\(^\text{12}\)

We recognize the stern moralist in Richardson’s first novel, *Pamela*, in which Pamela’s virtue is rewarded by marriage, a reward on earth and in the flesh. Her abidance with the “Law” (especially the one which says “Thou shalt not …”) may be compared to Fiore’s Age of the Father. In *Clarissa* Richardson describes the clash between authority (external authority: the power or right to persuade individuals or groups to obey precepts or recommendations) and conscience (inner authority: knowledge within oneself, associated in the New Testament with faith and the Holy Spirit). Richardson expresses this dilemma of serving two masters by a process of suffering in which Clarissa ultimately achieves illumination (no cross, no crown), reminiscent of the Age of the Son. Then, finally, in *Sir Charles Grandison* we find Richardson’s vision of love and harmony, the Age of the Holy Spirit, which is the outcome of the illumination achieved in *Clarissa*.

*Sir Charles Grandison* is therefore not a description of the millennium or an earthly (very English) paradise, as has been suggested by Jocelyn Harris,\(^\text{13}\) although it may very well be connected with John’s Book of Revelation, in
which John sees the Lamb open the seven seals of the scroll. The opening of the seventh seal in particular brings destruction and death on earth and its inhabitants. Only a small remnant of 144,000 sealed with the name of the Father and of the Lamb on their foreheads, are to be saved and gathered in the harvest of the earth (Rev. 7:3; 14:1). I will argue in chapter 7 that Sir Charles, aided by the Holy Spirit, can be seen gathering the truly pious out of all denominations.

**Richardson’s Origins**

To discover the key to Richardson’s labyrinth it is necessary to go into the past, into Richardson’s origins. Richardson has been considered as practically uneducated and without contact with the formative tradition of European culture. Looking for literary sources, Eaves and Kimpel sum up their views of Richardson’s education as follows:

Richardson, unlike Fielding, was not a learned or even well-read man. .... The influences which have been sought out for Richardson are remarkable largely because they are so distant and so minor. .... [He] was more a product of the Zeitgeist than of literary influences. 14

And Marijke Rudnik-Smalbraak writes:

Richardson was not ... a man of great erudition. As a consequence of his profession he was constantly dealing with manuscripts of authors, with booksellers and books, yet he never belonged to the more professionally established literati of his age. His printing press was not primarily literary. The knowledge that he did acquire during the fifty years preceding his actual writing life was of a general sort; it was what a moderately curious individual, in temperament ever be the distinguishing Characteristic of a Briton”, specifically referred to the “traditional hope of seventeenth-century revolutionaries that England would be relieved of the Norman yoke and restored to its ancient Anglo-Saxon birthright of liberty.” This, Harris continues, “suggests that Richardson was not untouched by the millenarian dreams that his father must have known.” Harris writes that Richardson’s own work expresses millenarian hopes: “First Pamela sketches the overthrow of wickedness and the return to a prelapsarian state; then Clarissa shows goodness confronting avarice, Anti-Christ, hierarchy, and clerical privilege, and finally Grandison presents a carefully worked out vision of millennial love, justice and reform.”

14 Eaves and Kimpel, *Op. cit.*, p. 117. In the foreword to the *Selected Mystical Writings of William Law*, Aldous Huxley writes that the world in its concrete reality is complex and multitudinous almost to infinity. To understand it, we generalize, we omit “what we choose at the moment to regard as irrelevant and to reduce such diversity as still remains to some form of homogeneity. .... What we understand is our own arbitrary simplification of that reality ... at the price of neglecting qualities, values and the unique individual case. .... [Thus] we achieve a limited but, for certain purposes, extremely useful understanding of the world. .... In the same way the historian achieves his much more limited and questionable understanding of man’s past and present by selecting, more or less arbitrarily, from the chaotic mass of recorded facts precisely those which exhibit a kind of homogeneity that happens to appeal to a man of his particular time, temperament and upbringing. This homogeneity is then generalized as a principle, or even hypostatized as a Zeitgeist, i.e. personified as the Spirit of the Age. .... Such facts as do not suffer themselves to be
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both diligent and didactic, would have absorbed from his surroundings, almost imperceptibly.\textsuperscript{15}

She continues to say that, contrary to Fielding, Richardson lacked an expensive education (i.e. non-university trained), as a result of which his real school was life “as he lived it and as it was lived by those around him”, adding that many present-day readers perceive Richardson as “the fellow whom Fielding mocked”.

It is true that Richardson was not too fond of the literary products of his age. Yet, even though, as Eaves and Kimpel pointed out, Richardson may indeed have disliked some of the writers of his age, he was also a great admirer of Spenser, Shakespeare and Milton, as well as Chaucer, to name but a few, as appears from his letter to Aaron Hill of January 19, 1743/4:

\begin{quote}
I have bought Mr. Pope over so often, and his Dunciad so lately before his last new-vampt one, that I am tir’d of the extravagance; and wonder every Body else is not. Especially, as now by this, he confesses that his Abuse of his first hero, was for Abuse-sake, having no better Object for his Abuse. I admire Mr. Pope’s Genius, and his Versification: But forgive me, Sir, to say, I am scandaliz’d for human Nature, and such Talents, sunk so low. Has he no Invention, Sir, to be better employ’d about? No Talents for worthier Subjects? - Must all be personal Satire, or \textit{Imitation of others Temples of Fame}, \textit{Alexander’s Feasts}, \textit{Coopers Hills}, \textit{MacFlecknoe’s}? (Italics are mine)\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Richardson printed Chaucer’s “Prologue” and Dryden’s version of the “Knight’s Tale” for Thomas Morrell, and he discussed with his friend Thomas Edwards plans for a new edition of Chaucer.\textsuperscript{17}

Moreover, his mind was amazingly receptive receiving numerous impressions other than literary which can be traced in his novels. Richardson considered the age in which he lived as spiritually dead, and though he recognized the genius of authors such as Swift and Pope, and perhaps even of Fielding, he did not like their morality. In a letter to Cheyne, dated 21 January 1742/43, Richardson refers to Quarles and Bunyan as writers of morality and piety which clearly shows Richardson’s ethical preference, all too easily dismissed by modern critics.\textsuperscript{18} Richardson rather turned to other than literary works and it is these works which reveal the spiritual side of his nature. Not explained in this way are either explained away as exceptional, anomalous, and \textit{irrelevant, or else completely ignored.” (Italics are mine) I will prove that Richardson was not a product of the Zeitgeist, by showing the influence of certain “exceptional” people on him, an influence which has been dismissed as “irrelevant or else completely ignored” by most critics.

\textsuperscript{15} Marijke Rudnik-Smalbraak, \textit{Samuel Richardson: Minute Particulars within the Large Design}, Leiden, 1983, p. 90.
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at all, or only briefly, discussed in the books dealing with Richardson or his novels, these will become the subject of this study.

In his Selected Bibliography: Samuel Richardson (1689-1761) of April 2000 Richardson scholar John Dussinger states that Eaves and Kimpel’s biography of Richardson of 1971 is still “the definitive biography”, and that William M. Sale Jr.’s Samuel Richardson: Master Printer is “requisite reading”.19 I find Eaves and Kimpel’s remarks about Richardson’s possible sources interesting:

Sources have ... been suggested for Richardson’s method. Parallels between his piety and that of the Quaker journals20 and the Puritan conduct books have been noted, but parallels are not sources: Richardson’s piety need not have been learned from any book; it was the general property of his class. We do not deny that he has much in common with this unread literature. On the other hand, what Richardson shares with it is least interesting in him. For a social historian, contemporary platitudes are undoubtedly revealing. For us, a work of literature is generally impressive not for what it has in common with its age ... but for what it says that no one else has said in the same way, for what it does not share with everyone else. (Italics are mine)21

It is in William M. Sale’s Samuel Richardson: Master Printer that we find proof that Richardson was indeed much better acquainted with this so called “unread literature” than Eaves and Kimpel as well as other Richardson critics may have been aware of.

As a master printer, Samuel Richardson was already a successful London tradesman when he published his first novel Pamela in 1740-41. A list of the books he printed can help us better to understand Richardson’s character as well as his fiction. Because almost all the records of Richardson’s career have disappeared, Sale compiled a list of more than five hundred books that came from his press, identified by the presence of Richardson’s ornaments. From the very beginning Richardson exercised choice over the books, and, genuinely pious and free from scepticism and immorality, they clearly reflect his interests and his preferences. It is through these books that we are able to disprove statements such as the one made by John A. Dussinger that Clarissa is the pro-

20 Eaves and Kimpel probably refer to the remarks by Brian W. Downs about the possible influence of Quaker writing on Richardson. Downs notes that “the published journal came into fashion about the same time as the published letter, the Journals of Fox, Penn … appearing in 1694.” He mentions Miss Danielowski who had shown how the spiritual self-analyses of the early Quakers developed a regular literary form and had remarked on the close resemblance between this literary form and the one Richardson chose for Pamela. (Cf. Brian W. Downs, Richardson, (1928), London, repr. 1969, p. 162). Downs also mentions the growth of Pietism and Quakerism among the Protestants, and refers to “phenomena such as Madame Guyon’s Quietism on the Roman side” on p. 172.
tototype of feminine chastity in the Puritan tradition.\textsuperscript{22} When he refers to William Law, Dussinger concludes that, besides popular devotional manuals and sermons of the seventeenth-century divines, William Law’s earlier writings \textit{A Serious Call} and \textit{Christian Perfection}, appeared “especially pertinent” to Richardson’s tragic view. It is clear that Dussinger never recognized the influence of Law’s mystical writings.

\textbf{Interpretative Chaos after 1971}

Later criticism has generally adopted Dussinger’s point of view. In \textit{Samuel Richardson and the Eighteenth-Century Puritan Character} Cynthia Griffin Wolff discusses what she considers Richardson’s “Puritan” indebtedness.\textsuperscript{23} At one point she states that worldly ambition has replaced religious fanaticism in the life of the Puritan-turned-merchant.\textsuperscript{24} Even so, she says, we can never single out a given Puritan work, and only through close textual examination can we prove Richardson’s direct or indirect indebtedness.\textsuperscript{25} She concludes that \textit{Pamela} adopts one standard Puritan solution to the problem of worldly morality in that it equates earthly reward with divine reward. Griffin Wolff believes that \textit{Clarissa} offers a second alternative, also from the Puritan tradition, whereby earthly values are transcended, with the individual defining himself purely in terms of a community of Saints. Finally, as to \textit{Grandison} she argues that most of Richardson’s “new ethic” bears “unmistakable resemblances to Latitudinarian sentiments”, adding that Richardson admired the Latitudinarian divines.\textsuperscript{26}

In \textit{A Natural Passion: A Study of the Novels of Samuel Richardson} Margaret Ann Doody also argues that Latitudinarian influences contributed to \textit{Sir Charles Grandison}.\textsuperscript{27} Doody believes that Richardson adopted a strict Pelagian morality in \textit{Sir Charles Grandison}, and adds that Sir Charles imitates the Latitudinarian deity who rewards merit with love, and withdraws as soon as merit lapses.\textsuperscript{28} Carol Houlihan Flynn states that Clarissa’s perfectionism is a softened version of the Puritan progression towards sainthood which comes out of the Latitudinarian tradition.\textsuperscript{29} Purified through her sufferings “like gold in a crucible”, Clarissa emerges as a saint in the mystic tradition. Her progress, argues Flynn, recalls the spiritual journeys of Teresa of Avila and John of the Cross.\textsuperscript{30}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{Ibid} Ibid., p. 29.
\bibitem{Ibid2} Ibid., p. 55.
\bibitem{Ibid3} Ibid., pp. 168, 179, 180.
\bibitem{MAD} Margaret Ann Doody, \textit{A Natural Passion: A Study of the Novels of Samuel Richardson}, Oxford, 1974, p. 12.
\bibitem{Ibid4} Ibid., p. 270.
\bibitem{Ibid5} Ibid., pp. 27-29.
\end{thebibliography}
life, but she compares him with “a corpse walking among his admiring mourners”. 31 This criticism recalls Hippolyte Taine who in 1899 summed up Sir Charles as follows:

He is great, he is generous, he is refined, he is pious, he is irreproachable; he has never done a mean action nor made a false gesture. His conscience and his peruke are intact. Amen. We must canonize him and stuff him [Il faut le canoniser et l’empailler]. 32

Mary V. Yates interprets Sir Charles as the Christian rake, who reflects his libertinistic predecessors as often as his saintly ones, and she argues that Grandison is Lovelace resurrected as a good Christian. 33

Tom Keymer’s Richardson’s Clarissa and the Eighteenth-Century Reader appeared in 1992. 34 Though he mainly discusses Clarissa, he refers to seventeenth-century millenarianism in relation to Jocelyn Harris’s remarks on Sir Charles Grandison:

Regeneracy rather than mere stabilisation becomes the primary impulse of Richardson’s writing until, in Grandison, he ends by delineating (in Jocelyn Harris’s words) a “vision of millennial love, justice and reform”. If this work’s lessons were truly learned, wrote one early reader, “how would this world be changed, from a sink of corruption, into a paradisaisall [sic] state, our lost Eden be restored again to us.” 35 Less fanciful contemporaries recognised Richardson’s writing as in this sense political interventions, attempts to buttress and repair the “polity” itself. 36

From this I conclude that between 1987 and 1992 no additional research was done about the influence, if any, of millenarianism on Samuel Richardson. Keymer further discusses the problem of interpretation and the inevitable interference by different experiences, mentalities, predispositions and idiosyncrasies, which, he believes, can easily drift towards “unlicensed invention”. He especially seems to disagree with the post-structuralists’ “free play”. 37 Keymer discusses a tripartite division of Richardson’s oeuvre and suggests that this would do much to explain Richardson’s idea that his novels “complete one plan”:

31 Ibid., p. 46.
35 Thomas Newcomb to Richardson (late October 1754), FM XV, 4, ff. 39-40.
37 Ibid., pp. 71-73.
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Pamela addressing the major cases inherent in the relative duties of masters and servants, Pamela II doing the same for husbands and wives, Clarissa for parents and children, and Grandison for almost anyone (but emphasizing the classic case of marriage between Protestant and Catholic, to which Defoe had devoted much of Religious Courtship). Such an account would do much to explain Richardson’s idea that the novels “complete one plan”.38

In 1996 New Essays on Samuel Richardson appeared.39 It contains Jerry C. Beasley’s essay “Richardson’s Girls: The Daughters of Patriarchy in Pamela, Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison” in which Beasley argues that Sir Charles Grandison is a powerful argument on behalf of a traditional model of patriarchy, even more so than Clarissa.40 In the same collection of essays we find John Allen Stevenson’s “Alien Spirits: The Unity of Lovelace and Clarissa”, which recognizes that it is difficult to understand Lovelace and Clarissa’s attitudes and emotions if we approach the novel from the Puritan point of view that many readers have employed or from the more generalized Christian viewpoint that, according to Stevenson, Richardson himself claimed to represent.41 Stevenson is even “tempted” to call Richardson a Catholic malgré lui.42 He believes that Clarissa and Lovelace share a contempt for the world and that their dualism, their sense of alienation, their emphasis on a higher knowledge, characterized the great rivals of the early Christian Church, who were, in Stevenson’s words, “collectively called Gnostics”.43 However, Stevenson immediately claims that there was no influence here, as there was with Blake, because Richardson was “a good Church of England man”, and no secret adherent of these “ancient heresies”.

Lois A. Chaber’s essay “Sir Charles Grandison and the Human Prospect” is interesting because it discusses “compromises” as an inevitable part of Grandison’s universe. Chaber concludes that Sir Charles’s own estate is a “version of the Augustan Compromise” between pleasure and profit and that the wide spectrum of concessionary arrangements arbitrated by Sir Charles is tainted by its lowest common denominator: an appeal to sordid gain.44 She believes the reader is entrapped by the illusory utopia of Grandison Hall, only to face disillusionment and a lowering of expectations in volume VII. She argues that, according to Jocelyn Harris by the end of his story Sir Charles has returned to the restored world of the millennium, an ideal world that has achieved “paradisal harmony”, a view which Chaber obviously does not share.45 Chaber suggests on the other hand that Richardson is deliberately

38 Ibid., pp. 95-96.
40 Ibid., p. 45.
41 Ibid., p. 92.
42 Ibid., p. 92.
43 Ibid., p. 93.
44 Ibid., pp. 200-201.
invoking the pastoral “Golden Age retreat” convention of the contemporary popular novel as a set-up, a trap, to question and modify expectations of perfect happiness and ideal harmony in the human condition. Summing up the above criticism we find that Richardson has been classified as a Puritan, a Latitudinarian, a millenarian, a Catholic malgré lui, a good Church of England man, or as someone showing signs of a gnostic spirit.

**Richardson’s Ideas**

But who was Richardson really? Without trying to pigeonhole him all over again, we should try to find out which persons and ideas really influenced him. But first I will explain why I will not use the term “Puritan” to classify Richardson. The word “Puritan” never had a single precise meaning and in the senses of the post-1559 period it ceased to be applicable after the Restoration in 1660. Kristen Poole discusses the term “Puritan” as an ambiguous label that did not signify any specific group of people. She refers to numerous scholars who have provided surveys of historical and historiographical uses of the term and mentions Patrick Collinson’s important remark that “no laboratory-bench taxonomy of religious types and tendencies ... will serve if it sticks labels on isolated and inert specimens and fails to appreciate that the very terms themselves are evidence of an unstable and dynamic situation.” Poole refers to Peter Lake who argued that contemporaries assigned the label of “Puritan” based on a degree of zeal rather than on theological differences. She explains that the term “Puritan” rather signalled religious separatism and when not applied to religious separatism, “Puritan” signalled nonconformist practices.46

Initially, Puritans were the more extreme English Protestants who were dissatisfied with the Elizabethan Settlement and sought a further purification of the Church from supposedly unscriptural and corrupt forms along the Genevan model.47 Queen Elizabeth had aimed at a compromise: a middle road between the parties which divided the kingdom, a golden or leaden mediocrity depending on which side of the fence one stood. Richardson himself disliked the word Puritan and in _Sir Charles Grandison_ has Harriet comment on it as follows:

> 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

---

The adjective “Puritan” was first used in the 1560s as a term of abuse, meaning precise, over-strict, over-severe, and failing to make allowances. Owen Chadwick correctly states that there is more than one view on what is too severe and the courtiers of Charles II needed little severity or strictness to justify calling anyone who disagreed with them a Puritan. On the whole the Reformation age was earnestly moral. Referring to the Spaniards of the Counter-Reformation, the Lutherans, Catholics and Protestants, predestinarian or Arminian, Johann Arndt, William Laud or Jeremy Taylor, Chadwick tells us that the tone was reforming and often strict and therefore one could describe the moral ideals of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation as Puritan, if removed from its special use to condemn the hypocrite, the canting and the bizarre.

It will become clear during the course of this study that any classification of Richardson is difficult. Like the men who influenced him more than anyone else, such as his contemporaries George Cheyne, William Law and Zinzendorf, Richardson was himself interested in and concerned with the religious divisions in Europe in the late seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries, especially with religious tolerance and harmony. In this respect Richardson’s first novel Pamela is less interesting, as it is rather concerned with the here and now. The place where Pamela will be rewarded for all her “suffering” is here on earth, in England or, more specifically, at Brandon Hall. However, in Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison freedom of conscience and tolerance play a much more important role. For although on the literal level Clarissa is about a young girl of eighteen whose fall ultimately becomes her ticket to heaven, on the anagogical or mystical level it represents her quest for the freedom of conscience, or the right to choose. And especially in Sir Charles Grandison we see Grandison’s efforts to achieve the goals set out in Clarissa of freedom of conscience, toleration and world harmony.

It is interesting to know that the Dutch translator of Clarissa was the distinguished Mennonite preacher, Johannes Stinstra, who between 1739 and 1749 also translated Samuel Clarke’s sermons. Upon receiving a letter from Stinstra dated 14 September 1752, Richardson had William Duncombe find out more about him. Pleading for liberty of conscience, belief and religion, Stinstra had published five sermons in May 1741 which led to an attack on him as a champion of Socinianism and ultimately, in 1742, to his being suspended from the ministry. This gave him sufficient leisure to translate Clarissa.

48 Sir Charles Grandison, ed. Jocelyn Harris, Oxford, 1972. All further references in the text will be to this edition.
which was to be published in eight volumes between 1752-55, although he later admitted in his letter to Richardson of December 24, 1753, that the translation was “a burden too heavy for my shoulders”. In 1750 Stinstra wrote *Waarschuwinge tegen de geestdrijverij vervat in een brief aan de doopsgezinden in Friesland (Pastoral Letter against Enthusiasm)*, a tract published by Folkert van der Plaats (Clarissa’s publisher) and Isaac Tirion. Tirion was a well-known Mennonite publisher in Amsterdam, who was interested in translating *Sir Charles Grandison*, an important subject in the correspondence between Richardson and Stinstra. Henry Rimius translated the *Pastoral Letter* into English in 1753. In this 81-page pamphlet Stinstra argued that reason is an absolute necessity in religion and that an unreasonable religion is really no religion. He believed that the free play of the imagination and passions could lead to madness, but concluded that “the mad people now more deserve our pity, compassion, and sympathy than our hatred, bias, and persecution”.

Apparently pleased with the information obtained by Duncombe, Richardson and Stinstra embarked upon a correspondence which would last till 1756. In his first letter to Stinstra, Richardson writes:

A learned and worthy Friend thus writes to me on the Subject - You will judge on reading the Extracts from his letters, why I trouble you with them. “I find, that your Monsieur Stinstra is the same Gentleman as wrote ye Pastoral Letter against Fanaticism. It is supposed, that the Book being originally published in Dutch, is the Occasion of its not being known here. He has published also in Dutch Five Sermons for Liberty of Conscience, and Toleration, and against all Imposition of Human Authority. By his clear manner of Writing, I make no doubt but this is an excellent Work. I am one of his Admirers, and think he

---


Introduction

Returning to the discussion of the labels stuck on Richardson, we have seen that he has also been called a Latitudinarian, a term opprobriously applied in the seventeenth century to describe certain anti-dogmatic Anglican divines some of whom were among the Cambridge Platonists, such as Henry More. Latitudinarianism gained strength in the early part of the eighteenth century, emphasizing practical Christian living, morality and a distrust of every kind of enthusiasm. Cragg informs us that many of the representatives of the Latitudinarians had been taught by the Cambridge Platonists, but that they were different from them in their complete absence of any mystical strain and also by a far less imaginative approach to the life of faith. It may have been due to Cragg’s description of the Latitudinarians as reasonable, dispassionate, and charitable men, whose virtues, however, easily degenerated while their good-will subsided into mere complacency, that whenever Richardson’s critics apply the term Latitudinarian to Richardson it always seems to have a slightly negative connotation. For a more modern discussion of the term see B.M. Young’s *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England: Theological Debate from Locke to Burke*. Young refers to Spurr’s “Latitudinarianism and the Restoration Church” in which Spurr discusses “Latitudinarianism” in some detail and concludes that it is a “stigmatizing nickname”, an “abusive insinuation of a readiness to enlarge one’s conscience to suit personal ends”, which will never be pinned down, because of the confusing meanings and connotations. Those who had received the sobriquet were indeed trying to slough off Calvinism, but rather saw themselves as impartial, free, moderate, rational and new. Whether as a reaction to so-called Latitudinarianism or as a development of it, we find that Evangelicalism emerged in the later part of the eighteenth century.

Richardson’s novels appealed to the Evangelicals, who unlike the Methodists, remained within the Church of England. They were devoted to good works. Aided by the Quakers, they helped to abolish the slave trade. Zachary Macaulay, William Wilberforce and Hannah More were among the original Evangelicals who admired Richardson. In *Coelebs in Search of a Wife* (1808) Hannah More considers Richardson’s virtuous characters as portrayals of the triumph of religion and reason over the passions.

57 Ibid., p. 7.
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For a long time Richardson’s morals were an important reason for his popularity [which] could be demonstrated from many sources, but Macaulay will suffice. He praises Richardson for raising ‘the fame of English genius in foreign countries’, for originality, for pathos, for ‘profound knowledge of the human heart’, and concludes by praising his moral tendency, citing two morally unimpeachable witnesses: ‘My dear and honored friend, Mr. Wilberforce, in his celebrated religious treatise, when speaking of the unchristian tendency of the fashionable novels of the eighteenth century, distinctly excepts Richardson from the censure. Another excellent person whom I can never mention without respect and kindness, Mrs. Hannah More, often declared in conversation, and has declared in one of her published poems, that she first learned from the writings of Richardson those principles of piety by which her life was guided.”

Richardson’s ideas as they were expressed through his novels appealed also to certain Pietist circles in Germany. We know from Lawrence Marsden Price’s “On the Reception of Richardson in Germany” that the first German translation of Clarissa was published in 1748 and began to appear in Göttingen in the same year. The translator of the first four volumes was Johann David Michaelis (1717-1791), a Lutheran theologian and Orientalist, as well as professor at Göttingen from 1746 to his death. He was to have a far reaching influence on the development of biblical criticism. He was also the annotator of Robert Lowth, William Warburton’s greatest opponent, which points towards a dialectic between Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment tendencies. The identity of the translator of volumes V to VIII is not known. In a letter dated 2 April 1753 Stinstra writes to Richardson “That your Clarissa has been translated by a Göttingen professor named Michaelis you undoubtedly know.”

Since Stinstra clearly was an admirer of Michaelis as can be testified by the many books written by that author in Stinstra’s possession, we can accept his reference to Michaelis as an authoritative statement. The driving force behind the translation was Albrecht von Haller, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Göttingen. An early admirer of Richardson, Von Haller was a

---

64 Lawrence Marsden Price, "On the Reception of Richardson in Germany", in Journal of English and German Philology, XXV (1926), 7-33.
67 Cf. Johannes Stinstra, Catalogus Bibliothecae insignem Praestantissimorum atque Optimae Notae Librorum ad Paratum Complexae, quos collegit vir Doctissimus et Plurimum Reverendus Joannes Stinstra, dum viveret, Ecclesiae Teleiobaptistarum Harlingae, per longam Annorum, Van der Plaats and Dion, Romar, Harlingen and Franeker, 1790. For instance nrs. 321 etc., nrs. 894 etc., nrs. 1205, 2175, 2350, 2556. Contemporary appreciation of Michaelis may be testified as well by the fact that William Bowyer was involved in the publication of several of Michaelis’s works. Bowyer
Swiss physiologist and the author of philosophical romances. In the 1750s and 60s Richardson enjoyed the unqualified support of such literary leaders as von Haller and Lessing.68

Sir Charles Grandison was most probably translated by Johann Mattheson in 1754-55,69 although it appears from the correspondence between Richardson and the Leipzig bookseller, Erasmus Reich, that Christian Fürchtegott Gellert was involved in supervising and sponsoring the work.70 McKillop tells us that Grandison was more favourably received in Germany than in England or France. Gellert’s lines “Unsterblich ist Homer, unsterblich-er bei Christen/Der Britte, RICHARDSON” together with Gellert’s letter on reading Grandison, give us the equivalent of Diderot’s Éloge, to which McKillop adds that Gellert is more fully representative of Germany than Diderot is of France.

Lessing was especially impressed by Sir Charles Grandison and put it on the same level with Clarissa. Goethe was also influenced by Richardson. Evidence of this is to be found in his Werther, and in Wilhelm Meister Goethe specifically names Pamela, Clarissa and Grandison. However, he was not uncritical in his praise, and, according to Price, Grandison soon became for Goethe practically synonymous with “Schwärmerei”. Nevertheless, it seems that in the 1770s Richardson was still in high favour in Germany.71

Summarizing the above we find that Richardson did not seek his friends among the leading writers of his time, because he felt that they misapplied their genius. It is essential for a better appreciation of Richardson to find out with whom he did find his friends and acquaintances whose influence stimulated him to write his three novels by which he depicted the evolutionary growth towards his own distinctive and powerful vision of a new world.

In order to achieve my objective I will discuss in the first chapter Richardson’s printing career with special attention to those works which reveal his spiritual side. Chapters 2 and 3 will explore the relationship between Richardson and Cheyne, which extended over a period of about nine years, from 1734 to 1743, when Cheyne died. The aim of these chapters is to show similarities between Cheyne and Richardson’s psychological make-up and to point at instances where Cheyne may have exerted an influence on

printed in 1763 an edition of the Greek Testament in two volumes to which he added Conjectural Emendations, selected from various authors one of whom was Michaelis. In 1773 Bowyer translated and published Select Discourses from Michaelis, on the Hebrew Months, Sabbatical Years, &c. (cf. the Dictionary of National Biography on William Bowyer, the younger or “the learned printer”, pp. 84-85).

69 Johann Mattheson is described as “nicht nur der bedeutendste Kritiker, Ästhetiker, Polemiker, Enzyklopädist der deutschen Musikgeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts, sondern auch ein anerkannter Sänger und Komponist, ein beachteter Autor juristischer und staatswissenschaftlicher Schriften und - endlich - auch ein fleissiger Übersetzer meist englischer Autoren (Defoe, Richardson u.a.).
70 Alan Dugald. McKillop, Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist, Chapel Hill, 1936, pp. 253-259.
Richardson. I will put Richardson in an international context, showing his acquaintance with the works of the French Protestant theologian Pierre Poiret, who spent the largest part of his life in Holland and who influenced the whole Pietistic movement, and the Swiss Henry Wetstein, publisher in Amsterdam of Poiret, Boehme, Bourignon, Guyon and other mystics. Richardson’s familiarity with the *Theologia Germanica* will also be discussed as well as his interest in the East.

The fourth chapter will examine the relationship between Richardson and Law, while chapter 5 will be concerned with the direct influence of Boehme on Richardson. Chapter 6 will trace Richardson’s millenarian ideas, concentrating on Richardson’s own vision or utopian dream of the preparations for a better world in *Sir Charles Grandison*.

Finally, we will see in the last chapter how Richardson conveyed his own Utopian dream in *Sir Charles Grandison*, expressing his belief that the “truly pious” can be found in all Christian denominations. He even went further and suggested that the truly pious can be found beyond Christianity, which is quite an extraordinary idea for an “ordinary” printer of the first half of the eighteenth century.
Richardson’s Printing Career

Richardson was not merely printing for booksellers: he bought shares in the copyright of books, he entered into partnerships with newspapers, secured government contracts, printed the *Philosophical Transactions* for the Royal Society, and obtained monopoly rights in the printing of law books.\(^2\) Because he was in some way emancipated from the booksellers, it is from the books Richardson printed that we can measure his preferences and his prejudices especially relating to the spiritual aspects of his life. To explore Richardson’s printing career we must return to William Merrit Sale’s *Samuel Richardson: Master Printer*. Sale states that the integrity of his press was always a matter of concern to Richardson, and that, though it would be “absurd” to contend that Richardson only printed works of authors whose position or cause he could support, it is difficult to find among the books that he printed any that he thoroughly repudiated.\(^3\)

Among the first authors who employed him in the 1720s was Archibald

---

\(^2\) Sale described Richardson’s relations with the printing trade quite extensively and explained that though Richardson was primarily a printer, he sometimes served as a “publisher” of books and sometimes, when he owned the copyright or part of the copyright in a book that he printed, as a “bookseller”. Sale relates how in the eighteenth century the term “publisher” and “bookseller” were used interchangeably, but that the difference between these terms referred to the role one man was playing in getting books into the hands of the purchaser. The situation was as follows. If the proprietor of a bookshop owned the copyright of a book, found a printer for it and then managed the sale to the public, his role was that of “bookseller”. If, on the other hand, the author (or printer) owned the copyright and secured the services of the proprietor of a bookshop in selling a book, then that proprietor was in the role of “publisher”. Some proprietors played exclusively the role of booksellers, but in general they were at times acting as booksellers and at others acting as publishers. The words “published” and “publisher” began to appear in imprints in the second quarter of the eighteenth century. According to Sale, Richardson never played the dual role of printer and publisher as conspicuously as did some others in his trade. In fact he was technically publishing only when he delivered to subscribers copies of subscription editions. This occurred for instance in 1729 with the first volume of Captain James Ogilvie’s translation of Giannone’s *Civil History of the Kingdom of Naples*, printed by Richardson and sold by subscription. More important than this role was the one Richardson played in printing books for which he owned the copyrights, or a share in the copyrights, as was the case with for instance his edition of the *Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe*. Sale states that the size of shares held by Richardson in books other than those he wrote and the number of books in which he held such shares will probably never be accurately determined, especially since Richardson was often a hidden partner. Yet enough evidence exists to account for the fact that Richardson was occasionally referred to by men in England and on the continent as a “bookseller”. (Cf. William Merrit Sale Jr., *Master Printer*, Ithaca, 1950, pp. 86-91, 104-105; See also Charles Mullett, *The Letters of Doctor George Cheyne to Samuel Richardson (1733-1743)*, Vol. XVIII, No. 1, Columbia, 1943., pp. 20-23).  

Hutcheson, Member of Parliament for Hastings. His pamphlets attacked the fiscal policy of Walpole (especially the South Sea scheme and stock) and exposed the Whig manipulation of elections. Richardson admired Hutcheson and had Lord M. quote him in Clarissa: “I remember what my old friend Archibald Hutcheson said; and it was a very good Saying”. From Richardson’s press came both pious and scientific works.

**Pious Works**

As to the pious works, we find that Richardson printed for James Hervey Meditations among the Tombs, The Cross of Christ and The Christian’s Glory. He also printed for the non-conformist John Leland, some of whose works were directed against Deism. From his press came many of the works of his friend and physician Dr George Cheyne, who was interested in mysticism as well as science. Essential to this study is Cheyne’s correspondence with Richardson to be discussed in the next two chapters.

Richardson printed The Oxford Methodists and The Way to Divine Knowledge for William Law. He printed for Law’s close friend John Byrom the poems Enthusiasm, containing an attack on Bishop Warburton, and An Epistle to a Gentleman of the Temple, which upholds William Law against the bishop of London, Thomas Sherlock, in a controversy concerning the fate of man. Law’s position was expressed in his Spirit of Prayer. Moreover, Richardson was actively associated with William Webster’s Weekly Miscellany, which gave an account of the religion, morality and learning of the times, and which was published from 1732 to 1741. According to Sale, Webster represented the simple piety of the eighteenth-century clergyman who leaned towards “neither deism nor dissent”. The Weekly Miscellany was one of the many presents which Richardson sent to Cheyne on a regular basis.

**Fénelon’s Works**

Another interesting title on Sale’s list of books from Richardson’s press in 1721 is the Instructions for the Education of a Daughter, the fourth edition of a translation by George Hickes of Fénelon’s Traité de l’éducation des filles, first published in 1687. Richardson’s association with Fénelon’s work is interesting, because Fénelon (Plate I) had met Mme. Guyon, the French Quietist writer, and was impressed by her account of her spiritual experiences (which he regarded as authentic) and especially by her doctrine of pure love and passive prayer. His defence of her got him into serious problems with the Roman Catholic Church, but he submitted unreservedly and later wrote in defence of the

---

74 Ibid., pp. 120-121, 180-181.
75 Ibid., p. 126.
76 Madame Guyon (1648-1717) was a French Quietist writer. The unhappiness of her life with her husband and mother-in-law turned her increasingly to a life of intensive prayer and she began to have mystical experiences. In 1695 her writings were condemned and she was imprisoned first in various convents and finally in the Bastille in 1698. After her release in 1703 she spent the rest of her life under the close supervision of her son. She taught complete detachment from the world,
I. François de Salignac de La Mothe Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai (1651-1715). Engraved by J. Thomsom from a picture by Vivien, Musée du Louvre.
orthodox teaching. Appointed archbishop of Cambrai, Fénelon (1651-1715) had considerable influence in the eighteenth century, both inside and outside France, and among Protestants. We shall see below that Cheyne and his friends also admired Fénelon, as did John Wesley later. In the Netherlands Fénelon’s work was published by Henry Wetstein, a friend of George Cheyne and Pierre Poiret, a French spiritual writer and companion of Antoinette Bourignon. In 1723 A.M. Ramsay’s Histoire de la vie de Messr. François de Salignac de la Motte-Fénelon had appeared, with an English translation in the same year. Ramsay was a Scotsman who had been converted to Roman Catholicism by Fénelon and worked as tutor to Charles Edward and Henry Stuart. He also knew Poiret and Wetstein as well as Cheyne. Ramsay’s best known work, written in imitation of Fénelon’s Telemachus, was The Travels of Cyrus, the second edition of which was printed by Richardson in 1727-1728.

We can only speculate as to why Richardson printed the Instructions for the Education of a Daughter. Had he been genuinely interested in Fénelon’s work? Did he know of Fénelon’s connection with Madame Guyon? In the introduction to La Vie de Madame Guyon Tourniac writes:

En tous cas la filiation spirituelle entre les quakers et Madame Guyon avait déjà été relevée en 1727 par Aubraye de la Mottraye à propos du quiétisme; d’ailleurs, au temps de la persécution des quakers dans les pays anglo-saxons, chaque foyer quaker possédait les œuvres de Madame Guyon et de Fénelon. ....

indifference to suffering and misfortune, self-abasement, and submission to God’s will in pure love. Her prayer of quietude and simplicity was well-received by Quakers, and John Wesley. For a discussion of the relationship between Fénelon and Madame Guyon, see Michael de la Bedoyere, The Archbishop and the Lady: The Story of Fénelon and Madame Guyon, London, 1956. He tells the story of Madame Guyon which he considers, among other things, “a story of the defence of the liberty of an individual’s conscience in an age when individual consciences counted for little”. He proposes to include Madame Guyon in the roll of “women heroes”, and to regard Fénelon as the “champion of the long race of the bullied and the browbeaten” (cf. Bedoyere, Op. cit., p. 9). For a sympathetic and modern examination of Madame Guyon see Marie-Louise Gondal’s Madame Guyon (1648-1717): Une nouveau visage, Paris, 1989. A new edition of La Vie de Madame Guyon écrite par elle-même was published 1983.

For information on Ramsay see for instance G.D. Henderson, Mystics of the North-East, Including I. Letters of James Keith, M.D., and Others to Lord Deskford; II. Correspondence between Dr. George Garden and James Cunningham, Aberdeen, 1934, pp. 18, 41, 51-55.


The story of Madame Guyon and Fénelon was familiar in England in the early eighteenth century. One of the first publications in English had appeared in 1698 [128 pages in octavo format]. It was called Quakerism A-la-Mode; or, A History of Quietism, particularly that of the Lord Archbishop of Cambry and Madam Guyon, containing an account of her life, her prophecies and visions, as well as “an account of the management of that controversy, now depending at Rome, betwixt the Arch-bishop of Cambry and the Bishop of Meaux, by way of answer to the Arch-bishop’s book [the Explication des maximes des Saints].” It had been printed for a J. Harris and A. Bell in London in 1698. Later publications of Fénelon’s work were for instance The Archbishop of Cambry’s Dissertation on Pure Love; with an Account of the Life and writings of the Lady [Madame Guyon] for whose sake the Archbishop was banish’d from Court. This work, with a preface by a Josiah Martin, was published in London by Luke Hinde in 1735; a third edition appeared in 1750, and another edition was “printed and sold by Mary Hinde” in 1769.
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Pur amour, Eglise de l’Esprit, Eglise invisible des croyants, voilà les maillons d’une chaîne qui unira le cercle des fervents de Madame Guyon aux adeptes de George Fox.

Or did Richardson print the work because the nonjuring bishop George Hickes had made the translation? A man of great piety and wide scholarship, Hickes (1642-1715) had served as chaplain to John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale (Charles II’s vice-regent in Scotland). Though opposed to the pro-Roman Catholic measures of James II, Hickes refused to take the oaths to William and Mary in 1689. Hickes’s elder brother, John, had joined Monmouth and Mary in 1685 and had been tried and executed at Taunton. From Richardson’s letter to Stinstra of 2 June 1753, we know that Richardson’s father had somehow been involved with Monmouth and Shaftesbury:

My Father’s Business was that of a Joiner, then more distinct from that of a Carpenter, than now it is with us. He was a good Draughtsman, and understood Architecture. His Skill and Ingenuity, and an Understanding superior to his Business, with his remarkable Integrity of Heart and Manners, made him personally beloved by several Persons of Rank, among whom were the Duke of Monmouth and the first Earl of Shaftesbury; both so noted in our English History. Their known Favour for him, having, on the Duke’s Attempt on the Crown, subjected him to be looked upon with a jealous Eye, notwithstanding he was noted for a quiet and inoffensive Man, he thought proper, on the Decollation of [the first-named] unhappy Nobleman, to quit his London Business and retire to Derbyshire; tho’ to his great Detriment; and there I, and three other Children out of Nine, were born.

Eaves and Kimpel refer to the same incidents, but conclude that Richardson either did not really know why and when his father left London and moved to Mackworth in Derbyshire or just did not want the facts to be known. Sale informs us that Richardson’s father had supported Thomas Wharton and therefore had been driven into a form of exile in Derbyshire, which may explain Richardson’s relations with the True Briton, a semi-weekly periodical directed against Walpole’s government, published from 1723 to 1724 and sponsored by Thomas Wharton’s son Philip.

84 Sale, Op. cit., p. 38. The True Briton had a strong Tory and Jacobite bias, even though Philip Wharton followed the principles of Old Whiggism which he had inherited from his father. Sale,
The connection between Richardson’s father and the first earl of Shaftesbury still remains enigmatic, but the relationship between Shaftesbury and William Penn suggests a link with the Quakers. At one point during 1674 the interests of James, Duke of York, Shaftesbury and the nonconformists had been identical and it was then that Shaftesbury threw overboard his violent anti-catholic feelings, and met with James along with the Quaker William Penn, Owen, and other leading nonconformists. Apparently, the duke had been trying to bring Shaftesbury over to his side and spent three hours with him on 16 June 1674. It was also about this time that Shaftesbury rented Thanet House in Aldergate Street, close to where Samuel Richardson senior lived. In 1681 Shaftesbury reintroduced a bill for a repeal of the act which imposed penalties on protestant dissenters. Later that year Shaftesbury was seized at Thanet House, carried to Whitehall and committed to the Tower on the charge of high treason, of conspiring for the death of the king and the overthrow of the government. He was released from bail on 13 February 1682, but after this the penal laws against protestant dissenters were vigorously executed.

The Quakers were severely persecuted during the reign of Charles II, but on May 16, 1686, James II issued a warrant commanding that all Quakers who had been convicted on charges of praemunire, or for not swearing, or for not going to church, should be released. In this “Order of Release” is the name of John Bunyan, who was included in this Royal Pardon. George Fox describes the persecution and the subsequent release of “all prisoners for conscience’ sake” in chapter XX “The Seed Reigns over Death” of his autobiography. However, after the Revolution of 1688 the situation deteriorated again. Penn was held to bail as one of James’s adherents and in 1692 he was deprived of his Governorship of Pennsylvania. As to Shaftesbury, he left England for Holland on 28 November 1682 and died there on 21 January 1683. He may be regarded as the principal founder of the party which opposed the (Royal) prerogative and uniformity (in public worship and use of the Book of Common Prayer, especially that of 1662) on behalf of political freedom and religious tolerance. He was reputed a deist, but there is an anecdote which perhaps describes him most accurately. When asked by a lady as to his religion, he answered “Madam, wise men are of but one religion” and when she further pressed him to tell her what that was, he said “Madam, wise men never tell.” This is the kind of ambiguity or evasion which we sometimes also encounter with Richardson.

however, reminds us that the terms Whig and Tory were so variously used in this time that they lost all precise meaning. (Cf. pp. 35-38).

85 Most probably John Owen (1616-83), originally a Presbyterian, who had come to believe with John Milton that “new presbyter was but old priest writ large”, and took up the more tolerant independent position. The Restoration drove him to London, where he continued to preach and write until his death.

86 George Fox’s Autobiography, Chapter XX, footnote 248 (from the Rufus Jones 1908 edition of George Fox’s Journal, repr. 1976, internet source Street Corner Society). Fox’s boyhood is described in the first chapter, called “A Seeker”, 1624-1648.
Returning to Fénelon, Richardson must have been fascinated by him. In 1728 he printed The Adventures of Telemachus in two volumes, in which Fénelon defended human rights and presented his vision of a universal peace. To the second Volume is added A Discourse upon Epick Poetry by Ramsay. Richardson refers to Telemachus as a prose epic in Pamela (plate on p. 32 reads: “What are you reading? - Sir, said he, stammering with the surprize, it is the French Telemachus”) and Clarissa. Clarissa had both a French and an English version.

**Richardson’s Interest in the Quakers**

Richardson’s interest in the Quakers appears from another interesting work that came from his press in 1736, i.e. the Papers Relating to the Quakers’ Tythe Bill. In his article “Sir Robert Walpole, The Church of England, and the Quakers Tithe Bill of 1736” Stephen Taylor describes the political consequences of this Bill and establishes that historians have tended to overestimate the stability of Walpole’s administration. However, more important for the purpose of this study is Richardson’s involvement. The Quakers’ conscientious refusal to pay tithes until they had been subjected to the process of prosecution and distraint made them anxious for this process to be as quick and cheap as possible and that was exactly what the Quakers Tithe Bill aimed to do. The Bill had been introduced into the Commons by William Glanville on March 17, 1736, intended to relieve Quakers from “grievous Sufferings by Prosecution in the Exchequer, Ecclesiastical, and other Courts”. It therefore appealed to Whig support for toleration and opposition to persecution in religion. Already as early as October 1735 Walpole had promised the Quakers that he would approve their applying to parliament for relief. According to Taylor, Walpole had been aware that the dissenters generally had been consistent supporters of his government.

In the end the Bill was not passed, because of the clerical opposition, headed by Edmund Gibson, the ecclesiastical minister. Gibson had written “Remarks upon a bill now depending in parliament … for the more easy recovery of tythes, church-rates, and oblations, and other ecclesiastical dues from the people called Quakers: and also remarks upon a printed paper, intitled, The case of the people called Quakers” to be found in Papers Relating to the Quakers’ Tythe Bill, pp. 18-19. Of course, the fact that Richardson printed the Papers does not say anything about whether Richardson himself was in favour of the Bill. What we can infer, however, is that Richardson knew about the case of the Quakers and about their suffering as a result from the persecution in-

---

91 Ibid., p. 65.
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Richardson’s Connection with the Moravians

Richardson’s connection with the Moravian Society in London and the Moravians’ evangelical fervour may have originated as a result of his business relations with James Hutton. Hutton and Richardson’s friend Charles Rivington were booksellers for two religious works which Richardson printed, the first was George Whitefield’s “The Benefits of an Early Piety”, published in 1737, the second was Clement Ellis’s “The Scripture Catechist”, which appeared in 1738.

The son of a High-Church clergyman, Hutton had been largely responsible for the beginning of the Moravian work in London, the aim of which was not to make Moravians but to help people to become better Anglicans. In 1736 James Hutton had set up his own business as a bookseller and founded a new religious society in his back parlour which became a centre of revival. Here he met and encouraged the Wesleys and Whitefield. When the room at this house became too small, Hutton hired a Baptist Hall in Fetter Lane, which became known as the Fetter Lane Society: “the main seed-bed from which the English Revival would spring”. He had also founded another society in Aldersgate Street. Both societies were just a few streets away from Richardson’s house in Salisbury Court. We can read about this in John Byrom’s journal for 1739. The ecumenical aim of the Moravians is perhaps best described by Colin Podmore:

[They] recognized true Christians in every church, even in the Roman Catholic

95 See for instance the entry dated June 21, 1739, in which Byrom mentioned he had met Mr Jacobi and that he had read the “Vorbericht to Count Zinzendorf’s Reden”. Both Byrom and Jacobi then went to “Mr. Hutton’s”. Also included in the Journal is John Christian Jacobi’s letter to Byrom (in German), dated September 5, 1739, (The Private Journals and Literary Remains of John Byrom, 2 Vols., ed. Richard Parkinson, Manchester, 1856-57, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 247, 282). For Jacobi, see Podmore, Op. cit., pp. 23, 26. I will regularly refer to Byrom’s journal, because it contains valuable information relating to this study. It was Henry Talon who revived Byrom in his Selections from the Journals & Papers of John Byrom, Poet-Diarist-Shorthand Writer 1691-1763, London, 1950. In the 1990s Joy Hancox explored Byrom's life which, she thought, was full of paradoxes. In 1992 she published The Byrom Collection in which she tells us how she discovered 516 architectural and mathematical drawings which Byrom held in the possession of the Cabala Club, which, she claims, he had formed in London in 1725. In 1994 she wrote The Queen’s Cameleon, a study of Byrom’s life in which she described him as an enigma: “a playboy, a philosopher, a poet, and possibly a spy, ..., an active and secret Jacobite who had an affair with Queen Caroline”, all of which are beyond the scope of my study.
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Church and among the sects, and strove to establish fellowship with them. [They] deplored division between Christians and objected to the attitudes dominant within some of the existing denominations, but [they] nevertheless respected, indeed cherished, the traditions represented by the various national Churches, regarding their differences as important. ... [They were] neither [partisans] for one confession who regarded others as worthless, nor did [they] wish to blur differences; [they] deplored the making of a latitudinarischer Mischmasch out of the variety of the Churches.96

Or in the words of Amedeo Molnár:

Das Licht des Evangeliums soll eben nicht mehr dem sakralen Raum der Einzelkirche vorbehalten bleiben, sondern der ganzen Welt leuchten.97

It is an aim which we find again in Sir Charles Grandison.

In 1737 Zinzendorf visited England and, while in London, he became acquainted with several leading Anglican figures, such as Archbishop Potter, some of whom he admitted to his Order of the Mustard Seed. The order aimed at the establishment of ecumenical fellowship among Christians and the carrying of the Gospel to the heathen. James Oglethorpe, the famous colonist of Georgia, and Bishop Thomas Wilson of Sodor and Man also became members.98 The latter accepted the “Presidency of the Anglican Tropus”, offered to him in 1749.99 Thomas Wilson (1663-1755) was well acquainted with the history of the Bohemian Brethren and had a copy of Comenius’s history of them,100 Wilson included among his friends both Richardson’s friends Skelton and Delany, and was also a friend of George Cheyne.101 Richardson very much admired Bishop Wilson and when the latter was succeeded by Mark Hildesley in 1755, Richardson wrote:

The late prelate was such a credit to religion, and kept so admirably right the people of his diocese, that I am glad so worthy a successor is given to them, and he [Hildesley] rejoices in the pleasure he shall have of finding so good

order there, and that he shall have little to do, but to tread in the same path.\textsuperscript{102}

In 1741 Richardson printed Wilson’s essay designed to instruct the Indians in Christianity: \textit{The Knowledge and Practice of Christianity Made Easy: or, an Essay towards an Instruction for the Indians}.\textsuperscript{103} It had been written at the request of James Oglethorpe and carried a dedication to the Trustees of the Colony of Georgia by Wilson’s son, Thomas Wilson Jr. (1703-84), for whom Richardson had printed as early as 1736. Wilson Jr. corresponded with the dissenter John Leland from 1742, inviting Leland’s criticism of his father’s manuals of religion. Leland’s chief work, \textit{A View of the principal Deistical Writers}, was written as letters to Wilson, published at his expense, and printed by Richardson.\textsuperscript{104}

The Moravians were interested in Georgia, because they considered it a possible location for another Moravian settlement. James Oglethorpe (1696-1785) was an English army officer, philanthropist, and founder of the British colony of Georgia in America. He was educated at Oxford, entered the army in 1712 and fought the Turks in 1717. On his return to England in 1722 he entered Parliament. In 1729 he presided over a committee for prison reform and this gave him the idea of founding a new colony in America as a place where the poor and destitute could start a new life and where persecuted Protestant sects could find refuge. In 1733 he accompanied the first settlers and founded Savannah. He returned to England in 1743 where he resumed his parliamentary career.\textsuperscript{105} Richardson’s interest in the colonies may also appear from the fact that in 1738 he printed Sir William Keith’s \textit{History of the British Plantations in America}, a book sponsored by the Society for the Encouragement of Learning, of which Oglethorpe had been a member since its formation in 1735. Its objective was to assist authors and promote the arts and sciences. Richardson was the printer for the Society, which finally expired in 1749, partly due to the opposition of the booksellers and their boycott of the Society’s publications.\textsuperscript{106}

Richardson’s contacts with the Moravians also appear from the fact that they had invited him to visit them. There is a letter from Lady Bradshaigh to Richardson, dated 21 August 1756, in which she refers to this invitation:


\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., p. 184. See also the Dictionary of Nationaly Biography for the relation between the younger Wilson and Leland, p. 142.

\textsuperscript{105} For further connections between Oglethorpe and the Moravians, see Podmore, \textit{Op. cit.}, pp. 243-245.

I return the enclosed with thanks. I have heard very bad things of the sect, but
do not understand their religion. However, I cou’d allmost pronounce them
good people from their admiration of your writings, but if I was to advise you
to accept of an invitation, it shou’d not be of that from the Moravians. I find
they wou’d be glad to engage your penn, and I wonder not at them.\textsuperscript{107}

As a bookseller James Hutton may have helped to get several Moravian
works published in England during the 1740s, such as their sermons, a \textit{Manual
of Doctrine} and a \textit{Short History}, but we have no idea whether Richardson was
involved in printing them. Podmore informs us that they were generally pur-
blished by members, adherents and admirers through Hutton’s shop. William
Whiston bought “a small Book of their Sermons”, but later wrote in his \textit{Memoirs}
that he did not like them and was “cured of [his] inclination to go to
their publick Worship, and avoided it”.\textsuperscript{108} When he was at Tunbridge Wells in
July and August of 1748, Richardson met Whiston whom he described in an
undated letter to Miss Westcomb as follows:

Another extraordinary old man we have had here … the noted Mr. Whiston,
showing eclipses, and explaining other phaenomena of the stars, and preach-
ing the millennium, and anabaptism (for he is now, it seems, of that persua-
sion) to gay people, who, if they have white teeth, hear him with open mouths,
though perhaps shut hearts; and after his lecture is over, not a bit the wiser,
run from him … to flutter among the loud-laughing young fellows upon the
walks.\textsuperscript{109}

Richardson had some business relations with William Whiston’s son, John
Whiston the bookseller, between 1738-1754, through the printing of Daniel
Defoe’s \textit{A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain} and \textit{Aesop’s Fables}
both works Richardson had been the editor of.

\textbf{Richardson and Pietro Giannone}
Among the scholarly work that came from Richardson’s press was James
Ogilvie’s translation of Pietro Giannone’s \textit{Civil History of the Kingdom of
Naples} (1729 and 1731). Some critics briefly commented on the connection be-
tween Richardson and Giannone. McKillop was the first who mentioned
Giannone’s work in 1936.\textsuperscript{110} In an essay on \textit{Sir Charles Grandison} written in
1956 McKillop returned to the subject when he asserted that the name of
Grandison “suggests” the aristocracy.\textsuperscript{111} He believed that Richardson might

\textsuperscript{107} Forster MSS, Folio XI, Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
\textsuperscript{109} Barbauld, \textit{Op. cit.}, Vol. III, pp. 318-319. For the date of this visit, see Eaves and Kimpel, \textit{Samuel
\textsuperscript{110} Alan Dugald McKillop, \textit{Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist}, 1936, p. 295.
\textsuperscript{111} Alan Dugald McKillop, “On Sir Charles Grandison”, (1956), in \textit{Samuel Richardson: A Collection
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have remembered Giannone’s History of Naples which was dedicated to Earl
Grandison and, according to McKillop, his son Viscount Falkland, whereas in
actual fact it was his brother-in-law. McKillop quotes from Ogilvie’s dedication
to the Civil History of the Kingdom of Naples:

“I have at hand the noble Historian, who, in his Catalogue of Heroes (great as
any Greece or Rome ever produc’d) has not two more beautiful Characters,
than those of Falkland and Grandison.”

In 1974 Mary Ann Doody also discussed the origins of the name of
Grandison, arguing that the names of both Grandison and Byron used in the
novel suggest rank and station. She especially believes that “Grandison” is a
felicitous choice, because of what the name itself suggests (true grandeur,
greatness of mind, noble lineage), and because of its historic associations.
Then she explains that William Villiers, Viscount Grandison, was one of the
leading Royalists in the Civil War, praised in Clarendon’s History of the Rebellion as:

A young Man of so virtuous a habit of mind, that no temptation or provoca-
tion could corrupt him ... and of that rare Piety and Devotion, that the Court,
or Camp, could not shew a more faultless Person.

Doody further adds that his descendant was Richardson’s contemporary, John
Villiers, 5th Viscount Grandison and 1st Earl, husband of the Honourable Frances Carey, daughter of Viscount Falkland. She ends by concluding that “it
was a trifle daring of Richardson to use a name so like a real title”.

The real reason for Richardson’s use of the name of Grandison could actu-
ally have been much more interesting. In 1996 Hugh Trevor-Roper wrote an
article about the connection between Pietro Giannone and Great Britain. He
describes how Giannone, a revolutionary thinker, had tried in the early
eighteenth century to liberate Italy from the feudal power of the Roman Cath-
olic Church with a further aim of freeing Christianity itself from the cor-
ruping power of the political church. Trevor-Roper considers Giannone, the
great Neapolitan lawyer and philosophic historian, as the real founder, if not
protomartyr, of the “civil history” (philosophic) of the Enlightenment. He fur-
ther informs us how Giannone’s writings were disseminated in Britain by the

112 ibid., p. 124.
113 Margaret Ann Doody, A Natural Passion: A Study of the Novels of Samuel Richardson, Oxford,
114 Two other critics briefly discussed the same subject in 1975 and 1976, cf. W. Zach, “Two Notes
on ‘Sir Charles Grandison’”, in Notes and Queries, Nov. 1975, 392-493) and J.C. Hilson, “Richardson
and the Dedication to the Earl of Grandison”, in Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen
und Literaturen, (213), 1976, 343-345.
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non-juring bishop and antiquary Richard Rawlinson, the learned Scottish journalist Archibald Bower, a former Jesuit and author of the History of Popes, as well as by some other Jacobites.

In 1705 Archibald Bower (1686-1766) went to Rome where he was admitted into the Society of Jesus in 1706. In 1726 he left Italy and went back to England. His enemies said that the reason for his return was his involvement with a nun, but Bower explained that it was the result of the horror he felt at the cruelties committed by the court of the inquisition at Macerata in which he acted as a counsellor or judge. In 1754 some letters were made public which were allegedly written by Bower to Father Sheldon, provincial of the Jesuits in England, as a result of which Bower was accused of being in fact a Roman Catholic while pretending to be an adherent of the Protestant faith. Other charges followed against Bower’s moral, religious and literary character. The pamphlets brought out by Bower in 1756-57 to defend himself were printed by Richardson. Richardson and Bower together with the fellow-Scot Andrew Millar had been associated from 1735 to 1744 in connection with the preparation and publication of the Ancient Part of An Universal History.116 Bower contributed the history of Rome.

Giannone’s first book Istoria civile del regno di Napoli forced him to flee from Napels in 1723 and find safety in Vienna.117 This flight may have influenced Richardson to choose Vienna as a safe haven when Grandison had to flee Italy (Vol. III, pp. 174, 226). In 1723 Richard Rawlinson, who was strongly attached to the cause of the exiled James III, was in Italy. He was a collector of manuscripts, coins, medals and miscellaneous curiosities. Visiting Rome in 1724, he saw a copy of the bull pinned to the door of a church which condemned the Civil History of Giannone. He detached it to join it to his collection. He returned to England in 1726. Around this time he also obtained a copy of Giannone’s manuscript of which he coordinated what was to become the first translation of the book in any language. The publisher was Andrew Millar,118 the translator was Captain James Ogilvie (according to William Merritt Sale an officer of the Earl of Orrery’s Regiment of Scotch Fuziliers, but Trevor-Roper cannot add much information on the “mysterious” Captain Ogilvie),119 and the printer Samuel Richardson.

In the meantime Bower had also returned to England as stated above where he ran a periodical in which he enthusiastically reviewed Giannone’s

116 This is confirmed by Sale, who tells us that in 1756-57 Richardson printed for Archibald Bower several pamphlets in which he defended himself against accusations of being a secret member of the Catholic Church (Sale, Op. cit., pp. 103, 121, 152).
117 For biographical information about Giannone, see the Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani, Vol. 54, Rome, 2000.
119 According to Sale, Orrery had been arrested in 1723 for conspiracy in connection with the Jacobite plot in which Bishop Atterbury and his amanuensis George Kelly had been involved. He had also been associated with the Duke of Wharton in the early opposition to Walpole. Kelly’s speech in his own defence had been printed in five editions by Richardson, see Sale, Op. cit., pp.
Richardson’s Printing Career

Civil History as “the most perfect history of Naples that is extant in any language”. This review coincided with the publication in 1729 of the first volume of the English translation of the Civil History, and did much to boost the sale. When Giannone received Ogilvie’s translation of his work, he was surprised to find in Ogilvie’s preface a long list of subscribers, “milordi, arcivescovi, vescovi ed altre persone illustri”, all attracted to Giannone, according to Trevor-Roper, by his learning, his independence and his anti-clericalism. Indeed, the list of subscribers was impressive and contained seven dukes, two marquesses, sixteen earls, seven viscounts, thirteen barons, twenty baronets. More than half of the subscribers were Scots, especially from the Jacobite, Episcopalian North-East of Scotland which had made a number of contributions to the literature of mystical religion. There was not a negligible number of Jacobites from this area with mystical leanings, followers of Fénelon, Madame Guyon, Antoinette Bourignon and Poiret, who had no taste for religious controversy: intelligent men of good positions, the educated and the leisureed, hoping for better days to come under Stuart rule, which, they thought, would allow for true inward personal religion associated with Episcopal forms of government and worship. These men disliked Presbyterianism which they associated with scholastic dogmatism and ecclesiastical tyranny as well as with puritanism. The list included names such as the Ogilvies (apparently a very large family, because there were seven of them on the list), Forbes, Arbuthnot, Gordon, etc., all of whom play a significant role in the letters of Dr James Keith (who had a medical practice in London and was a friend of George Cheyne) and others to Lord Deskford.

But now the question remains as to what was the link with Lord Grandison. It is in the preface and the dedication of this work that Ogilvie mentions Grandison. He writes how he had suffered a terrible “change of cir-

109, 182-183. This incident is also mentioned by Trevor-Roper in the same article, p. 664, footnote 13. Trevor-Roper describes Ogilvie as follows: “Fluent in French and Italian, financially ruined in a year fatal to many of his friends, travelling companion of an impoverished Jacobite peer, friend and collaborator of a migratory Jacobite hedge-bishop, translator of Catholic political propaganda in the Stuart interest - such is the character of the mysterious Captain Ogilvie which emerges from his own arcane admissions.” (Trevor-Roper,Op. cit., p. 665)


121 Mentioning Lord Deskford as another interesting member of the group who visited Madame Guyon at Blois, Henderson calls him: James Ogilvie, Lord Deskford, afterwards 5th Earl of Findlater and 2nd Earl of Seafield (p. 39). Then, a few pages later, Henderson mentions another Ogilvie. Referring to a collection of books and manuscripts which belonged to Lord Forbes of Pitsligo, Henderson informs us that these had belonged to him personally or to his friend James Ogilvie of Auchiries (cf. G.D. Henderson’s Mystics of the North-East, Including I. Letters of James Keith, M.D., and Others to Lord Deskford; II. Correspondence between Dr. George Garden and James Cunningham, Aberdeen, 1934, pp. 39 and 46). On p. 33 of the aforementioned book, Henderson discusses Dr George Garden and tells us that Garden was intimate with the Ogilvies and the Forbeses. James Ogilvie, the translator of Giannone’s Civil History, apparently was a member of this very extensive family.

122 These letters have all been printed in G.D. Henderson’s Mystics of the North-East. They include letters from Madame Guyon and her secretary A.M. Ramsay, who, together with the Garden brothers, was also a member of this group.
cumstances” in the “fatal year that involved so many in irretrievable ruin” (he most probably referred to the Jacobite rebellion of 1715) and how he had been relieved by the generosity of Lord Grandison, to whom he now dedicated the first of his two volumes. He further explains how he had then travelled in Italy with Grandison’s brother-in-law, Lord Falkland, “from whom he received many favours” and to whom he had intended to dedicate the second volume, but that Falkland had died in the meantime and therefore he dedicated it to his son and successor in title. Trevor-Roper adds that whereas Falkland had been a committed Jacobite, Grandison, as an Anglo-Irish landlord, had been bound to support the Protestant establishment, though his sympathies seemed to have been Jacobite. As to Trevor-Roper’s question why British non-jurors and Roman Catholics would have welcomed a work condemned by the Roman Catholic Church, I can only suggest that they were probably all very concerned with the issues of freedom of conscience and religious liberty.

Richardson’s choice of the name of Grandison may have been caused by various reasons. First there is their connection with the Stuarts. John Fitzgerald Villiers, fifth viscount Grandison, was created Earl Grandison in 1721 and was married with Frances Carey, daughter of viscount Falkland. Grandison descended from the aristocratic Villiers family who had sided with Charles I during the civil war. Their very complicated family tree shows their roots going back to a companion of William the Conqueror. I will only briefly mention a few other members of this family. George Villiers, one of the half-brothers of Grandison’s great-grandfather, was the Duke of Buckingham, court favourite of James I. His father’s cousin was Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland, mistress of Charles II. Grandison’s sister, Lady Harriet Fitzgerald Villiers, was the mother of William Pitt (the Elder). William Villiers, another member of this extensive family and a contemporary of Lord Grandison, was also a Jacobite and had received a titulary earldom from the “old pretender”.

Secondly, there is the matter of Grandison’s management of his estate which was rather innovative. In 1677 Grandison’s father, Brigadier General Edward Fitzgerald Villiers, had married Katherine Fitzgerald (as a result of which Edward added Fitzgerald to his name). Katherine had inherited the Dromana estate in Ireland in 1664, the seat of one of the principal families of the south of Ireland. When Grandison inherited the estate, he did much to improve it, planting many thousands of trees, which is confirmed by Ogilvie who informs us about the “magnificence and splendour” as well as the “exact Oeconomy and order” of his household.  

Yet another reason why Richardson may have chosen the name Grandison could be the fact that in 1750 Grandison had started building the village of Villierstown, a Protestant colony, which housed weavers and other personnel needed for the linen industry which he had introduced. The plan of Villierstown is rather interesting in that it strongly resembles Zinzendorf’s
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“Nieuw-Zeist” which he designed and built after he had been able to purchase the Zeister castle in 1745.124 Villierstown consisted of twenty-four houses, each of which had a garden. There was a school for boys and girls as well as a church. The houses were built on either side of a very wide street which ran towards Dromana House, Grandison’s residence. He obtained the epithet of “Good Earl John”. From the estate and business correspondence it appears that he had business dealings with a Quaker, called Thomas Leveing, about an arrangement to manufacture a compound manure, and with another Quaker, Samuel Pike, who supplied him with wine and lead. His Catholic sympathies appear from the correspondence of 1715-1716. In connection with the invasion scare of 1715 Grandison received directions to raise a militia and a warrant for seizing horses that belonged to “Papists”. He did not want to comply with these demands and protested against the seizure of plough horses belonging to Catholics. Moreover, we find an order for the release of people imprisoned merely on suspicion.125

Scientific and Other Work

Among the scientific works that came from Richardson’s press we find that in 1735 he printed Edward Saul’s An Historical and Philosophical Account of the Barometer, which is still referred to by modern authorities on the subject.126 He printed books on gardening by Philip Miller, such as The Gardener’s Dictionary and The Gardener’s Kalendar, printed in 1733 and 1737 and reprinted during the 1740s and 1750s. Miller was the head of the Chelsea Botanical Gardens and Fellow of the Royal Society. Richardson knew him personally. When Philip Erasmus Reich, a bookseller at Leipzig to whom Richardson had sent a copy of Sir Charles Grandison, visited Richardson in 1756 he found him at his country house, surrounded by a large company, all people of merit, among whom Miller.127 It was during this visit that Reich said Richardson’s country home recalled his idea of the Golden Age. According to Sale, Richardson subscribed for and may have printed an edition of the Works of Francis Bacon, which was published in 1740 in four volumes.128 Apart from printing for Dr

126 See English Barometers 1680-1860, Suffolk, 1992, the standard work on the subject today by Nicholas Goodison, who attended King’s College, Cambridge. He refers to Saul on several occasions.
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George Cheyne, Richardson printed in 1743 and 1745 Robert James’s *A Medical Dictionary including physic, surgery, anatomy, chymistry, and botany, in all their branches relative to medicine*. It was published by Thomas Osborne’s Society of Booksellers for Promoting Learning in which Richardson was a partner. From 1736 to his death in 1761 he was involved in a huge project to print *An Universal History, from the Earliest Account of Time to the Present*. For the modern part Tobias Smollett acted as general editor.

Richardson’s interest in history and travelling appears from the fact that he printed in 1732 Volume VI of *A Collection of Voyages and Travels*. Awnsham Churchill, a London bookseller, had collected the material for these volumes. Churchill also owned some of the manuscripts of Sir Thomas Roe (1581–1644). Richardson edited these manuscripts and printed them in 1740 as *The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe in His Embassy to the Ottoman Porte*. No longer in opposition to Walpole, he dedicated it to the King. Roe was ambassador to Constantinople when the Thirty Years War broke out in 1618 and the husband of King James’s daughter Elizabeth, the so-called Winter King (Frederick V of the Palatinate), lost both his new kingdom in Bohemia and his hereditary Palatinate after the Battle of the White Mountain in 1620.

A salient fact is that at the same time all Protestants were also exiled from Bohemia together with the last bishop of the Bohemian Brethren, the famous educationist Jan Comenius. It was the remains of this sect which, having survived for a hundred years, accepted in 1721 an offer from Zinzendorf to join the Herrnhuter, with whom they amalgamated.

**Conclusion**

The picture we get from looking at Richardson’s printing career is definitely not that of an uneducated printer. Having discussed some of the spiritual and scientific work which came from Richardson’s press, representing the Inner

---

129 Ibid., pp. 96–97, 182.
131 See p. 26 above.
132 Delno C. West states that the role of Joachite eschatology among the Taborites in Bohemia was great. The Taborites were the extreme party of Hussites who scorned all reasoned theology, had no churches and kept no feast days. They professed extreme social doctrines, demanding the abolition of oaths, courts of justice and all worldly dignities. The militant Taborites steadily lost influence after 1434, but the pacific and sectarian elements in their tradition were inherited by the Bohemian Brethren (cf.: Joachim of Fiore in Christian Thought: Essays on the Influence of the Calabrian Prophet, Vol. 1, New York, 1975, p. xi). It has also been suggested that the Bohemian Brethren were inspired by the Rosicrucian dream which owed something to the Joachist prophetic programme and that Comenius (1592–1670) was influenced by the Rosicrucian ideas, which he brought to England. This great educationist hoped for a Utopian Church which would unite all religions in Christian love, and he saw education as the surest way to its fulfillment. Comenius set up schools in which men were to be formed into images of Christ by means of a pansophia, an organic development of all elements of Divine wisdom. Coercion was to be avoided; the senses were to be employed wherever possible, and everything to be learned was first to be properly understood. His ultimate aim was the development of the character on Christian lines. For a connection between Boehme and Comenius, see also Andrew Weeks, *Boehme: An Intellectual Biography of the Seventeenth-Century Philosopher and Mystic*, New York, 1991, pp. 101–102.
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Light (the “heart”) and the Enlightenment (the “head”) respectively, it is now time to narrow down my research to the “spiritual” Richardson and focus on those friends who shared his interest in spiritual and mystical matters. I will therefore explore in the next chapters Richardson’s relationship with such men as Cheyne, Law and Byrom, starting with the examination of the role Cheyne played.
The Relationship between Richardson and Cheyne

Introduction
So as to establish Richardson’s interest in spiritual and internal religion, it is necessary to explore the relationship between Richardson and the mystically inclined Scot George Cheyne (1672-1743), a Newtonian physician and Behmenist, on the basis of their correspondence and some of Cheyne’s books. I will show in this and the next chapter that Cheyne was the link between certain seventeenth-century ideas as found in the works of Boehme, Fénelon, Guyon, Bourignon and Poiret, and those found in William Law’s works, especially after 1735, as well as in Richardson’s last two novels. As we go along similarities in their thought patterns become clear, proving that, consciously or subconsciously, Cheyne influenced Richardson.

We will see that in Cheyne’s works certain Enlightenment objectives can be traced alongside ideas found in mystical or radical Pietism with its emphasis on the “light within”. Cheyne did not believe that there was a contradiction between science and the essence of Christianity, an essence which he believed he had found through studying the mystics.

A brief introduction to Cheyne should suffice. He was born in Methlick, near Aberdeen in Scotland, in 1672. He received a classical education, being at first intended for the ministry. However, on the advice of Dr Archibald Pitcairn, Professor of Medicine at Edinburgh and chief representative of the so-called iatromathematical school of medical science, which drew close analogies between the human body and a machine, Cheyne went to the University of Edinburgh to study medicine. During these years he may have spent a brief

---

133 A late twentieth-century critic David Shuttleton remarked in 1999 that, although literary historians have noted the biographical link between Richardson and Cheyne as his “proto-psychiatrist”, their relationship remains relatively unexamined. (Cf. David E. Shuttleton, “Pamela’s Library: Samuel Richardson and Dr. Cheyne’s ‘Universal Cure’”, in Eighteenth-Century Life, 1999, Feb. 23 (1), 59-79).
134 Rightly or wrongly, it does not concern us here.
135 There is some confusion as to the exact date of his birth. Actually, he was born in 1672, a fact which is based on the information Cheyne gives in his letters to Richardson (cf. letter LII, 23 December 1741, “70 in a few months”; letter LVI, 9 March 1742, “... as I am at 70”; letter LXVI, 30 June 1742, “now at 70”; letter LXVIII, 30 July 1742, “I am 70” (Charles Mullett, The Letters of Doctor George Cheyne to Samuel Richardson (1733-1743), University of Missouri Studies, Vol. XVIII, No. 1, Columbia, 1943, pp. 77, 88, 103, 106). He was baptized in Mains of Kelly, Methlick, Aberdeenshire, on 24 February 1673, and died at Bath on 12 April 1743.
time in Leiden. Cheyne was an active physician in the summer in Bath and in the winter at London, applying himself to chronic and especially nervous cases more frequently at Bath, where such patients would come most often. He finally settled in Bath permanently in 1718, where Richardson visited him several times during their nine years’ friendship. Though in the past some critics have referred to Cheyne as a quack, Roy Porter recognizes him as one of the originators of the neurological school of psychiatry.

The Correspondence between Richardson and Cheyne

The correspondence between Richardson and Cheyne (plates II and III), which was kept up on a regular basis over a period of about nine years, from 1734 to 1743, the year in which Cheyne died, gives us a clue not only to some of the physical problems Richardson experienced during those years, but, more importantly, to his psychological make-up. Their relationship was such that Cheyne regularly urged Richardson to treat or use him “as a brother”. In his letter of 13 May 1739, Cheyne tells Richardson he is too modest and assures Richardson that he would serve him as he would himself or his family and use his friendship as his brother’s.

Cheyne’s use of the word “brother” is essential, as it is concerned with the concept of agape: the selfless love which originates in God or Christian love, charity (“brotherly love”). Cheyne regularly refers to “charity” in his

---


138 For references to Cheyne and his work as a physician in London and Bath, see G.D. Henderson, Mystics of the North-East, Including I. Letters of James Keith, M.D., and Others to Lord Deskford; II. Correspondence between Dr. George Garden and James Cunningham, Aberdeen, 1934, pp. 75, 99, 105, 141.


140 It is in the New Testament that agape obtains a special meaning, because it represents the love
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II. Samuel Richardson (1689-1761). Engraved by E. Scriven from a picture by M. Chamberlin in the possession of the Earl of Onslow, Speaker of the House of Commons from 1728 onwards and later a close friend of Richardson. Published in January 1811 by J. Carpenter & W. Miller.
III. George Cheyne (1672-1743). From an engraved portrait dated 1817.
books, and in his *Essay on Regimen* (1740) he specifically quotes from Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians in which Paul extolls the virtue of love above other spiritual gifts (1 Cor. 13): “For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known” (1 Cor. 13:12). The last verse of chapter 13 reads “And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of them is charity” (1 Cor. 13:13). Charity is the “pure love” described by Fénelon: “L’amour pour Dieu seul, considéré en lui-même & sans aucun mélange de motif intéressé ni de crainte ni d’esperance, est le pur amour, ou la parfaite charité”, reminiscent of the doctrine of pure love expounded by Madame Guyon, the Quietist writer whom Fénelon defended for a long time, which got him into serious problems with Bossuet among others. Fénelon was greatly admired by Cheyne and his friends, about whom more later.

Cheyne urges Richardson in his letter of 13 May to be frank with him and “all honest Men”, for one cannot know one another’s heart but by what we say and write. He further tells Richardson that he always speaks and thinks out, for he has nothing to conceal: “not my Faults and Frailities”. We will see various examples of his “speaking out” in the course of this and the next chapter.

The friendship between Richardson and Cheyne and the ensuing correspondence may have started around 1733. Richardson’s brother-in-law, James Leake, knew Cheyne and may have introduced the two men. Leake began his business as publisher in Bath in the early 1720s. Cheyne’s *Essay of Health and
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revealed in Christ, an indication of a special quality in God and a model for humans to imitate. This resulted in a contrast in Christian usage between *agape*, as spiritual and unselfish love, and *eros*, carnal passion. The Christian doctrine of *agape* is based on the selfless love originating in God, whereas the pagan *eros* represents sexual or earthly love. *Agape* was usually translated into Latin by *caritas*, which explains the original meaning of the word “charity”. The term *agape* is also applied to the religious meal which seems to have been in use in the early Church in close relation to the Eucharist. In the eighteenth century the “love-meal” was introduced among various Pietist communities, including the Moravians, and later by the Methodist John Wesley.

141 For the connection between Richardson and Fénelon, see p. 19 above. Fénelon distinguished between *eros* and *agape*. He wrote the following lines: "Il y a dans l’état passif une liberté des enfants de Dieu qui n’a aucun rapport au libertinage effrené des enfants du siècle. ... L’amour pur leur donne une familiarité respectueuse avec Dieu, comme une épouse en a avec son époux. (Article XXXII. VRAY, in *the* *Explication des Maximes des Saints* sur La Vie Intérieure, (1697), printed by the Swiss Henry Wetstein who had settled in Amsterdam. The quotation is from the new edition of 1698, p. 142). (I will return to Henry Wetstein later, especially in chapter 3.) In the *Explication des Maximes des Saints* Fénelon defended the concept of disinterested love and cited the works of recognized spiritual writers, such as François de Sales, one of the leaders of the Counter-Reformation (cf. the “Avertissement” of the *Explication*, p. ix). For the controversy between Fénelon and Bossuet, see “Déclaration des trois Prelats ... contre le livre de l’Explication des Maximes des Saints”, pp. 196–259. Special reference is made by these three prelates, including Bossuet, to Madame Guyon. They write: “Il y avoit parmi nous une femme qui allant mis au jour un petit livre, sous le titre Moyen Court & c. & quelques autres encore, & qui allant avec cela répandu des Manuscrits des Quétistes, semblait être le chef de cette faction.” (pp. 203-205). Bossuet accused the Quietists of pure fanaticism. In private he called Madame Guyon Héloïse and Fénelon Abelard, and even compared the “cas Fénelon-Guyon” with the “cas Montanus-Priscilla” (cf. Bedoyere, *Op. cit.*, pp. 200, 210). An English translation of the *Maximes* was published in London by H. Rhodes in 1698.
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*Long Life* was published in 1724 by him and George Strahan, one of the leading London booksellers, and a relation of Cheyne’s wife Margaret Middleton.\(^{143}\) We know that Richardson printed Cheyne’s *The English Malady* in 1733, also published by Leake and Strahan.\(^{144}\) The second work Richardson printed for Cheyne was the eighth edition of the above mentioned *Essay of Health and Long Life* in 1734. In a letter, undated but before December 1734, Cheyne writes to Richardson that he is convinced no printer could have done more than Richardson.\(^{145}\)

Cheyne liked Richardson much more than he did James Leake, which may appear from Cheyne’s letter of 21 December 1734. Referring to an earlier visit of Richardson to Bath, Cheyne writes:

> I am sorry to hear your great Business and close Application sinks your Spirits often. I wish you could resolve once more to make a little Recess at Bath again: did I and you converse but honestly and freely one Month again, without the Participation or Example of your Brother in law, I should be able to make you as much or more alive, and gay than I am myself, who have been able cheerfully and comfortably to go through more Business of all Kinds, these 6 Months, since I recovered of that Misfortune you saw me under.\(^{146}\)

Actually, other people seemed to have disliked Leake as well. One of those who met him described him as the “Prince of all the Coxcomical fraternity of booksellers” who hardly had any learning himself and yet tried to sell it as dear as possible to others.\(^{147}\)

Cheyne often asked Richardson for advice in the latter’s capacity as a printer in relation to the printing and publishing of his own works. Sometimes he gave Richardson advice on how to write. An example of this in relation to *Pamela*, Part II, which appeared in December 1741, can be found in his letter of 24 August 1741 in which Cheyne stressed the importance of having a plan or outline without which “no regular or finished Picture can be wrought” and even went on to suggest several plans in quite some detail.\(^{148}\) Occasionally he functioned as a literary critic, as appears from an unpublished letter from January 1741-42 in which Richardson asked Cheyne’s advice on *Pamela*, Part II:

> If, Sir, there may be anything flagrantly amiss, in ye Opinion of any who may

\(^{143}\) In a letter to Richardson of 24 October 1741, Cheyne writes: “Mr. Strahan ... wrote to my Wife ... to intercede with me ... , being our Countryman and her Relation”, cf. Mullet, *Op. cit.* p. 71.

\(^{144}\) For a complete list of Cheyne’s works printed by Richardson, see W. Merritt Sale Jr., *Master Printer*, Ithaca, 1950, pp. 157-160.


\(^{146}\) Ibid., pp. 31-32.

\(^{147}\) H.K. Plomer, *Dictionaries of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland 1557-1775*, Ilkley, Yorkshire, 1977, p. 152.

think it worth while to Speak of it (for want of a better Subject) in your Presence, I shou’d be greatly oblig’d to you for Hints of that Kind. I printed a very large Number, and the Bookseller advises me to proceed with another Impression, and I should be very glad, That cou’d receive the Benefit which the first could not have.149

But more importantly, Cheyne was a spiritual advisor to Richardson. It is in this capacity that Cheyne played a much greater role than has been imagined by earlier critics. Their relationship was one to which the saying par pari cognoscitur applies. At the same time, however, we would probably do well to bear in mind the distinction between einfühlen and einsfühlen.150

Though not a great traveller, Richardson made several visits to Bath. The last one was in the spring of 1742. In a letter received on 17 May 1742 Cheyne wants Richardson to set out for Bath immediately, because he is convinced that the journey to Bath, which he thinks can be easily done in three days, would do Richardson good. Cheyne writes that he wants to organize lodgings for Richardson “just by him out of Town”, because he cannot possibly come near Richardson if he should be distant half a street, and he wants “to be very much with him”. That the visit did in fact take place appears from the next letter of 22 June 1742, in which Cheyne writes that Richardson has “one of the meekest, gentlest, and most bountiful [hearts] [Cheyne] ever observed and which is to such a Degree, as [he] could have had no Idea of, had [he] not had full Leisure to feel and observe it.”151

It is after this visit that the content of Cheyne’s letters changes and becomes more focussed on the subject of spirituality. This explains why Pamela (published in 1740-41) is not especially relevant to my discussion of the spiritual side of Richardson, whereas Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison are much more important. On 30 June 1742 Cheyne writes to Richardson that “low-living and its Attendants to mend a bad or weakened Constitution of [the] Body has a great Analogy and Resemblance to the Meanest Purification and Regeneration” as described in the Bible. He explains how this cure was known to the “ancient Physicians” who called it Cyclus Metasyncriticus or the “Transubstantiating Round and Circle”, intending to throw off “the old corrupted Mass, representing Repentance, Self-Denial, avoiding the Occasions of Sensuality and Sin, [or] the old Man with all his Works of Darkness.” Cheyne added that

149 [Ibid., p. 81.
150 In the Signatura Rerum Boehme writes: “For that I see one to speak, teach, preach, and write of God, and albeit I hear and read the same, yet this is not sufficient for me to understand him; but if his Sound and Spirit out of his Signature and Similitude, entrith into my own Similitude, and imprinteth his Similitude into mine, then I may understand him really and fundamentally, be it either spoken or written, if he has the Hammer that can strike my Bell” (Signatura Rerum, 1.1). Whenever I use the word “influence” in this study, it will be mostly in this sense of “similitude” (likeness) and “similarity” (like, alike or having mutual resemblance, of the same kind or nature).
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a low and sweetening, but especially a milk and seed diet would "shadow out" innocence and simplicity. He believed that living under the "Influence of the Divine Spirit" and in his constant presence, the inward peace and joy in the Holy Ghost would be resembled by a freedom of spirits, serenity, activity and cheerfulness on "returning Health and a mended Constitution" resulting from this "Cyclus Metasyncriticus." 152

The correspondence between Cheyne and Richardson was kept up to the very end of Cheyne’s life and it meant so much to Cheyne that - a bit impatiently perhaps but we should bear in mind that by now he was about 70 - he writes in his letter of 27 January 1742/43:

You may observe that I take a Pleasure always to answer yours, always as soon as possible; and if you had as great a Pleasure to write to me as I to you, I should hear from you at least weekly.153

Richardson was in the habit of sending Cheyne presents on a regular basis, which appears for instance from a letter of 20 April 1740 in which Cheyne acknowledges the present of "Sr. Thomas Roes Letters" or again in a letter dated 2 May 1742, in which Cheyne expresses his gratitude for "your fine Present of the fine new Edition of Pamela".154 It is in this letter also that Cheyne specifically asks Richardson:

Besure you destroy all my Letters when perused, for though I value little what the present or future World of this State, thinks of me, yet for my Family’s sake I would not be counted a mere Trifler, as these long Nothing-Letters, merely to

152 Ibid., p. 101. Cheyne wrote in the Essay on Regimen that "the Purification of the Soul is perfectly analogous to the Cure of the cacochymical and cadaverous State of the Body; and the Method of Cure of Spiritual Nature, taking in the different Subjects, Matter and Spirit, is perfectly similar to the Methodus metasyncriticus of the Ancients in the Cure of a Cachexy in the Body. The Analogy is here perfect and complete; they differ only, as the first and subsequent Terms of a geometrical divergent Progression. Sin, Disorder and Rebellion, is to the spiritual Nature of an intelligent Being, precisely and really (as much as they are both Realities) what a cancerous and malignant Ulcer is to an animal Body; The Cure of the last is by a low, sweetening and thinning Dyer at first, to enable the Patient to bear the last Operation, which must be by Excision and Extirpation, and raising new sound Flesh in its Place; Penitence, Self-denial, calm Passions, a meek Spirit, and a constant patient Attendance to, and Dependence on, the Directions of the Physician of Souls) by his omnipotent Power, and his being GOD, he, I say, must perform supernaturally and instanteously, as it were, (for a sweetening Cure of such inveterate Humours alone, would require infinit Time) some grand Operation, (in which the Creature is entirely passive) analogous to Excision and Extirpation, to divide between the Joints and the Marrow, to cut out the Adimal Core in lapsed spiritual Nature, and to raise up, ingraft and implant his own Nature and Substance in its stead, to perpetuat and eternise its Soundness and Integrity, not in Figure or Metaphor, as is commonly, tho' I think barbarously, philosophised; but at last, and in the dernier Resort, and before the hyperboloid Curve (to speak so) can meet with its Asymptot, as really and truly as Matter and Spirit are Realities, tho' of different Natures." (Essay on Regimen, pp. 316-317).

153 Ibid., p. 123.

154 Ibid., pp. 59; 93.
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This concurs with the following injunction, written by Richardson and dated 11 August 1744, found at the front of the notebook, a small octavo bound volume of 264 pages into which Richardson had all of Cheyne’s 87 letters copied. The injunction reads:

This Book, and the Letters in it, on no Terms, or Consideration, whatever, to be put, (or lent) into such hands, as that it may be printed, or published.

Mullett’s attention was called to the notebook containing the extensive correspondence of Cheyne with Richardson, while preparing The Letters of Dr. George Cheyne to the Countess of Huntingdon. Selina Hastings (1707-91), countess of Huntingdon, joined the Wesleys’ Methodist Society in 1739 and was largely responsible for introducing Methodism to the upper classes. In the disputes between John Wesley and George Whitefield, whose Calvinist theology led him to break with the more Arminian Wesleys in 1741, she took the side of Whitefield and became the founder of the body of Calvinistic Methodists known as “the Countess of Huntingdon’s Connexion.”

155 Ibid., p. 96. Yet, in a later letter dated 2 November 1742 Cheyne writes: “Perhaps I may pick out among my many Letters received from Time to Time some others that either describe [my Patients’] cases or record their Cure, which may be a Consolation or Encouragement for you, and might be of Service to others in like Cases when I am dead and gone, for my Letters and Correspondence are not the meanest Part of my Works and Experience; and as I do not think of printing more they may be as well deposited with you as with my Successors.” (Cf. Mullett, Op. cit., p. 115)

156 The notebook, Laing MSS. III, 356, is at the University of Edinburgh Library.


158 The correspondence between Cheyne and Selina Hastings took place between 1730-39. Charles F. Mullett, ed., The Letters of Dr. George Cheyne to the Countess of Huntingdon, San Marino, 1940.

159 John Byrom refers to the disputes in his letter to Dr. Hartley, dated April, 1741. Apparently, Dr. Hartley had read Whitefield’s letter about predestination, written in answer to Wesley, and thought it “a shrewd thing”. However, to Byrom it appeared to be a “thorough mistake of St. Paul’s words”, who according to him, was “far from a predestinarian”. He imagined Wesley and Whitefield had “different constructions on the same word”, otherwise he could not explain such a contradiction to the “general assertion of the whole Bible”. i.e. that grace and salvation were offered and intended to all men. (Cf. John Byrom, The Private Journals and Literary Remains of John Byrom, 2 Vols., ed. Richard Parkinson, Manchester, 1856-57, Vol. II, part I, p. 306.) Consider for instance what Boehme wrote about the subject of predestination: “Now come on, you Electionists [Sparrow’s note explains “that contend about Election and Predestination”] and contenders about the Election of Grace, you that suppose you alone are in the right, and esteem a simple faith to be but a foolish thing; you have danced long enough before this door, and have made you boast of the Scriptures, that they maintain that God hath of grace chosen some men in their mother’s womb to the kingdom of heaven, and reprobated or rejected others.” (Cf. Aurora, 26:151). Cheyne wrote about predestination as follows: “[I] can never be induc’d to believe that the omnipotent and infinitely good Author of [this terrestrial Globe and the State of Things in it], could, out of Choice and Election, or by unavoidable Necessity, much less from Malice or Impotence, have brought some into such a State of Misery, Pain and Torture, as the most cruel and barbarous Tyrant can scarce be supposed wantonly to inflict, or be delighted with, in his most treacherous Enemies, or villainous Slaves: For to such a Height of Pain and Torture, and higher, if possible, have I seen some
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Like Richardson, Selina Hastings had found in Cheyne not only a physician, but also a friend and adviser. This appears from a letter she wrote from Bath to her husband on 31 December 1741 in which she said that, after a friendly dinner with Cheyne and his wife, the three had spent the evening “in most pious and religious conversation, a thing hard to be found here. ... He is I think more in favour than ever with me, though much out of fashion here.” Two days later she wrote that:

[Cheyne] had been talking like an old apostle. He really has the most refined notions of the true spiritual religion I almost ever met with. The people of Bath say I have made him a Methodist, but indeed I receive much light and comfort from his conversation.160

Mullett found included in the appendix of the book in which Richardson had collected Cheyne’s letters some other items relating to Cheyne such as his obituary which appeared in the Gentleman’s Magazine in 1743,161 as well as an article on Cheyne which had appeared first in the Weekly Miscellany and then in the Gentleman’s Magazine of 1738. Sometimes the copyist misread Cheyne’s letters, for instance when Cheyne refers to Jacob Boehme (spelled as “Behmen” instead of the more common English form of “Behmen”) or to Henry Wetstein (Western).

The original letters have not been found, but six of these letters, with omissions and alterations, were printed in Rebecca Warner’s Original Letters, published in 1817. Some of Richardson’s letters to George Cheyne have been included in John Carroll’s Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson.162 Carroll brought from mere natural Diseases. No! None but Devils could have such Malice, none but Men themselves, or what is next themselves, I mean, their Parents, who were the Instruments or Channels of their Bodies and Constitutions, could have Power or Means to produce such cruel Effects.” (The English Malady, pp. 25-26.)

160 Mullett, Op. cit., pp. vi-vii. This letter may have contributed to the view that Cheyne perhaps had been a Methodist, a view with which I do not agree. See for instance Anita Guerrini, “James Keill, George Cheyne, and Newtonian Physiology, 1690-1740”, in the Journal of the History of Biology, 18 (1985), 247-266. In this essay Guerrini suggests that Cheyne perhaps saw in Methodism an antidote to the “overly intellectual apologetics of low-church Anglicans”, which had, so Guerrini informs us, reduced much of the “spiritual content of the church to a vague deism”. She then tells us that Cheyne was “certainly” open to Methodism’s appeal and that Cheyne’s autobiographical account contains all the elements of what became, in her view, the standard Methodist conversion tale. In her essay “Case History as Spiritual Biography: George Cheyne’s ‘Case of the Author’”. Guerrini further argues that Cheyne’s “religious awakening” bears many of the marks of the “standard” Methodist testimony, including the description of a sinful youth, a dramatic experience leading to a recognition of mortality, and an extended ordeal of conversion (published in Eighteenth-Century Life, 1995, May, 19 (2), 18-27). See also David E. Shuttleton, “Methodism and Dr. Cheyne’s More Enlightening Principles” in Medicine in the Enlightenment, ed. Roy Porter, Amsterdam, 1995.

161 There was another obituary in The London Magazine, XII (1743), 205.
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did not appreciate the value of George Cheyne’s contributions as appears from his remark “Dr. George Cheyne who advised Richardson not only on ways of alleviating his nervous disorders - advice which put him on a vegetarian diet and a chamber horse - but also, with equally unsatisfactory results, on the subject-matter for the second part of Pamela.”

Mullett decided to edit the letters mainly because they express in some detail the medical ideas and practices in the first half of the eighteenth century and because they show us two distinguished personalities. More importantly for the purpose of this study, however, they are so interesting because they give us information about Richardson’s concern with the world of spirituality and mysticism. Increased knowledge about the two men will lead to a better understanding of the first half of the eighteenth century. Cheyne is in fact the link between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as regards the European theosophical-occult tradition, the influence of which is far from negligible.

Cheyne, Physician and Metaphysician

Cheyne was in his own day considered to be a very competent doctor and was the author of several very successful books, which appeared over a period of forty years. They show his wide interest which extended from medicine and natural philosophy to religion, metaphysics, astronomy and mathematics.

His writings usually went through several editions and were translated into other languages. As I have mentioned earlier, at least four of them were printed by Richardson. They were extensively listed in contemporary periodicals and are found in many libraries of his day and later, for instance in those of

---

163 Ibid., p. 18.
164 In *The Natural Method* (1742) Cheyne explained that he considered the practice of physic in three different lights. First the “Medicina Philosophica Seu Rationalis” of which true natural philosophy is the stem or root, and practical medicine merely a branch. Pharmacy is of a lower order, but still part of this first branch. Secondly, the “Medicina Expectativa”, which consists in keeping up the patient’s hopes, expectations and spirits, till nature clearly points out the principal causes and symptoms in acute diseases, and in chronic cases, till air, exercise and regimen have taken place. Thirdly, the “Medicina ad Euthanasiam” which, when the case is mortal, “lays the Patient down in Death with the least Pain”. But Cheyne urges that this should only be practised like “extreme Unction”. Always averse of pain, he writes that, if our pains become insupportable, opium and its solution laudanum, duly dosed, have wonderful effects. Opiates allow nature (the only “true Physician”) to go undisturbed about her work. He thinks that wherever pain is acute, intolerable or past enduring, opiates will most certainly relieve. He admits that there is the fear of overdosing, but adds that those who die of an overdosage of laudanum in the “Opinion of the World”, would have lived few days without it (cf. *The Natural Method of Curing the Diseases of the Body, and the Disorders of the Mind depending on the Body*, London, 1742, pp. 216-219). Always open and ingenuous, Cheyne tells us how the last two branches, though soon learned and readily met with in every good book of pharmacy or medicine, “yet could never strike [his] Fancy” (pp. 64-66). Perhaps Richardson thought of this phrase when he had Harriet explain to Sir Hargrave that he just did not hit her fancy (Sir Charles Grandison, Vol. I., p. 84).
165 A list of Cheyne’s works is to be found in Mullett’s Appendix I.
166 The editing and printing of Cheyne’s last two books, the *Essay on Regimen* (1740) and the *Natural Method* (1742), were an important subject in the letters written in the period from 1739 to 1742.
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Thomas Gray, Samuel Johnson, John Wesley, John Byrom, and Edward Young, who all made complimentary remarks about Cheyne’s work. Samuel Johnson recommended the books of “the learned, philosophical, and pious Dr Cheyne”, especially The English Malady. James Boswell was less impressed with Cheyne’s works, but that should not come as any surprise to those familiar with certain aspects of his personal life. We even find Cheyne’s works listed in the Catalogue of Stinstra’s library.

It is to the Essay on Regimen (Cheyne’s least successful book, though by himself considered to have been his best), that the Earl of Chesterfield referred when on 24 May 1739 he wrote to his friend George Lyttleton to tell him that he had read a great part of Cheyne’s magnum opus. Mockingly, but perhaps not viciously, Chesterfield stated that Cheyne had found out the whole secret of metaphysics and was “kind enough” to communicate it to the public, under the title of Conjectures, but that Cheyne had assured Chesterfield as a friend that he had done so only out of modesty, for, that “by the living God, he could mathematically demonstrate the truth of every conjecture”. Chesterfield added that Cheyne “snarls louder, grins fiercer, and is more sublimely mad” than when [Lyttleton] saw him.

We find that in the eighteenth century Cheyne’s professional contemporaries


170 Cf. Johannes Stinstra, Catalogus Bibliothecae insignem Praestantissimorum atque Optimae Notae Librorum ad Paratum Complexae, quos collegit vir Doctissimus et Plurimum Reverendus Ioannes Stinstra, dum viveret, Ecclesiae Teleobaptistarum Harlingae, per longam Annorum, Harlingen, 1790, nr. 693 (Philosophical Principles of Religion Natural and Revealed, 2 parts, 1715) and nr. 713 (Fluxionum Methodus Inversa of 1703).

171 Chesterfield had read the sheets before publication. See footnote 166. Cf. Bonamee Dobree, The Letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope, 4th Earl of Chesterfield, London, 1932, vol. 2, p. 358. Three years later, in 1742, Chesterfield wrote to Cheyne to thank him for inquiring after his health. He admitted having had frequent returns of giddiness, languors and other nervous symptoms, for which he had taken vomits, which did not really agree with him. As to his diet, Chesterfield informed Cheyne that the lowest sometimes agreed, and at other times disagreed, but he blamed that mostly on his constitution, which, he said, conformed itself the fashion of the times, and changed almost daily its friends for its enemies, and its enemies for its friends. However, Cheyne’s alkalised mercury and his (own) Burgundy had proved to be its two most constant friends. He added that he had read with great pleasure Cheyne’s book (i.e. his next book, The Natural Method, published in 1742 and dedicated to Chesterfield) which had been sent as per Cheyne’s request to Chesterfield by either Strahan or one of the Knapton brothers (Cheyne had returned to Strahan for this last book and had finally swapped Leake, with whom he had not been happy for a long time, for the Knaptons). Chesterfield found the physical part of The Natural Method extremely good, but admitted that as to the metaphysical part, he was not the right judge, because he looked
raries referred to him frequently, often in praise, but sometimes in derision. One such an attack is the following witty poem, which appeared in the 1730s and was printed in 1757 in the London Magazine. It was probably written by a doctor Winter of Bath:

Tell me from whom, fat-headed Scot,
Thou didst thy system learn;
From Hippocrate thou hast it not,
Nor Celsus, nor Pitairne.

Suppose we own that milk is good,
And say the same of grass;
The one for babes is only food,
The other for an ass.

Doctor! One new prescription try,
(A friend's advice forgive;)
Eat grass, reduce thyself, and die;
Thy patients then may live.

Cheyne did not take this lying down and replied in the same tone:

My system, Doctor, is my own,
No tutor I pretend:
My blunders hurt myself alone,
But yours your dearest friend.

Were you to milk and straw confin'd,
Thrice happy might you be;
Perhaps you might regain your mind,
And from your wit get free.

I cannot your prescription try,
But heartily “forgive”;
'Tis nat'ral you should bid me die
That you yourself may live.172

upon all metaphysics as guess-work of the imagination and added that he would take Cheyne's guess against that of any other metaphysician whatsoever (pp. 494-495).

172 London Magazine, XXVI (1757), 510. Also in Mullett, Op. cit., pp. 16-17. The “milk and seed” diet (without meat and wine, but with a lot of vegetables, milk and water) which Cheyne prescribed in certain “serious” cases (such as his own and Richardson’s) may have led George Rousseau to state gratuitously in 1988 that Cheyne's weight (in 1723-25) had been reduced from 32 stone or 203 kg to 9-3 stone or 59 kg. Rousseau even added in a footnote that Cheyne was “probably the best source for this figure”, and refers to p. 342 of The English Malady, where indeed 32 stone is mentioned, but nothing else. This may have caused Roy Porter to remark in 1990 that it would be “fascinat-
However, sometimes the attacks were more serious and scurrilous. We find Cheyne’s reaction to the accusations in some of his books. Cheyne identified two groups, the first of which he described as “stiff, rigid and precise Men”, who dismissed his conjectures and sentiments as dangerous and presumptuous, and himself as “wise above what was written”. To the second group belonged the “licentious, unguarded, spurious, Freethinkers”, from whom he expected “less Quarter”. They would merely “honour him with Enthusiasm, Romancing and Castle-building without any solid Foundation”, to which Cheyne added that “Enthusiasm can only hurt the Bodies or outward Fortunes by diabolic and tyrannical Persecution”.173

**Enthusiasm**

The accusation hurled at Cheyne of being an enthusiast is important and needs some clarifying.174 In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the word “enthusiasm” was applied disparagingly to emotional religion, representatives of which were for instance Antoinette Bourignon and Madame Guyon as well as the Quakers and the Moravians. In *Enthusiasm* Knox points at the distinction between the forced antithesis between spirit and matter upon which Manicheism is based as well as the dualism of the “Enthusiasts”,

173 Essay on Regimen, p. v.

174 An enthusiast, *en theos*, is defined as someone who is literally possessed or inspired by a god. “Inspired” is very similar in that it means to breathe in (the godlike essence). Ronald Knox explains that the word “enthusiast” has commonly been misapplied as a label, adding that it is generally used in a pejorative sense to denote a group of Christian men and women who are more attentive to the guidance of the Holy Spirit. They are often ridiculed for their so-called “over-godliness” or repressed by “unsympathetic authorities”. Since words only live so long as they have an errand to fulfil, the word “enthusiasm” in the religious sense belongs to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Knox suggests that Bishop George Hickes (see pp. 19 and 22 of this study for the connection between Hickes and Richardson) may have started “the vogue of the word” with his sermon on “The Spirit of Enthusiasm Exorcised” (1680), to be followed by the (third Earl) of Shaftesbury in 1711 with his “Essay on Enthusiasm” calculated to injure revealed religion in general. It was Shaftesbury who wrote that “inspiration is a real feeling of the Divine Presence, and enthusiasm a false one.” (Cf. Ronald A. Knox, *Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion*, (1950), Indiana, 1994, pp. 1-8).
The Relationship between Richardson and Cheyne

which he clarifies as follows:

Your traditional enthusiast over-emphasizes the distinction between 'the spirit' and 'the flesh': but the flesh is not matter, it is human nature, whether material or immaterial, still unredeemed. Human wisdom, for example, belongs to 'the flesh' quite as much as our bodily functions do. But this Oriental antithesis between spirit as entirely good and matter as entirely evil is something quite different; ... it leads away from Christianity to Pantheism.175

It is essential to remember that Cheyne considered the Manichean system an “impious Heresy”.176

The enthusiast described above often suffered persecution, hence Cheyne’s remark about “diabolical and tyrannical” persecution of enthusiasts. Originally from the Episcopalian (and often Jacobite) North-East of Scotland, he was well aware of the persecution several of his friends had been the victim of. Some had had to flee Scotland to safe havens offered them for instance in France or Holland. Such was the fate of his friend, the Jacobite Episcopalian minister Dr George Garden, who had issued translations of several of Antoinette Bourignon’s works with prefaces of his own.177 After the suppression of the Jacobite rising in 1715 Garden was thrown into prison, but manage-
ed shortly afterwards to escape to the continent. Cheyne may also have remembered the persecution of Antoinette Bourignon and Madame Guyon themselves, and these themes of persecution and enthusiasm may have influenced Richardson into writing *Clarissa* and *Sir Charles Grandison*. The little poem underneath one of Bourignon’s engravings (plate IV) especially applies to Clarissa’s predicament, and is equally relevant to Clementina’s situation, though in the latter case Sir Charles Grandison intervened as comforter or mediator.  

178 It reads as follows:

Christians I’ve sought from my Nativity  
I liv’d, I wrote, to shew them how such to be  
Convinc’d the World of errors, sins, abuses  
All hate me for ‘t, each one my NAME traduces.  
To death they persecute me every where  
How should I other Lot than JESUS bear?

Similarly, Madame Guyon’s song, sung in her prison cell, shows some striking parallels with Clarissa’s case:

When pure love is fought  
They imagine that this ought  
To cut off its spreading rays.  
But all they can fulfil  
With their martyrising ways  
Is to make it stronger still.  

Discussing for example the state of suffering, expiation, and progressive purification which, at last, will set human beings at liberty to become the sons and daughters of God, Cheyne argues that all this darkness, suffering and “unintelligible Play” is only to save human liberty and to produce at last *pure love* and *naked Faith*.  

Bedoyere describes Guyon’s love of God as follows:

Henderson mentions Cheyne. As I have mentioned earlier, other members of this group were William and James Forbes, and Andrew Michael Ramsay, secretary to Fénelon and Madame Guyon, though Ramsay lived mostly in France. They were all, according to Henderson, simply intelligent men of good social position, who had had some experience of the political and ecclesiastical conflicts during a difficult period of history and had been led from dissatisfaction with the “outward state of things” to seek and find “peace within”.  

178 I will argue in chapter 7 that Sir Charles Grandison represents the Paraclete, the advocate or one called to aid or support another (in *Sir Charles Grandison* Sir Charles is called to support and comfort Clementina). The Paraclete is a word used as a title of the Holy Ghost, the comforter, in art represented as a dove. Among the (seven) gifts of the Holy Ghost we find enumerated counsel, fortitude, piety, understanding, wisdom and knowledge.  


180 *Essay on Regimen*, pp. 84-85.
I loved Him without any motive or reason for loving, for no thoughts passed through my head, even in the deepest part of my being. .... I well knew He was good and full of mercy. His perfections were my happiness. But I did not think of myself in loving Him. I loved Him and I burnt with love, because I loved Him. I loved Him in such a way that I could only love Him; but in loving Him I had no motive but Himself.  

It is a description of the soul in love with God and as such an accurate picture of Clarissa (Plate V).

In *Sir Charles Grandison* Richardson used Cheyne’s definition of enthusiasm in the scenes in which Harriet describes Clementina to Mrs Shirley before she had met her:

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. But could the noble Lady have thus acted, my dear grandmamma, had not she been stimulated by that glorious Enthusiasm, of which her disturbed imagination had shewn some previous tokens. (VII. 351) (Italics are mine)

Upon meeting Clementina for the first time, Harriet is confirmed in her suspicions:

If I admired, if I loved her before, now that I have seen her, that I have conversed with her, I love, I admire her, if possible, ten times more. She is really, in her person, a lovely woman, of middle stature; extremely genteel: An air of dignity, even of grandeur, appears in her aspect, and in all she says and does. .... Indeed she is a lovely woman! She has the finest black eye, hair, eyebrows of the same colour, I ever saw; yet has sometimes a wildish cast with her eye, sometimes a languor, that, when one knows her story, reminds one that her head has been disturbed. (VII. 353) (Italics are mine)

I will return to this subject in chapter 7.

Cheyne and Richardson were not the only ones struggling with the accusation of enthusiasm. William Law had the same problem to contend with. Cheyne was thoroughly familiar with Law’s works, as was Richardson. (I will
prove later that Richardson printed some of Law’s Behmenist works from the mid-1730s onwards.) In An Earnest and Serious Answer to Dr. Trapp’s Discourse of the Folly, Sin and Danger of Being Righteous Over-Much (1740), William Law responded to Trapp’s accusation that men and women who tried to live up to “their Height and Holiness and Perfection, which was proper to their State and Condition” were “deluded, weak, or hypocritical, or half-thinking People”, who disturbed the Christian Church with their “Projects about their State and Condition” were “deluded, weak, or hypocritical, or half-thinking People”, who disturbed the Christian Church with their “Projects about Perfection”. These “deluded” people, whom Trapp thought were in the “very Paths” that lead to “Fanatic Madness”, had to be set right by returning to “the Instruction of Common Sense”. Moreover, Trapp argued that in all ages Enthusiasts had been “Righteous over-much” and that enthusiasm would lead either to presumption or to desperation. In the latter case, it would throw them into despair, make them “stark mad” and have them end up in Bedlam. As is clear from the above, Cheyne, Richardson and Law had a different interpretation of the word enthusiasm than Dr. Trapp, but to all of them it had a negative connotation.

Law tried to show that Dr Trapp’s arguing was a clear example of what “miserable Work Learning can make with the Holy Scriptures” among the clergy:

We need not look at Rome or Geneva, or the ancient Rabbis of the Jewish Sanhedrin. … For it must be said, that the true Messiah is not rightly owned, the Christian Religion is not truly known, nor its Benefits rightly sought, till the Soul is all Love, and Faith, and Hunger, and Thirst, after this new Life, Birth, and real Formation of Jesus Christ in it, till without Fear of Enthusiasm it seeks and expects all its Redemption from it.

Law was deeply hurt at the fact that Dr. Trapp had on several occasions distorted his words, which appears from the following text:

Does not the Doctor know that he designedly mangled the Words he quoted, and left out that Part which showed the Reason of my so expressing myself?

Finding himself in a similar situation with people distorting his words, Cheyne wrote that he always had only one “uniform manner of thinking in Philosophy, Physics and Divinity. in the main, ever since [his] Thoughts were fixed and [his] Principles established”. Though he acknowledged that his thoughts might have had “Alternatives of greater Light and Darkness, occasionally and transiently according to the State of his Spirits, Knowledge and Experience,” yet in the “Heart of his Soul” he had been “uniform, and under the same Convictions”, and always thought “spurious Free-Thinkers, active La-
titudinarians, and Apostolic Infidels” under some bodily distemper, and much more proper subjects for medicine than argument. These words, written in 1740, are reminiscent of William Law’s writings. Law’s views of freethinkers and Latitudinarians are found especially in The Case of Reason (1731) in which he attacked Matthew Tindal, who had maintained that:

1. Human reason, or natural light, is the only means of knowing all that God requires of us. 2. That reason, or natural light, is so full, sufficient, plain, and certain a rule or guide in all religious duties, that no external divine revelation can add anything to it, or require us to believe or practise anything, that was not as fully known before.

In Chapter V of The Case of Reason Law shows that, according to him:

All the mutability of our tempers, the disorders of our passions, the corruption of our hearts, all the reveries of the imagination, all the contradictions and absurdities that are to be found in human life, and human opinions, are strictly and precisely the mutability, disorders, corruption, and absurdities of human reason.

As we have seen, Cheyne strongly disapproved of infidelity. It seems that Richardson held similar views. This appears from the scene in Sir Charles Grandison in which Harriet tries to explain away her frightful dream (a subject I will return to later in chapter 7), which belonged to the nightmare type, not worth interpreting. She writes:

But Superstition is, more or less, I believe, 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. (Vl. 149) (Italics are mine)

While admitting that superstition seems a “natural defect”, Richardson clearly rejected it, but, like Cheyne, he equally rejected scepticism, “the parent of
infidelity”.

Important information in relation to the accusation of enthusiasm can be found in Cheyne’s autobiographical account published in The English Malady. Realizing how “indecent and shocking Egotism is”, Cheyne apologized for making himself the subject of his work, but he believed that a detailed account of his own case was necessary, because of the “various and contradictory reports of, and sneers at [his] Regimen”. Moreover, he hoped that his case would be of some use to “low, desponding, valetudinary, over-grown Persons”, whose case might have some resemblance to his own. This, he believed, applied to everyone who had a “mortal Tabernacle subject to, and afflicted with nervous Disorders”, by a bad diet, or hereditary misfortune. He concludes:

After all the Pains I have taken, I have not yet got so large a Share of Enthusiasm, as to hope, by these my poor Labours, to do Good to any, except, perhaps, to a few poor, low, valetudinary, dying, miserable Creatures, who have not the Courage magnanimously and gloriously to suffer, pine, and putrify. The Brave, the Bold, the Intrepid, the Heroic, who value not Pain, who can suffer for Di-

190 George Cheyne, The English Malady, p. 362. In the Essay of Health and Long Life, published several years earlier in 1724, Cheyne had strongly recommended that our intake of meat and drink should be adjusted to our “concoctive” powers, so that we can live as long as our constitutions were originally made to last. The causes of chronic distempers are in Cheyne’s view the viscosity in the juices, the sharp and acrimonious salts and the relaxation or want of due force and “Springiness” in the solids (Essay of Health and Long Life, London, 1724, pp. 18-19). Cheyne refers to “Lewis Cornaro”, a Venetian nobleman, whose life was despaired of at 40, but who lived to a great age as a result of merely being temperate (Essay of Health and Long Life, pp. 31, 206). Cheyne recognized that our northern climate made the appetite keener, but still advised temperance, which, in his eyes, meant that a person with no laborious employment should restrict himself to about 8 ounces of flesh a day (c. 220 gr), 12 ounces of bread or vegetables (c. 340 gr) and a pint of wine or other liquor, and even less for those in a sedentary profession, because their nerves were more worn out by intellectual studies, for “a clear Head must have a clean Stomach” (Essay of Health and Long Life, p. 34). Only as a last resort in severe cases of “nervous distempers” (fearing apoplexy or palsy which would ultimately cause the patient’s death) would Cheyne prescribe his “milk and seed” diet. When seriously ill around 1711, Cheyne had heard of the “total Milk Diet” of Dr Taylor of Croydon and found that Thomas Sydenham (plate VI), a physician whom he very much admired and to whom he refers regularly throughout his works, had with great success prescribed a total milk diet in a case of “obstinate Hysterick Fits and Colicks”. Sydenham (1624-1689) repudiated all dogmatic authority in matters of science and was as little influenced by theory as by tradition. His aim was to observe nature. His first book Methodus Curandi Febres (1666), dedicated to Robert Boyle, was expanded into Observationes Medicae (1676) which was regarded of great importance in the history of medicine and had considerable success. It was reprinted in Amsterdam in the same year. Sydenham’s Opera universa were printed in 1687 by Henry Wetstein in Amsterdam. Sydenham suffered from gout (and calculus) from 1649 onwards and his personal experience enabled him to write a description of gout which seemed to have been unsurpassed in its kind. He made several other important contributions to medicine. We find Sydenham’s name mentioned in connection with Cheyne. In the Gentleman’s Magazine (XIII, 1743, 218) Cheyne is described “as a Physician, [who] seemed to proceed, like Hippocrates of old and Sydenham of late”. Similarly, in an early issue of the Gentleman’s Magazine Cheyne’s and Sydenham’s names are linked: “‘Tis Magick, Powerful Magick, reigns in this [Cheyne’s works] / And proves what Sydenham was, bright Cheyne is.” (Cf. Mullett, Op. cit., pp. 132, 136).
VI. Thomas Sydenham (1624-1689). Engraved by E. Scriven from the portrait at All Souls College, Oxford.
version, and who prefer death with a Bounce, to Life on such Conditions as I propose; and chuse rather to extinguish now, than in forty or fifty Years hence, will heartily despise and pity me and my Lucubrations: Nunquam persuaderis etiamsi persuaseris: You shall never convince, tho' you convict me. \(^{191}\)

Cheyne tells us how, some years after the publication of the first part of the Philosophical Principles of Religion Natural and Revealed in 1705, so probably in 1707-1709, \(^{192}\) he felt melancholy and dejected, but with his faculties “as clear and quick as ever”. He explains how he had examined and believed the great and fundamental principles of all virtue and morality, viz. the existence of a supreme and infinitely perfect being, the freedom of the will, the immortality of the spirits of all intelligent beings, and the certainty of future rewards or punishments, but that now he started meditating about what he called “higher and more enlightening Principles of Virtue and Morality” and wondered whether there were not some clearer accounts discoverable from the mere “Light of Nature and Philosophy”.

Cheyne then thought of whom of all his acquaintances he would like to resemble most, or who of them had lived up to what he called “the Plain Truths and Precepts contained in the Gospels”, in particular those found in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7), which in its broadest context proclaims the kingdom of God to all, focussing on the spiritual and ethical nature of the people of the kingdom, whose place in it is not based on their own accomplishments. \(^{193}\) And Cheyne fixed on one: “a worthy and learned Clergyman of the Church of England”, who was known and distinguished in the philosophical and theological world, but whom he could not name, because he was still living (in 1733) and now very old. \(^{194}\) He added:

\(^{191}\) Ibid., p. 365.
\(^{192}\) Cheyne now gives us an indication as to when this happened, for he writes “… my Philosophical Principles publish’d some years before that happen’d” (The English Malady, p. 331).
\(^{193}\) The Sermon on the Mount is addressed to the humble and persecuted, rather than the proud and triumphant, just as Cheyne’s own works were not for “the Brave, the Bold, the Intrepid, the Heroic, who value not Pain, who can suffer for Diversion, and who prefer death with a Bounce.” The Sermon contains nine beatitudes or blessings, the sixth of which - “blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God” - has had a strong influence on the mystical tradition. The people of the kingdom are spiritually sincere and simple, oriented towards the kingdom rather than towards their own material security. In this sense the kingdom of God was a spiritual reality rather than a political system and as such different from the theme of the Book of Revelation in which the establishment of the kingdom of God (or the millennium) upon earth is described as a political reality. One has to bear in mind that the kingdom of God is a broad concept with many divergent strands. For Cheyne this (spiritual) kingdom would have represented a state “within him”, an inner state of mind, which in fact demonstrates Cheyne’s mysticism. This kingdom should not be confused with the millennium (or the thousand-year-period of blessedness to be enjoyed on earth) as we find it depicted in the Book of Revelation. I will return to this subject in chapter 6.
\(^{194}\) The English Malady, p. 332. In the same book Cheyne had said of truth that it is “simple, and one in its Root and Source, but various and manifold in different Situations and Circumstances” (cf. English Malady, p. xi).
So, in this case, the more quickly to settle my Mind, and quiet my Conscience, I resolved to purchase, study and examine carefully such Spiritual and Dogmatic Authors, as I knew this venerable Man did most approve and delight in. In this manner I collected a Set of religious Books and Writers, of most of the first Ages since Christianity, recommended by him, with a few others of the most Spiritual of the Moderns, which have been my Study, Delight and Entertainment in my Retirements ever since: and on these I have formed my Ideas, Principles and Sentiments: so as, under all the Varieties of Opinions, Sects, Disputes, and Controversies, that of late, and since the Earliest Ages, have been canvassed and bandied in the World, I have scarce ever been the least shaken, or tempted to change my Sentiments or Opinions, or so much as to hesitate in any material Point.

My theory is that the venerable man whom Cheyne admired was Thomas Wilson (plate VII), bishop of Sodor and Man, who in 1733 was about 70 years old. So let us now briefly turn to Wilson to back up my speculation.

**Thomas Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man**

Having turned his thoughts from medicine to the church, Wilson obtained in 1686 his B.A. at Trinity College, Dublin, followed several years later by an M.A. In 1687 he became curate to his uncle Richard Sherlock in the chapelry of Newchurch Kenyon, Lancashire, and was ordained priest in 1689. In 1692 he was appointed domestic chaplain to the ninth earl of Derby and tutor to his only son, for which he received a salary of 30 pounds. Appointed in 1693 as master of an almshouse at Lathom he earned another 20 pounds. At Easter of that year he made a vow to set apart a fifth of his meagre income for pious purposes, especially for the poor.

In 1697 Lord Derby offered him the bishopric of Sodor and Man. On April 6 of the next year Wilson took up his residence at Bishop’s Court, Kirk Michael, which he found in a ruinous condition. He rebuilt the greater part of it at a cost of about 1,400 pounds which he paid himself, except for 200 pounds. His biographers tell us that he became a very energetic planter of fruit and forest trees, turning “the bare slopes into a richly wooded glen”.

Wilson also was an enthusiastic farmer and miller, doing much to develop the resources of the island. Cheyne must have been much impressed by the fact that for some time Wilson was the only doctor on the island. He set up a drug-shop and gave advice and medicine gratis to the poor. These facts may again, much later, have influenced Richardson when he described how Sir Charles Grandison employed an apothecary and a surgeon who attended his tenants. Seeing a glass-case filled with “physical matters”, Harriet asks

195 See p. 27 above.
VII. Bishop Thomas Wilson (1663-1755). His portrait was painted in 1732 and engraved in 1735 by Vertue (reproduced in 1750). It shows his black skullcap and hair flowing.
what it is for. Mrs Curzon, the housekeeper, answers:

Here is ... a collection of all the useful drugs in medicine: But does not your Ladyship know the noble method that my master has fallen into since his last arrival in England? ... He gives a salary ... to a skilful apothecary; and pays him for his drugs besides ... and this gentleman dispenses physic to all his tenants, who are not able to pay for advice; nor are the poor who are not his tenants, refused, when recommended by Dr. Bartlett. (VII. 286)

Then Mrs Curzon describes the surgeon who lives on the estate:

There lives in an house [a surgeon]... within five miles of this, almost in the middle of the estate, and pays no rent, a very worthy young man; brought up, under an eminent surgeon of one of the London hospitals, who has orders likewise for attending his tenants in the way of his business - As also every casualty that happens within distance, and where another surgeon is not to be met with. And he ... is paid on a cure actually performed. But if the patient die, his trouble and attendance are only considered according to the time taken up; except a particular case requires consideration. (VII. 286)

The building of new churches was one of Wilson’s earliest projects. In 1704 Wilson drew up his famous “Ecclesiastical Constitutions” of which it was said that “if the ancient discipline of the church were lost, it might be found in all its purity in the Isle of Man”. He also established parochial libraries in his diocese as well as a public library at Castletown in 1706. He was responsible for the first book published in Manx.

Like the Moravian Comenius whose works he had read, Wilson was involved in educational projects. With the help of the philanthropist Lady Elizabeth Hastings, sister-in-law of Selina Hastings, Countess of Huntingdon, and highly admired by William Law, Wilson was able to increase the efficiency of the grammar schools and parish schools in the island.

---

197 See Sir Charles Grandison’s activities in this respect (e.g. Vol. III, p. 7).
198 See footnote 266 below.
199 This was called Principles and Duties of Christianity ... in English and Manx ... with short and plain directions and prayers, 2 vols., 1707.
200 Comenius (1592-1670) set up schools in which men were to be formed into images of Christ by means of a pansophia, an organic development of all elements of Divine wisdom. Coercion was to be avoided; the senses were to be employed wherever possible, and everything to be learned was first to be properly understood. The ultimate aim was the development of the character on Christian lines. In the XL Questions Concerning the Soule, Sparrow mentions Comenius in his address to the “earnest Lovers of Wisdom”. Sparrow writes that Comenius, by his Pansophia, designed the best way to educate all from their childhood, so that in the shortest time they may get the highest learning their natures can attain to.” It is in this address that Sparrow also refers to ancient philosophers such as Hermes Trismegistos, Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Plato, and the “modern Raymundus Lullius, Paracelsus and others”.
201 In An Earnest and Serious Answer to Dr. Trapp’s Discourse of the Folly, Sin and Danger of Being Righteous over-much (1740), William Law describes how he had a universal love and kind-
Wilson’s sympathies were not limited to the Church of England. Roman Catholics attended his services, and he allowed dissenters to sit or stand at the communion. The Quakers loved and respected him. We have already seen that Wilson met James Oglethorpe in 1735 with whom he shared an interest in foreign missions, especially to Georgia, whose trustees were mostly dissenters, and we know he met Zinzendorf in 1737 and was much interested in Moravian activities, became a member of Zinzendorf’s Order of the Mustard Seed and accepted the Presidency of the Anglican Tropus. From the above we may conclude that Wilson was most probably the “venerable” man whom Cheyne referred to, which is especially interesting because of Richardson’s connection with Wilson.

ness for all mankind, and more especially for those whom God had called to be his fellow-labourers in promoting the salvation of mankind, with whom he may have referred to Lady Elizabeth Hastings, who had died the year before [Works, Vol. VI, pp. 1-2].

In his article “Mysticism and Millennialism: ‘Immortal Dr. Cheyne’” (pp. 93 and 98), Rousseau argues that William Whiston had been the “venerable clergyman of the Church of England”, asserting that “there is a good deal of circumstantial evidence to suggest that Whiston is the scientist and philosopher whose ‘primitive Christianity’ subdued [Cheyne’s] misery in illness” and that these works of primitive Christianity “confirmed Cheyne’s developing sense that the material world was proximate to dissolution and the New Jerusalem imminent. To prop up his case Rousseau adds that William Whiston’s Arianism and disavowal of the coeternity of the Father and Son were notorious by 1706. Rousseau further states that Cheyne was ill and despondent and as a result of this followed Whiston’s example. We may compare this with Cheyne’s firm rejection of Arianism as a heresy. In the Essay on Regimen (pp. 186-188, 287-288) Cheyne explains that the Arian and Sabellian heresies are the “two capital Errors in the Doctrine of the Trinity, (especially of the Incarnation) and divine Nature of the Persons (which is the Hinge of the Doctrine of the Trinity)” and that both are very detrimental to “Christian Perfection and the Practice of its cardinal Virtues: Faith, Hope and Charity, or the Acquisition of the moral Powers of the Soul”, (i.e. justice, goodness, truth). But he adds that the Arian heresy is much more detrimental than the Sabellian. Cheyne apologized for having meddled with this subject, which he admitted to be quite out of his province, but it had been necessary to do so, because some of what he had said in the Philosophical Principles had been misunderstood as a result of which he had been accused of being an Arian. See for a modern discussion of Arianism: Maurice Wiles, Archetypal Heresy: Arianism through the Centuries, Oxford, 1996. For a detailed description of the complex issue of Whiston’s Arianism, see pp. 93-111. In the article mentioned above Rousseau claims that in 1709 or 1710 Cheyne “believed that the millennium had begun” and “that recent political and social events were sufficient proof, and that [Cheyne] bore a special mission in its commencement”. In the same article cited above Rousseau continues in a similar vein and, now discussing the year 1729 (according to Rousseau “[Cheyne’s] second medical annus mirabilis”), he states that “unfortunately, no evidence exists as to whether Cheyne still extolled Whiston as he had in 1706 - as a beacon of primitive Christianity -, but that [Cheyne’s] “evangelical mission to connect medicine and millenarianism increasingly obsessed him.” (Cf. Rousseau, Op. cit., p. 104). It is in this essay in footnote 68, p. 102, that Rousseau describes Cheyne as a man who suffered primarily from “manic-depression”, but that as Cheyne aged “this psychiatric condition was aggravated by chronic cardiac arrest.” I equally disagree with Guerrini’s theory that the venerable “clergyman of the Church of England” was the Episcopalian clergyman George Garden. She informs us that in 1705 Cheyne looked for “spiritual guidance” and, “as Augustine had turned to his mother”, Cheyne turned to whom Guerrini thinks was a friend of his youth, who led him toward certain appropriate texts. Guerrini incorrectly identifies this unnamed person as the “Scottish Episcopalian clergyman and mystic, George Garden”, arguing that Garden “could reasonably be called an Anglican”. (Cf. “Case History as Spiritual Biography: George Cheyne’s ‘Case of the Author’” in Eighteenth-Century Life, 1995, May, 19 (2), 18-27, esp. her endnote 33, p. 27).
Returning to Cheyne’s “own Case”, he informs us that the study of the spiritual and dogmatic authors, which he knew this “venerable” man approved, gave him much “Peace, Tranquility and Chearfulness” and contributed to the cure of his nervous diseases. Or in his own words:

The Fright, Anxiety, Dread and Terror, which, in Minds of such a Turn as mine, (especially under a broken and cachectick Constitution, and in so atrocious a nervous Case) arises, or, at least, is exasperated from such Reflexions, being once settled and quieted, That after becomes an excellent Cordial, and a constant Source of Peace, Tranquility and Cheerfulness, and so greatly contributes to forward the Cure of such nervous Diseases.204

And so he decided from then on:

To neglect nothing to secure my eternal Peace; more than if I had been certified I should die within the Day; nor to mind any thing that my secular Obligations and Duties demanded of me, less, than if I had been ensured to live 50 Years more.205

It is an interesting fact that this text was printed by Richardson as early as 1733 and surely must have had some influence on him considering the fact that we see similar words appear in Sir Charles Grandison. When Harriet refers to the end of Sir Charles’s natural life on earth, she writes:

That as he must one day die, it was matter of no moment to him, whether it were to-morrow, or forty years hence. (II. 440)

When in 1740 the first announcements appeared of Bishop Wilson’s The Knowledge and Practice of Christianity Made Easy: or, an Essay towards an Instruction for the Indians, which, as I have mentioned earlier, was printed by Richardson in 1741, Cheyne wrote to Wilson and expressed his feelings as follows:

I am rejoiced the good, the worthy Christian Bishop of Man continues, an honour to human nature, and a faithful dispenser of the words of the holy Jesus, and shall be glad to benefit by his labours and works.206 (Italics are mine)

In 1741 Cheyne acknowledged the book as a joint gift from the Bishop and his son in the following words:

204 The English Malady, p. 333.
205 Ibid., p. 334.
In another letter dated 13 August 1740, Cheyne had written to Wilson that they must do their best and wait God’s time, adding that he believed, though the nation, especially those of the two extremes, “the highest and greatest, and the lowest and most abject”, was extremely ignorant, corrupted and vicious, there was “the dawning of some good spirit among the middling rank”.208 As to the “end proposed”, Wilson’s essay was also meant to be read by those Christians of “all denominations” who “understand not why they are called Christians”, it was for all “such Christians as have not well considered the meaning of the religion they profess, or, who profess to know God, but in his works do deny him”.209

Cheyne’s Family Life
Cheyne mentions his wife Margaret Middleton (whom he had married around 1712 or earlier) several times in his letters to Richardson. When advising Richardson on *Pamela*, Part II, in a letter of 24 August 1741, Cheyne sharply criticizes several instances of class distinction, which may explain why he had been called a Leveller by some of his contemporaries. First Cheyne writes that there is no difference between the sexes for they are both of the same species, a subject discussed on several occasions in *Sir Charles Grandison* and one which I will return to in chapter 7. Then Cheyne adds that since Richardson had made Pamela a “Gentlewoman” originally, he therefore thinks it is “improper” that Pamela and her parents should “ever creep and hold down their Heads in the Dirt”. On the contrary, Cheyne argues that as man and wife, father and children, Pamela and her parents should approach other people “to a Par”, at least “for [Cheyne’s] sake”. He adds that he should not have permitted such creeping behaviour in his wife, even if she had been a milkmaid.210

In another letter dated 2 February 1742, Cheyne writes to Richardson that “from her Cradle” Margaret had been “notoriously abstemious” from a better principle than mere natural health.211 Some months later Cheyne informs Richardson that his wife showed signs of an incipient palsy as a consequence of which she had given up wine and meat almost completely.212

The Cheynes had three surviving children, Francis, who was baptized on 23 August 1713 at St Michael’s parish in Bath, Peggy (Margaret), and John, pos-

---

208 Ibid.
209 Ibid., Vol. IV, pp. 129, 131.
211 Ibid., p. 82.
212 Ibid., p. 105.
The Relationship between Richardson and Cheyne

sibly born in 1717. According to Viets, the elder daughter Francis married William Stewart, an advocate, on 30 April 1741, and they lived in London. We find several references to Francis and Peggy in Cheyne’s letters to Richardson. On 12 February 1741 Cheyne writes that he will be in London to visit Francis and his son-in-law “who will be married before that Time”. In the same letter he promises to visit Richardson. He mentions his daughters again in his letter to Richardson of 22 June 1742:

My daughter Peggy is so obliged by your Kindness and Civility to her that she charged me again and again upon her last leaving me to go to Westown, to return her most sensible Acknowledgements to you, and I really believe if she finds herself in Spirits enough to go to London to visit her Sister she would not fail to express her Gratitude to you in her own Manner personally but to make some Stops at your Habitation and Family in the Country.

In his letter of 14 January 1742/43 Cheyne writes that his whole family, “Wife, Daughters, Nanny, etc. (they are honest People)”, admire Richardson much, and he adds that if Richardson “wanted Women” he might have his choice, though he is quick to add that Richardson has “very good ones of [his] own”. Cheyne further writes that Peggy had said Richardson was the “perfect Original of [his] own Pamela” and that “Generosity and Giving, which in others are only acquired Virtues, are in [Richardson] a natural Passion”. For other people “only like to give as much as they receive”, whereas Richardson only likes to give. It comes therefore perhaps as no surprise that it was Peggy who was to be among the first of Richardson’s friends who saw the manuscript of Clarissa in 1746.

Cheyne’s only son, John, became vicar of Brigstock in Northamptonshire. Cheyne only occasionally mentions his son in his letters to Richardson, possibly because John had already left Bath for Oxford, when

---

213 For the baptism of Francis, see the Public Record Office, Bath. There is no information on the baptism of Peggy (who had inherited her father’s health problems to some extent). She never married and continued to live with her parents. For John’s date of birth, Cheyne’s biographers refer to the Alumni Oxoniensis, ed. J. Foster, 1888, I, 246, which lists John Cheyne as fourteen when he matriculated in 1731.


216 Ibid., p. 100. For other references to Francis, see pp. 98, 121-124.

217 Ibid., p. 121.
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Cheyne and Richardson embarked upon their correspondence.  

Summing up the above, my conclusion is that Cheyne was a very sensitive man who described himself in the English Malady as one of those “mean-spirited Wretches” who wanted to live as long as nature had designed him to last, submitting with the utmost peace and resignation he could arrive at when his life had to end. But since pain, sickness, and especially oppression, anxiety and lowness were his “mortal Aversion”, he would refuse no means to avoid them, except those that would bring him even greater suffering. Deeply abhorring religious persecution, Cheyne was a great defender of tolerance and the freedom of conscience, arguing that there are “as many and as different Degrees of Sensibility or of Feeling, as there are Degrees of Intelligence and Perception in human Creatures”:

One shall suffer more from the Prick of a Pin or Needle, from their extreme Sensibility, than others from being run thro’ the Body; and the first sort seem to be of the Class of these Quick-Thinkers I have formerly mentioned; and as none have it in their Option to chuse for themselves their own particular Frame of Mind, nor Constitution of Body, so none can chuse his own degree of Sensibility. That is given by the Author of his Nature, and is already determined; and both are as various as the Faces and Forms of Mankind are.

Cheyne strongly believed in the “two Fountains of Life and Health”, i.e. the head and the heart. He recognized in Richardson a kindred spirit, confirmed by Cheyne’s letter dated 12 January 1739-40:

220 In his letter of 28 February 1738/9 Cheyne wrote to Richardson how angry he was with both Strahan and Leake. He felt he had been used “intolerably in all [he] had to do with [Strahan]”. But Leake, Cheyne wrote, had used him “like a Scoundrel” and added that “of late [Leake] is so insolent and selfish I dare not speak to him. He as good as gives me Lie in every Instance.” But Cheyne is even more upset at the fact that Leake had complained to Cheyne’s son: “He complained he had a hard Bargain of me to my own Son”, (cf. Mullett, Op. cit., p. 46). In his letter of 24 October 1741 Cheyne wrote that he had sent sheets to Oxford “to be polished a little in the Language”, probably by his son and/or half-brother William (cf. Mullett, Op. cit., p. 71).

221 In The English Malady (p. 182) Cheyne had divided mankind into quick thinkers, slow thinkers and no thinkers. He believed that “Persons” of slender and weak nerves usually belonged to the first class, as a result of the activity, mobility and delicacy of their intellectual organs. Flattering, easy and agreeable amusements, and intervals of “No-Thinking” and “Swiss-Meditation” were therefore, according to Cheyne, as essential to them as sleep is to the weary, and meat to the hungry: else the spring would break. Study of difficult and intricate matters would infallibly hurt. Reading should be light and entertaining and conversation must be easy and agreeable, without disputes or contradiction. The advice given here has surely influenced Richardson, because it is identical to that given by Sir Charles Grandison in Clementina’s case (V. 557) when he writes that Clementina must not be contradicted. (Cheyne had made a similar tripartite division of mankind in The Essay of Health and Long Life, 1724, pp. 159-160).

222 English Malady, pp. 366-367.

223 Written in a letter to Richardson, dated 27 January 1742-43. Cf. Mullett, Op. cit., p. 122. See also entry LXXIII on the death of Cheyne in which we find another reference to “heart and head”. The writer states “that those who best knew him most loved him, which must be the felicity of every Man who values himself more upon the Goodness of his Heart than the Clearness of his Head; and yet Dr. Cheyne’s Works show how much he excelled in both.” (Cf. Mullett, Op. cit. p. 126). Indeed
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I hope you know me too well and my Manner of acting with the Lovers of Virtue and its Source, whom I profess to love and serve with my Power, to be any longer shy with me but to use me with that Freedom that becomes Persons designing the same Ends.\(^\text{224}\)

In the next chapter I will look in greater detail at Cheyne’s thoughts inasmuch as they are relevant to this study, and show how they found their way into *Clarissa* and *Sir Charles Grandison*.

Cheyne was very much interested in mysticism, but he was equally fascinated with science. He mentions for instance that those who had influenced and helped him to amend the new edition of *the Philosophical Principles of 1724* were Dr. Gregory, Savilian Professor of Astronomy at Oxford, and the “reverend and learned” Mr. John Craig, Sir Isaac Newton (plate VIII), special reference is made to the second version of Newton’s *Opticks* and *Mathematical Principles of Philosophy*, Mr. Cotes, Plumian Professor of Astronomy at Cambridge, and several others. Last but not least, he referred to the *Philosophical Transactions* and the *Memoirs of the Academy Royal at Paris*.\(^\text{224}\) Mullett, *Op. cit.*, p. 58.
As to the influence of Cheyne’s thoughts on Richardson we find that certain more common medical topics, such as those concerned with gout and melancholia, extensively dealt with by Cheyne, found their way into Richardson’s novels. We know that Clarissa’s and Sir Charles’s father suffered from gout, which badly influenced their moods.\(^{225}\) Clarissa tells us that her father, ill-tempered as the result of a ”gouty paroxysm”,\(^{226}\) insisted upon her marrying Solmes as an act of duty, set upon by her brother James (I. 60). Her mother was passive (“my mother never thought fit to oppose my FATHER’S will when once he has declared him determined”, I. 60). Here we are at once introduced to one of the main themes in Clarissa, i.e. the issue of the freedom of the will. More explicitly, Clarissa explains to Miss Howe:

They were my father’s lively spirits that first made him an interest in her gentle bosom. They were the same spirits turned inward … that made him so impatient when the cruel malady seized him. He always loved my mother: and would not LOVE and PITY … make a good wife (who was an hourly witness of his pangs, when labouring under a paroxysm, and his paroxysms becoming more and more frequent, as well as more and more severe) give up her own will, her own likings, to oblige a husband, thus afflicted, whose love for her was unquestionable? And if so, was it not too natural [human nature is not perfect …] that the husband thus humoured by the wife, should be unable to bear control from anybody else? much less contradiction from his children? (I. 133)

Both Clarissa and Clementina show signs of severe “melancholia”. Discussing in depth the subjects of melancholia and suicide, The English Malady may have influenced Richardson. For Clarissa writes in a letter to Lovelace:

O wretched, wretched Clarissa Harlowe! .... You have killed my head among you

\(^{225}\) Though not printed by Richardson, Cheyne’s Nature and due Method of Treating the Gout (1720), strongly influenced by Thomas Sydenham (see footnote 190 above), is almost exclusively concerned with gout, but the subject is discussed in his other books as well.
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- I don’t say who did it! God forgive you all. .... I will neither eat nor drink. .... I shall never be myself again. .... Let me be carried out of this house, and out of your sight; and let me be put into that Bedlam privately which once I saw. (Ill. 211-212)

By not eating and drinking Clarissa may be perceived, at least in some sense, as trying to commit suicide. In The English Malady’s preface Cheyne had elaborated on the title, which had been a reproach “universally thrown” on this island by foreigners and all “our neighbours” on the continent by whom nervous distempers are in derision called “the English Malady”. He referred to the Greek, Roman and Arab physicians who had observed nervous distempers, but most probably in a lesser degree, for, Cheyne assumed, they were a stronger people and lived in warmer climates, where the “slow, cold and nervous Diseases” were less known. According to Cheyne, in the northern climates these nervous diseases seemed more numerous and he referred to Sydenham, who had made the “most particular and full” observations on them, and even established them into a “particular Class and Tribe” with a proper though different cure from other chronic distempers.227

Cheyne opened the first chapter of the English Malady by quoting a prophet who had asked who could bear a “wounded Spirit”. Cheyne believed that a person of sound health, of strong spirits and firm fibres could struggle with and bear any misfortune, pain and misery of his mortal life, whereas the same person that is broken, dispirited by weakness of nerves, melancholy or age, is bound to become dejected, oppressed and peevish.228 It is clear that Clarissa suffered from a wounded spirit as a result of the cruel treatment she

227 For Sydenham, see footnote 225. Cheyne explained that his objective in The English Malady was to provide a remedy against the frequency of suicide resulting from nervous distempers, a subject he had briefly touched upon in The Essay on Health and Long Life (cf. The Essay on Health and Long Life, pp. 4, 5, 181). It is in The English Malady that Cheyne discusses the doctrine of spirits. He writes how the doctrine of spirits had been known from the Arab physicians to explain the animal functions and diseases. According to Cheyne, there was hardly anyone, “except here or there a Heretick of late”, who had doubted this “Catholic Doctrine” (The English Malady, p. 77). He further explains how the existence of animal spirits, or some kind of fluid carried through the nervous distempers are in derision called “the English Malady”. He referred to the Greek, Roman and Arab physicians who had observed nervous distempers, but most probably in a lesser degree, for, Cheyne assumed, they were a stronger people and lived in warmer climates, where the “slow, cold and nervous Diseases” were less known. According to Cheyne, in the northern climates these nervous diseases seemed more numerous and he referred to Sydenham, who had made the “most particular and full” observations on them, and even established them into a “particular Class and Tribe” with a proper though different cure from other chronic distempers.

228 The English Malady, p. 2.
experienced by both her family and Lovelace, for she writes that they had “killed her head”. I will return to this issue of melancholy later when discussing Clementina’s special case of religious melancholia.

To investigate further Cheyne’s influence on Richardson, I will only discuss those subjects in Cheyne’s works which have found their way into Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison. As these subjects are of a spiritual nature I will frequently refer to Cheyne’s first important work, i.e. the Philosophical Principles of Religion Natural and Revealed (1705, 1715), and to the Essay on Regimen (1740). In these works we will come across several terms which are reminiscent of the Theologia Germanica, Jacob Boehme, Antoinette Bourignon, Fénelon and Madame Guyon.

Cheyne often used the word “signature”, which was one of Boehme’s favourite words, especially found in Boehme’s Signatura Rerum or the Signature of All Things, which had been translated by John Ellistone and published by Giles Calvert in 1651. Because of their quality Ellistone’s translations of Boehme as well as Sparrow’s were still read in the first half of the eighteenth century. In the preface to the Signatura Rerum Ellistone highly prizes self-knowledge as the greatest wisdom and the key to all knowledge. For man, so he writes, is the great mystery of God, the microcosm, or the complete abridgment of the whole universe. He goes on to state that man is a living emblem and hieroglyph (words repeatedly used by Cheyne) of eternity and time. Whoever wants to attain this wisdom, Ellistone argues on the basis of Boehme, must be reborn by and in the word of wisdom, Jesus Christ, for the divine essence which God breathed into the paradisaical soul must be revived. I will return to this subject in chapter 5.

The Principle of Reunion

When Cheyne discusses in both the Philosophical Principles and the Essay on

229 The first edition of part I of the Philosophical Principles appeared in 1705, while part II appeared in 1715. The second edition of part I was printed in 1715. In 1974 Bowles discussed some of the differences between the 1705 and 1715 editions. Guerrini did the same in 1985 and 2000. I will be using the third edition published by George Strahan, which was corrected and enlarged in 1724, as this is closer to the period with which we are concerned. Though this edition was certainly not printed by Richardson, we may, however, be fairly sure that Richardson was familiar with the Philosophical Principles. A fifth edition was printed in 1736 and John Byrom owned the eighth edition of 1753, cf. The Private Journals and Literary Remains of John Byrom, 2 Vols., ed. Richard Parkinson, Manchester, 1856-57, Vol. II, Part I, p. 308.

230 Cheyne described how all the integral parts of nature have a beautiful resemblance, similitude and analogy to one another and to their “mighty Original”. whose images they are (cf. Philosophical Principles, pp. 2 and 5). Cheyne believed that the whole foundation of “Natural Philosophy, is Simplicity and Analogy, or a Simple, yet Beautiful Harmony” which runs through all “Works of Nature” in an uninterrupted “Chain of Causes and Effects”, though always with “proper Limitations of Circumstances”. He added that if these principles would be superseded, or this chain broken, we could only expect “Absurdities and Inconsistences in Philosophy” (cf. The Philosophical Principles, Part I, p. 42). Hence, Cheyne’s understanding of nature or what he called the vast, if not infinite “Machine” of the universe, the perfect and wise “Production of Almighty God”, consisting of an infinite number of lesser machines, everyone of which is adjusted by weight and measure.
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Regimen what he called the “Principle of Reunion”, we recognize Boehme’s influence. In the Philosophical Principles Cheyne explained that God, the sole sovereign, a self-existent and independent being, had made “Creatures” to be “Partakers” of himself, images, emanations, effluxes and streams out of his own “Abyss of Being”, and impressed upon them a central tendency toward Himself, a principal of “Re-union” with himself. This principle of reunion or attraction of them towards God was analogous to the principle of gravitation in the great bodies of the universe. To believe otherwise, argued Cheyne, would amount to supposing a ray to be dissimilar to the sun, or the stream to the “Fountain-Head”. He writes:

God has most certainly implanted something Analogous to Attraction, in the greatest Central Body of each System towards the lesser ones of the same; Or, a Principle of Gravitation in these lesser ones towards the greatest Central one, and towards each other. From hence, and from their directly impress’d Motions, all their comely, regular and uniform Revolutions, Appearances and Actions upon one another spring.

Cheyne describes in the Essay on Regimen how “infinite Wisdom, Power and Love” has impressed in the fund and essence of intelligent beings an infinite love to Him, and how they have an “insatiable and unextinguishable” desire, thirst and ardour to be reunited with Him at last. This is reminiscent of Boehme’s Dialogue between an Enlightened and a Distressed Soul which had been anonymously translated and published in 1645. It contained a discourse between a “Soul hungry and thirsty after the Fountain of Life”, showing how one soul should seek out and comfort another, and bring it into the path of “Christ’s Pilgrimage”. In the hungry soul we recognize the isolated and persecuted Clarissa.

We can identify Sir Charles as the soul seeking out and comforting others. On the anagogical level Sir Charles is the Comforter or Holy Ghost, comforting the distressed Clementina, showing her clemency or mercy. Cheyne returned to the concept of attraction or gravitation (principle of reunion) in the Essay on Regimen in which, discussing centripetal and centrifugal forces, he informs us that the sun is placed in the centre of our system, and is the material image of the deity. The planets revolve about him. They have no light in themselves, all is derived by reflection from him. Heat, light and attraction are his main properties, and by this attraction the planets are kept in their orbits.

233 Cheyne also explains in the Essay on Regimen that there is a projectile force which gives the planets a constant tendency to recede from the sun and “to fly off in a Tangent”. Knowing that attraction and projectile force are contrary to one another, and always act in opposite directions, Cheyne tells his readers that it is by the joined action of attraction and projectile force that the planets are kept in their orbits. However, Cheyne adds that it is supposed by the best philosophers
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This, according to Cheyne, strongly pictures the love of God, continually soliciting all intelligences to a nearer approach to him. The light of the sun is diffused through the whole system, representing "that Light which enlightens every Man that comes into the World". It is an emblem of him who “came forth from the Father of Lights, Godman”. The sun’s light is always accompanied with heat, which represents the Holy Spirit, the principal of spiritual life.234

Richardson may have been strongly influenced by these ideas, for he has Charlotte Grandison say that “Light is hardly more active than my brother, nor lightning more quick” (VI. 114). We find that in Volume II Harriet compares Sir Charles’s “superior excellence” with sunshine (II. 375) and in Volume VI she depicts him as the sun:

Ah, my partial friends! You studied your Harriet in the dark; but here comes the sun darting into all the crooked and obscure corners of my heart; and I shrink from his dazzling eye; and compared to Him ... appear to myself such a Nothing. (VI. 132)

I will discuss this in greater detail in chapter 7.

Considering Cheyne’s fascination with the movements of the planets around the sun, which may have influenced Richardson, it is perhaps not surprising that Sir Charles owned an orrery which illustrates with balls of various sizes the movements of the planets around the sun.235 However, there may have been another reason that Richardson used the word “orrery”, for there is a rather interesting connection between Captain Ogilvie, the translator of Giannone’s Civil History and the Earl of Orrery,236 especially the latter’s arrest in connection with a Jacobite plot and his association with the Duke of Wharton.

Describing Sir Charles’s study in which there are books in all the sciences, Richardson refers to the “globes, the orrery, and the instruments of all sorts, for geographical, astronomical; and other scientifical observations.” (VII. 271) The influence of this imagery on Sir Charles Grandison, though by Jocelyn Harris attributed to Addison and to Edward Young (especially to his

that the solar attraction will at last prevail over the projectile force as a result of which the planets will be swallowed up and transformed into the substance of the sun (Essay on Regimen, pp. 233-236, 302-303).

234 See “Preface to the reader” in the Law-edition of the Aurora (Vol. I): “Neither can any one understand this, though he read of it in the Scriptures, but by the Holy Spirit within himself, which proceedeth from the Father and the Son in the soul of every one; and by the Word in the heart, the Word of faith, which is God and Christ, even that true, divine Light which lighteth every one that cometh into the world.”

235 This complicated piece of mechanism was invented about 1700 by George Graham, who sent his model to Rowley, an instrument maker, to make one for Prince Eugene. Rowley made a copy of it for Charles Boyle (1676-1731), earl of Orrery, hence the name.

236 See p. 30 above.
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*Night Thoughts*, will become clear by the following scene. 237 Depicting the wedding procession in Volume VI, Charlotte compares Sir Charles and Harriet as (primary) planets and all other characters as mere satellites (secondary planets revolving around a primary one):

Tho' Lady G. Lady W. and the four Bride-maids, as well as the Lords, might have claimed high notice; yet not any of them received more than commendation: We were all considered but as Satellites to the Planets that passed before us. What, indeed, were we more? (VI. 224)

The next day, when all the wedding festivities are over, Charlotte answers the question asked by some people whether there was no man like her brother:

He ... is most likely to resemble him, who has an unbounded charity, and universal benevolence, to men of all professions; and who, *imitating the Divinity*, regards the heart, rather than the head. (VI. 241) (Italics are mine)

The influence of Cheyne’s principle of reunion becomes clear in Clarissa’s allegorical letter (IV. 157) in which she describes her flight into the country as the return to “her father’s house”. The earthly Lovelace interprets this as a reference to a possible reconciliation with her family, whereas Clarissa refers to her approaching death, and reunion with God, her Father. I will return to this subject later.

Cheyne tells us that “as it is considered as a theological Virtue [the Principle of Reunion] is Charity”:

When fully expanded and set at freedom, Charity, or the Love of the Supreme Being, and of all his Images in a proper Subordination, according to their Rank in the Scale of Subsistences, is the necessary Effect of this Principle of Reunion. 238

Cheyne reminds his readers that charity is not founded on interest or on rewards or punishments. It is, he writes, in a higher degree what motion is in brute matter, or what the tendency of the planets is towards the sun and he

237 Harris writes that in Addison’s hymn “the planets revolve ... about their benevolent and impartial sun”. She further explains that the planets in Young’s *Night Thoughts* were an emblem of millennial love and adds that: “So too in *Grandison* [Richardson] provided a vision which was indeed the completion of his whole plan, an ordered universe revolving about Sir Charles” (cf. *Samuel Richardson*, Cambridge, 1987, p. 163). Young’s poem reads as follows: The Planets of each System represent / Kind Neighbours; mutual Amity prevails; / Sweet Interchange of Rays, receiv’d, return’d; / Enlight'ning, and enlighten’d! All, at once / Attracking, and attracted! Patriot-like, / None sins against the Welfare of the Whole; / But their reciprocal, unselfish Aid, Affords an Emblem of Millennial Love. (Edward Young, *Night-Thoughts*, (1742-45), ed. George Gilfillan, Edinburgh, 1853, p. 276, IX. 698-705). We may wonder how much Cheyne in fact influenced Young, who greatly admired Cheyne as well.

238 *Philosophical Principles*, Part II, pp. 91-92.
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refers to Henry More’s “cogent and just Argument” that held:

“As the Object of the Intellect is that which is simply true, and is assented to as such, and not as true to this particular Intellect which contemplates it, so there is an Object that is simply Good and Lovely, and to be loved as such, without regard to the Party that thus loves it.”239

Hence, Cheyne concluded that the worship of and homage to the supreme being was founded entirely upon his own original perfection and not on his rewards and punishments, for there neither ever was or could be room for “Contracts or Pacts”. The primary reason must be love.240

According to Cheyne “as a Rule of Action [the Principle of Reunion] is our natural Conscience”.241 From this Cheyne argued that we could derive the true and genuine nature of moral good and evil and of all the moral virtues and social duties of life. He had written earlier that:

Though defaced and buried by contrary attractions, sensuality and the violent worldly amusements, this was no argument to deny [the] existence [of the Principle of Reunion], just like the “Ideotism [sic] of Some is not an Argument against the Principle of Reason in Human Nature”.242

Whatever retards or opposes this principle of reunion (the source of charity or brotherly love) is moral evil, and whatever promotes or advances it is moral good.243 Once we recognize this, it is clear that Lovelace, in killing his own conscience because it tried to “oppose him”, represents moral evil. Lovelace describes his action as follows to Belford:

Lord, Jack, what shall I do now! How one evil brings on another! Dreadful news to tell thee! While I was meditating a simple robbery, here have I (in my own defence indeed) been guilty of murder! A bloody murder! So I believe it will prove. At her last gasp! Poor impertinent opposer! Eternally resisting! Eternally contradicting! There she lies, weltering in her blood! Her death’s wound have I given her! But she was a thief, an imposter, as well as a tormentor. She had stolen my pen. While I was sullenly meditating, doubting, as to my future measures, she stole it; and thus she wrote with it, in a hand exactly like my own. .... Thus far had my conscience written with my pen; and see what a recreant she had made me! I seized her by the throat - There! - There!, said I, thou vile impertinent! Take that, and that! How often have I given thee warning! .... Take that, for a rising blow! And now will thy pain, and my pain from thee,

239 Ibid., pp. 94-95.
240 Ibid., p. 96.
241 Ibid., p. 91
242 Ibid., pp. 88-89.
243 Ibid., p. 91.
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soon be over. Lie there! Welter on! Had I not given thee thy death’s wound, thou wouldst have robbed me of all my joys. (III. 145-146) (Underlining is mine)

Cheyne argued that if we inverted the order of subordination and placed ourselves in the rank and order which belongs to God, which we do when we make our own happiness the sole motive, then we would become “guilty of the most gross and blackest Idolatry”:

Charity, or the pure and disinterested Love of GOD, and of all his Images in a proper subordination, is the end of the Law; the Accomplishment of all the Graces, and the consummate Perfection of Christianity. .... The whole of Christianity is nothing but Rules for attaining this Love, or Measures whereby to remove the Impediments that hinder this Principle of Reunion (the source of charity) from operating, or Means to destroy the contrary Attractions which disturb the natural Operation of this Principle of Reunion; which wou’d of it self, if not stifled, opposed, and counteracted, necessarily beget this Divine Charity; whereby the Soul wou’d instantly be united with it’s [sic] Center; and ultimate End, the supreme and absolute Infinite.244

Clarissa represents moral good in that she promotes the principle of reunion. She follows her conscience, the light within, against all opposition, both from her family and Lovelace. She explains that:

My soul disdains communion with [Lovelace]. .... The single life ... has offered to me, as the life, the only life, to be chosen. But in that, must I not now sit brooding over my past afflictions, and mourning my faults till the hour of my release? And would not every one be able to assign the reason why Clarissa Harlowe chose solitude, and to sequester herself from the world? .... What then, my dear and only friend, can I wish for but death? And what, after all, is death? ’Tis but a cessation from mortal life: ’tis but a finishing of an appointed course: the refreshing inn after a fatiguing journey: the end of a life of cares and troubles; and, if happy, the beginning of a life of immortal happiness. (III. 521)

If she should live longer, she would never marry this or any other man:

I ought not to think of wedlock; but of a preparation for a quite different event. I am persuaded ... that I shall not live long. The strong sense I have ever had of my fault, the loss of my reputation, my disappointments, the determined resentment of my friends, aiding the barbarous usage I have met with where I least deserved it, have seized upon my heart: seized upon it, before it
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was so well fortified by religious considerations as I hope it is now. (III. 522)²⁴⁵

She is convinced that:

God will soon dissolve my substance; and bring me to death, and to the house appointed for all living. (III. 523)

I will return to this later when discussing the Theologia Germanica.

Like other mystics, Boehme expressed his Christ mysticism by using the metaphors of the soul’s marriage to Christ, of the birth of Christ in us, and of our death and resurrection with him. He also uses the figure of the soul’s marriage to Sophia, the Virgin Wisdom, which is indirectly also a marriage to Christ. Cheyne equates wisdom with the “divine Sophia” when he explains that power, subsistence, duration, knowledge, wisdom, goodness, beauty in created beings are the images of the omnipotence, necessary existence, eternity, omniscience, the divine Sophia, benignity, and infinite perfection in the divine nature.²⁴⁶ Richardson uses the image of wisdom in Sir Charles Grandison. Describing Harriet on her wedding day, Charlotte refers to her as the Goddess of Wisdom or Sophia:

We followed the … Goddess of Wisdom [Such her air, her manner, her amiable
ness, seemed in my thought, at that time, to make her], never, never, was such graciousness! (VI. 213)

A Tripartite Division of the Universitas rerum omnium into Supreme Spirit, Rational Soul, and Body

Important for the correct understanding of Cheyne is his discussion in The Philosophical Principles of the tripartite division of the Universitas rerum omnium into the supreme spirit, enabling communication with the supreme infinite, followed by the rational soul, designed to communicate with the material world, and finally, by the senses of the body. This Behmenist concept is

²⁴⁵ For the parallels between Clarissa and Madame Guyon, see Michael de la Bedoyere, The Archbishop and the Lady: The Story of Fénelon and Madame Guyon, London, 1956. Madame Guyon had a jealous (half)-brother who was furious with her, perhaps because of the way in which she had disposed of the family fortune, “without consulting anyone” (pp. 35, 37). About her persecutions Guyon writes “I knew not what I would become, on what side to turn, being alone and aban doned by all, without knowing, my God, what You wanted me to do.” In a lodging-house in Genoa she was taken for a prostitute (p. 41), and her letters were forged (p. 45).

²⁴⁶ Philosophical Principles, part II, p. 61. See also Ellistone’s Preface to the Reader of the English translation of the Signatura Rerum: “Whosoever will be a nursling of Sophia, and learn to understand, and speak the language of Wisdome, must be born again of, and in, the word of wisdome. Christ Jesus, the Immortall Seed: the Divine Essence which God breathed into his Paradissicall Soul must be revived, and he must become one again with that, which he was in God before he was a creature, and then his Eternall Spirit may enter into that which is within the vail, and see not onely the literall, but the Moral, Allegorical, and Anagological meaning of the Wise and their dark sayings … And so he may step into the most inward and holiest place of Theosophical Mysteries” (Signatura Rerum, A3).
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extensively dealt with by the Boehme scholars Hans L. Martensen and Andrew Weeks.247 According to Cheyne, it is in the due subordination, the perfect harmony and perpetual concord of these three, that the perfection of beings consists. Degeneracy, corruption and the Fall are a result of their discord, confusion and rebellion one against the other. 248

Cheyne believed that the rational soul is not fitted for the real kind of knowledge of spiritual objects.249 He argued that, as the light of the sun is the medium through which material things are seen and perceived, so the essential light of the supreme infinite is the sole medium by and through which his nature and infinite perfections can be understood. He wrote:

In the Analogy of Things, as the Light of the Sun (that noble and glorious Representation, Image and Vicegerent of the Supreme Infinite, in the material World) is the Medium, through which material Things are seen and perceived in our System, so the essential Light of the supreme Infinite himself, is the sole Medium, by and through which, his Nature and infinite Perfections are to be understood, and comprehended. And therefore, as certainly as the Sun sends forth his Light on the whole material World without bounds or limits, on the just and on the unjust, so certainly the Sun of Righteousness, the Pattern and Archetype of our material Sun, sends forth his enlightening and enlivening Beams on all the System of created intelligent Beings; and is, that Light which enlightens every Man that cometh into the World.250

The similarities between Sir Charles and the “Sun of Righteousness” are made clear by Richardson in the scene describing Grandison Hall, in which the words “boundless” and “no bounds” as well as “free” and “open” stand out:

The gardens and lawn seem ... to be as boundless as the mind of the owner, and as free and open as his countenance. .... The park itself is remarkable for its


248 The Philosophical Principles, Part II, p. 66. Cheyne believed that the faculties belonging to the rational soul are limited, like the powers of the body, but are of a higher rank than those of the body. Imagination and memory are faculties of the rational soul. The former can paint a larger idea than the eyes can see, and the latter can store more than all the senses can present at one time. It is the understanding that combines, disjoins, or perhaps even garbles them. Cheyne again reminds his reader that all the faculties of the rational soul are finite in their capacity. The will, which is free, can pick and choose, but is still limited to the ideas and images as they present themselves to the imagination and as they are found in the memory (Ibid., p. 64).

249 Cheyne asserted that in this “anarchical and rebellious state of human nature” the faculties belonging to the material world, i.e. those belonging to the rational soul, presume to judge the nature of subjects that belong to the supreme spirit. In their “usurp’d Superiority” they force “their Captives and Slaves to comply with the practical dictates they prescribe, as a result of which the whole order of nature and the material system of things has become distorted, inverted and corrupted. (Philosophical Principles, Part II, pp. 107-108).

250 Philosophical Principles, Part II, p. 112. See p. 74 above, especially footnote 234.
prospects. ... the excellent owner [contents] himself to open and enlarge many fine prospects. ... The orchards, lawns, and grass-walks ... bounded only by sunk fences, the eye is carried to views that have no bounds. (VII. 272-273) (Italics are mine)

By distinguishing between the supreme spirit and the rational soul, Cheyne accounted for the errors of Spinoza and Hobbes, and the mistakes of the “otherwise genious” Mr. Locke. The supreme spirit may be dark, dead, almost quite obliterated as to its overt actions, while the rational soul is full of ideas, pictures and images of things. On the other hand, the supreme spirit may be full of light, brightness, substantial knowledge, joy and peace, while the rational soul is weak, faint and languid, and almost empty of all ideas and images.251

Religious Melancholy

Another subject which may have influenced Richardson was the one of religious melancholy, discussed by Cheyne in chapter VI of The Essay of Health and Long Life. Cheyne alleges that often the person so “distempered” has little solid piety. According to him, this form of melancholy is actually caused by disgust or disrelish of worldly amusements and creature comforts. He classifies it as a disease of the body, caused by a bad constitution in which the nervous system is broken or disordered, and the juices viscid and glewy. Those who suffer from religious melancholy, so Cheyne argues, are very ignorant as to how to govern themselves and it always leads to “Fluctuation and Indocility, Scrupulosity (a word used by Richardson in Sir Charles Grandison), Horror and...
Despair”.  

We will see how Richardson used this theme of religious melancholy in *Sir Charles Grandison* when he depicts Clementina’s “madness”, especially her wanderings. In a last effort to convert Sir Charles, Clementina dresses up in her servant’s clothes and sets out on “God’s errand” to convince Sir Charles of his errors and so to save his soul (III. 202). She believes she has heard a voice from heaven bidding her to convert Sir Charles. Or, again, in the scene in which Clementina thought that God had laid his hand upon her (V. 573). Fearing a relapse, Sir Charles was not so convinced and called her in his letter to Dr Bartlett a “noble Enthusiast”.

In *Sir Charles Grandison* Richardson pays tribute to Cheyne in the scene describing how Sir Charles had decided to take two more doctors with him to Italy:

Two physicians eminent for their knowledge of disorders of the head, to whom he had before communicated the case of the unhappy Clementina; and who brought to him in writing their opinions of the manner in which she ought to be treated, according to the various symptoms of her disorder. ... [He] said very high things at the same time in praise of the English surgeons. ... As nervous disorders were more frequent in England, than in any country in the world, he was willing to hope, that the English physicians were more skilful than those of any other country in the management of persons afflicted with such maladies. ... As he was now invited over, he was determined to furnish himself with all the means he could think of, that were likely to be useful in restoring and healing friends so dear to him. (IV. 313)

The description of Clementina’s aching head and Sir Charles’s concern about the state of Clementina’s health, may have been influenced by *The English Malady*, in which Cheyne divided the nervous distempers into three degrees, although he warned he could not be very accurate in such a “Proteus-like” distempers. 253 In *The English Malady* Cheyne explained that nervous distempers of the first degree were mainly confined to the stomach and bowels, often involving a pain in the “Pit of the Stomach”, and headaches “behind or over the Eyes”, like a “Puncturation”, with flies and atoms dancing before the eyes. Sometimes there would be a noise “like the dying Sounds of Bells” in the

252 It is therefore something of a surprize that Porter writes that “major early Georgian texts on melancholy, such as George Cheyne’s *English Malady* (1733) hardly touch on religious melancholy.” He adds that “in Cheyne’s case the silence is almost deafening. For Cheyne himself was a depressive, suffering religious crises and personally proselytizing a chiliastic, quasi-mystic faith. Yet no discussion of souls in crisis appears in his medical work.” (Cf. *Mind-forged Manacles: A History of Madness in England from the Restoration to the Regency*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1987, pp. 80-81). The most probable reason why Cheyne did not mention religious melancholy in *The English Malady* in 1733 was that he had already discussed it in *The Essay of Health and Long Life*, written in 1724. And he had dismissed it, not for any obscure personal reasons, but simply because he believed that the person so “distempered” had little solid piety.

253 *The English Malady*, p. 196. The word “Proteus” is used by Richardson in *Clarissa*, Vol. II, p. 82.
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ears and several other symptoms.

In the second stage of this distemper we encounter the same symptoms, but in a higher degree, as well as some new ones. There is now a fixed and deep melancholy, wandering and delusory images on the brain, despondency and horror, sometimes unaccountable fits of laughter and crying, which generally end in faintings. We have seen how Clementina had already “progressed” to the second stage when she set out on “God’s errand”, hearing voices from heaven. Cheyne believed that if this second stage was not cured, the third stage would begin and this generally involved a mortal and incurable distemper, such as dropsy, consumption, palsy and apoplexy, which may explain Sir Charles’s concern for Clementina.254

Hence, Cheyne’s conclusion that the “Vapours”, which he admits to be a very loose term, are the symptoms of a real chronical disease, which, if neglected, will put an end to life.255 Though some may be born with such a constitution, neglecting it, or fuelling the disease by a mal-regimen would, according to Cheyne, certainly lead to those real distempers like dropsy, etc., mentioned above, and ultimately to death. Such mortal distempers are irre-medial and admit of nothing else but a “palliative” cure to make the symp-toms easy. Some of the suggestions made by Cheyne to cure the first stages of the vapours are gentle vomits, helped by “Ipecacuanha”,256 familiar to the readers of Clarissa, because Lovelace took it to make himself sick so as to make Clarissa feel pity for him (Vol. II, 434-436, 455). Cheyne further suggests camomile tea to “throw off” the phlegm, as well as steel and water.

Mercury and Phlebotomy

As mentioned, Cheyne prescribed Ipecacuanha and camomile tea in the first stage of nervous distempers. In the second and, especially, the third stages, it was mercury and phlebotomy with which Cheyne attempted to restore the patient’s health. He prescribed both to Richardson. More importantly, the practice of phlebotomy is described in Sir Charles Grandison. Some elaboration therefore seems appropriate.

In his works Cheyne mentions the curative qualities of mercury when he discusses palsy in the third stage of the nervous distempers. He states that anyone acquainted with nature and the “animal Oeconomy” knows why the same cause, mercury, should cure and yet also cause and produce, in different degrees and quantities, the same disease palsy. He explains how mercury in moderate doses will break, dissolve and attenuate the blood and the juices, whose viscosity and consequent compression on the nerves interrupt their vibrations and action and so cause palsy, which a “gentle Salivation” will remedy. But, he warns, when the active steams and small ponderous particles of mercury have entered and saturated the substance of the nerves and solids,

254 Ibid., p. 200.
255 Ibid., pp. 194, 203.
256 Ibid., p. 206.
they will spoil and change the whole substance and action, and thus cause a “universal” palsy.\textsuperscript{257} It is a warning found in chapter VIII of Boehme’s\textit{Signatura Rerum} in which Boehme describes mercury and advises physicians as to the use of it for medical purposes:

> Here the physicians must observe, that they learn distinctly to know what kind of property is the strongest in each thing with which they would cure; if they do not know it, they will oftentimes give their patients death.\textsuperscript{258}

Phlebotomy was another method contributing to the cure of the patient in the case of nervous distemper. To remove any misunderstandings about the scene in \textit{Sir Charles Grandison} which describes how Clementina undergoes the eighteenth-century practice of phlebotomy, we have to understand that, according to Cheyne, it was the “whole Business of the Physician” to render the blood sufficiently fluid, sweet and balsamic, because only this could restore the patient’s health. The physician could only try to improve the juices, because he could not do much for the solids after maturity. Cheyne explains that bleeding is absolutely fit and indispensable both with a quick, strong pulse or a weak, quick pulse and in headaches or when there is confusion. He does not believe that it matters much from which vein or artery the blood is taken, but that in the case of an immediate relief, the one nearest to the part of the body affected is better. However, he warns that too much bleeding could lead to lowness, faintness and a disability of motion, which should be avoided.\textsuperscript{259}

\textsuperscript{257} Ibid., p. 241. On pp. 125-126 Cheyne advises “Calomel, Mercury alcalifated, Precipitat, Quicksilver, Silver-Water, Aethiops, Mineral, Cinnabar of Antimony, Antimony diaphoretic, Bezoar Mineral, crude Antimony, Bezoardicum joviale, Salt of tin, Ens veneris and the like”. Modern research has shown that the two main effects of acute exposure to mercury poisoning are neurological and renal disturbances (this is perhaps why Richardson complained about tremors and his shaky handwriting in later years (see John Carroll, Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson, Oxford, 1964, p. 342). The classic signs and symptoms of long-term exposure to mercury vapour are objective tremors, mental disturbances and gingivitis. This may explain Richardson’s complaints about loosening his teeth, which caused him great distress. We find several references to “teeth” throughout his letters (cf. p. 28 of this study). In \textit{Sir Charles Grandison} we are told that Sir Hargrave had lost three front teeth in the struggle with Sir Charles (I. 200) and wants revenge (I. 196). See also \textit{Sir Charles Grandison}, I. 181: “I wonder what business a man has for such fine teeth, and so fine a mouth, as Sir Charles Grandison might boast of, were he vain”. Most of the antimony absorbed accumulates in the spleen, liver and bone. Workmen in a plant where antimony trisulfide was used exhibited increased blood pressure, significant changes in their ECG’s and ulcers (see A. Ruiter, “Kwik”, in Chemische Feitelijkheden, cd-rom Actuele Chemische Encyclopedie, Koninklijke Nederlandse Chemische Vereniging, Nov. 1998, and for the effects of mercury and antimony, see the World Health Organization, \textit{International Programme on Chemical Safety: Guidelines for Drinking-Water Quality}, Vol. 2, 2nd ed., 1996).

\textsuperscript{258} \textit{Signatura Rerum}, p. 79.

\textsuperscript{259} The \textit{Natural Method}, pp. 138-140; for a warning against bloodletting see p. 251. See also \textit{The Essay of Health and Long Life}, p. 191. Cheyne informs us how he uses a microscope to investigate the blood and refers to Dr Jurin’s experiments, who, by chemical analyses, had found a great proportion of phlegm or pure water in the serum, and only a little salt, oil and earth. But Cheyne adds
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The subject of phlebotomy is for instance discussed in Cheyne’s letter of 12 September 1739. We read that Cheyne is disappointed that Richardson’s health had not improved as much as he had expected. He writes he is extremely concerned that Richardson should still have reason to complain, but adds that suffering is “the Fate of all honest Men in this Life, which is a State of Trial and Probation for another Mansion”. However, in his next letter of 26 October 1739 he writes that Richardson’s symptoms of pain, anxiety and discouragement were merely “nervous and hysterical”, and as, in his views, “all nervous Distempers come from imperfect Digestion”, he advises Richardson to stick to the diet he prescribes together with a regular vomit to “free the stomach from phlegm and choler”, and a “little gentle bleeding once a quarter” which should do the trick to cure him. He further writes that:

[He is] rejoiced Mr. Freke found your Blood so good; he is a very good Judge and therefore you need fear Nothing but breeding too much of it which little frequent Bleedings will always prevent.

Freke was one of the select group of friends who read the manuscript of Clarissa in 1746. Moreover, Freke was a friend of both William Law and John Byrom.

It is clear from the above that the eighteenth century practice of Phlebotomy was seen as a medical operation of blood-letting, and, however unpleasant and unnecessary it must seem to us today, it was not related to any sadomasochistic predilection, as has been suggested by Albert J. Rivero, who thought that the bleeding of Clementina was “the most memorable incident that he had little faith in the “Principles of any natural Bodies forced out by the Tortures of Fire in Chymistry, at least for the Purpose of Medicine”. He also mentions the experiments of transfusion (The Natural Method, p. 140).

Freke made experiments in electricity and in 1748 he published An Essay to show the Cause of Electricity and why some things are Non-Electricable, in which is also considered its Influence in the Blasts on Human Bodies, in the Blights on Trees, in the Damps in Mines, and as it may affect the Sensitive Plants. This essay along with two others was republished in 1752 as A Treatise on the Nature and Property of Fire, which he sent to Law, because he had been influenced by Law’s remark that “all is magnetism”. In 1748 he published An Essay on the Art of Healing in which the causes of various diseases are accounted for both from nature and reason and in which he made some interesting remarks about breast cancer and the danger of not removing the infected lymphatics.

in the novel”. When Clementina’s health further deteriorates, her mother suggests that Clementina be blooded. Clementina applies to Sir Charles because, quite understandably, she has a strong aversion against it, but Sir Charles, following eighteenth-century medical ideas, considers it merely the breathing of a vein (III. 192). She compares herself in this scene to Iphigenia about to be offered (III. 194). When Harriet is ill in Volume VII it is the much respected Dr. Lowther “who thought it advisable that [Harriet] should loose blood” (VII. 421).

Richardson in a Wider International Context
We have seen that, via Cheyne, Richardson was influenced by Boehme, Bourignon, Guyon and Fénelon. By a further examination of the Cheyne-Richardson correspondence, we will find that Richardson was familiar with some of the work of the French theologian Pierre Poiret, whose books were published by the Swiss/Dutch Henry Wetstein. The latter lived and worked in Amsterdam. Richardson had contacts with the French refugee Paul Vaillant, who was a bookseller in London. Moreover, Richardson knew the Theologia Germanica and was interested in the Far and Middle East.

But let us first turn to Pierre Poiret whose name appears in relation with one of Cheyne’s last projects. In a letter dated 5 September 1742 Cheyne explains that he is looking for someone, he leaves it up to Richardson to find “such a Person”, who would prepare a Catalogue of Books for the Devout, the Tender, Valetudinarian and Nervous. It was to be “judiciously collected by a Man of Virtue and Taste” and was to contain “a Character and short Contents of all the Books in English or French that are fit to amuse, divert, or instruct”. The books would have to be on the side of “pure Virtue” without “much Love-Affairs”. They would also have to be interesting and “gently soothing” the passions of “Friendship, Benevolence and Charity”, and they would have to include a sufficient mixture of the “Probable and Marvelous” to keep the soul awake and suspend its too intense thinking on its own misfortunes. He believed that such a catalogue would be a “great Charity” and would be well received by the “Virtuous and Serious of all Parties”. He also suggests that it might be called a “Catalogue of [Pamela’s] Library”.

Of course, Cheyne hoped that Richardson would get involved in the pro-

---

264 As I have mentioned in the Introduction of this study, Albert Rivero argues that the bleeding scene in Sir Charles Grandison is a maimed rite, a dark romantic scene hinting unspeakable sexual transactions. (Cf. Albert J. Rivero, New Essays on Samuel Richardson, London, 1996, p. 221.)
266 Ibid., pp. 109-110. Cheyne highly valued his own library (see p. 105 below) and in Sir Charles Grandison, Richardson extensively describes Sir Charles’s library which contained books in all the sciences (VII. 271), as well as the servants library which was divided into three classes, “one [class] of books of divinity and morality: Another for housewifry: A third of history, true adventures, voyages, and innocent amusements. I, II, III are marked on the cases, and the same on the back of each book, the more readily to place and re-place them, as a book is taken out for use. They are bound in buff for strength”(VII. 286). The gardener had his own books in a little house in the garden (VII. 286).
ject of the catalogue as well for several reasons. First, Cheyne and Richardson shared an interest in spiritual and internal religion; secondly, Cheyne valued Richardson’s opinion; and thirdly, Cheyne knew Richardson could also contribute in other areas, for instance in assisting to write the index and table of contents, which Richardson was very good at. Richardson had been highly complemented in the History of the Works of the Learned for his index to the first volume of The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe: “The Table of Contents is an excellent pattern, which the Publishers of such collections will always do well to imitate.”

In his letter of 17 September 1742 Cheyne recommends Poiret’s work on the mystic writers as the best model he could propose for his own little catalogue. He notes how “finely and elegantly” Poiret had described the characters of the mystics in a small octavo in Latin, called the Bibliotheca Mysticorum, which had been published in 1708 by Henry Wetstein. Cheyne especially mentioned that it had been printed by Henry Wetstein and that Richardson could possibly get it at Mr Vaillant’s shop in the Strand, at least that was where Cheyne had bought it himself. Paul Vaillant came from a Protestant family at Samur in Anjou, France, and had escaped to England at the time of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He had settled as a bookseller in London around 1696 and obtained a good reputation since he became one of the publishers of John Mills’s Greek Testament (1707). Vaillant was one of the publishers of Nathaniel Hooke’s translation of A.M. Ramsay’s Life of Fénelon (1723) and also of Fénelon’s Pious Thoughts (1720). In 1743 Cheyne still bought books through Vaillant’s shop, now run by his sons, for he asked Richardson to have James Leake junior, to go to Mr. Vaillant and send him a list of all the newest books, philosophical or entertaining.

In his letter of 2 November 1742, Cheyne further elaborates on his project of the catalogue. He wants it to contain the “best, easiest, and most genuine Books in all the Arts and Sciences”, such as the most approved spiritual and religious works of Christianity, books of “History Natural and Political”, travel books and the “Accounts of all Countries and Nations”. Moreover, those “allegorical Histories, Adventures and Novels” that are religious, interesting and probable, should be included, as well as divine and moral poetry and some plays, but only if they recommend “Virtue and good Manners”. He also wants “Books on physic” to be included, because these are “absolutely necessary in such a Catalogue”. He realizes that only “Lovers of pure Evangelical Virtue” ought to be employed, because others can have “neither Taste nor Judgment” in such a work. He asks Richardson to talk about it “among the Brethren”,

267 Alan Dugald McKillop, Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist, Chapel Hill, 1936, pp. 311-312, also p. 13.
268 Pierre Poiret, Bibliotheca Mysticorum Selecta, Amsterdam, 1708.
270 Ibid., p. 124.
271 Ibid., p. 111.
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with whom he meant the booksellers and not some secret society or circle, as has been suggested by Guerrini. Cheyne specifically mentions that the size of the book had to be of a “reasonable octavo”. Cheyne apparently did not approve of the smaller and cheaper duodecimo size. He wanted it to be the work of “Time and several Hands” which, he thought, might be “picked up among the Booksellers.” He enclosed a sketch of the title page:

The Universal Cure of Lingering Disorders either of the Mind or of the Body. .... The Characters, a brief Summary and Catalogue of the most approved Books, their Prices, and the Places where to be had, in all the Sciences fit to instruct in the Cure of Chronical Distempers, to Eradicate the black Passions, to bend the Vices to Virtue and Piety, to soothe Melancholy, Vapours and Pain, and to support the Spirits under Misfortunes or Bodily Ails. Either in the French or English Tongues. Collected and executed by a Society of Gentlemen, eminent respectively in the Theory of Physic or Cure of Bodily Distempers, in Speculative or Practical Divinity, in Ecclesiastical or Civil History, in Natural History or Natural Philosophy, in Travels or the Works of the Imagination. Which are fittest for the Use proposed. With a general Preface and Reflections on the Use and Benefit of such a Work and of such Writing as agreeably withdraw the Mind from Thinking.

Felix quem Faciunt aliena pericula Cautum. Cheyne used the word “Brethren” in the same context in The Essay of Health and Long Life when he described Dr Pitcairne, who had thought himself ill-used by some of his “Brethren” of the profession (The Essay of Health and Long Life, Preface, p. ii, 1724). And again, in “The Author’s Case” Cheyne wrote that he had been seized with a fever, which, notwithstanding all the “Skill and Care of my Brethren, the Physicians” lasted more than twenty days (p. 340 of The English Malady). In Obesity and Depression in the Enlightenment: The Life and Times of George Cheyne, Guerrini quite erroneously states that “Richardson was another member of what Cheyne referred to as “the Brethren”, who shared mystical literature and opposed “meer Rationalists” on every front”, quoting as her sources the same letters I have used, to be found in Mullett, Op. cit., pp. 112 and 118 (Guerrini, Op. cit., p. 156, n. 29 on p. 231). See also letter XIV of 24 October 1741 in which Cheyne uses the word “Fraternity” to refer to booksellers. He writes to Richardson on the subject of his last book, i.e. The Natural Method, as follows: "If [Strahan] would take the whole [book] and part it among his Fraternity as he thought fit he should have the Remainder of the Copies of the last Book with the whole Impression of this and the sole Property of Both paying the 80 [Pounds] I advanced to Leake and Rivington and 125 [Pounds] for this last" (cf. Mullett, p. 71). It is therefore unfounded to suggest that Richardson was a member of a secret “circle” called “the Brethren”.

272 Cheyne used the word “Brethren” in the same context in The Essay of Health and Long Life when he described Dr Pitcairne, who had thought himself ill-used by some of his “Brethren” of the profession (The Essay of Health and Long Life, Preface, p. ii, 1724). And again, in “The Author’s Case” Cheyne wrote that he had been seized with a fever, which, notwithstanding all the “Skill and Care of my Brethren, the Physicians” lasted more than twenty days (p. 340 of The English Malady). In Obesity and Depression in the Enlightenment: The Life and Times of George Cheyne, Guerrini quite erroneously states that “Richardson was another member of what Cheyne referred to as “the Brethren”, who shared mystical literature and opposed “meer Rationalists” on every front”, quoting as her sources the same letters I have used, to be found in Mullett, Op. cit., pp. 112 and 118 (Guerrini, Op. cit., p. 156, n. 29 on p. 231). See also letter XIV of 24 October 1741 in which Cheyne uses the word “Fraternity” to refer to booksellers. He writes to Richardson on the subject of his last book, i.e. The Natural Method, as follows: "If [Strahan] would take the whole [book] and part it among his Fraternity as he thought fit he should have the Remainder of the Copies of the last Book with the whole Impression of this and the sole Property of Both paying the 80 [Pounds] I advanced to Leake and Rivington and 125 [Pounds] for this last" (cf. Mullett, p. 71). It is therefore unfounded to suggest that Richardson was a member of a secret “circle” called “the Brethren”.

274 Ibid., p. 126.
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The Relation between Pierre Poiret and Henry Wetstein
Cheyne referred to Poiret’s Bibliotheca mysticorum section V of which contains the Catalogus plurimorum auctorum qui de rebus mysticis aut spirituallisibus scripserunt. It had been published in 1708 at Amsterdam by Poiret’s close friend, Henry Wetstein. The Bibliotheca mysticorum was to become an important reference work for Protestants, and we find frequent references to it by Byrom and Law. We know Cheyne was also an admirer of Poiret. He certainly had most, if not all, of Poiret’s works,275 and he may even have met him while in Leiden, for Poiret lived in Rijnsburg, a small village near Leiden.276

Poiret was a French Protestant spiritual writer and a keen student of mystics such as Thomas à Kempis and J. Tauler, but especially of Boehme, Fénelon, Guyon, and Antoinette Bourignon, whose companion Poiret had been until her death in 1680. Marjolaine Chevallier wrote an interesting biography entitled Pierre Poiret (1646-1719): Du protestantisme a la mystique, published in 1994.277 She also published an extensive bibliography of Poiret.278 Chevallier describes the group of friends surrounding Poiret and Wetstein, among whom George Cheyne, Dr James Keith in London, James and George Garden, Lord Forbes of Pitsligo, the diplomat Baron Wolf von Metternich, A.M. Ramsay, and the Philadelphian Francis Lee,279 not as a sect, but as a group of very spiritually-minded men (“âmes intérieures”), who exhibited a form of quietism typi-

275 In Dr James Keith’s copy of James Garden’s Theologiae Pacificae there is in Cheyne’s handwriting an instruction referring to certain of Poiret’s books and George Garden’s Apology for M.A. Bourignon, which reads as follows: “Direct for Dr. Cheyne at Bath till the end of Octr [sic] at Mr. Skine’s apothecary, after that for him at London to be left at Old Man’s Coffee House near Charing Cross, Westminster” (cf. Henderson, Op. cit. p. 104). If Cheyne really spent some time in Leiden, it is perfectly possible that he met Poiret, who lived in Rijnsburg, as well as the printer Henry Wetstein and his younger brother Jean-Luc (see footnote 136 above).
276 Poiret lived in Amsterdam from 1680 until 1688 when he moved to Rijnsburg, “where the Collegiants, a small offshoot of the Remonstrants, held their meetings. The Collegiants, or “Rijnsburgers”, held that the Church was an invisible society and every externally constituted Church a corruption. At the end of the eighteenth century most of the adherents of this sect were absorbed in the Remonstrants or the Mennonites. Chevallier describes Rijnsburg as “la bourgade pieuse” (Marjolaine Chevallier, Pierre Poiret (1646-1719): Du protestantisme a la mystique, Genève, 1994, p. 70).
277 Ibid.
279 Marjolaine Chevallier, Pierre Poiret (1649-1719), pp. 80-82, 97-98, 133-134, 136. The doctrines of the Philadelphians derived ultimately from Boehme whose ideas had been adopted by John Pordage and Jane Lead. As a religious sect the Philadelphian Society for the Advancement of Piety and Divine Knowledge had virtually disappeared after the death of Janet Lead in 1704. The term “Society” was preferred to “Church” because its members were expected to remain within their respective Churches. The Philadelphians professed a kind of nature pantheism and believed that their souls were illuminated by the Holy Spirit. The learned Francis Lee (1661-1719) was much impressed by Jane Lead’s writings, which he had come across in the Netherlands. He became an ardent disciple, married Jane Lead’s daughter, and was the key figure who spread Philadelphian doctrines on the Continent. A detailed description of the historical development of the Behmenists and the Philadelphians was made by Nils Thune in The Behmenists and the Philadelphians: A Contribution to the Study of English Mysticism in the 17th and 18th Centuries, Uppsala, 1948. Hans Schneider writes in “Der radikale Pietismus im 18. Jahrhundert” that in their statutes of
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cal of Christians originally belonging to the Reformed Church, though they generally remained Protestant. Pure love and charity played a very important role.

Chevallier uses Kolakowski’s expression to describe Poiret as one of those “chrétiens sans Église” whose aim it was to disseminate the idea of a purified religion, using mainly literary means. Poiret did not condemn the whole world as did Antoinette Bourignon, nor did he predict the salvation of only a small community of saints. He suggested models which could be followed. His main objective was to break down the barriers between the various confessions and to contribute to a true spirit of tolerance. The similarity between Poiret’s objective and that of Richardson as expressed in Richardson’s notes to his books is remarkable. An example is for instance to be found in the “Concluding Note by the Editor” to Sir Charles Grandison:

There is no manner of inconvenience in having a pattern propounded to us of so great perfection, as is above our reach to attain to; and there may be great advantages in it. The way to excel in any kind is, optima quaeque exempla ad imitandum proponere; to propose the brightest and most perfect Examples to our imitation. No man can write after too perfect and good a copy; and tho’ he can never reach the perfection of it, yet he is like to learn more, than by one less perfect. He that aims at the heavens, which yet he is sure to come short of, is like to shoot higher than he that aims at a mark within his reach. (Appendix to Sir Charles Grandison, p. 466)

Another important contributor to the knowledge about Poiret is Gianluca Mori, whose intellectual biography of Poiret Tra Descartes e Bayle. Poiret e la Teodicea, is a synthesis of his earlier philosophical research. He describes Poiret as follows:

Nel periodo considerato, lo vedremo, Poiret, continuamente all’opera, nell’ansioso tentativo di arrivare ad un “sistema” finalmente coerente ed armonico nelle sue parti.

In his fight with Bayle (theology versus reason) Poiret concluded that silence was the only dignified answer. Mori describes this as follows:

1702 we explicitly find “das böhmistische Substrat der philadelphischen Theosophie ... (Makrokosmos-Mikrokosmos-Vorstellung, himmlische Sophia, „mittlerer Zustand“ der Seelen nach dem Tod, Chiliasmus, Apokatastasis).” (Cf. in Martin Brecht et al., Geschichte des Pietismus: Der Pietismus im 18. Jahrhundert, Band 2, Göttingen, 1995, p. 112).
281 Ibid., p. 84.
283 Ibid., p. 11.
Hardly anything has appeared about Poiret in either Dutch or English.  

In his youth Poiret briefly became an apprentice to the engraver Sébastian Le Clerc, which may explain his later interest in this area. He was for instance involved in getting new engravings which were to accompany Wetstein’s publication of Spener’s *Pia Desideria*. Poiret afterwards left Le Clerc to go to the Latin school in Metz. In 1664 he left Metz to go to the Erasmus College in Basel to study Greek, Hebrew, philosophy and, ultimately, theology with Johann Rudolph Wetstein (1614-1684), Professor of the New Testament from 1656 till his death. Poiret became friends with this very learned and famous family from Basel, especially with Johann Rudolph’s sons Henry and Johann Rudolph (the Younger), whom he taught French. Henry Wetstein (1646-1726), a learned man, proficient in French, Italian, German, Dutch, Latin, Greek and Hebrew, would later go to Amsterdam, first to work for Daniel Elsevier from 1669 to 1676 and then to set up his own publishing business.

---

284 Ibid., p. 255.  
285 E.G.E. van der Wall briefly mentions Poiret in *De mystieke Chiliast Petrus Serrarius (1600-1669) en zijn wereld*, Dordrecht, 1987, e.g. pp. 514, 522-523. As we have seen, Poiret is frequently mentioned in Byrom’s letters and journal, as a result of which he occurs in Henry Talon’s *Selections from the Journals & Papers of John Byrom, Poet-Diarist-Shorthand Writer 1691-1763*, London, 1950.  
288 See Wetstein’s obituary in the “Republyk der Geleerden”, a journal published by his sons Rudolph and Gerard (March-April 1726, pp. 372-376). They announced their father’s death as follows: “Dat de naam van den nu onlangs overleden Hre. Hendrik Wetstein in wezen zal blijven, en met lof gedacht worden, zo lange als het grote getal van fraaie drukken, door hem met vele kosten in het licht gebracht, als zo vele getuigen van zynen onsterfelyken roem, zullen gezien en getrokken, en door brave mannen in hun schriften aangehaald worden, is eene waarheit, die zelfs door zyne bemyders onaaengvochten zal blyven. .. Een kort bericht van het leven dezes geleerden Boekhandelaars byvoegen. Johan Rudolph Wetstein, de grootvader van onzen Hendrik Wetstein, [was] burgermeester des stadt Bazel. Johan Rudolph, .. de vader van onzen Hendrik, vermaard hoogleeraar in de Godgeleerdheid in de hogeschole te Bazel, en een der geleerdste mannen van zynen tydt. .. Verscheidene talen machtig. .. de Grieksche en Latynsche, de hebreuysche, de Fransche, de Italiaansche, en de Hoog- en Nederduitsche.” Henry Wetstein remained active to the very last which appears from the March-April issue of 1724 of the “Republyk der Geleerden” (pp. 374-376) in which Rudolph and Gerard had advertised a few smaller works published in 1724 by
Wetstein published works by Boehme, as did his sons afterwards, for Geissmar informs us for instance that Rudolph and Gerard Wetstein had published a new collection of Boehme’s work in 1718, called “Einleitung zum Wahren und gründlichen Erkänntnis ... , Amsterdam, zu finden bei R. und G. Wetstein.” 289 Wetstein also published all of Poiret’s works, as well as works by Fénelon, Guyon, Bourignon and some translations of the Philadelphian Jane Lead’s work in Dutch and German. 290 This caused Bayle to write in 1698: “Le Libraire Wetstein ... est un peu prévenu des opinions des mystiques”, but in 1684 Jean le Clerc had written to Bayle about Wetstein: “C’est un fort honnête homme et qui entend aussi bien son métier qu’aucun libraire d’Hollande”. 291

As to Johann Rudolph the Younger (1647-1711), he followed in his father’s footsteps and became a famous professor of the New Testament from 1703 till his death. The friendship between Cheyne, Poiret, Henry and Rudolph Wetstein would later include the youngest brother Jean-Luc Wetstein, who worked for Henry until 1698, when he joined Poiret in Rijnsburg. 292 Moreover, I have been able to connect Cheyne directly with Henry’s sons, Rudolph and Gerard, for they announced in the “Republyk der Geleerden” (issues of 1725 and 1726) the forthcoming Dutch and Latin translations of Cheyne’s Essay of
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Henry Wetstein, i.e. “De Godelieveande ziel” and “De gedurige Blysdchap des Geestes; zynde het eijen juweel der genen, die den Vader aanbidden in geest en waarheit ... weker eerste [hoofdstuk] handelt van den uitwendigen en inwendigen mensch.” It was written by Alethophilus, using the name of Hilarius Theomilus, both in the mystic-religious genre Wetstein so admired and probably written by Wolf von Metternich. Not only were Rudolph and Gerard Wetstein book-sellers, they also had their own printing shop, as well as a type-foundry, from which they supplied Arabic types to publish a Malayen bible (see also I.H. van Eeghen, Op. cit., pp. 170, 173, 176, 180). 289 Christoph Geissmar, Das Auge Gottes. Bilder zu Jacob Böhme, Wolfenbutteler Arbeiten zur Barockforschung, Bd. 23, Wiesbaden, 1993, pp. 39-40, see also plate 174 “Kransen van Leliën en Rosen”. In the seventeenth century Hendrick Beets had been one of the first publishers to the German adherents of Jacob Boehme, later Henry Wetstein would become involved as well. See for Hendrick Beets, Willem Heijting’s “Hendrick Beets (1625?-1708), Publisher to the German Adherents of Jacob Böhme in Amsterdam”, in Quaerendo 3 (1973), pp. 250-280. See also F.A. Janssen, Abraham Willemz van Beyerland: Jacob Böhme en het Nederlandse hermetisme in de 17e eeuw, Amsterdam, 1986.

290 See for the connection between Fiore and the seventeenth century, Serge Hutin, who mentions that Jane Lead had read A Revelation of the Everlasting Gospel Message which shall never Cease to be preached till the hour of Christ’s Eternal Judgment Shall Come, the German translation of which was published in Amsterdam in 1697 (Les disciples anglais de Jacob Boehme, au XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles, Paris, 1966, pp. 254, n. 39). As to the doctrine of the “Third Dispensation” and the reign of the Holy Spirit, cf. Hutin, Op. cit., pp. 70, 75-76.

291 I.H. van Eeghen, Op. cit., pp. 169, 171-172. Wetstein was equally interested in science and the list of books he published in this area is impressive, such as the Conamen novi Systematis Cometarum, pro motu eorum sub calculum revocando & apparitionibus praedicendis, which appeared in 1682, and the Dissertation e Gravitate Aetheris, in 1683. Both were works by Jacob Bernoulli (1654-1705), who had travelled through the Netherlands and into England where he met, among others, Boyle and Hooke. It was said that the scientific result of his journeys was his inadequate theory of comets and a theory of gravity that was highly regarded by his contemporaries. It may have influenced Cheyne’s theory of gravitation. In 1685 Wetstein published the works of Francis Bacon (see footnote 128 above).

It is interesting to see how all these pious people were able to find one another, for it was Johann Jacob Wetstein (1693-1754), another member of the famous Wetstein family and himself Professor at the Remonstrant Seminary in Amsterdam since 1736, who helped Zinzendorf translate the New Testament. Johann Jacob Wetstein was also mentioned in connection with the Stinstra affair by Van Eijnatten. He had studied with Johann Rudolph Wetstein (the Younger) in Basel and had worked for some time at Henry Wetstein’s publishing and printing house in Amsterdam. Like the other members of the Wetstein family, Johann Jacob was also specialized in the New Testament. Byrom refers to him in his letter to his wife, dated 13 November 1733. It was Wetstein’s Prolegomena ad Novi Testamenti Graeci editionem accuratissimam a vetustissimis Codd. MSS. denuo procurandam (1730) which was borrowed by John Byrom from his friend the Rev. John Kippax, Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, on 26 August 1739.

Returning to the Bibliotheca mysticorum, apart from the more well-known mystics section V mentions for instance Boehme, John Bunyan, Hiël, and Joachim of Fiore. It refers to Drexelius (Drexelius, Hieremias, Auctor singulariter pius), mentioned by Richardson in Clarissa: “A Drexelius on Eternity” (Vol. II. 256). Also included are Madame Guyon and Antoinette Bourignon. According to Chevallier it was not by an act of feminism that Poiret included female mystics in his catalogue, although he believed in the absolute equality of all human beings before God. He included women mainly because he thought they did not “suffer” from the handicaps of a deficient intellectual education: pretentiousness, complacency and pride. For Poiret the mystics,

293 They first announced in the July/August 1725 issue: “De Gebroeders Wetstein zyn bezig met te doen drukken ... uit het Engelsch in het Nederduitsche vertaalt: Proeven ..., door M. Cheyne ... in Octavo.” (pp. 183-184). Then Rudolph and Gerard announced in the March/April 1726 issue the following: “De Gebroeders Wetstein, die over eenigen tydt hebben laten bekend maken [Republyk van de maanden July en Augustus, 1725, bladz. 183, 184] dat het uitmuntende werk van den Hre. Cheyne, geneesmeester, en lidt van de koninklyke Maatschappij van Londen, van de Proeven aan- gaande de gezondheit, en de middelen om het leven te verlangen, by hen in de Nederduitsche tale gedrukt wordt. .... [Wij] hebben het zelve werk, door een bekwaam man, ten dienste van alle geleer- den, in de Latynsche tale overgezet, tegenwoordig mede op de drukpersse gebragt, en zullen beide, om dat er zo zeer naar verlangt wordt, zo spoedig in het licht brengen, als eenigzins mogelyk is.” The Dutch translation finally appeared in 1727 and was called Eene Proeve om gezond en lang te leven, geschreven door den Heer George Cheyne, M.Dr. En Lid van het Koninklyke Genootschap der Genees-Heeren te Edenburg, midsanders van de Koninklyke Maatschappij te London. Uyt het Engelsch vertaalt, doorgaans vermeerderd, in beter orde gebragt, en met Bladwyzer verrukt, door Jan de Witt, Med. Doct., T’Amsterdam, By R. en J. [Jacob, Rudolph’s son] Wetstein, en W. Smith [William, Rudolph’s son-in-law], 1727. A Latin translation was published by Strahan and Leake in 1726, but it is not clear whether this translation is the one announced by Rudolph and Gerard.

294 Zedler Universal Lexikon, Graz, Austria, 1962, p. 1024.


male and female, were always models who represented the true life.\textsuperscript{297} They were the essence of the evangelical doctrine of self-denial, mortification, imitation of Christ, exercise of virtue, love of God and dependence on Him.\textsuperscript{298}

Poiret's views on learning are most clearly expressed in his religious-philosophical work \textit{De Eruditione Solida, Superficiaria et Falsa}. The frontispiece rather tells it all (plate IX). It depicts an allegorical image of three types of learning. The first type, the \textit{Eruditione Falsa}, is represented by quite a few people pressing together in a cave, occupying themselves with secret subjects and fanciful conceptions. Both the teachers and the students are blowing bubbles while showing off prestigious titles on their books. The domain of the \textit{Eruditione Superficiaria} is symbolized by a precipitous and rocky mount with people falling down who tried to climb it too quickly. On top of the mountain we see a painting, a faint copy of the “Truth”. To reach this painting the rays of the sun have to travel through thick clouds, representing pretentious Reason and its ideas. In the meantime we see the \textit{Eruditione Solida}, solid and eternal, sitting on another mountain. In her right hand she holds the sun which drives away the darkness and obscurity. In her other hand she holds the reins with which she guides the souls. Those who try to reach her must leave behind their books and deny themselves. They must climb the mountain on their own, and not be discouraged. They will find a door through which to enter and then have to labour along a narrow and secret road, but they will be sustained by the fruit of the holy mountain. At the end of the road they will find the “Truth” and receive their reward.\textsuperscript{299} On the engraving of 1692 the pilgrimage travelled alone, however, in the 1707 edition a woman and a child were added.\textsuperscript{300}

Chevallier tells us that Poiret included only such mystics approved by those who were prepared to put (Christian) confessional differences in perspective or who were attracted by a piety imbued with mysticism.\textsuperscript{301} Irenic by nature, Poiret rejected all religious controversies. His utopian vision was to contribute to a lasting peace among the various Christian parties which, he believed, could be achieved by a true spiritual tolerance, by recognizing the love of Christ among some “bonnes âmes”, minorities and outcasts.\textsuperscript{302} Moreover, he was very much opposed to the concept of determinism which denied any form of free will to men. His favourite subjects were the freedom of men, the birth of Christ in the soul, the difference between the established Churches and the true community of Christians, and the millenarian dream.

\textsuperscript{298} Ibid., p. 253.
\textsuperscript{299} Ibid., pp. 86-87.
\textsuperscript{300} Ibid., p. 87, footnote 95. For Poiret’s influence in England, see Byrom’s \textit{Journal}, Vol. II, Part II, p. 552. Many of Poiret’s works were in Byrom’s library (\textit{Journal}, Vol. II, Part I, p. 216). For more details see the Catalogue of the Library of the late John Byrom, which was printed for private circulation only, London, 1848.
\textsuperscript{301} Ibid., p. 90.
of the final “rétablissement définitif des élus par le règne de mille ans”.\textsuperscript{303} (I
will return to the subject of millenarianism in chapter 6). It is therefore no sur-
prise that Cheyne admired him.

As mentioned above, Poiret’s works had found their way into Cheyne’s
library and so, when visiting Cheyne in 1742, Richardson may have seen the
French version of Poiret’s catalogue which had been published by Henry
Wetstein only a few years earlier in 1700. It was called Un Catalogue sur les
Écrivains Mystiques which appeared as a separate section in La Théologie
Réelle Vulgairement Ditte la Théologie Germanique.\textsuperscript{304} It is to the Théologie
Germanique or the Theologia Germanica that I will turn next, for I will argue
that it influenced Richardson.\textsuperscript{305} If he was unable to read the French text, at
least he may have been captured by the engraving on the frontispiece, about
which more later. We know that Richardson at least was aware of the existence
of the English translation.

**The Influence of the Theologia Germanica**

Cheyne explicitly referred to the Theologia Germanica in his letter of 12
October 1742, when he asked whether Richardson could find for him among
the booksellers the English translation of the “German Theology”.\textsuperscript{306} He ad-
depted that it had been translated into Latin by Luther,\textsuperscript{307} and that he had a
French edition of it. The radical Reformer Sebastien Castellio had made an
anonymous French translation of the Theologia Germanica in 1558,\textsuperscript{308} but
because of the differences between sixteenth and seventeenth-century French,
Poiret made a new translation in 1676, which was published in Amsterdam by
Henry and Theodore Bloom. In 1700 Poiret made another translation which, as

---


\textsuperscript{304} Pierre Poiret, La Théologie Réelle. Vulgairement ditte La Théologie Germanique, avec
quelques autres Traités de même Nature; Une Lettre & un Catalogue sur les Écrivains Mystiques.
Une Préface Apologetique sur la Théologie Mystique, avec la Nullité du Jugement d’un Protestant
sur la même Théologie Mystique, Amsterdam, 1700. The Catalogus in the Bibliotheca Mysticorum
is an extended version of the Catalogue included in the edition of the Théologie Germanique.

\textsuperscript{305} The Theologia Germanica was an anonymous medieval spiritual treatise, written in German
and widely used by the Anabaptists. It stresses the priority of individual experience and insight in
religious matters and therefore may be considered to represent a transition from medieval to
modern history. The generally accepted view is that the work comes from the milieu of the Friends
of God, associated with the fourteenth-century mystics Eckhart, Suso and Tauler, whose doctrines
it reflects. It advises radical poverty of spirit and self-denial as the way of union in and with God,
elaborating this against the Free Spirits, who thought that man could be God-like, living beyond
ethical rules and laws and believing themselves to be above suffering and conscience. (Cf. Steven
Ozment, Mysticism and Dissent: Religious Ideology and Social Protest in the Sixteenth Century,


\textsuperscript{307} Luther edited it in 1516 and 1518, giving it the title Deutsche Theologia. Though initially he
had admired it as in line with the Bible and Augustine, he would later come to regard it as
“Schwärmerei”. Calvin condemned it as poison of the devil and as “delirium anabaptisticum”,
while the Pope placed it on the Index of forbidden books.

\textsuperscript{308} Cf. Pierre Poiret, La Théologie Germanique: Chaptres Choisis, introduite par Sebastien
60.
I have mentioned above, was published by Wetstein as *La Théologie Réelle, Vulgairement ditte La Théologie Germanique.* Cheyne of the *Theologia Germanica* to which Cheyne refers is undoubtedly Poiré’s translation of 1700.

Cheyne further writes that the *Theologia Germanica* had been “englished” long ago and he wants the English version for his family. In his letter of 2 November 1742, Cheyne refers to it again and writes to Richardson that he does not have to trouble himself any further about the “German Theology”, because it was a “Twelvepenny Book only” and he repeats that he had the best French edition. He adds, however, that should Richardson come across it after all, he would still love to have it.

We have seen earlier in this chapter that Cheyne believed that a “principle of reunion” is implanted in all human beings. Yet he admitted that this principle may be unknown or forgotten. Possibly inspired by the *Theologia Germanica* he wrote:

> But Sensibility and Intelligence, being by their Nature and Essence free, must be *labile*, and by their *Lability* may actually *lapse*, degenerat [sic], and by Habit acquire a *second Nature*, opposit [sic] and contrary to this implanted *Byass* and Tendency towards a *Reunion* and permanent *Commerce* with their original and *first Cause*; and by *Selfishness*, inordinat [sic] Love and Idolatry of their *Fellow-Creatures*, sopit and extinguish this central *Byass*, at least as to *elicit Acts*, though not in the *Root* and *Fund*: And in this *Contrariety, Distraction* and tearing asunder of these *moral Powers in Spiritual Nature*, the *Essence of Misery* and *Hell* itself chiefly consists. So long as this contrary, habitual and foreign *Byass* lasts, so long must the *Unhappiness* and *Tortures* of such *sentient* and *intelligent Creatures* continue; like the *Chill* and *Cold* in the *Comets*, while in the Parts of their *Orbit* most distant from the *Sun*.310

However, this contrary bias to reunion was only accidental, and only by habit confirmed into a second nature, and therefore the infinite love, wisdom and “Oeconomy” of the Son of God was designed to melt down, annihilate and destroy this foreign bias, so as to allow the original and innate bias to operate.311 The etymology of the word “bias” is very interesting in this context (*bifax, bi and facies: looking two ways*) and undoubtedly must have reminded Cheyne of the *Theologia Germanica*, in the seventh chapter of which we find a Platonic image describing “the two eyes of the soul of man” in relation to the concept of the impossibility of “serving two masters”. It explains the left and the right eye of Jesus’ soul. The right eye is turned towards eternity and divinity, while the left eye is concerned with God’s creatures and the differences that are between them, who is the best and who the worst. But the soul of man

---

311 Ibid.
has also been created with two eyes, one of which can look into eternity, the
other one can only see this world, its creatures and the differences between
them. It is merely concerned with the body. These two eyes cannot both per-
form their work at the same time. For if the soul is looking with the right eye
into eternity, the left eye must close itself and refrain from working, and be as
if it was dead. Because if the left eye were fulfilling its task towards outward
things, holding converse with time and creature, then the right eye will hin-
der its working (contemplation). Thus, to have the one, you must let the other
go, for no man can serve two masters.312 This reflects the dilemmas of Clarissa
and Lovelace, who, on the anagogical level, represent the right and the left eye
of the soul respectively.313

Discussing spiritual and internal religion,314 Cheyne may have shown
Poiret’s translation of the Theologia Germanica to Richardson when the latter
visited Cheyne in Bath. There is a beautiful engraving on the frontispiece of
the Théologie Germanique which shows a girl sitting on a globe representing
worldly vanities, looking out of the window towards the sun and the tetra-
grammaton (plate X). Next to her there is a wheel the outside of which con-
tains the text “Relinquam mundum & vado ad Patrem” while the inside is en-
graved with the signs of the zodiac. Poiret gives the explanation to the figure
himself:

Intention de la figure du Tiltre. Après avoir banni de soi l’esprit du monde,
mis sous soi du loir toute prétension, ne regarder qu’à Dieu dans une paix
profonde, Telle est du pur Amour la contemplation.

312 On dit que l’ame de Jesus Christ, a eu deux yeux, un droit & un gauche. Dès qu’elle fut créée,
elle tourra l’oeil droit vers l’éternité & la divinité & elle s’y arrêta immuablement dans la con-
templation & dans la jouissance parfaite de l’être divin & de la Perfection divine, sans que nuls des
accidents extérieurs, nuls des travaux, nulles des émotions, des souffrances, des peines & des tourn-
mens qui survenoient à son homme extérieur, pussent ébranler ou empecher la fermeté de sa
contemplation. Quant à l’oeil gauche, il en regardoit les créatures pour les connoître & pour
observer le différences qui étoit entr’elles, ce qui y étoit le meilleur ou le pire, le plus ou le moins
excellent, selon quoi Jesus Christ regloit son homme extérieur. …. L’ame de tout homme que Dieu
a créé, a aussi deux yeux: l’un est, la faculté ou la puissance de voir dans l’éternité: & l’autre, celle
de voir dans le temps & dans les créatures, pour connoitre leurs différences, (comme on vient de le
dire.) & pour en entretenir la vie corporelle. Mais ces deux yeux de l’ame ne sçauaient [main-
tenant] bien faire leurs fonctions en même temps. C’est pourquoi, si l’ame veut envisager l’éter-
nité avec l’oeil droit, il est nécessaire que l’oeil gauche se défasse alors de tout son travail, & qu’il
se tienne comme s’il étoit mort. Comme au contraire, si cet œil gauche veut vaquer à ses fonctions
extérieures, c’est à dire, s’occuper du temps & des créatures, il n’est pas possible que l’œil droit
n’en soit alors détourné de sa contemplation. (Cf. La Theologie Réelle, Vulgairement ditte La
Theologie Germanique, Amsterdam, 1700, pp. 16-19).

313 Cf. the XL Questions concerning the Soul, in which Boehme describes the characteristics of the
“left” eye. He writes that the “whore of Babel” says she is the Eye, but she hath a false Eye: … in
Pride, Envy and Anger; and her seate … is the averse left Eye: she boasteth upon the Crosse, but
she entreth not into the Centre, she will not goe through Death into life. …. She oppresseth the
Children that are borne upon the Crosse, and treadeth them under her feet.” (XL Questions, 1:259-
260). He continues as follows: “For when I search to the beginning of the Essence, then I finde the
Eye which is God.” (XL Questions, 1:263).

Could this figure have inspired Richardson as early as 1742 to write *Clarissa*?

Clarissa’s allegorical letter must clearly have been based on the “two eyes of the soul”.\footnote{See p. 75 above.} Lovelace’s literal interpretation of Clarissa’s “setting out to her father’s house” perfectly agrees with his wrong bias (his “left eye”). Upon receiving this letter, Lovelace immediately set out for her father’s house to await the “happy reconciliation and the charming hopes she had filled him with”. However, Clarissa represents the “right eye” of the soul, for on the anagogical level she “returns” to God. She writes to Lovelace:

Sir, - I have good news to tell you. I am setting out with all diligence to my father’s house. I am bid to hope that he will receive his poor penitent with a goodness peculiar to himself; for I am overjoyed with the assurance of a thorough reconciliation, through the interposition of a dear, blessed friend whom I always loved and honoured. I am so taken up with my preparation for this joyful and long-wished-for journey that I cannot spare one moment for any other business, having several matters of the last importance to settle first. So pray, sir, don’t disturb or interrupt me - I beseech you, don’t. You may possibly in time see me at my father’s; at least, if it be not your own fault. I will write a letter, which shall be sent you when I am got thither and received: till when, I am, etc. (IV. 157)

We may even connect Clarissa’s allegorical letter with Lovelace’s dream which terrified him so much. Writing to Belford, Lovelace describes his dream in which he sees Clarissa, dressed in white, ascend to heaven, while he ends up in hell:

I awaked just now in a cursed fright. How a man may be affected by dreams! Methought I had an interview with my beloved. I found her all goodness, condescension, and forgiveness. .... [Lord M., Lady Sarah, Lady Betty and others] came ... to express their sorrow for my sins against her, and to implore her to forgive me. I myself, I thought, was upon my knees, with a sword in my hand, offering either to put it up in the scabbard, or to thrust it into my heart, as she should command the one or the other. At that moment her Cousin Morden, I thought, all of a sudden, flashed in through a window with his drawn sword. Die, Lovelace! said he, and be damned, if in earnest thou repairest not by marriage my cousin’s wrongs! .... I thought I would have clasped [Clarissa] in my arms: when immediately the most angelic form I had ever beheld, all clad in transparant white, descended in a cloud, which, opening, discovered a firmament above it, crowded with golden cherubs and glittering seraphs, all addressing her with: Welcome, welcome, welcome! and encircling my charmer, ascended with her to the region of the seraphims; and instantly, the opened cloud closing, I lost sight of her, and of the bright form altogether. .... And then

\footnote{See p. 75 above.}
The English Translation of the *Theologia Germanica*

As to the English translation of the *Theologia Germanica* mentioned by Cheyne in his letter to Richardson, we know that the seventeenth-century theologian Dr Everard of Clare College, Cambridge, translated Castellio’s Latin edition of the *Theologia Germanica* (1557) into English in 1628. He called it *The Golden Book of German Divinitie*. Everard held ideas similar to those of the Quakers such as the inadequacy of university learning as a preparation for spiritual ministry and his works were read by Quakers.

In 1648 Giles Randall published a new edition of the *Theologia Germanica*, again translated from Castellio’s Latin version, but showing some variations with the earlier one by Everard. He called it the *Theologia Germanica, or Mysticall Divinitie: A Little Golden Manuall briefly discovering the mysteries, sublimity, perfection and simplicity of Christianity, in Belief and Practice*. In the introduction Randall explains that for a long time it had been “veiled and obscured” from the eyes of the “illiterate and unexpert”, because of the fact that it was in Latin, but that several years ago “through the desires and industries of some of our own Countrymen, Lovers of the Truth”, it was translated into English. He further states that this translation had never been sent to the press, but had only circulated in manuscript form. However, now in 1648, this “worthy work of piety and charity” could appear “without blush in the most publique way”. He writes that as:

The Eagle in flight is highest, swiftest, in sight cleerest, in fight strongest; so this Tractate soareth aloft, buildeth on high, even above the starry Heavens, bearing her chickens the children of Truth, upon wing to the face of the Sun, speedeth unto the farthest end of truth, pierceth into the inwards and bowels...

---

316 Elden Hole is a deep chasm in the Derbyshire Peak, which was at the time reputed to be bottomless.
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thereof, and over-powereth the mind with her veritie, chasing away deceitfull vanity.320

Randall adds that the subject is that of the new man or new creature, showing how he may be restored and revived from sin and return to God from whom he has strayed. This can only be achieved through a true and holy theology. Because man has fallen by his own will, he can only return to God and to righteousness by abandoning his own will and follow the will of God, since remedies are to be found through their opposites, and the will of man is the opposite of the will of God (Castellio wrote that “les remèdes des choses sont toujours [sic] par leur contraire”, which was also one of Cheyne’s maxims). Randall argues that it is impossible to serve two masters who are contrary to one another (Castellio wrote: “il est impossible ... de servir à deux Maitres contraire l’un à l’autre”).321

Randall ends his preface by stating that the beauty of God is goodness itself, which is, he adds, what St. John calls “perfect love”. He then goes on to state that God himself is love, and that those who have obtained this love are deprived of all “Egoity” and love God only as he is good, as well as all things which “God loves himself”, that is “all things” anywhere, except sin: “for there is nothing which God loveth not, except sin”. Randall’s translation is perhaps the “German Theology”, the twelve penny book, to which Cheyne referred in his letter of 2 November 1742.

Cheyne’s interest in the Theologia Germanica may be explained by the fact that Boehme had been influenced by it. There is, for instance, a reference to fire in the first chapter of the Theologia Germanica which is interesting in relation to the fire-scene in Clarissa. It describes the “perfect” and the “imperfect”. Referring to St. Paul, the anonymous author of the Theologia Germanica states that when that which is perfect is come, that which is imperfect and in part shall be abolished. The perfect, which is “that thing which in itself, and in that which it is, comprehendeth and containeth all things”, is like a brightness or a flash of lightning, and its source is fire.

And yet it was not only a deep interest in spiritual matters which connected Cheyne and Richardson. Both men were much interested in foreign travel, especially in relation to the East.

Richardson’s Interest in the Far and Middle East

We know that Richardson was not indifferent to accounts of foreign travel from the fact that he had for instance published The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe in 1740.322 And earlier, in a letter dated 12 April 1739, Richardson had received a request from his friend Aaron Hill to allow him “the Favour of

322 See p. 34 above.
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a Second Inspection of the Harris, which you formerly sent me". According to Sale, this may have been John Harris’s Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca or A Complete Collection of Voyages and Travels, which had been first published in 1705. Plans for a second, revised and enlarged edition (consisting of the accounts of more than 600 writers) may have been contemplated as early as 1739 with John Campbell as the editor. Campbell had been associated with Richardson as one of the authors of the Universal History. The second and revised edition of Volume I appeared in 1744, and Volume II in 1748. Richardson was involved in printing both volumes. The booksellers for this large project were Thomas Woodward, who was on friendly terms with Richardson and whose shop was in Fleet Street near Salisbury Court, and Aaron Ward. The new maps for this second edition were drawn by Emanuel Bowen, the appointed engraver of maps for King George II and Louis XV of France (Plate XI). The preface states that:

The mind of man is so form’d, as scarce to admit of Amusement without Instruction. .... This kind of Reading ... charms us by a perpetual variety and keeps alive our Thirst of Inquiry.

Richardson’s interest in the Far and Middle East may be reflected by the remark in Volume I of Sir Charles Grandison that, since the tour of Europe had not contented him, Sir Charles had visited some parts of Asia, Africa and Egypt (I. 181). It may also explain the scene in which Harriet comments on human nature as follows:

But is not human nature the same in every country, allowing only for different customs? - Do not love, hatred, anger, malice, all the passions, in short, good or bad, shew themselves by like effects in the faces, hearts, and actions of the people of every country. And let men make ever such strong pretensions to knowledge, for their far-fetch’d and dear-bought experience, cannot a penetrating spirit learn as much from the passions of a Sir Hargrave Pollexfen in England, as it could from a man of the same or like ill qualities, in Spain, in

---

324 A theologian, scientist and mathematician, John Harris had published in 1704 his Lexicon Technicum in two volumes, which is the earliest modern encyclopedia of science, containing the only writings of Newton on chemistry.
326 The maps for the first edition of Harris’s Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca had been made by Herman Moll, a Dutchman who had moved to England in the 1680s. The new maps for the second edition were made by Bowen (fl. 1714-1767) who worked in London from approximately 1714 (cf. R.V. Tooley, Maps and Map-makers, (1949), 6th ed., London, 1982, pp. 55-56). Bowen had been involved in the Universal History, from the Earliest Account of Time to the Present as well, a project with which Richardson was concerned from 1736 until his death in 1761. Sale mentions that the authors of the Ancient Part of the Universal History were John Swinton, Archibald Bower (discussed in connection with Giannone on p. 30 above), John Campbell, George Psalmanazar, as well as George Sale, the Orientalist (see Sale, Op. cit., p. 103).
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France, or in Italy? And why is the Grecian Homer, to this day, so much admired, as he is in all these nations, and in every other nation where he has been read, and will be, to the world’s end, but because he writes to nature? And is not the language of nature one language throughout the world, tho’ there are different modes of speech to express it? (I. 185)

Book III of Harris’s *Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca or A Complete Collection of Voyages and Travels*, containing travels through the empire of Persia and covering subjects such as manners and religion, may have inspired Richardson to write the scene in which Harriet describes Dr Bartlett talking about the ancient Persians and reciting “Brachman’s prayer”:327

Looking up to the rising Sun, which it was supposed they worshiped, these were the words of the Brachman: “O THOU (meaning the ALMIGHTY) by whom Thou (meaning the Sun) art enlightened, illuminate my mind, that my actions may be agreeable to THY Will”. And this I will think of … as often as my early hour, for the future, shall be irradiated by that glorious orb. (Sir Charles Grandison, II. 233)328

Cheyne, likewise, had been interested in the East. He referred to Arab physicians in his books and mentioned some friends in Turkey to whom he sent copies of *The Natural Method*. In *The Essay of Health and Long Life* Cheyne discusses “foreign Luxury” which had been brought to its “Perfection” in England and specifically refers to “a kind of Liquors” which “some great Doctors” had condemned by “Bell, Book and Candle”, while others had “as extravagantly commended” it. With foreign luxury he means “Coffee, Tea and

---

327 It was the Neoplatonist Porphyry who associated “theosophy” (originally a Greek term denoting knowledge of divine things) with Indian philosophy; a connection which, according to scholars, suggests that it may be the Greek equivalent of the Sanskrit *brahmavidya* or divine knowledge. It is interesting to note that Richardson apparently also connected “divine knowledge” with Brahma, which shows that his interest in religious matters was not confined to Christianity.

328 We are informed about the priests, Brahmins, and their tenets in religion and how they believe in the transmigration of souls: “They hold Pythagoras’s Doctrine, believing the *metempsychosis* [sic], or Transanimation, or passage of Souls into Beasts” (cf. Harris, *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 412). This may account for Cheyne’s defence of vegetarianism: he did not believe people to have such “cruel and hard” hearts, or those “diabolical” passions, which could have them tear and destroy their “fellow-creatures”. at least not in the “first and early” ages before man had become so corrupted in every way and God had been forced to exterminate the whole race by a universal deluge in order to avoid that the earth would become a hell and a dwelling place for incarnate devils. (*Essay of Health and Long Life*, 1724, p. 92). Metempsychosis holds that souls migrate from one body into another until complete purification has been achieved. It forms an integral part of Hinduism and Buddhism and is also found in the Jewish Kabbalah, as well as with Plato and Pythagoras. However, it is fundamentally at variance with the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body and frequently attacked by Augustine. In Harris’s *Navigantium atque Itinerarium*, Volume II, p. 394, we find a reference to “what [had been] taken notice of by Le Brun”, a Dutchman (De Bruin) and a painter who spent a considerable time drawing the scenery and inhabitants of several regions of the world which he had visited. His *Voyages de Corneille le Brun par la Moscovie, en Perse et aux Indes Orientales* had been printed in 1718 by the Wetstein brothers.
Cheyne explains that coffee is a "mere Calx or a kind of Horse Bean", but lighter on the stomach, and informs us that the Turks used it. As to "this Mahometan Custom", he wrote that the complaint "for running into Excess in it" was altogether weak and groundless, for "those that do so there, suffer by it, as we do here". Moreover, those that debauched in it, would turn "Stupid, Feeble and Paralitick" by it, especially when they joined it with opium, "as they frequently do", just like those who "wallow" in opium do in England, and are as much "Despised and Expos’d by serious Persons as our Topers and Brandy-Swillers are here". All in all, Cheyne believed that "a Dish or two of Coffee, with a little Milk to soften it" is not only innocent, but a relief.329

A shared interest in the East may appear from Cheyne’s letter to Richardson of 2 November 1742, in which Cheyne asks him for the sheets of a book of travels by Dr Charles Perry that Richardson was printing. Cheyne explicitly wrote how much he liked the subject, but that he was afraid the work itself would be a disappointment, because he did not highly regard his fellow physician Perry. It seems as if his doubts were justified, for on 19 November 1742 Cheyne writes to Richardson that he had received the sheets of Perry’s book and that he indeed agreed with Richardson, whose "Judgment [was] very just as [he] really foresaw by some Visits", that the book was the "most trifling Stuff [he] ever met with and would not give it House Room in [his] Library.330 The book referred to was called A View of the Levant: particularly of Constantinople, Syria, Egypt, and Greece, and was published in 1743. Perry (1698-1780) was a traveller and medical writer, who had travelled between 1739 and 1742 in France, Italy, and the East, visiting Constantinople, Egypt, Palestine, and Greece. Upon his return he published the above mentioned book, illustrated with thirty-three plates.

Cheyne’s strong orientation towards the East appears from his reaction to Richardson’s complaint about the cold and frost, which causes Cheyne to write in his letter of 14 January 1742/43: "It is the laxity of your Solids from the Diet that makes Frost and Cold hurt and chill us so much; as our Diet is Eastern, so ought our Climate to be, to enjoy their Health and Spirits."331

Just before his death on 13 April 1743, Cheyne asked in his last letter to Richardson of 24 March what sort of book it was that had been printed by "one Pocock".332 This time he was referring to Richard Pococke (1704-1765), who had also been an enthusiastic traveller. From 1733 to 1736 he made tours in France, Italy and other parts of Europe. In 1737 he went to Egypt and Ethiopia and from there he continued his travels to Palestine, Cyprus, parts of Asia Minor and Greece. After visiting Naples, he returned to England in 1742. A year later

331 Ibid., p. 121.
332 Ibid., p. 125.
he published the first volume of A Description of the East, dedicated to the Earl of Pembroke, containing observations on Egypt and “the journey of the Children of Israel”. It also described many other subjects, such as the religion of Egypt, education, customs, dress, as well as hieroglyphs, embalming, vegetation, animals and the preparation of ice. Unfortunately, Cheyne never had a chance to read it, for he died only twenty days later.

The second volume of A Description of the East appeared in 1745. It was dedicated to the Earl of Chesterfield, to whom Pococke was domestic chaplain and who gave him the archdeaconry of Dublin, and includes Pococke’s descriptions of Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia, Cyprus, etc. Both volumes were printed by William Bowyer and contain 178 plates. The booksellers involved were John and Paul Knapton (also involved in Cheyne’s last book, The Natural Method), William Innys (Law’s bookseller) and Charles Hitch, Robert Dodsley and John Rivington (the booksellers involved in the publication of Sir Charles Grandison). Visiting his father Bishop Wilson in 1750, Thomas Wilson wrote in his journal that Dr Pococke had come from Dublin to the Isle of Man and presented Bishop Wilson with “his Travels, handsomely bound in morocco”.

It is interesting that in 1761 Pococke, by then Bishop of Ossory and Meath, published a sermon called “The Happiness of Doing Good”, which he had preached before the governors of the Magdalen House Charity. Richardson was an annual governor of this institution and in 1761 appeared among the contributors. At the request of Lady Barbara Montagu, Richardson had printed The Histories of Some of the Penitents in the Magdalen-House, published anonymously in 1760. In the sixth edition of Defoe’s Tour Thro’ Great Britain, published in 1761, Richardson provided an account of this charity, stating that its purpose was “to reclaim and reform such unhappy Wretches as had not escaped the Snares of vile Men”.

Cheyne’s Other Activities
As we have seen, Cheyne was a busy and active man. Besides writing books, he also pursued other projects concerned with “spiritual and internal religion”, which involved Richardson. We find in Cheyne’s letter to Richardson of 10 February 1738 a reference to the Catechism which Richardson had printed for him. Referring to the conflict between Pietism and Enlightenment, Cheyne writes that he thought it:

A pretty Thing for People sincerely disposed to be serious and in earnest about Religion. It will not go far with meer Rationalists, but I hope there will come a Time when such Instructions may relish even with them: that is when the Things of this World lose their Relish with them.

This Catechism is possibly Le Catéchisme Spirituel, one of the works of J.J. Surin (1600-1665), a Jesuit mystic and spiritual writer, admired by Madame Guyon. He advocated the practice of the presence of God and the prayer of contemplation in which the soul loses itself in the love of God. An Italian translation of the Catéchisme was placed on the Index in 1695 during the controversy surrounding Fénélon. Surin was regularly mentioned in the correspondence between Cheyne’s friend and fellow-physician in London, Dr James Keith, and Lord Deskford in Scotland.336

In his letter to Richardson of 23 August 1738 Cheyne enclosed a paper he had written on the character of Mr. George Baillie, who had recently died. He wanted Richardson to print about 250 copies. The text was also published in The Gentleman’s Magazine of 1738. George Baillie of Jerviswood, was the son of the Baillies of Jerviswood martyred at the Restoration. Educated in Holland, he returned at the Revolution in 1688 and became an M.P. for Berwickshire. In 1716 Baillie stood bail for several imprisoned Jacobites.337 There are similarities between Baillie’s character and Bishop Wilson and Earl Grandison (the real one).338 All admired by Richardson.

Apparently, Richardson found Cheyne’s paper on Baillie so important that it also found its place in the small octavo containing everything relating to Cheyne. It is obvious that Richardson used parts of it to paint Sir Charles Grandison (the description of the “Gentleman who did honour to Humane Nature”) and I will therefore quote it in some detail:

337 Ibid., pp. 94, 123.
338 See p. 31 above. The connection between Cheyne, Garden, Baillie and the Jacobites may be explained through Cheyne’s wife, Margaret (Peg) Middleton. My theory is that Margaret Middleton descended from Robert Middleton of Cauldham and Catherine Strachan of Thornton. Their son Alexander Middleton (?1610-1686), Principal of King’s College, Aberdeen, may have been Margaret’s grandfather, if we assume that Patrick Middleton (1662-1736), perhaps a younger son of Alexander, was Margaret’s father. Another son of Robert Middleton was John Middleton (1619-1673), who became the first Earl of Middleton, a family who had strong connections with the House of Stuart. Robert Middleton’s daughter, Isobel Middleton, was the mother of George and James Garden, which makes Margaret related to the Garden brothers. One of the ministers of St. Nicholas, the town parish of Aberdeen, George Garden was laid aside in 1692 because of his refusal to pray for William and Mary. Patrick Middleton also was a Scottish nonjuring clergyman, who was equally prohibited from exercising the ministry in 1692, because of his refusal to pray for William and Mary. In 1717 he refused to pray for King George and was for the second time discharged from preaching. Charles (1640?-1719), the second and last Earl of Middleton, played a significant role as head of the less extreme section of the Jacobites, going for a “restoration”, but restraining James. He was secretary of state to James II, who tried to convert him. Charles’s wife was a Catholic, but the earl was said to be “without much religion”. An anecdote tells us that when a priest said to Charles: “You believe in the Trinity”, he answered: “Who told you so?”. After the threatened invasion of England by France in 1692, Charles was apprehended in disguise at a Quaker’s in Goodman’s Field on 17 May 1692. I have already shown earlier the connection between James II and William Penn: perhaps Charles’s arrest at the house of a Quaker was another instance of some connection between the Jacobites and the Quakers. However, he was discharged on 19 August 1692. Early in 1693 he joined the court of James at St. Germains. James II died in 1701. By the titular James III Charles was created Earl of Monmouth.

107
He was, I think, a Gentleman, who in this corrupt Age, did honour to humane Nature. ... Piety, Charity, Justice and Truth, being the base and Model of all public Transactions and Deliberations. He considered Mankind as his own Family, and each Individual as his Child, and as the Image of his Heavenly Father. He continued in his own Society and Church, ... but without Rigidness or Narrowness of Soul, believing Charity to be one of the highest of Christian Virtues, and a guarded Freedom of Mind to be essential. ... He was one of the best of Fathers, Husbands, Masters, Friends and Neighbours, as well as one of the best of Men and Christians. If Saintship were in Use amongst Us, he would have made a Saint on Earth, as, I hope, he is now one in Heaven. ... with Truth [I] can affirm, I never knew his Superior in solid Virtue and just Thinking ... His Courage was undaunted, and yet his Patience was unalterable. His Piety unfeigned, and his Truth even to Precision; ...his Compassion was unbounded, even to those who were in Distress by their own Indiscretions. ... It was truly a Life hid with Christ in God, and he passed through several States of Purification and Trial, unknown to common and unexperienced Christians, which if published, might be subject to the Ridicule of the Profane, and those so severe ones, ... sufficient to annihilate Self in him in all its Mortifications and Subtilities. ... Considering the present Degeneracy and Lapse of Human Nature, the present deep Corruption of the Age and this Nation, ... he was the most perfect Instance of Humanity, Benevolence, Christian Fortitude, Perseverance, and Universal Charity, I ever knew, or can form any Idea of, under these Limitations and Circumstances; and I heartily wish his Example may influence and excite many of his Countrymen to follow it, and to imitate him, as he did his divine Master, who went about doing Good.339

The last literary project for which Cheyne sought Richardson’s cooperation was the translation into English of a “little French book”, entitled “L’Essence de le [sic] Extract de Religion Chretienne”.340 In a letter dated 27 January 1742/43, he told Richardson that he was looking for any person “having a Taste of Spiritual Religion” to help him with this.341 He would pay for

340 George Rousseau states that this was “another of Poiret’s Bourignonist compilations” which, he says, “describes the life and works of Mme. Guyon and was printed by Wetstein in Amsterdam” (cf. Mysticism and Millenarianism: ‘Immortal Dr. Cheyne’”, in Millenarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought 1650-1800, Leiden, 1988, pp. 111-112). I have not been able to confirm this. I could not find it in Chevallier's bibliography of Poirot, which lists all of Poirot's works and the works he edited, as well as the works of Guyon and Bourignon (cf. the “Avant-Propos” on p. 9). Nor could I find it in the British Library.
341 Cf. his letters of 27 January 1742/43, 17 February 1742/43, and 4 and 24 March 1743. In his letter of 4 March 1743, Cheyne tells Richardson that he plans to write a preface to it and add so much “Entertainment both in Physic and Divinity” so as to obtain a sufficient number of readers. He also thinks of adding a catalogue of all the English books that are either “amusing or interesting with Innocence” or advance the mind in “mystical or spiritual Knowledge”. If the translator is up to his task, Cheyne wants to use him to translate other parts of “this Author's Work” of which there are “10 or 12 Volumes, the most divine and instructive I ever met with” (cf. Mullett, Op. cit., pp. 123-125).
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both the translation and the printing “to give it away gratis”, because it was beyond “every Thing [he] ever saw ... [he] was sure it was sent from Heaven”. With the next letter of 17 February Cheyne sends his own copy, explaining that, though he initially promised to send his daughter’s copy, he did not want to wait for hers. He calls it “An Extract of the Essence of the Christian Religion” and tells Richardson that he wants it printed in a large type (always careful about his reader’s eyes) and on good paper.

A Mr Bernard is found among the French refugees, but Cheyne is very disappointed at the price Mr Bernard asks. He writes to Richardson that he had expected a specimen of Mr Bernard’s performance on the translation before he “pretended to set so exorbitant a Price on his Labours”. He finds that generally the French refugees are the most mercenary people, and he fears that his translation will prove “as bald as his Price is extravagant”.342 As it turned out, Cheyne was not very happy with the translation and he writes in what was to become his last letter to Richardson, dated 24 March 1742/43, that he had received the translation, on the basis of which, though unwilling to hurt Bernard if he should be obliged to translate for a living, he believed that Bernard “neither understood English nor Spiritual Writers in any language”.343 Unfortunately, Cheyne never had a chance to see his last project finished.

I will close this discussion with one last example of Cheyne’s influence on Richardson. Those who have read Cheyne’s works know how very much he admired the natural world. In the Philosophical Principles he remarks that to admire the “manifold Wisdom of the Author of Nature”, one would only have to look at the variety of beautiful figures and colours of shells, petrifications, ores, minerals, stones, and other natural curiosities of which the noblest and largest collection now extent is to be seen in the possession of the “industrious and learned” Dr. Sloane (plate XII).344 Even this aside influenced Richardson, for he depicted Sir Charles’s brother-in-law, Lord G., as a collector of shells (IV. 417).

342 Ibid., p. 124.
343 Ibid., p. 125.
344 Philosophical Principles, Part I, p. 293. The physician Sir Hans Sloane (1660-1753) had a taste for natural history specimens, manuscripts and books. His whole collection was moved to Chelsea in 1742. An account of it was given in the “Gentleman’s Magazine”. In his will he bequeathed his collections to the nation (on the condition that 20,000 pounds would be paid to his family, which was less than half of what it was worth) and so what is now known as the British Museum was founded. (Source DNB).
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Having come across the name of William Law in the previous chapters, we shall now further explore the relationship between Law and Richardson. Law’s life has been researched quite extensively by such scholars as Stephen Hobhouse, John Brazier Green and A. Keith Walker. An important source for Law is Walton’s Notes and Materials for an Adequate Biography of the Celebrated Divine and Theosopher William Law, privately printed in 1854, in which we also find much additional information on Law and his relation with the mystics.

Walton especially mentions Boehme, whose writings he describes as unpremeditated, simple, unsophisticated effusions, not characterized by the high sentiment of sanctity of the mystic schools, but rather presenting a piety and devotion of a utilitarian character, though still after the pure gospel form. Walton specifically refers to Boehme’s regeneration, repentance and resignation tracts. He points at a connection between Boehme, Law, Zinzendorf and the Methodists and traces the popular religion of the nineteenth century as well as the popular sciences back to “the source, or fundamental revelations [sic] of Behmen”. Modern scholars have confirmed this connection. Dietrich Meyer describes the great influence Henriette Katharina von Gersdorf had on her grandson Zinzendorf as follows:

Henriette Katharina von Gersdorf war ein durchaus selbständiger Charakter. Sie vertrat ihre eigenen Anschauungen und konnte auch an Halle Kritik üben. Sie war eine “Mittlerin” (Zinzendorf) sowohl zwischen Orthodoxen und Pietisten als auch zwischen den einzelnen Gruppen des kirchlichen und radikalen Pietismus. Sie setzte sich kritisch mit Johann Wilhelm Petersen auseinander und war bekümmert über dessen unbiblischen Ansichten von

---
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der Bekehrung nach dem Tode. Sie las Jakob Böhme sowie Jane Leade. .... Sie hatte alchemistische Neigungen, malte und musizierte. Mit dieser weiten, philadelphischen Gesinnung hat sie ihren Enkel geprägt und ihm ihre musische, poetische Begabung vererbt. (Italics are mine)\footnote{347}

As to Law, he lived a tranquil life. In contrast to his contemporary John Wesley, who showed such widespread activity and who was known to thousands of people, Law travelled little and was personally known only to a small circle. There are relatively few salient moments in his career, which revolved around three fixed points, Cambridge, Putney and King’s Cliffe. About fifteen years younger than Cheyne and some three years older than Richardson, Law was born in 1686 in the Northamptonshire village of King’s Cliffe to which he returned in 1740 and where he died in 1761. He was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he studied classics, philosophy, mathematics as well as Hebrew. He became a Fellow of the College in 1711. When in 1714 Queen Anne died and George, Elector of Hanover, was invited to succeed to the English throne to ensure the Protestant succession and public peace, Law became a Nonjuror for he refused to break his Oath of Allegiance to the House of Stuart. As a result of this he lost his Fellowship.

It is through the journal and the correspondence of his friend John Byrom, whose interest in Law was first kindled in 1729 by the \textit{Serious Call}, that we know several facts about Law which we would otherwise not have known. Byrom’s journal informs us that Cheyne was the one who mentioned the book \textit{Fides et Ratio}, in which Law found Boehme’s name.\footnote{348} Recording a conversation he had with Law in May 1743, Byrom writes that Law:

\begin{quote}
mentioned Dr Cheyne ... that the Dr was always talking in coffee-houses about naked faith, pure love, ... that Dr Cheyne was the providential occasion of his meeting or knowing of Jacob Behmen by a book which the Dr mentioned to him in a letter, which book mentioned Behmen.\footnote{349}
\end{quote}

Edited by Poiret, \textit{Fides et Ratio} consists of five separate sections which, except for Poiret’s preface, are all anonymous or pseudonymous. The main discourse, entitled \textit{Animadversions}, praises the writings of Boehme.\footnote{350}

\footnotetext{347}{Martin Brecht et al., \textit{Geschichte des Pietismus: Der Pietismus im 18. Jahrhundert}, Band 2, Göttingen, 1995, p. 7.}
\footnotetext{350}{The title page of the book is \textit{Fides et Ratio collatae, ac suo utraque loco redditae, adversus Principia J. Lockii. ... Cum accessione triplex: 1, de fide implicita sive nuda, 2, De ss. Scripturarum certitudine ac sensu, 3, De perfectione et felicitate in hac vita. Edidit et praefatus est Petrus Poiret. Amstelaedami, 1708. The main discourse, entitled \textit{Animadversions}, begins by the reprinting of a}
Since, according to Hobhouse, Law’s writings began to contain a genuine mystical note after 1735, Cheyne must have mentioned *Fides et Ratio* probably late 1735 or 1736. It is interesting that its reputed author, Count von Metternich (1660-1727), was in close sympathy with, if not actually a Philadelphian, and, moreover, a friend of some of Cheyne’s friends in Scotland. After Law had read *Fides et Ratio*, he obtained one of Boehme’s books and towards the end of his life he described to his Moravian admirer, Francis Okely, the experience he had when reading it:

> When I first began to read him, he put me into a perfect sweat. But as I discerned sound truths, and glimmerings of a deep ground and sense, even in the passages not then clearly intelligible to me; and found in myself a strong incentive to dig in these writings, I followed the impulse with continual aspirations and prayer to God for his help and divine illumination, if that I was called to understand them. By patiently reading in this manner again and again, and from time to time, passing over any little objections and difficulties that stood in my way for the moment, I perceived that my heart felt well, and my understanding kept gradually opening: till at length I discovered the wonderful treasure there was hid in this field.

In the prefatory advertisement to *A Demonstration of the Errors of a late Book* (1737), written against Bishop Hoadly’s *Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*, Moreton explained that the *Demonstration* was written after Law had become “greatly influenced by the writings of Jacob Behmen”. Moreton further writes that *The Grounds and

series of twenty-two Theses*, deduced by a Scottish disciple from the principles of Locke, demonstrating that “Reason is the more excellent [i.e. a better guide to Truth] than Faith”. The writer then takes these Theses and refutes them one by one in 474 sections. This must have appealed strongly to Law who was much opposed to the Christian rationalism of Locke with its rejection of innate ideas and its conception of the human mind as a tabula rasa.

For a survey of the Philadelphian Society see Nils Thune, *The Behmenists and the Philadelphiaians: A Contribution to the Study of English Mysticism in the 17th and 18th Centuries*, Uppsala, 1948. On the similarities and differences between the Philadelphian Society and the Quakers, Thune quotes from one of their publications: “the Philadelphians were not so silly as to place Religion in Thouing and Theeing, in keeping their Hats, or in a sad countenance. ... Then as to their Peculiar Principles, I told them I knew none but that single Opinion, That the Coming of Christ was near at Hand; and therefore they think it their Duty to warn and awaken the World, that they may prepare for that great and solemn Time, by a good Life, universal Charity, and Union amongst the Protestant Churches”. See also the words from probably Dr Francis Lee: “The Philadelphian Society must be considered as a part of the great movement for awakening spiritual life which had broken out like a new reformation in Germany under the name of Pietism. ... The Philadelphians do not want to be taken for a special sect separated from others, but that they felt allied to any movement of the age contending for the increase of spiritual life.” (Nils Thune, pp. 93-94).


Works, V, p. v.
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Reasons of Christian Regeneration (1739) was based upon the “teaching or revelation of Jacob Behmen”, adding:

The influence of Jacob Behmen’s writings with William Law has proved fatal to Law’s reputation as a Religious Teacher with many persons; and a great stumbling-block to those to whom the ‘Christian Perfection’ and the ‘Serious Call’ have been most convincing and productive of eternal benefit.354

The way in which Law approached the subject of “universalism” and the doctrine of “Free Will” is interesting. In The Grounds and Reasons of Christian Regeneration Law writes:

For God is Love, yea, all Love, and so all Love, that nothing but Love can come from him; and the Christian religion, is nothing else but an open, full Manifestation of his universal Love towards all Mankind.355

He appeals to the state of “your own Hearts and Consciences”356 to prove the “Necessity of your embracing this Mystery of Divine Love” and adds:

[He] will grant you all that you can suppose, of the Goodness of God, and that no Creature will be finally lost, but what Infinite Love cannot save. But still, here is no Shadow of Security for Infidelity; and your refusing to be saved through the Son of God, whilst the Soul is in the redeemable State of this Life, may at the Separation of the Body, for aught you know, leave it in such a Hell, as the infinite Love of God cannot deliver it from. For, first, you have no Kind, or Degree of Proof, that your Soul is not that dark, self-tormenting, anguishing and imperishable Fire, above-mentioned, which has lost its own proper Light, and is only comforted by the Light of the Sun, till its Redemption be effected. Secondly, You have no Kind, or Degree of Proof, that God himself can redeem, or save, or enlighten this dark Fire-Soul, any other Way than, as the Gospel proposes, by the Birth of the Son of God in it. Therefore your own Hearts must tell you, that for aught you know, Infidelity, or the refusing of this Birth of the Son of God, may, at the End of Life, leave you in such a State of Self-torment, as the infinite Love of God can no way deliver you from.357

354 Ibid., p. vii.
355 Ibid., p. 156.
356 Law had written earlier in the Demonstration that “we are apt to consider Conscience only as some working of our Heart, that checks us, and so we are rather afraid, than fond of it. But if we looked upon it as it really is, so much of God within us, revealing himself within us, so much of a heavenly Life, that is striving to raise us from the dead, we should love and adhere to it, as our happy Guide to Heaven” (Works, V, p. 94). If we read these lines in connection with Lovelace’s killing his conscience, then we will recognize how Richardson wanted us to understand that Lovelace had killed the “God within him”.
357 Ibid., p. 158.
Cheyne was a great admirer of Law and they corresponded together. One such letter by Law to Cheyne is on the subject of spirituality and the attitude of rationalists towards it. Law writes:

Spirituality itself is such a contrariety both to learned and unlearn’d Human Nature, that nothing whimsical or conjectural should be connected with it. This gives Rationalists too great an opportunity of exploding it all as chimerical, and makes even people well inclined to it, to be distrustful of it, and afraid of giving in to it. Whereas if the true spirituality of the Christian life was kept within its own bounds, supported only by Scripture doctrines, and the plain appearances of Nature and experience, Human reason would be strangely at a loss to know how to expose it. I could allmost wish that we had no spiritual Books but those that have been wrote by Catholics.358

According to Talon, Law here refers to Cheyne’s admiration for the Marquis de Marsay, whom Cheyne had described to Byrom in 1741 as “that wonderful German author of several treatises in French, printed at Berlebourg entituled, Témoignage d’un enfant de la vérité & droiture des voyes d’Esprit, &c.”359 Cheyne had asked both Byrom and Law (the “solid most judge in these sublime and abstracted matters”) for their opinions on Marsay, because of their experience in the “mysteries of the kingdom of heaven and the means of the universal restoration”.360 especially since “his last labours in medicine” (The Natural Method and the Essay on Regimen) had some “very remote tendency that way”. Because Law’s first reaction had not been too positive, Cheyne had sent him “all the history of the person, adventures, and methods of proficieny ... with the number of his books ... consisting of eight to ten octavo volumes”.361

As to Cheyne’s admiration for Guyon and Bourignon, Byrom tells us how, during one of his visits to Putney (Plate XIII) in April 1737, Law dismissively

359 Talon, Op. cit., p. 207. Charles Hector de St George Marquis de Marsay (1688-1753) was the son of a Huguenot family who had emigrated to Switzerland. In the 1710s Marsay became a great admirer of Bourignon. In 1726 he and his wife had plans to emigrate to Pennsylvania, plans which never materialized, probably because they became, though briefly, influenced by Zinzendorf during the latter’s visit to Berlebourg. In the mid 1730s Marsay began to write various treatises collected under the main title “Zeugniss eines Kindes von der Richtigkeit der Wege des Geistes”, deeply influenced by Madame Guyon’s thoughts. Cheyne’s admiration, then, does not come as a surpize. Edelmann, Marsay’s contemporary, described Marsay and his friends as follows: “Da fand ich nun wider eine ganz andere Art von Heiligen, die zwar alle auch Separatisten waren: Aber sie hatten sich in die Schriften der Bourignon und der Guion dergestalt verbildet, dass sie sie mehr als die Bibel selbst venerierten. Der Herr von Marsay, auf dem der Geist dieser beyden Heiligen zwiefach zu ruhen schien, und der alle seine Schriften aus dem Wasser dieser Quellen schöpfte, war der Götze dieser kleinen Familie.” (Cf. Hans Schneider, “Der Radikale Pietismus im 18. Jahrhundert”, in Martin Brecht’s Geschichte des Pietismus: Der Pietismus im 18. Jahrhundert, Band 2, Göttingen, 1995, pp. 128-130).
360 See footnote 279 above and footnote 495 below.
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XIII. Lime Grove, home of the Gibbon family in Putney, where Byrom walked with William Law
referred to these two female mystics, expressing his view that they wrote too much and were inclined to delusion. He believed that the world would be reformed but that those fit to do so had not yet arrived. He recommended more solid mystical writers such as Ruysbroeck, Tauler, Thomas à Kempis, the old Roman Catholic writers, and, of course, Boehme, the only Protestant mystic on his list.362

The first clear reference to Law appears in Cheyne’s letter to Richardson of 9 March 1742. It is in this letter that Cheyne enthusiastically asks Richardson “Have you seen Law’s Appeal?” which he described as “admirable and unanswerable”. Moreover, he wished all the Methodists “might get it by Heart”.363 Cheyne is here referring to An Appeal to all that Doubt, or Disbelieve the Truths of the Gospel, whether they be Deists, Arians, Socinians, or Nominal Christians, published in 1740.

In Master Printer Sale mentions that Richardson had printed two works by Law. The first work was The Oxford Methodists (1733). Though the book has been attributed to Law by Dr. J.S. Simon, I have not found any proof of this, nor is it mentioned as Law’s in any of the collected editions of Law’s works.364 The second book listed by Sale was Law’s preparation to a new edition of works by Jacob Boehme, i.e. The Way to Divine Knowledge (1752).365 The publisher of both works was William Innys, with whom, according to Sale, Richardson was...

362 Ibid., Byrom’s journal entry for 19 April 1737, pp. 174-175. Byrom often visited Law at the home of the Gibbon family in Putney. Two years earlier Byrom had written in his journal for 7 June 1735 that Law had said “much about [Antoinette Bourignon] and against her” and that Law had locked her books up “that Miss Gibbon might not find [them] among his books” (cf. Talon, Op. cit., p. 155). Ruysbroeck (or, more correctly, Ruusbroec) was a mystic who lived from 1293 to 1381. He wrote almost entirely in Middle Dutch and his works include The Spiritual Espouses, The Book of Supreme Truth, etc. Several of his works were translated into Latin in the 14th century. His writings show the influence of St. Augustine, Bede, St. Bernard, Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite and Eckhart. John Tauler (d. 1361) was a German spiritual teacher, influenced by Eckhart and the Neoplatonists. His spirituality is notable for its balance between inwardness (detachment, the birth of God in the soul, and living in the “ground” of the soul) and the external practice of the virtues and of pious exercises. He had a lasting influence on later German piety, both Catholic and Protestant. Thomas à Kempis (Thomas Hemerken) was an ascetical writer who lived from 1380 to 1471. He was educated at the school of the Brethren of the Common Life. After that he entered the house of the Canons Regular, a daughter-house of Windesheim (the chief representatives of the “Devotio Moderna”). He is the probable author of the Imitation of Christ, the famous manual of spiritual devotion meant to instruct Christians how to seek perfection by following Christ as their model.

363 Mullett, The Letters of Doctor George Cheyne to Samuel Richardson, p. 88.
Richardson as the Printer of Law’s Works

During my research I came across a collection of three of Law’s books, the first of which was Law’s Appeal (pp. 1-214) followed by Some Animadversions upon Dr. Trapp’s late Reply (pp. 215-332). These two works have always been printed together. Though originally printed in 1740, this edition was published in 1742. The third book in the collection was the third edition of An Earnest and Serious Answer to Dr. Trapp’s Discourse of the Folly, Sin, and Danger of being Righteous over-much (renumbered pp. 1-92), the first edition of which was also published in 1740, while the second edition appeared in 1741. This third edition of 1756 was again published by Innys and since it has the same imprint used by Richardson in 1740 for Cheyne’s Essay on Regimen (Plate XIV), it is obvious that Richardson printed this edition.

Further research has yielded the following result. I found a second edition of Law’s Practical Treatise upon Christian Perfection (first edition 1726), published by William and John Innys in 1728. This second edition contains on p. 68 another imprint used by Richardson, which connects Richardson with Law’s works as early as 1728. It therefore seems reasonable to suppose that Innys had Richardson involved in the printing of Law’s works from 1728 onwards. In answer to Cheyne’s question as to whether or not Richardson had seen Law’s Appeal, Richardson may have written that, indeed, he knew the Appeal, for he was involved in printing Law’s books.

It then would come as no surprise that, only a few weeks later on 26 April 1742, Cheyne writes that Law had already sent him the Regeneration (The Grounds and Reasons of Christian Regeneration, published in 1739) as well as the Appeal, but that he would very much appreciate it if Richardson would ask William Innys to get all Law’s works bound and send them to him:

I have had but too much of your Compliments and Gratitude, and instead of your thinking yourself in my Debt for any Thing I can do for you, I have always thought myself in Yours. Remember the Catechism, Mr. Baillie’s Character, … but to ease your hyppish, honest, grateful Heart, if you’ll get Innys to gather all Mr. Law’s Pieces, all he ever wrote or published or is reckoned his, and get
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never close, but their relationship continued over a long period.366

366 Ibid., p. 328.
367 It is a collection of Law’s works which belongs to the library of the Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam.
368 I found that the first (1740) and second edition (1741) of An Earnest and Serious Answer to Dr. Trapp are in the British Library, but with different imprints on the first page of each edition. I have been unable to check whether these imprints belonged to Richardson, since Sale’s list of Richardson’s imprints is not complete. This, however, does not exclude Richardson’s involvement in these editions.
369 This imprint has been listed by Sale as no. 53, but has not been connected by him with this particular work (Sale, Op. cit., p. 292). This edition was also found at the library of the Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam.
XIV. The title page of Cheyne’s *Essay on Regimen* (first edition 1740). The imprint at the top of the page also appears in Law’s *Answer to Dr. Trapp* (third edition 1756).
them handsomely bound and send them to me, I will keep them in my Family and Library as an eternal Remembrance of you and him, whom I know to be the greatest best Man, and the most solid and deep of this Island. I have most of his larger Pieces already sent by himself, his Appeal and Regeneration lately.

370 (Italics are mine)

In a footnote to his letter to Richardson of 17 May 1742, Cheyne mentions that he has received Richardson’s “most valuable Present of Mr. Law’s Works”. 371

Having established the connection between Law and Richardson, we will now have a closer look at Law’s Christian Regeneration and Appeal.

**Law’s Christian Regeneration and Boehme’s Doctrine of Regeneration**

As mentioned above, Law had published in 1739 The Grounds and Reasons of Christian Regeneration, or, The New Birth, Offered to the Consideration of Christians and Deists in which the subject of rebirth, or the New Man, features prominently. Law compares the world with a hospital “where People only are, because they are distempered” and where there is no happiness, but that of being healed and “made fit to leave it”. 372 It is also in the Regeneration that Law refers to a dark guest hidden within every man, “a hidden Hell within us”:

> There is a dark Guest within [every Man], concealed under the Cover of Flesh and Blood, often lulled asleep by worldly Light and Amusements, yet such as will, in spite of everything, show itself, which if it has not its proper Relief in this Life, must be his Torment in Eternity. 373

Since these issues of rebirth and the New Man are themes in Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison, it is important to have a look at Boehme’s doctrine of

---

371 Ibid., p. 99. It is probably in reference to these books that Shuttleton made his obnoxious remark that Richardson was Cheyne’s patient, whom he paid for medical advice with “parcels of trade-discount books”. (Cf. “Pamela’s Library”: Samuel Richardson and Dr. Cheyne’s ‘Universal Cure’, in Eighteenth-Century Life, 1999, Feb. 23 (1), p. 59.
373 Ibid., p. 141. Boehme referred to the dark guest within as follows: “Seeing therefore wee are in such horrible danger in this world, that wee are environed with enemies on every side, and have a very unsafe Pilgrimage or Journey to walke, and above all, wee carry our worst Enemy within us, which wee our selves hide, and desire not to learne to know it, though it [note adds: viz. our evil & corrupt nature and will, which is inclined to all evil] be the most horrible Guest of all, which casteth us headlong into the anger of God; yea it selfe is the very Anger of God, which throwewth us into the eternall Fire of Wrath, into the Eternall, unquenchable torment: therefore it is most needfull for us to learne to know this Enemy, what he is, who he is, and whence he is, how he cometh into us, and what in us is his proper own” (The Three Principles, Preface 9). In the Threefold Life of Man Boehme writes: “You goe to Church, into the Congregation of Christ, and you bring a false hypocrite, lyer, a covetous, angry, adulterous, proud person and soule in with you; and the same you bring out with you againe, what benefit have you thereby? You goe into the Congregation to the Supper of Christ, and desire Christs flesh and bloud, and yet keepe the black Devill in you for a Guest: What meane you?” (14:18).
Regeneration on which Law’s theory is based. Boehme believed that Lucifer’s fall was beyond remedy, but that Adam’s was not, for the latter had desired to know good and evil, while the former had said “Evil, be thou my good.” Consequently, Adam introduced into his mind a false knowledge, which, however, did not entirely destroy the true Divine perception. He still recognizes evil as evil, whereas Lucifer knows evil as good. Thus Adam had died, not to the entire ability to know good, but only to the true, Divine perception which knows only good. This true, Divine perception went into a hiddenness, but it is still there as a latent potentiality within him. And yet Adam is at first totally unaware of it so much so that it seems it was not in him at all. According to Boehme, natural life is a life in death, and if the dead life is to come to real life, it can only be through that whereby we come to this life, a birth.

Boehme explains that the power of this new birth is the power of God through the life and death of Christ, the second Adam, who came down to save man, or to “re-tincture” the disappeared divine nature that stood as dead, that it might again spring forth to new life. Christ leads us to the recovery of the true Divine perception, by leading us to the cross, on which we must crucify the false which lies over and obscures the true. In Evelyn Underhill’s words, to be *re-born* means “to return to a world where the spirit of wisdom and love governs and animal-man obeys”. It means, says the Philadelphian Jane Lead, “the bringing forth of a new-created Godlike similitude in the soul”.374 Underhill states that this idea of re-birth is perhaps of Oriental origin and that it can be traced back to Egypt, being found in the Hermetic writings of the third century B.C.375 We have already seen how Sparrow connected Boehme with Hermes Trismegistos.376

Alchemic symbols such as “re-tincture” were also used by the “Hermetic Philosophers” or “Spiritual Alchemists”, but Underhill warns us that the hermetic writers did not always use the symbols in the same sense, nor did their later admirers. Some of the alchemic symbolism clearly dealt with the physical quest for gold. Typical of the different alchemist recipes was fire. We have seen how Cheyne uses the word “fire” in a literal sense, although mostly with a negative connotation, as the “tortures of fire”, because he disapproved of alchemy, whereas Law, like Boehme, uses it in a figurative sense.

The alchemists’ primary object was to produce the Philosopher’s Stone, a perfect and incorrupt, “noble tincture”, which would purge all baser metals and turn them into pure gold. The quest of the Stone was a symbol of man’s quest for perfection, and consequently a beautiful symbol of the mystic life. Underhill describes the activities of both the real alchemists and the spiritual alchemist as follows:

---

375 ibid., footnote 3 on p. 122.  
376 see footnote 200 above.
Nature, they thought, was always trying to make gold, this incorruptible and perfect thing; and the other metals are merely the results of the frustration of her original design. Upon the spiritual plane they held that the Divine Idea is always aiming at “Spiritual Gold” - divine humanity, the New Man, citizen of the transcendental world - and “natural man” as we ordinarily know him is a lower metal, silver at best. He is a departure from the “plan”, who yet bears within himself, if we could find it, the spark or seed of absolute perfection: the “tincture” which makes gold. Hence the prosecution of a spiritual chemistry is a proper part of the true Hermetic science. The art of the chemist, whether spiritual or physical, consists in completing the work of perfection, bringing forth and making dominant, as it were, the “latent goldness” which “lies obscure” in metal or man. Thus the proper art of the Spiritual Alchemist, with whom alone we are here concerned, was the production of the spiritual and only valid tincture or Philosopher’s Stone; the mystic seed of transcendental life which should invade, tinge, and wholly transmute the imperfect self into spiritual gold. [His] quest was truly a spiritual search into the deepest secrets of the soul.

To Boehme the Magnum Opus seemed a magnificent symbol of the “maximum opus” of regeneration or new birth. The transmutation of the base metal into the perfect metal stands for the transmutation of the fallen, external nature into the unfallen internal in which man was originally created in the image and likeness of God. And the process through solution, purification, and re-fixation exemplifies the spiritual process, through putting the false imagination to death to be followed by the re-creation of the “new man”. Many of the Christian alchemists identified the indwelling Christ, the Sun of righteousness, with the “Lapis Philosophorum” and with Sol. His spirit was the noble tincture which should, and would, restore an imperfect world.

Yet Law wrote in The Way to Divine Knowledge that when Boehme’s work first appeared in English, his readers were people of “the greatest Wit and Abilities”, who, instead of entering into his “one only Design”, i.e. their own regeneration from an earthly to a heavenly life, turned “Chemists” and set up furnaces to “regenerate Metals”, in search of the Philosopher’s Stone. This had never been Boehme’s intention, Law wrote, for “of all Men in the World” no one had so deeply and from such a true ground laid open the “exceeding Vanity of such Labour, and utter Impossibility of Success in it from any Art or Skill in the Use of Fire”. This concurs with Boehme’s admonition. He had written in the Signatura Rerum:

Herein now lieth the Philosophers Stone, [to know] how the Seed of the Woman bruiseth the Serpents Head, which is done in the Spirit and Essence,

378 Ibid., pp. 143-144.
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Temporally and Eternally; the sting of the Serpent is God’s Anger-fire, and the Womans Seed is God’s Love-fire, which must be again awakened, and illustrate the Anger, and deprive the Wrath of its might, and put it into the divine Joyfulness. Now observe the Process, and meditate thereon, ye dear Children of Wisdom, and then ye shall have Enough Temporally and Eternally; do not as Babel doth, which tickleth and comforteth itself with the Philosophers Stone, and boasteth of it, but keepeth only a gross Masons-Stone shut up in Poison and Death, in stead of the precious Philosophers Stone: What is it for Babel to have the Stone, when it lieth wholly shut up in Babel? It is as if a Lord bestowed a Country upon me, which indeed was mine, but I could not take possession of it, and remained still a poor man for all that, and yet I boasted of the Dominion, and so had the Name, and not the Power: Even thus it goeth with Babel about the precious Stone of the Newbirth in Christ Jesus. (Signatura Rerum, 7:23, 25)

In the Christian Regeneration Law described the process of rebirth or regeneration as follows:

Regeneration, or the Renewal of our first Birth and State, is something entirely distinct, from this first sudden Conversion, or Call to Repentance; it is not a Thing done in an Instant, but is a certain Process, a gradual Release from our Captivity and Disorder, consisting of several Stages and Degrees, both of Death and Life, which the Soul must go through, before it can have thoroughly put off the old Man.380

Law did not believe that this process must necessarily be of the same degree in all or that there are no exceptions, but added that it is certain that Christ is the pattern:

What he did for us, that we are also to do for ourselves, or, in other Words, we must follow him in the Regeneration. For what he did, he did, both as our Atonement and Example, his Process, or Course of Life, Temptations, Sufferings, denying his own Will, Death and Resurrection, all done, and gone through, on our Account, because the human Soul wanted such a Process of Regeneration and Redemption; because, only in such a gradual Process, all that was lost in Adam, could be restored to us again. And therefore it is beyond all doubt, that this Process is to be looked upon, as the stated Method of our Purification.381

It is a process which Lovelace rejects, whereas Clarissa embraces it. In A Demonstration Law had made a distinction between the Christ of history and the

381 Ibid.
Christ of experience:

The Gospel is not a History of something that was done, and past 1700 Years ago, or of a Redemption that was then present, and only to be transmitted to Posterity as a Matter of History; but it is a Declaration of a Redeemer, and a redeeming Power that is always in its redeeming State, and equally present to every Man.382

It is clear why Cheyne was full of admiration for Law, for they were kindred spirits. We have seen how Cheyne was fascinated with the phenomenon of attraction. Law was equally interested in this subject and wrote in A Demonstration:

For all is Magnetism, all is Sentiment, Instinct, and Attraction, and the Freedom of the Will has the Government of it. There is nothing in the Universe but Magnetism, and the Impediments of it. For as all things come from God, and all things have something of God and Goodness in them, so all things have magnetical Effects and Instincts both towards God and one another. This is the Life, the Force, the Power, the Nature of everything, and hence everything has all that is really Good or Evil in it; Reason stands only as a Busybody, as an idle Spectator of all this, and has only an imaginary Power over it.383

Law added:

382 Ibid., Vol. V, p. 105. See also Boehme, The Threefold Life of Man: “But for you to depend wholly on the History, and so to apply the merit, suffering, and death of Christ, and will still keepe the Devill lodging in your soule, that is a reproach to Christ; what doth it availe you to pray, that God would forgive you for Christ’s sake: when you forgive not all others? Your heart sticketh full of revenge and robbery” (14:17). The distinction between the Christ of history and the Christ of experience is reminiscent of the seventeenth-century English enthusiasts, also found among the Seekers, with their strong Anabaptist tinge, and the early Quakers (see also R. Knox, Enthusiasm, pp. 94, 174-175). See Boehme’s first epistle, “a Theosophical letter, or letter of divine wisdom, wherein the life of a true Christian is described...”, in which he writes that: “He is farre from a Christian, who onely comforteth himselfe with the Passion, Death, and Satisfaction of Christ, and doth apply and impute it to himselfe as a pardon or gift of favour, and yet remaineth still an unregenerated, wilde [wordly, and sensual] Beast; such a Christian is every ungodly Man: For every one would faine be saved through a gift of favour, the devill also would very willingly be an Angell againe by grace received and applyed from without. But to turne, ... and be borne anew of Gods grace-water of love, and the holy Ghost, that pleaseth him not. Even so it pleaseth not the Titular Christian, who will put upon himselfe the mantle of Christs grace [and apply his merits unto himselfe by an Historicall laying clame to a promise] and yet will not enter into the Adoption and New birth; albeit Christ saith, that he cannot otherwise see the Kingdome of God” (Epistles, 1:7-8).

383 Works, Vol. V, p. 90. Boehme explained that magnetic attraction is the beginning of nature (cf. Concerning the Election of Grace or of Gods Will towards Man, commonly called Predestination, 2:41). See also footnote 262 on magnetism, Law and Freke. Boehme stated that “although men cannot say of God that the pure Deity is Nature, but that it is the Majesty in the Ternary; yet we must say that God is in Nature, although Nature can as little reach or comprehend him, as the Aire can comprehend the Sunshine” (XL Questions, 1:3).
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This is that Trumpet of God which will raise and separate the Dead, and then all Impediments being removed, everything will take its place, not according to the Images and Ideas it has here played with, but according to the inward Tendency and Attraction of its Nature, and heaven and hell will each take its own. And even whilst we are in this Life, this Magnetism is the Mark within us, to what Part we belong; and that which has its Attraction in us, has the Right to us, and Power over us.384

As to the relation between reason and sensibility, Law writes:

It is the Sensibility of the Soul that must receive what this World can communicate to it; it is the Sensibility of the Soul that must receive what God can communicate to it. Reason may follow after in either Case, and view through its own Glass what is done, but it can do no more. Now the Sensibility of the Soul, which is its Capacity for Divine Communications, or for the Operation of God’s Holy Spirit upon it, consists in inward Sentiment of the Weight and Disorder of Sin, and in an inward Sentiment of Hope and Conversion to the Mercy of God. ... It is this Seed of Life, or Sensibility, that the Holy Spirit of God acts upon, moves and quickens, and enlightens.385

Law explains that “nothing but this Sensibility, or State of Heart, has Eyes to see, or Ears to hear the Things of the Spirit of God.”386

As to the freedom of the will and happiness, Law wrote:

Now the Freedom of the Will ... is only a Liberty of choosing to be made happy, either by yielding ourselves up to the Attraction or Operation of God upon us, or to be miserable, by yielding ourselves up to the Impressions of the World, and sensible Things.387

Cheyne’s interest in the concept of rebirth again appears from his letter to Richardson of 30 June 1742, in which he expressed his conviction that “low-living”, which in Richardson’s case meant a diet of bread and milk, would “mend a bad or weakened Constitution of Body”. It was a method which, according to him, had a great analogy to the “meanest Purification and Regeneration preserved in holy Writ.” He believed this diet would help to throw off the “old corrupted Mass” or “old Man with all his Works of Darkness”, which represented repentance, self-denial, sensuality and sin. The “new Man”, guided by the Divine Spirit, would obtain inward peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, “freedom of spirits”, serenity, activity, and gaiety, and a returning health.

385 Ibid., p. 117.
386 Ibid.
387 Ibid., p. 121.
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and mended constitution. Cheyne adds that he could moralise “much further” on this topic and show the resemblance “much more extensive”, but he thought “such a Hint” would do for the time being.

However, clearly back on earth again, Cheyne immediately continues to advise Richardson not to neglect his “Thumb Vomits”, which though “most painful, disagreeable and irksome ... are by far the most beneficial”. Together with (cold) bathing they are, in his words:

> Like Self-denial in Religion without which our Lord tells us none can be his Disciples. Milk and Bread is our only daily Food, sweet, mild, and nourishing and is like becoming little Children. Without becoming such we cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Cold Bathing is our Corporal Baptism and outward Cleansing. Go on with Faith and Patience and labour by the Assistance from above to cleanse the Outward and Inward Man from all Roots of Bitterness and labour to perfect Health and Holiness in the inner and outer Man.

Cheyne realises that his words may be misinterpreted, for he writes that if some of “our pretty Fellows” were to see this “doughty Epistle” they would swear he was mad and Richardson “not wise”, but Cheyne adds that he is not afraid Richardson should mistake or despise his “Insinuations”, for Richardson had always shown a “Relish for Spiritual and internal Religion”.

**Law’s Appeal to all that doubt, or disbelieve the Truths of the Gospel**

The other book Cheyne referred to in his letter to Richardson was Law’s *Appeal*, published in 1740. In the *Appeal* Law discusses subjects such as free will, the Trinity and the triune nature of God in human beings (“as there are *Three* in God, so there must be *Three* in the Creature”), Arianism and Deism. The Trinity as described by Boehme was a subject which, as we have seen, found its way into Cheyne’s works. It was also an important issue with Law, who, like Cheyne, was everywhere in his work insistent upon the activity of the Holy Trinity in the work of creation as well as insistent upon the indwelling of the triune being of God in the life of man. Law writes in the *Appeal*:

---

388 Mullett, *Op. cit.*, p. 101. Cheyne did not understand how bathing could ever have come into disuse, especially among Christians, when it was commanded by Moses under the direction of the Holy Spirit to his chosen people, and perpetuated to us in the immersion at baptism by the same spirit. Cheyne explained that frequent washing of the body in water cleanses the “mouths” of the perspiratory ducts from the “glutinous foulness” that is continually falling upon them. He argued that having the circulation “full, free and open” would be of great benefit to health and long life. His advice to everyone who could afford it, was to have a bath in a basin at their house, at least two or three times a week, if not daily, or otherwise to go into a river or a “living” pond (*Essay of Health and Long Life*, pp. 100-102).


390 Ibid., p. 102.
Every Thing that is said of God, as Father, Regenerator, or Sanctifier of Man; every Thing that is said of Jesus Christ, as Redeeming, forming, dwelling in, and quickening; and of the Holy Spirit, as moving and sanctifying us; Every Thing that is said of the Holy Sacraments, or promised in and by them, has its deep and inward Ground fully discovered; and the whole Christian religion is built upon a Rock, and that Rock is Nature, and God will appear to be doing every Good to us, that the God of all Nature can possibly do. The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity is wholly practical; it is revealed to us, to discover our high Original and the Greatness of our Fall, to show us the deep and profound Operation of the triune God in the Recovery of the Divine Life in our Souls; .... For as every Thing that is in us, whether it be Heaven, or Hell, rises up in us by a Birth, and is generated in us by the Will-spirit of our Souls, which kindles itself either in Heaven or Hell; so this Mystery of the triune Deity manifesting itself, as a Father creating, as a Son, or Word, regenerating, as a Holy Spirit sanctifying us is not to entertain our Speculation with dry, metaphysical Distinctions of the Deity, but to show us from what a Height and Depth we are fallen, and to excite such a Prayer and Faith, such a Hungering and Thirsting after this triune Fountain of all Good, as may help to generate and bring forth in us that first Image of the Holy Trinity in which we were generated, and which must be born in us before we can enter into the State of the Blessed.391

Also in The Appeal, Law discusses fire. He describes how fire is either a fire of wrath or a fire of love. If not overcome by Light, fire is the fire of wrath, which tears in pieces, consumes and devours all that it can lay hold of, because that is all it “wills”, whereas light is the fire of love, meek, and amiable.392 Again, this may have influenced Richardson when writing the fire-scene and its aftermath in Clarissa, with Lovelace representing the fire of wrath (loveless), refusing to be overcome by Clarissa representing light or the fire of love.

Law discusses fire in a slightly different context further down in the Appeal when he compares fire, light and air in this world not only as a true resemblance of the Trinity in Unity, but as the Trinity itself in its “most outward, lowest kind of existence or manifestation”, for, so he argues, there could be no fire, fire could not generate light, air could not proceed from both, “these three could not be thus united, and thus divided, but because they have their Root and Original in the Triunity of the Deity”.393

This comparison of fire, light and air with God, the Son and the Holy Spirit may reflect Richardson’s statement that with his third and last novel, Sir Charles Grandison, he was completing a plan. For indeed Sir Charles Grandison, in which Sir Charles represents air, or the Holy Spirit, seems but a natural continuation of or sequel to Clarissa, in which Clarissa represents

391 Works, Vol. VI, pp. 82-83.
392 Ibid., p. 112.
393 Ibid., p. 118.
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light, or the Son. Richardson writes in the preface to *Sir Charles Grandison*:

> The Editor of the following Letters takes Leave to observe, that he has now, in this Publication, completed the Plan, that was the Object of his Wishes, rather than of his Hopes, to accomplish.394

Since in the perception of Boehme, Cheyne and Law, the Son is necessarily and eternally begotten of the Father, and the Holy Spirit necessarily proceeds from both, it is not surprising that Sir Charles, as the Holy Spirit, has characteristics of all three.

**Byrom's Versification of Law's Prose**

Richardson's continued admiration of Law in later years may appear from the following two poems, found upon Richardson's death among his manuscripts. Although on top of the page of the manuscript the reader is referred to Law's *Appeal*, the first poem, to be quoted below, is actually based on *Some Animadversions upon Dr. Trapp's late Reply*, also published in 1740.395 Since Byrom often versified parts of Law's prose, and since Richardson printed some poems for Byrom, these poems may well be attributed to Byrom.396

The first poem reflects both Law's and Richardson's concern with the concept of universal love and their dismay at the disputes among the various sects of Christianity.


In this divided State of Christendom,
Of differ'ng Parts one must conform to some.

394 *Sir Charles Grandison*, 1972, Part 1, p. 3.
396 These poems are to be found in MS XVI, nr. 2. In the "Index to Poetry", nrs. 77 and 78 describe the two poems discussed. In this MS we find other poems by Byrom, e.g. nrs. 55, 56 and 57. See for the connection between Richardson, Byrom and Law, *The Private Journals and Literary Remains of John Byrom*, Vol. II, Part II, pp. 520-524, 543. In a letter dated October 21, 1751, Byrom writes to Law that the "letter to the Templar does indeed want to be printed". He then informs Law that Richardson "was so willing to print it upon hearing [it] repeated at first that I should have him to print it". If Law had no objection, Byrom writes he wanted "the other too", i.e. his poem *Enthusiasm*, to be printed by Richardson. Apparently not having received Byrom's letter, Law wrote to Byrom on November 4, 1751, that he had "desired Mr. Innys to let Mr. Richardson" print his work. It is in this letter that Law informs Byrom that both doctor Freke and Richardson will correct the proof sheets. In Byrom's *Journal* we also find Warburton's reaction to Byrom upon having read the *Epistle to a Gentleman of the Temple* and the *Essay on Enthusiasm* as he called them. Though trying to remain polite in his letter at the censure upon him in these two works, Warburton wrote to Hurd that "[Byrom] is certainly a man of genius, plunged deep into the rankest fanaticism. ... He is very libellous upon me; but I forgive him heartily, for he is not malevolent, but mad." (*Private Journal*, p. 522). Both the *Epistle to a Gentleman of the Temple* and the *Essay on Enthusiasm* are printed in *The Poems of John Byrom*, 3 Vols., Manchester, 1894-1912, Vol. II, Part I, 1895, pp. 138 ff. and 173 ff.
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I have been led, and thought it best to join
The Church of England, in her Rites Divine;
And, as in Life I profited thereby,
In her Communion I desire to dye:
Trusting, that if I worship God with her,
In Spirit, and in Truth, I shall not err;
But as acceptable to him be found
As if in Times for one pure Church renown’d,
Born, I had really liv’d, in Heart, and Soul,
A faithful Member of th’ unbroken whole.

Now as the time is come for me to go
From this divided State of Things below,
To share I hope, thro’ Mercy in a scene
Where no Disorders, no Divisions reign;
Into his Hands as I am, now to fall,
Who is the great Creator of us all;
God of all Churches, who with unconfined
Unchanging Love embraces all Mankind;
Who for his Creatures, has prepared, above,
A Kingdom __ that of Universal Love, __
For them that worship him the best they can,
Of every People, Nation, Tribe, or Clan:

So in this Loving Spirit, I desire,
As in the midst of this one holy Choir,
With solemn Rites, and with a Christian view.
Of all the World to take my last Adieu.
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.

Father! Thy Kingdom come! Thy Sacred Will!
May all the Nations upon Earth fulfil!
Thy Name be praised by every living Breath;
Author of Life, and Vanquisher of DEATH. 397

As an example of Law’s beautiful prose, rather different from Cheyne’s
slightly awkward (or archaic) style, I will quote the text on which the poem is

---

397 Forster MSS, Folio XVI, nr. 47, Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
Reading the poem cited in connection with Sir Charles Grandison, we recognize that “This divided State of Christendom” reflects the differences between Protestant England and Roman Catholic Italy as well as between other denominations. Sir Charles, then, though on the literal or surface level a member of the Church of England, is in “heart and soul a faithful Member of the unbroken whole”. Grandison Hall represents a place where “no Disorders, no Divisions reign”. Godlike, Sir Charles embraces “all Mankind” in a “Kingdom of Universal Love”. In Grandison Hall Grandison receives people that “worship [God] the best they can”. The lines “of every People, Nation, Tribe or Clan” are echoed in Harriet’s words: “But is not human nature the same in every country, allowing only for different customs? ... And is not the language of nature one language throughout the world, tho’ there are different modes of speech to express it?” (I. 185) Defending Sir Charles, Mrs. Beaumont writes:

He is a man of honour in every sense of the word. If moral rectitude, if practical religion ... were lost in the rest of the world, it would, without glare or ostentation, be found in him. He is courted by the best, the wisest, the most eminent men, where-ever he goes; and he does good without distinction of religion, sects, or nation. (III. 169)
And in Volume VII Harriet writes in a letter to Mrs Shirley what a pity it is that different nations of the world, though of different persuasions, do not really consider themselves as the creatures of one God “the Sovereign of a thousand worlds” (VII. 367).

The second poem is also interesting. It is based on the words of Boehme, quoted by Law at the end of *The Spirit of Prayer* (1749-50), and reads as follows:

Mr. Law’s Quotation from Jacob Behmen at the Conclusion of his Treatise upon the Spirit of Prayer.

Alas’ that we shou’d be so blindly led,  
And fill the Heart with Fancies of the Head!  
Truth in its Nature is as plain as Day;  
But vain Conceptions still obscure its Ray:  
Were its illuminating Power divine,  
Within the Souls internal Ground to shine  
Then were God present in its Life and Will,  
Which he and all his heav’nly Powers, wou’d fill;  
His manifested Love wou’d make it soon,  
The Place and Dwelling of the great Triune:  
The Temple of the Soul once freed from Sin,  
God wou’d display his Deity therein;  
The Father generate the Son, indeed,  
And from them both, the Holy Ghost proceed.

Of all the World, saith Christ, I am the Light;  
Who followeth me is never in the Night.  
We need not go, then, for Direction, far  
He is himself, the inward Morning Star,  
That riseth in us, by a willing Birth;  
And shineth in the Darkness of our Earth:  
O! What a Triumph is there, in the Soul  
When he enlightens its capacious whole!  
Then a Man knows, what’s hid from him before  
That he’s a Stranger in a foreign Shore.399

Law’s original text, preceded by a small introduction, is as follows:

I shall conclude this first Part, with the Words of the heavenly Illuminated, and blessed Jacob Behmen.  
‘It is much to be lamented, that we are so blindly led, and the Truth withheld from us through imaginary Conceptions; for if the Divine Power in the inward

399 Forster MSS, Folio XVI, nr. 46, Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
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Ground of the Soul was manifest, and working with its Lustre in us, then is the whole Triune God present in the Life and Will of the Soul: and the Heaven, wherein God dwells, is opened in the Soul, and There, in the Soul, is the Place where the Father begets his Son, and where the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. Christ says, “I am the Light of the World, he that followeth me, walketh not in Darkness.” He directs us only to himself, He is the Morning Star, and is generated and rises in us, and shines in the Darkness of our Nature. O how great a Triumph is there in the Soul, when he arises in it! then a Man knows, as he never knew before, that he is a Stranger in a foreign Land.400

We find the confrontation between the head and the heart in the second line of Byrom’s poem, when he writes that we “fill the Heart with Fancies of the Head”. He laments that the divine power is not manifest in the soul: “Were its illuminating Power divine, within the Souls” then God would be present. Byrom refers to the “Temple of the Soul”, which, when “freed from sin” would be the dwelling-place of the “great Triune”, i.e. the Father, the Son and, from both, the Holy Ghost. He describes Christ “the Light” that “riseth in us by a willing Birth”, who “enlightens” the soul. It is then that “a Man knows, what’s hid from him before”. This is reminiscent of the text quoted by Cheyne in the Essay on Regimen: “For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.” (1 Cor. 13:12) The connection between Boehme, Cheyne, Law, Byrom and Richardson is clear.

More Behemenism in Law’s Later Works
Law continued to work with Boehme’s ideas, and we shall see that, as the printer of Law’s works, Richardson was involved. In The Way to Divine Knowledge (1752) and The Spirit of Love (2 parts, 1752-54) Law explains Boehme’s theory of the seven natural “Forms” or “Properties”, the first three of which are Harshness, Attraction and Bitterness. The fourth Form is Fire, essential in Boehme’s theory. The fifth and sixth Forms are Light and Sound, and the seventh Form is the Body or Mansion of the six Forms. At the fourth Form of Fire, the evolution divides into two contrary directions, and it is within the power of the consciousness to decide which of the two it will take. The Fire is at first a cold and dark fire which can burn and hurt, but cannot purify. However, if the evolution goes on in the right way, the Fire grows stronger until it passes into the fifth Form, Light, the true Divine Light, and makes manifest things as they really are. When this Light arises, the Fire gives over all its power to the Light. Thereupon the first three Forms also change their character and be-

400 In the original Spirit of Prayer (2 parts, 1749-50), the text is found on p. 101 of part I. The Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam has it in its collection bound together with The Way to Divine Knowledge (1750). Cf. William Law, Works (The Spirit of Prayer), Vol. VII, p. 47. (This volume likewise contains The Way to Divine Knowledge.)
come gentle, soft and harmonious. So, if the evolution has gone right, then the creature stands marked with the “signature” of God.

However, if the evolution had proceeded from the fourth Form in the false direction, preferring might, power and anger to meekness, humility and love, then its light is dull, its sound is harsh and its figure monstrous. So it is in the fourth Form, or Fire, that the great choice has to be made whether the Fire shall be the Fire of “self” which consumes, or the Fire of “love” which illuminates.401

As mentioned above, Law discusses these seven Forms in The Way to Divine Knowledge and in the Spirit of Love.402 In the latter work Law writes:

The fourth [Property], called Fire, the fifth, called the Form of Light and Love, and the sixth, Sound or Understanding, only declare the gradual Effects of the Entrance of the Deity into the first three Properties of Nature, changing, or bringing their strong wrathful Attraction, Resistance, and Whirling, into a Life and State of triumphing Joy, and Fulness of Satisfaction; which State of Peace and Joy in one another is called the Seventh Property or State of Nature.403

Law adds that this is what Boehme means by his “Ternarius Sanctus” or “the holy Manifestation of the Triune God in the Seven Properties of Nature, or Kingdom of Heaven.” Richardson must have been familiar with this theory of the seven properties of nature before Law discussed it in the 1750s, for the function of Fire in the seven Properties of nature seems to have influenced Richardson when he wrote the controversial fire-scene in Clarissa, and gives it a symbolic meaning, additional to the one described above.404 Lovelace’s plots and schemes extend to setting fire to the house they stay at. He tells Belford:

401 This description is based on G.W. Allen’s article in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics as well as on the description of the seven natural Forms or Properties in Stephen Hobhouse’s Selected Mystical Writings of William Law, London, 1949, pp. 344-347. (See also Werner Buddecke, Die Jakob Böhme-Ausgaben, Volume II, Göttingen, 1957, p. 57).
402 Works, Vol. VII, pp. 251-253; Vol. VIII, pp. 19-20. It is on p. 19 of this Volume (The Spirit of Love, Part I) that Law mentions Sir Isaac Newton. He writes: “Here ... in these three Properties of the Desire, you see the Ground and Reason of the three great Laws of Matter and Motion lately discovered, and so much celebrated; and need no more to be told, that the illustrious Sir Isaac ploughed with Behmen’s Heifer when he brought forth the Discovery of them. In the mathematical System of this great Philosopher these three Properties, Attraction, equal Resistance, and the orbicular Motion of the Planets as the Effect of them, &c., are only treated of as Facts and Appearances, whose Ground is not pretended to be known. But in our Behmen, the illuminated Instrument of God, their Birth and Power in Eternity are opened; their eternal Beginning is shown, and how and why all Worlds, and every Life of every Creature, whether it be heavenly, earthly, or hellish, must be in them, and from them, and can have no Nature, either spiritual or material, no kind of Happiness or Misery, but according to the working Power and State of these Properties. All outward Nature, all inward Life, is what it is, and works as it works, from this unceasing powerful Attraction, Resistance, and Whirling.” Earlier Law called this “Whirling” a “Wheel, or whirling Anguish of Life” and “the Hell of Nature” (The Spirit of Love, Part I, p. 18; see also The Way to Divine Knowledge, Vol. VII, p. 196).
403 Works, Vol. VIII, p. 19-20. It is on p. 19 of this Volume (The Spirit of Love, Part I) that Law mentions Sir Isaac Newton. He writes: “Here ... in these three Properties of the Desire, you see the Ground and Reason of the three great Laws of Matter and Motion lately discovered, and so much celebrated; and need no more to be told, that the illustrious Sir Isaac ploughed with Behmen’s Heifer when he brought forth the Discovery of them. In the mathematical System of this great Philosopher these three Properties, Attraction, equal Resistance, and the orbicular Motion of the Planets as the Effect of them, &c., are only treated of as Facts and Appearances, whose Ground is not pretended to be known. But in our Behmen, the illuminated Instrument of God, their Birth and Power in Eternity are opened; their eternal Beginning is shown, and how and why all Worlds, and every Life of every Creature, whether it be heavenly, earthly, or hellish, must be in them, and from them, and can have no Nature, either spiritual or material, no kind of Happiness or Misery, but according to the working Power and State of these Properties. All outward Nature, all inward Life, is what it is, and works as it works, from this unceasing powerful Attraction, Resistance, and Whirling.” Earlier Law called this “Whirling” a “Wheel, or whirling Anguish of Life” and “the Hell of Nature” (The Spirit of Love, Part I, p. 18; see also The Way to Divine Knowledge, Vol. VII, p. 196).
404 See p. 127 above.
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And now for a little mine which I am getting ready to spring. The first that I have sprung, and at the rate I go on (now a resolution, and now a remorse) perhaps the last that I shall attempt to spring. A little mine, I call it. But it may be attended with great effects. I shall not, however, absolutely depend upon the success of it, having much more effectual ones in reserve. And yet great engines are often moved by small springs. A little spark falling by accident into a powder magazine has done more execution in a siege than a hundred cannon. Come the worst, the hymeneal torch, and a white sheet, must be my amende honorable, as the French have it. (II. 482)

The fire scene follows on June 7, but not with the hoped for consequences. Yet, it represents a crucial moment in the story, because from this moment onwards Lovelace is hell-bent, or all darkness, whereas Clarissa becomes illumined. If she had any doubts before, she is now completely enlightened as to Lovelace’s dark intentions. We can only fully perceive Richardson’s objective with the fire-scene if we take heed of Sparrow’s warning in the Signatura Rerum that only those readers of Boehme who understand “the ground” of Kabbalah will be able to grasp the true meaning of certain words, for “the bare letter will not give the understanding”. And Sparrow specifically refers to the word flagrat which meant not merely a burning, but an opening of life or death or “the dividing bound-mark” between the “dying” death in darkness and the “living” life in light, impressive words made even more so by the use of alliteration.

The contrast between light and darkness becomes stronger and more explicit immediately after the fire-scene. At one point Clarissa is arrested and thrown into prison in a sham action brought upon her by Mrs Sinclair (III. 419). Belford visits her there and describes her in terms of “light”, “illuminating” and “whiteness” contrasted with the darkness of her prison environment:

A horrid hole of a house, in an alley they call a court; stairs wretchedly narrow, ... into a den they led me, with broken walls. ... The windows dark and double-barred, the tops boarded to save mending; and only a little four-paned

405 See Sparrow’s postscript to the Signatura Rerum in which he explains certain uncommon words used in the English translation. He writes on p. 207 that “words are vehicula rerum, they are formed to express things, not bare sounds, or empty ays. Now He that rightly understands the ground of the Cabala ... and knows how the Language of Nature speaks in every Tongue, may well translate [Boehme]: but the bare letter of his Writings, though never so exactly translated, will not give a man the understanding of them, but the Spirit of Regeneration in Christ, in whom the fulness of the Deity dwelleth bodily.” Sparrow explains the use of the word flagrat as follows: “I have put it [German Schra’ck] flagrat, from the Latin word flagro, although by it I mean not a burning, but even the powerful opening of the Life or Death of the enkindling of the Fire in Nature; for the Fire is the dividing boundmark, wherein the life of both Principles is Opened and Severed; the life of the first is the dying death in the darkness, and the life of the Second is the living life in the Light; you may perceive a Resemblance of this Flagrat in [Thunder and Lightning, so also], in Gun powder, or the like. ... In some it is the horrible Flagrat to Death, and in others it is the pleasant Triumphant Flagrat to Life.”
The Relationship between Richardson and Law

eyelet-hole of a casement to let in air. 

... And this, thou horrid Lovelace, was the bedchamber of the divine Clarissa!!! 

... She was kneeling in a corner of the room, near the dismal window ... her arms crossed upon the table, the fore-finger of her right hand in her Bible. 

... Her dress was white damask, exceeding neat. 

... The kneeling lady, sunk with majesty too in her white flowing robes ... illuminating that horrid corner, her linen beyond imagination white.

(III. 444-446)

Exactly three months after the fire scene Clarissa dies, on Thursday, September 7 (IV. 348). The numbers three and seven are no coincidence, for they refer to Boehme’s theory of the seven Properties, divided into two Ternaries and connected by Fire.

Law’s Remarks on the Fable of the Bees

Law’s influence on Richardson may also appear from a much earlier work called Remarks on the Fable of the Bees, published in 1723. It contained Law’s answer to Bernard Mandeville’s Fable of the Bees; or Private Vices, Public Benefits, a cynical defence of certain licentious ideas which Lovelace likes to quote. Law describes Mandeville’s praise of immorality as follows:

[Mandeville writes] that Evil, as well moral, as natural, is the solid Basis, the Life and Support of all Trades and Employments without exception; that there we must look for the true Origin of all Arts and Sciences; and that the Moment Evil ceases, the Society must be spoiled, if not dissolved.

Equally important is Mandeville’s definition of man, quoted by Law:

As for my part, say you, without any Compliment to the courteous Reader, or myself, I believe, Man (besides Skin, Flesh, Bones, &c., that are obvious to the Eye) to be a Compound of various Passions, that all of them as they are provoked, and come uppermost, govern him by turns whether he will or no.

According to Mandeville, the passions which govern men are “Pride, Shame, Fear, Lust and Anger”. Pity is a “Frailty of our Natures”, Mandeville writes, of which “the weakest Minds have generally the greatest Share”, referring to women and children to support his case. Of course, Law does not agree at all.

406 Thursday was one of the second Mrs Richardson’s “lucky days”. Pamela insisted on being married on a Thursday (Pamela, London, 1966, Vol. I, p. 292). Harriet and Sir Charles also married on a Thursday (Sir Charles Grandison, VI. 191).


409 Ibid., p. 4.

410 Ibid., p. 5.
If women are more inclined to compassion “through a Tenderness of Nature”, Law writes, it is not from a weakness of their minds, but rather from “a right Judgment assisted, or made more easy, by a happy Tenderness of their Constitutions.” 411

Pride, lust and anger are Lovelace’s main characteristics. Believing that the “gaining” of Clarissa is essential to his happiness, and arguing that it is perfectly natural for all men to aim at obtaining whatever they think will make them happy, he writes to John Belford in a Mandevillian vein:

Whatever our hearts are in, our heads will follow. Begin with spiders, with flies, with what we will, girl is the centre of gravity, and we all naturally tend to it. …. I cannot but observe that these tame spirits stand a poor chance in a fairly offensive war with such of us mad fellows as are above all law, and scorn to skulk behind the hypocritical screen of reputation. (II. 23)

He repeats this imagery once again to Belford:

I have known a bird actually starve itself, and die with grief, at its being caught and caged. But never did I meet with a woman who was so silly. Yet have I heard the dear souls most vehemently threaten their own lives on such an occasion. But it is saying nothing in a woman’s favour, if we do not allow her to have more sense than a bird. And yet we must all own, that it is more difficult to catch a bird than a lady. …. How usual a thing is it for women as well as men, without the least remorse, to ensnare, to cage, and torment, and even with burning knitting-needles to put out the eyes of the poor feathered songster; … which, however, in proportion to its bulk, has more life than themselves (for a bird is all soul), and of consequence has as much feeling as the human creature! (II. 246-247)

Volume II of Clarissa ends with the following poem:

’Tis nobler like a lion to invade
When appetite directs, and seize my prey,
Than to wait tamely, like a begging dog,
Till dull consent throws out the scraps of love. (II. 526)

Defending his actions, Lovelace directly refers to Mandeville and says that at worst, he is entirely within his “worthy” friend Mandeville’s assertion “that private vices are public benefits” (III. 145). Recognizing the similarities between Mandeville’s depiction of man and the character of Lovelace, could help us understand that Richardson’s creation of Lovelace was perhaps not at all a depiction of a “dark guest” within himself. In a letter of 14 February 1754

411 Ibid., pp. 17, 24-25.
Richardson wrote to Lady Bradshaigh that in his novels he wanted to form characters, "one I intend to be all goodness" so "all goodness he is", whereas another he intended to be "all gravity" and "all gravity he is". He added that it was "not fair to say" that he was identical, "anywhere", while he "kept within the character".

Rather than Richardson's own "dark guest", Lovelace represents a "loveless" human being. Cheyne's "moral evil" or Boehme's "unenlightened soul".

In his Preface to the *Aurora* Boehme explains that there are two qualities in nature: "The one is pleasant, heavenly and holy; the other is fierce, wrathful, hellish and thirsty" (Preface, 8). Further down he adds:

Nature hath many times prepared and fitted a learned judicious man with good gifts, and then the Devil hath done his utmost to seduce that man, and bring him into carnal pleasures, to pride, to a desire to be rich, and to be in authority and power. Thereby the Devil hath ruled in him, and the fierce wrathful Quality hath overcome the good; his Understanding and his Knowledge and Wisdom have been turned into Heresies and Errors; and he hath made a mock of the Truth, and been the Author of great errors on earth, and a good Leader of the Devils Host. For, the bad quality in Nature hath wrestled with the good even in the mothers womb, and doth still wrestle, and hath elevated itself, and spoiled many a noble fruit. (*Aurora*, Preface, 17-18)

It would seem unfair to suggest that Richardson, at times, allowed himself to be carried away by his "own heated imagination", for in *Sir Charles Grandison* he allows Harriet to criticize the character of Sir Charles's father, Sir Thomas Grandison (a rake and a libertine). She comments that his fine

---

413 In this context we should read Boehme's description of the "four new little sons of Lucifer", i.e. pride ("all must stoop and bow to him"), covetousness ("averice"), envy ("the gout of this world"), and wrath (roaring "as a fierce lion") (cf. *Aurora*, 16:99-103). He concludes that "King Lucifer is the beginning of Sin and the Sting of Death, and the kindling of God's wrath, and the beginning of all Evil, a corruption, perdition and destruction of this world; and whatever Evil is done, there, he is the first Author and CAUSER thereof. Also he is a murtherer and a Father of Lies, and a founder of Hell, a spoyler and corrupter, and destroyer of all that is Good, and an eternal Enemy of God, and of all good Angels and Men; against whom I, and all men that think to be saved, must daily and hourly struggle and fight, as against the worst and Archet enemy" (*Aurora*, 16:104-105).
414 Keymer describes the four definitions of "libertine" as found in Johnson's *Dictionary": "In its original sense the Latin libertinus denotes a freedman or former slave, and from this root meaning develop three distinct senses. The first is relatively neutral, even perhaps positive: a libertine is 'One unconfined; one at liberty'. But in the second this envious state takes on more sinister implications: the libertine is 'One who lives without restraint or law'. The third sense, more ominously still, finds this lawlessness of practice matched by a similar abandonment of ideological restraint: 'One who pays no regard to the precepts of religion'. In its fullest and most subversive sense, 'libertinism' thus comes to mean 'Irreligion; licentiousness of opinions and practice'. The idea is of a wholesale challenge to law, and thus to the society preserved by its rule - a challenge which moves from the transgression of particular laws to a theoretical rejection of law's very grounding as authority or constraint." (Cf. Tom Keymer, *Richardson's Clarissa and the Eighteenth-Century Reader*, Cambridge, 1992, pp. 158, 163.)
poetical vein which he liked to cultivate made him somewhat suspicious and adds that “I have heard my grandfather say, that to be a poet, requires an heated imagination, which often runs away with the judgment” (II. 311).

**The Law-edition of Boehme**

We have seen how Law had been influenced by Boehme. He even projected a new translation of Boehme’s works, for which *The Way to Divine Knowledge*, printed by Richardson in 1752, had been the preparation. After the death of both Law and Richardson in 1761, the work was actually carried out by two of Law’s friends, George Ward and Thomas Langcake, who published a four-volume version (1764-81) which was paid for by Elizabeth Hutcheson.\footnote{A fifth volume had been planned, but Mrs Hutcheson died before it was completed. It was this four-volume edition of Boehme’s main works through which the English Romantics, especially Blake and Coleridge, got to know Boehme. (See for more details Werner Buddecke, *Die Jakob Böhme-Ausgaben*, Vol. II. Göttingen, 1937-1957, pp. 54-56). Elizabeth Hutcheson was the widow of Law’s friend, Archibald Hutcheson. She joined Law’s household in 1743 together with Miss Hester Gibbon (aunt of the historian Edward Gibbon), accepting his spiritual direction and sharing in his local philanthropic activities. (Cf. J. Brazier Green, *Op. cit.,* pp. 43 and 74.) For the connection between Hutcheson and Richardson, see pp. 18 and 19 above.}

Elizabeth Hutcheson was the widow of Law’s friend, Archibald Hutcheson. She joined Law’s household in 1743 together with Miss Hester Gibbon (aunt of the historian Edward Gibbon), accepting his spiritual direction and sharing in his local philanthropic activities. (Cf. J. Brazier Green, *Op. cit.,* pp. 43 and 74.) For the connection between Hutcheson and Richardson, see pp. 18 and 19 above.

Law’s biographer, Christopher Walton, refers to the common but erroneous supposition that Law had been the editor of this incomplete edition and he explains that, though Law indeed had the intention to produce a new and correct translation of Boehme’s works which can be inferred from his work *The Way to Divine Knowledge*, he died before the first of the volumes was printed. All the editors did was to take the original translations (by Ellistone and Sparrow) and make a few changes. They omitted certain portions of the prefaces and used the life of Boehme by Durand Hotham, which, according to Walton, was “tinted by the phantasies and old wives’ fables peculiar to the alchemists of former times”. All in all, Walton concludes, the assumption that Law had edited this “memoir” has discredited Law’s good sense and judgment.

There is a letter by Law on this subject in which he tells us how he had several times thought of undertaking a new edition of Boehme’s work, but never found the time to do so. He explains how he had taught himself the “High Dutch Language” on purpose to know the original text of the “blessed Jacob”. He refers to his own quarto edition of 1715, which had been carefully printed from the Gichtel edition of 1682.\footnote{This edition is the *Theosophia Revelata. Das ist: Alle Göttliche Schriften des Gottseligen und hocherleuchteten Deutschen Theosphi Jacob Böhmens, 2 Vols.,* Johann Otto Glüssing, Hamburg, 1715.} It depicts a lily on the first page (see plate XV). Law acknowledges the quality of the impressive translation by Ellistone and Sparrow, which had been done with great piety and ability as well as appreciation of the author, especially by Ellistone, but he found it nevertheless “too much overloaded with words”, while in many places the sense had been mistaken. He ends his letter by saying that if he were to undertake a new translation, he would try to make Boehme speak as he would have if he had written in English. Moreover, he would guard the reader at certain places...
where Boehme might be misunderstood. And, lastly, that by prefaces or introductions he would guide the reader in the right use of these writings, which, he adds, would be entirely unnecessary if only the reader would observe Boehme’s own directions. He is somewhat dismayed that though many people of learning had read Boehme with great earnestness, they merely stole from him “certain mysteries of nature” and ran away “with the Philosopher’s Stone”.\textsuperscript{417} Even though Law here shows a certain dislike of the alchemists, we know that he had ten or eleven books on this subject in his library in King’s Cliffe.\textsuperscript{418} Henry Talon reproduced Stephen Hobhouse’s restatement of the question surrounding the Law-edition as follows:

William Law learnt to read Boehme in his original German (the 1715 quarto edition still on the shelves at King’s Cliffe), but unfortunately he did not live to translate or edit any of his works. The so-called Law edition of Boehme, the fine four-volume quarto of 1764-81, is substantially and with slight alterations a somewhat incomplete reprint (made by Law’s friends as a pious offering to his memory) of the translations by John Sparrow, Ellistone, and Blunden. … The beautiful translation of Boehme’s \textit{Supersensual Life} (attributed to Law by Whyte and others) is, as Walton indicated, by Law’s fellow-nonjuror, the learned Francis Lee. \textit{Selected Mystical Writings of William Law}, p. 267.\textsuperscript{419}

Law had procured the commentaries of Dionysius Andreas Freher and these provide the Law-edition with some remarkable and impressive illustrations.\textsuperscript{420} The three principal ones are figures of man, woman, and the zodiac, covered with symbols; various parts of these open to reveal significations of the symbols, or of bodily parts; the whole is a series of up to nine or ten layers, dramatically organized to reveal at the deepest level the highest secret and greatest significations. These symbolic drawings illustrating Boehme’s mystical doctrine had such an overwhelming impact upon William Blake that, during a dinner party in 1825, he said “Michael Angelo could not have surpassed them”. Law’s great admiration for Boehme as the only one from among the generally anti-mystical Protestant spiritual writers compared with the great Catholic mystics also appears from the letter of Langcake to a friend, dated 30 November 1782, which said:

\textsuperscript{417} Christopher Walton, \textit{Behmen, Law, & Other Mystics: or The Present, Past and Future}, London, 1847, pp. 24-25.
\textsuperscript{420} Freher (1649-1728) was a German and one of Boehme’s early exegetists. He was much admired by William Law. His manuscript works are in Dr. Williams’s Library and in the British Museum. Excerpts were published by Christopher Walton in his \textit{Notes and Materials for an Adequate Biography of William Law}, London, 1854.
Mr. Law said to me (of ... Protestant Mystics) that Jacob Behmen was the first in Excellency, Hiël the next, and in the third place the Quakers ... tho' the deep mystic writers of the Romish Church surpassed them in their exceeding Love of God and Divine Wisdom.\textsuperscript{421}

As we have seen, Boehme was a powerful thinker and mystic, but his odd expressions make him rather obscure. Most men of the Enlightenment would probably have agreed with Warburton:

\textit{Jacob Boehme}, delivering to us ... a heap of unmeaning, or ... unintelligible words ... if indeed, this \textit{Wisdom} did come down from above, it hath so degenerated on its way down, as to be ever unfit to return.\textsuperscript{422}

Of course, William Law would not have agreed with such a view, but then again Law and Warburton disagreed on many things.\textsuperscript{423} Having established the connections between Boehme, Law and Richardson in this chapter, I will investigate Boehme’s direct influence on Richardson in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{423} See for instance Law’s \textit{Short Confinution of Dr. Warburton’s Projected Defence (As he calls it) of Christianity, in his Divine Legation of Moses. In a Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London.} This work was published in 1757. Law ends his confutation with the following words: “I should have had much Uneasiness, my Lord, in exposing so many gross Errors both in the Matter, and Manner of the Doctor’s Books, did not my Heart bear me full Witness, that no want of Good-will, or due Respect towards him, but solely a Regard to That, which ought only to be regarded, has directed my Pen.”
Boehme was not an isolated figure, but a representative of a type of spiritual religion which had reappeared over and over again with peculiar and regional variations throughout the history of Christianity.\textsuperscript{424} Much research has been done on Boehme’s thoughts by such scholars as Alexandre Koyré and Hans Grunsky, while Nils Thune has explored the relationship between the Behmenists and the Philadelphians. Also relevant are earlier works, for instance Evelyn Underhill’s \textit{Mysticism} and Rufus M. Jones’s \textit{Spiritual Reformers in the 16th & 17th Centuries}. Much more recent is Andrew Weeks’s \textit{Boehme: An Intellectual Biography of the Seventeenth-Century Philosopher and Mystic}.\textsuperscript{425}

We have seen in the previous chapters how Boehme’s ideas reached Richardson through men like Cheyne and Law. However, Richardson was most probably also directly influenced by Boehme’s works. Proof of this we find in a letter of 29 August 1742, in which Cheyne thanks Richardson for sending what appears to have been a work by or about Jacob Boehme. Cheyne writes:

\begin{quote}
I thank you for your Jacob Behemen [sic]; you will never have done with your Bribes. I wish I could do for you what you want and desire. All I can say, without Bribe or Entreaty, of mere Love and good Will, I shall ever do my best for you, and I shall beg of God to direct me in this particularly.\textsuperscript{426}
\end{quote}

We have no clue which of Boehme’s works, all of which were translated into English during 1645-1662, could have been the one Richardson sent to Cheyne.

\textsuperscript{426} Mullett, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 107; the misspelling of certain words is due to the fact that the letters were copied for Richardson by a third person. See also footnote 371.
Bohme wrote his first book, the *Aurora or Morning Redness*, as a result of his vision of 1610, which he compared with the opening of a gate. It was a vision in which he saw “the Being of all Being” as well the Trinity, and the three worlds, i.e. the divine and the dark world as well as the “external and visible” world. He describes his experience as follows:

In this my earnest and Christian Seeking and Desire the Gate was opened to me, that in one Quarter of an Hour I saw and knew more than if I had been many years together at an University, at which I exceedingly admired, and thereupon turned my Praise to God for it. For I saw and knew the Being of all Beings, the Byss and the Abyss, and the Eternal Generation of the *Holy Trinity*, the Descent and Original of the World, and of all creatures through the Divine Wisdom: knew and saw in myself all the three worlds, namely, *The Divine*, angelical and paradiseal; and the *dark World*, the Original of the Nature to the Fire; and then, thirdly, the *external and visible World*, being a Procreation or external Birth from both the internal and spiritual Worlds. And I saw and knew the whole working Essence in the Evil and the Good, and the Original and Existence of each of them; and likewise how the fruitful bearing Womb of Eternity brought forth. ... For I had a thorough view of the Universe, as in Chaos, wherein all things are couched and wrapped up, but it was impossible for me to explain the same. Yet it opened itself to me, from Time to Time, as in a Young Plant.\(^{427}\)

After the first book many others followed. As to the availability of Bohme’s works much information can be obtained from the bibliography of Bohme’s works by W. Buddecke’s *Die Jakob Böhme Ausgaben*. Also by Buddecke is “Die Böhme Handschriften und Ihr Schicksal”, an article which appeared in *The Jacob Boehme Society Quarterly*.\(^{428}\) More recently, Willem Heijting wrote an article about Hendrick Beets who published a large proportion of the seventeenth-century German editions of Bohme’s work in Amsterdam. Heijting also mentions, among other things, the Amsterdam merchant Abraham Willemzoon van Beyerland, who published Dutch translations of most of Bohme’s work between 1634 and 1642.\(^{429}\)

We can only speculate, and this is what I will proceed to do, as to which work of or about Bohme Richardson might have sent to Cheyne in 1742.

\(^{427}\) Cf. Evelyn Underhill, *Mysticism*, London, 1948, p. 257. According to Bohme God the father is the Abyss (Ungrund), the indefinable matter of the universe, neither good nor evil, but containing the germs of either, unconscious and impenetrable. This “abyss” tends to know itself in the Son, who is light and wisdom, and to expand and express itself in the Holy Spirit.


\(^{429}\) W. Heijting, “Hendrick Beets (1625?-1708), Publisher to the German Adherents of Jacob Böhme in Amsterdam”, in *Quaerendo* 3 (1973), pp. 250-280.
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Assuming that it was an English work, it could have been a book about Boehme, or it might have been an English translation of Boehme's works.

The English Translators of Boehme
As mentioned above, all of Boehme's works had been translated into English between 1645 and 1662 by John Sparrow and John Ellistone, and printed by Humphrey Blunden and a few others.430 The bookseller Giles Calvert was also involved in the publication of Boehme's works.431 For the translation Sparrow used manuscripts from Van Beyerland, sent from Holland.432 In the introductions to his translations Sparrow repeatedly asks his readers to allow the Inner Light, or Holy Spirit, into the heart, reminding them that light or darkness in life will extend into eternity.433

Boehme also had a profound influence on two Seekers, Charles and Durand Hotham. A Fellow of Peter-House, Cambridge, Charles Hotham wrote his Introduction to the Teutonick Philosophie. Being a determination concerning the Original of the Soul, whether it be immediately created by God, and infused into the body, or transmitted from the Parent. Englished by D.F. His brother Justice Durand Hotham wrote The Life of Jacob Behmen, which was published by H. Blunden in 1654. Aware of his treading on dangerous grounds, Hotham explains his purpose which was not to prove that Boehme was a saint, but at least to change the opinion that Boehme was a "pestilent" heretic. He writes:

Yet it being my happiness to be born an Englishman, and my Birth-right to be judg'd by my Lay-peers, I shall try the Danger of a Relation of the wonderfull Providences wherein this Man was conversant; and though perhaps he may be accounted no Saint, yet it may lessen his esteem of being a pestilent Heretick.434

430 Many of these books can be found at the Ritman Library in Amsterdam and, of course, in the British Library.
431 For Giles Calvert and some of his other publications, see "Giles Calvert's Publishing Career", in The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society, nr. 35, 1938, pp. 45-49. For his connection with Hendrik Nicolaes, the founder of the sect called the Family of Love, see Alastair Hamilton, "Hiël in England 1637-1810", in Quaerendo, 15/4 (1986), pp. 287-290. For Calvert and his connection with the Ranterers, see Norman Cohn, The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages, (1970), London, 1978, pp. 310-323. On p. 319 we find a reference by Abiezer Coppe (1619-72), the most famous Renter, to the Eternal Evangel, a work attributed to Joachim of Fiore. Coppe mentions the Eternal Evangel in his most significant work A Fiery Flying Roll for which he suffered imprisonment. Describing the imminence of the New Jerusalem, he writes: "Behold, he is now risen with a witness, to save Zion with vengeance, or to confound and plague all things into himself; who by his mighty Angell is proclaiming (with a loud voyce) that Sin and Transgression is finished and ended; and everlasting righteousnesse brought in with most terrible earth-quakes, and heaven-quakes, and with signes and wonders following."
433 See footnote 405 above.
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The translators, loyal to the Church, were deeply religious men, who hated the violent ideological conflicts caused by the civil war. The following text from 1716, a much later date, describes the first English translators of Boehme as learned and pious men who understood the “spirit of the author”, (except perhaps for the more obscure passages):

The person that translated these writings was John Sparrow, barrister of the Inner Temple; Mr. Ellistone and Mr. Hotham also have translated one or the other treatise into English, though Sparrow is generally considered the real translator and editor: he was a man of true piety and seems to have penetrated very deeply into the spirit of the author. His translation is considered faithful and correct in most points, except in some of the most obscure passages, which probably he did not apprehend. ... As regards the period, they were all translated towards the end of the reign of Charles I, and printed ... during the Civil War, except the last volume, which was not printed till the Restoration of Charles II in 1661 and 1662. Some have alleged that King Charles I read and highly esteemed the writings of Boehme (it had been said that he supplied the funds for their publication, and that therefore they are printed so royally).435

The reference to King Charles I is interesting in relation to Sir Charles Grandison.

Shortly before his execution in 1649, Charles I read Sparrow’s translation of the XI Questions of the Soul (1647)436 and much admired it. His wife was the Catholic Henrietta Maria. This may explain why Richardson gave the protagonists in Sir Charles Grandison the names of Charles and Harriet. According to Sparrow, when asked to give his opinion about the book, King Charles answered:

That the Publisher in English seemed to say of the Author, that he was no Scholar; and if he was not, he believed that the Holy Ghost was now in Men; but if he was a Scholar, it was one of the best inventions that he ever read.437

Confirmation of this was given by Francis Lee who wrote to Pierre Poirét:

436 The Latin translation of the XI Questions of the Soul, the Psychologia vera I.B.T. (Jacob Boehme Teutonicus), was made by Johannes Werdenhagen and published in 1632 in Amsterdam. It seems that the Psychologia vera was quite popular. According to Abraham von Franckenberg, forty copies were sent to Rome, where it was put on the Index of forbidden books in 1633. (Cf. Buddecke, Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 1).
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His [Boehme’s] work, *Forty Questions of the Soul*, came out here in England a little before the martyrdom of King Charles the First, and was put in his hands and read by him, with great admiration, for he quickly perceived that something remarkable was concealed under the enigmas (or emblems) of the writer.438

**Boehme’s Concepts**

So as to achieve a better understanding of the influence of Boehme’s concepts such as the soul and its destroyer, Light and Darkness, the Inner Light, the Holy Spirit, Wisdom, Sophia, music imagery, etc., I will discuss some of the English translations. In the *XL Questions concerning the Soul* we find a description of the image of the soul as well as of the Turba, the destroyer of the image, which may have helped to create the characters of Clarissa (as the soul) and Lovelace (as the Turba, the destroyer of the soul):

The distemper is nothing else but the Turba, which as a destroyer always insinuateth itselfe; beware of that (for the Old Serpent is subtle) and have a care, that you may be pure both in the beginning and in the End.” (*XL Questions*, 1:299)

Boehme adds a few paragraphs later:

And thus wee understand the soule, to be a life awakened out of the Eye of God, its Originall is in the fire, and the fire is its life; but if it goe not forth out of the fire with its will and Imagination into the Light, viz. through the wrathfull death into … the fire of Love; then it remaineth in its owne originall fire, and hath nothing for a body but the Turba; viz. the harsh wrath in the Desire in the fire, a consuming, and a hunger; and yet an Eternall seeking, which is an eternall Anguish. (*XL Questions*, 1:309)

In Ellistone’s translation of *The Epistles of Jacob Boehme* (1649) we find one of Cheyne’s favourite metaphors relating to music.439 Attacking a religion of notions, Ellistone argues in the preface that religion can no more consist of the “bare letter” than that music can consist of a row of written notes. Instead they are a “direction” as to how the skilful musician “shall play on the instrument” and he continues: “so also our minde is as an Organ or Instrument: but it Sounds onely according to the Tune, and Note of that Spirit, that doth possesse and act it”.440

---

439 In the *Essay of Health and Long Life* Cheyne likens the soul to a skilful musician in front of an instrument with keys within (the thoughts of the mind affecting the body), on which it may play, and keys without (the actions or sensations of the body affecting the mind), on which other persons and bodies may also play. (*Essay of Health and Long Life*, 1724, p. 144).
440 *The Epistles of Jacob Boehme*, 1649, pp. A2-A3. Ellistone adds that “we doe convert, and assi-
In 1651 Ellistone translated the *Signatura Rerum* in which we find several concepts equally familiar to those who have read Cheyne’s work, such as the mystery of God, macrocosm and microcosm, emblem, hieroglyph, wisdom, use of analogy, the imitation of Christ, rebirth and the kingdom of Heaven. In his preface to the *Signatura Rerum* Ellistone expresses his wish that the “little spark of breathing desire” within him for true knowledge (wisdom) will enable him to write an introduction worthy of Boehme’s work. He believes that true knowledge is the best treasure that we can attain in this world, including the knowledge of oneself:

For Man is the great Mystery of God, the Microcosm, or the compleat Abridgement of the whole Universe: He is the *Mirandum dei opus*, Gods Master-peece, a living Emblem, and Hierogliphick of Eternity and Time; and therefore to know Whence he is, and what his temporall and Eternal Being, and well being is, must needs be that ONE necessary thing, unto which all our chief Study should aym, and in comparison of Which all the Wealth of this world is but loss, and dross.\(^{441}\)

Ellistone quotes Solomon who said that he who finds wisdom is happy and that gaining understanding is better than silver or gold. Wisdom is the “precious Pearl” whose beauty is more glorious and whose virtue is more supreme than the sun. He adds that it is a balsam for all sores and a panacea for all diseases, an anti-dote against all poison, even to death itself. In order to attain this understanding, Ellistone tells us that one has to follow Christ, deny oneself and take up his cross daily, for “unless ye be born again, ye cannot see the Kingdom of heaven.”\(^ {442}\) It is something which no “sharp Reason” or worldly learning can reach, in whose eyes it is equal to enthusiasm, melancholy or even madness: \(^ {443}\)

The proud Sophisters, and wiselings of this world, have alwaies trampled it under foot with Scorn and contempt, and have called it Enthusiasm, madness, melancholy, whimsey, phancy, &c.\(^ {444}\)

\(^{441}\) *Signatura Rerum*, 1651, p. A2. See also p. 72 above.

\(^{442}\) Ibid., p. A2. See also p. 72 above.

\(^{443}\) Ibid., p. A2 reverse. See also the postcript by Sparrow, in which he describes the “Sophisters” as wiselings of pedantic reason, who will carp and cavil at anything but what dances to their pipe, or agrees with their conceits. He adds that their letter-learned mock productions of science are to

---
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Ellistone refers to the sons of Hermes and their “high School” of true magic and theosophy, who have always spoken “their hidden Wisdome in a Mystery” and couched it under parables and similies. He has no problem with this, because he believes that the mysteries of philosophy, divinity and theosophy should not be open to mere Reason, which turns everything into selfish pride, covetousness, envy, wrath and hypocrisy. Parables have a double meaning, he argues. They have a dark and a light side: they hide secrets from the rude and vulgar, who are not able or patient enough and only want to hear that which suits their common conceits and opinions, but they guide the mind of the true searcher into the depth of wisdom, or Sophia.445 To be a “Nursling of Sophia”, and to learn to understand, “one must be born again of, and in, the word of wisdome, Christ Jesus, the Immortal Seed”, for the divine essence which God breathed into “his paradissicall Soul” must be revived so that he will be “one again with that, which he was in God before he was a creature.” Only then will man be able to see beyond the literal meaning, and find the moral, allegorical and analogical meaning of the wise and dark sayings. By this means man will enter into divine understanding and knowledge. This explains Cheyne’s love of the “Art of Analogy”.

But, more importantly for the purpose of this study, it explains Clarissa’s allegorical letter.446 The misinterpretation of this letter by both Lovelace and many of Clarissa’s readers justifies Richardson’s exclaiming in exasperation that few readers could see beyond the literal meaning of Clarissa and were only concerned with the surface level and whether or not Clarissa should marry Lovelace (i.e. eros versus agape).447

Ellistone further informs us that in the Signatura Rerum Boehme deciphers and represents the “Signature of all Things”. He sets forth the birth, sympathy and antipathy of all beings, how they originally all arise out of one “Eternal Mystery”. He also demonstrates how man has turned himself out of good into evil, and how he can change again out of evil into good. Moreover, the outward cure of the body is explained, i.e. how the outward life may be freed from sickness “by its likeness” and so be one again with its first essence. Ellistone writes how Boehme describes the Philosopher’s Stone as a temporal cure and the “Holy Corner Stone”, Christ, as the “everlasting cure”, the regeneration and perfect restitution of all the “true, faithful, eternal Souls”. He explains Boehme’s aim to show to the reader the “inward Power and Property by the outward Sign”, which is the language of nature. By doing so, Boehme tried to supply a cure for both the body and the soul.

Proof of a continued interest in Boehme may appear from the fact that,
some thirty to forty years later, Edward Taylor published *Jacob Behmen’s Theosophic Philosophy unfolded* (1691). Taylor also had a profound understanding of Boehme and he even made a glossary of some Behmenist terms, such as the one on *Sophia* which is described as the true noble precious image of Christ, viz. the wisdom of God, the Tincture of Light. Boehme’s book sent by Richardson to Cheyne in 1742 could equally well have been Taylor’s *Jacob Behmen*.

I have mentioned above the art of analogy as an important instance of Boehme’s influence on Richardson, which helps us to interpret Clarissa’s allegorical letter correctly, but there are more examples as we shall see below.

**The Role of the Lily in Boehme and Richardson**

Richardson’s use of the lily to depict Clarissa may have originated in his familiarity with Boehme’s concept of the Age of the Lily or *Lilienzeit*. We find Boehme’s symbol of the lily in the first English treatise on Boehme of a mere seven pages which appeared in 1644 and was called *The Life of one Jacob Boehmen; who although he were a very meane man, yet wrote the most wonderfull deepe knowledge in natural and Divine things, that any hath been knowne to doe since the Apostles Times, and yet never read them, or learned them from any other man, as may be seene in that which followeth*. It was printed by L.N. for Richard Whitaker, and contains a brief relation of the “life and conversation of Jacob Boehmen, afterwards by learned men called Teutonicus”.

In Whitaker’s description of the wooden cross set up over Boehme’s grave (plate XVI, slightly different from the description given by Whitaker) we read that it “portrayed a Mystical three-fold Figure”:

---

448 Hutin, *Op. cit.*, pp. 44, 198, note 47. The complete title is *Jacob Behmen’s Theosophic Philosophy unfolded; in diverse Considerations and Demonstrations, shewing the Verity and Utility of the several Doctrines or Propositions contained in the Writings of that Divinely Instructed Author. Also, the Principal Treatises of the said Author Abridged. And Answers given to the Remainder of the 177 Theosophic Questions, Propounded by the said Jacob Behmen, which were left unanswered by him at the time of his Death. As a help towards a better Understanding the Old and New Testament. Also what Man is with respect to Time and Eternity. Being an Open Gate to the Greatest Mysteries*, London, 1691. It also contains a short account of the life of Boehme with a portrait. Sparrow’s and Ellistone’s translations form the basis of this work, though Taylor tried to deliver “[Boehme’s] Sense in more usual and familiar words” (Bl. A2v). Taylor asserted that Boehme’s works did not contain a new doctrine, but were “substantial, orderly, firmly and naturally founded on the immovable principles, and uncontrollable maxims of confessed Theology and Philosophy” (Bl. Av). On p. 285 we find Poiret’s remarks: “Vires intendit omnes auctor, ut Boemiana principia e fundamentis aperiet”.


450 For engravings of this cross, see the *Life of Jacob Behmen* (p. 683), by Durand Hotham, which was usually bound up with the English translation of the *Mysterium Magnum*, the first edition of which was published by H. Blunden in 1654, see p. 144 above. See also Buddecke, *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, nr. 131, pp. 158-161, esp. p. 159. The engraving is also found in Volume I (1764) of the William Law edition of 1764-1781, see Buddecke, *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, nr. 44 on p. 49 (a2r: “The Monumental Cross of Jacob Behmen”).
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XVI. Epitaph on the wooden cross set up over Boehme’s grave in Görlitz. From “The Life of Jacob Behmen” (1654) by D. Hotham, attached to the Mysterium Magnum, 1656, p. 685. J.R. Ritman Library (Bibliotheca Philosophica Hermetica) in Amsterdam, B.P.H., no. 7119-5.
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An Eagle with a Lilly-Twigge
A Lyon with a Sword
A Lamb with a Mitre.

Underneath the “threefold Figure” we find the following words:

Unser Heil im Leben Isen Christi In Uns.

Whitaker quotes Boehme’s motto, which was:

Borne of God
Dead in Christ
Sealed with the Holy Ghost.

Next a description follows of the southern eagle that stood upon a high rock with one foot upon a serpent’s head, and with the other holding a palm, while it received with its beak a lily given by the sun. The northern lion was crowned and signed with a cross. In its right claw it held a fire-flaming sword, and in its left a fiery-heart. Lastly, Whitaker describes the lamb with its mitre as it walked quietly between the eagle and the lion. The lily reappears in Boehme’s seal as a hand out of heaven holding a lily. According to Whitaker, Boehme’s favourite lines were:

Wem Zeit is wie Ewigkeit To whom Time is as Eternity
Und Ewigkeit wie die Zeit And Eternity as Time.
Der ist befreit von allem Streit He is freed from all Strife.

The same text is found, not in the first edition of 1647, but in the new edition of 1665 of the XL Questions concerning the Soule.

In the Signatura Rerum Boehme uses the word lily as follows:

Thus I have truly warned the Reader, and set before his eyes what the Lord of

451 As to the serpent’s head, Boehme explains in the Signatura Rerum that “herein now lieth the Philosopher’s Stone, [to know] how the Seed of the Woman bruiseth the Serpents Head, which is done in the Spirit and Essence Temporally and Eternally; the sting of the Serpent is Gods Anger-fire, and the Womans Seed is Gods Love-fire, which must be again awakened, and illustrate the Anger, and deprive the Wrath of its might, and put it into the divine Joyfulness, and then the dead Soul, which lay avalled in Gods Curse, doth arise” (cf. Signatura Rerum, 7:23). See also p. 122 above.

The beasts are based on Rev. 4:7, and the lamb’s description is found in Rev. 5:6. In the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical 2 Esdras we find the following reference to lilies: “And as many fountains flowing with milk and honey, and seven mighty mountains, whereupon there grow roses and lilies, whereby I will fill thy children with joy. Do right to the widow, judge for the fatherless, give to the poor, defend the orphan, clothe the naked, heal the broken and the weak, laugh not a lame man to scorn, defend the maimed, and let the blind man come into the sight of my clearness. And I will give thee the first place in my resurrection. Abide still, O my people, and take thy rest, for thy quietness shall come” (2 Esdras 2:19-24).
all Beings hath given me; He may behold himself in this Looking-Glass both within and without, and find what and who he is: Every Reader shall find his profit therein, be he either good or evil: It is a very clear Gate of the Mystery of all Beings; with glosses and self-wit none shall apprehend it in its own ground; but it may well embrace the Real Seeker, and create him much profit and joy, yea be helpful to him in all natural things, provided that he apply himself thereunto aright, and seeks it in the fear of God, being it is now a time of Seeking; for a Lilly blossometh upon the Mountains and Valleys in all the ends of the Earth: He that Seeketh Findeth. Amen. (Signatura Rerum, 16:40) (Italics are mine)

Richardson’s image of Clarissa, on what seemed a failed quest for the freedom of conscience, as a half broken lily may have been inspired by Boehme. In the scene in which Clarissa asks for Lovelace’s mercy (clemency), Lovelace compares Clarissa with a “half-broken-stalked” lily. He describes the scene to Belford as follows:

I see, I see, Mr. Lovelace, in broken sentences [Clarissa] spoke, I see, I see - that at last - at last - I am ruined! Ruined, if your pity - let me implore your pity! And down on her bosom, like a half-broken-stalked lily, top-heavy with the over-charging dews of the morning, sunk her head, with a sigh that went to my heart.452 (III. 193)

Though the issues of tolerance and freedom of conscience, or religion, figure largely in Clarissa, it is above all a story concerned rather with persecution and suffering, not with love and mercy. The age of the Holy Spirit (Boehme’s “Lilienzeit”) of tolerance and religious freedom had not yet arrived in Clarissa, and therefore, perhaps, Clarissa was depicted as a broken lily. It is only in Sir Charles Grandison that we find tolerance, love and mercy extended by Sir Charles, representing the eagle (the symbol of the sun) with the lily.

Boehme uses the imagery of the lily most often in the Three Principles. He explains that:

The Children of God, they shall perceive and comprehend this my writing, ... it may be proved by all the Creatures, yea in all things, especially in Man, who is an Image and Similitude of God: but it continueth hidden and obscure to the Children of Malignity or Iniquity, and there is a fast Seale before it;453 and though the Devil dis-relish the smell and savour, and raise a storme from the East to the North: yet there will then in the wrathfull or Crabbed sour Tree, grow a Lily with a roote as broad as the Tree spreadeth with its branches, and

452 Interestingly, this phrase is found in German: “wie eine geknickte Lilie dastehen” (to be deeply distressed or heart-broken).
453 A note adds: “A Seale that can be opened by no Academick, University, or Scholastick learning: but by earnest repentance ... and seeking in the sufferings of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost.”
bring its scent and smell even into Paradise. There is a Wonderfull Time coming: but because it beginneth in the Night,\footnote{A note adds: "Or great darknesse or blindnesse."} there are many that shall not see it, by reason of their Sleepe and great drunkennesse; yet the Sunne will shine to the Children at Midnight.\footnote{A note adds: "Children of Sophia or Divine Wisdom."} (The Three Principles, Preface, 20-21)

The twelfth chapter of The Three Principles opens with the words: "The Golden Gate, which God affordeth to the last world, wherein the Lilly shall flourish \[and blossome\]." In the last chapter of the Three Principles Boehme makes it explicitly clear that the lily will not be found in strife or wars, but in a friendly, humble, loving spirit, together with good sound reason which will dispel and drive away "the smoak of the Devill", adding:

Therefore let none thinke, that when strife goeth on, and he getteth the upper hand, now it is well and right: and he that is under, and subdued, let him not thinke. Sure I am found to be in the wrong, I should now goe to the other opinion or side, and help that party, to prosecute the other: no: that is not the way, such a one is meerely in Babell. But let every one enter into him selfe, and labour to be a righteous Man … and doe right, and consider that this his worke shall appeare in Heaven before God, and that he standeth every moment before the face of God, and that all his works shall follow after him, and then the Lilly of God springeth and groweth. (The Three Principles, 27:32-33).\footnote{See also The Three Principles 13:61 and 15:54 as well as 25:95.}

Richardson uses the image of the lily again in the scene describing Clarissa’s coffin. Here we find the persecuted Clarissa depicted as a white lily “snapped short off” and “falling from the stalk”. Referred to as the emblem of eternity, the serpent also symbolizes renovation and healing or rebirth. Writing to Belford, Lovelace describes Clarissa’s coffin as follows:

The principal device, neatly etched on a plate of white metal, is a crowned serpent, with its tail in its mouth, forming a ring, the emblem of eternity; and in the circle made by it is this inscription:

\begin{center}
CLARISSA HARLOWE
April x
[Then the year]
Aetat. XIX
\end{center}

For ornaments: at top, an hour-glass winged. At bottom, an urn. Under the hour-glass, on another plate, this inscription: HERE the wicked cease from troubling: and HERE the weary be at rest. Job iii. 17. Over the urn, near the bot-
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tom: Turn again unto thy rest, O my soul! for the Lord hath rewarded thee. And why? Thou hast delivered my soul from death; mine eyes from tears; and my feet from falling. Ps. cxvi, 7, 8. Over this text is the head of a white lily snapped short off, and just falling from the stalk; and this inscription over that, between the principal plate and the lily: The days of man are but as grass. For he flourisheth as a flower of the field: for, as soon as the wind goeth over it, it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more. Ps. ciii, 15, 16. (IV. 257) (italics are mine)

Even the hour-glass may have a special significance, since this instrument for measuring time consists of a glass vessel having two compartments from the uppermost of which a quantity of sand, water, or mercury runs in an hour into the lower one. Richardson may have used this imagery to depict his works (the lower compartment) through which Boehme’s vision of the “Lilienzeit” (the upper compartment) were disseminated. Perhaps we may compare Richardson’s role with the narrow section between the two compartments.457

The Unusual Form of Sir Charles Grandison’s House

Interesting in relation to our discussion of Boehme is the sketch of Sir Charles’s house, which is built, not in the form of an I or an E, but in the rather unusual form of an H (VII. 271). The reference to an H may be one of those clues which Richardson liked to scatter throughout his works, some more subtle than others, such as Thursdays,458 or threes and sevens. It may refer to the “heart” or to the “word”. In the Clavis Boehme describes the H as the “Word, or breathing of the Trinity of God” (Clavis, XX:16) and in the XL Questions concerning the Soule we read, in answer to the eleventh question “How and where is the Soul seated in Man?”:

Thus also is the soule; it is in God conceived in the Heart, and the Word which conceived it was in the Heart, viz. in the Centre; .... and so it is still at this Day.459

457 Boehme occasionally uses the hour-glass as imagery to compare this world with the next, see for instance the Aurora 16:106 and in the preface to The Three Principles: “I will heere write plainly and clearly enough for the children of God; the world and the devill may roare and rage till they come into the Abyss; for their Houre-Glasse is set up, when every one shall reape what he hath sowen: and the Hellish Fire will sting many sufficiently for his proud, spitefull, and despising haughtiness, which he had no beliefe of while he was heere in this life” (Preface, 18).
458 See footnote 406.
459 XL Questions concerning the Soule, 11:2. See also the fourth question which reads “What was the Breathing in of the Soule and when?”, and especially 4:7: “The royall soule was breathed in from within, by the Holy Ghost into the heart, in the Holy Man, into its Principle, like an awakening of the Deity”. For the “Heart of God”, see also Boehme’s Three Principles 12:3 (“There is no fire or thunder in the heart of God, but kinde love”); 23:10 (the Holy Ghost proceeded continually from Eternity, from the Father through his Heart [note adds: Sonne or Word].
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In the *Signatura Rerum* Boehme writes that the voice or breath of God continually and eternally brings forth its joy through the creature, as through an instrument, with the creature as the manifestation of the voice of God. And he adds that what God is in the eternal generation of his eternal word out of the great mystery of the Father’s property, such is the creature in the image as a joyful harmony, with which the eternal spirit plays or melodises (*Signatura Rerum*, 16:13). Richardson may have left this clue of the H for the perceptive reader to help him or her understand the purpose of what he believed to have been his “magnum opus”.

The H is also reminiscent of the Holy Spirit or Ghost, representing Boehme’s Third Age of the Holy Spirit, before the Last Judgement and the end of the world. If we allow the “world’s end” not only to refer to space but to time as well, the following text may refer to the end of the world in an anagogical sense: Sir Charles will find “no difficulty”, Lucy believed, to persuade Harriet to accompany him to the “world’s end” (VII. 263). The phrase “world’s end” could then be allowed to convey an eschatological message, referring to the end of the world described in the apocalyptic dream in the Book of Revelation in which the time pattern of the Six World Ages, with the Seventh (the Sabbath Age) usually located outside of time, was based on the Week of Creation in Genesis. In the Book of Revelation we read that John sees the Lamb open the seven seals of the scroll. The opening of the seventh seal in particular brings destruction and death to the earth and its inhabitants. Only a small remnant of 144,000, sealed with the name of the Father and of the Lamb on their foreheads, are to be saved and gathered in the harvest of the earth (Rev. 7:3, 14:1). It is this remnant which, I believe, is to be identified with Sir Charles Grandison’s Family of Love, who will be led to the end of the Third Age, which signifies the end of world history, into the millennium, beyond world history, as described in the Book of Revelation:

And I looked, and, lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father’s name written in their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps. And they sung as it were a new song before the throne, and before

---

460 It is interesting to compare the imagery of the eternal spirit “melodising” with Cheyne’s imagery of the musician which explains that, when playing on a well-tuned instrument (the nervous system), the musician (the soul) will produce distinct, agreeable and harmonious music. However, if the instrument (the nervous system) is spoiled or broken, not duly tuned or correctly fitted, it will not answer the intention of the musician and will not yield any distinct sound or true harmony. (*Cf. Essay of Health and Long Life*, pp. 144 and 158). See also footnote 439 above.

461 Marjorie Reeves, “The Development of Apocalyptic Thought: Medieval Attitudes”, in *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature*, Manchester, 1984, pp. 40-72. I use the word “apocalypse” in the sense that it unveils or reveals things usually hidden, and the word “eschatology” as concerned with the destiny of the individual soul as well as of the whole created order.

462 See p. 186 and footnote 547 below.
the four beasts, and the elders: and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, which were redeemed from the earth. ... These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb. (Rev. 14:1-4)

I will further discuss Sir Charles Grandison’s house and park in chapter 7.

**Boehme’s Perception of Free Will and Clarissa**

_Clarissa_ is very much concerned with the issue of free will, a concept of great interest to the English Behmenists. In the _Threefold Life of Man_ Boehme writes that man has a free will. (The note adds that this means choice or liberty.) In the _Three Principles_ he explains:

> For man is weake, and ignorant [voyde of understanding], ... yet he hath the Imagination, and the choosing, or the free yeelding [to a thing]. (Three Principles, 20:75)

This free will especially applies when a choice has to be made between heaven and hell. Boehme states in the _Clavis_ that the _Mysterium Magnum_ is that “Chaos, out of which Light and Darkness” or the foundation of Heaven and Hell, is “flown” from Eternity, and made “manifest”. He continues:

> For that foundation which wee now call Hell, (being a Principle of itselfe), is the ground and cause of the Fire in the Eternall Nature; which fire, in God, is onely a burning Love: and where God is not manifested in a thing ... there is an Anguishing, a painfull, burning fire. ... This ground is called _Mysterium Magnum_, or a _Chaos_, because, good and evill ariseth out of it: viz. Light and Darknesse, Life and Death, Joy and griefe, Salvation and Damnation. (Clavis, 48-50)

And he adds:

> It is a ground of Heaven and Hell, also of the visible world, and all that is there-in: therein have laine all things in one onely ground: _as an Image lyeth hid in a peece of wood before the Artificer doth carve it out and fashion it._ (Clavis, 51) (italics are mine)

The word “carve” stands out and is connected with the issue of free will, with “choosing and refusing”, which is an important issue in _Clarissa_.463

463 In _The Natural Method_, printed by Richardson in 1742, Cheyne elaborates on the subject of the freedom of the will. Cheyne argues that the freedom and liberty of choosing and refusing, which we find in ourselves, is inconsistent with mechanism. Those who deny that we have any free will at all, only have to examine their own conscience to find that they are utterly mistaken. When
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On the anagogical level we find that Clarissa has to choose between life and death. In order to choose “life” she had to follow her own will, which she believed to be God’s will, the light within or her own conscience. It meant that she was to deny herself and to follow or “imitate” Christ. Though this would ultimately lead to her death, in a spiritual sense it restores her to life. Had she given in to her parents’s choice, or to Lovelace’s pressure, she would have chosen death. We can see from the following quotation how important the subject of free will was throughout Richardson’s life. In his letter to Sarah Chapone from 18 April 1752, Richardson calls himself the “mistaken champion for the free will of women”, probably because he was disappointed that so many women interpreted Clarissa rather on a literal than a spiritual basis (plate XVII):

But Clarissa is made to declare by her Mistaken Champion for the Free Will of the Sex, that were a Marriage to be attempted between her and Solmes, and her Hand forced into his, by all her assembled Friends, whom she revered, however, more than they merited, she would forcibly withdraw her Hand, and adjure in the most solemn Manner, the Minister not to proceed; and this whether she was carried to her Uncle’s private chapel, or was offered to be imposed on her in her own or any other’s Apartment. For there was no Thought of prevailing on her to go to Church. ... It would have been a very hard Sentence, to pronounce upon her, that she incurred the guilt of Perjury, before God, for having been prevailed upon to give up her own Will to that of her Parents. Solmes was sure of her principles. He and her barbarous Friends declare that. And he was willing to be satisfied with her Fear, altho’ he should not have her Love.464

In relation to the free will of human beings Richardson uses in Sir Charles Grandison the word “carver”,465 which Johnson inserted into his famous dictionary and explained as “he that chooses for himself”.466 Giving they do so, they will find that, even if their reason tells them to do a certain thing, they have it in their power to do the contrary: they can rise or sit still, go backward or forward, to show their own freedom. Moreover, they can choose the time and place, the degrees and circumstances of all those actions that are called free. Cheyne admits that some of our natural actions are necessary, but that the ones which are commonly called “voluntary” are as free as the nature of things will permit them. (Cf. The Natural Method of Cureing the Diseases of the Body, and the Disorders of the Mind depending on the Body, London, 1742, p. 138.) Cheyne does not believe that freedom consists in doing anything or everything, but in varying and diversifying infinitely different ways how, where and what we do, and choosing without restraint or from any motive “foreign to the Party choosing”. Without free will, Cheyne believes, virtue and vice, justice and injustice are merely empty words. If rational creatures are free, which Cheyne thinks they most certainly are, then this freedom is a downright contradiction to mechanism, since mechanism produces all its effects necessarily.

466 Dictionary of the English Language. 1755. In his Preface to the Dictionary Johnson stated that he had departed from his intention never to cite living authors as testimony for words in the case
XVII. “Reflections on Clarissa Harlowe”, a painting by Sir Joshua Reynolds of his niece Theophila Palmer reading *Clarissa*. It was engraved by G. Scorodoumow and published in London in 1775.
up his own happiness to make others happy, Sir Charles argues that in earthly matters “we must not be our own carvers” (IV. 373). Again, Harriet later says to Sir Charles “It is well that the best of us are not always to be our own carvers” (VI. 133). Richardson used the word “carver” in his letters on *Grandison* in which he explicitly refers to his own authorial reticence and his encouragement to the readers to become “Carvers” of the text. 467

On the anagogical level the word carver is also used by William Law. Discussing heaven and hell in *A Demonstration of the Errors of a late Book*, Law believed, with Boehme, that everybody is his own maker, his own “carver”, everybody is that which he wills:

> If you have lived upon the Amusements of Reason and Speculation, your life has been worse than a Dream, and your Soul will, at the End of such a Life, be left to itself in its own Darkness, Hunger, Thirst, and Anxiety, to be for ever devoured by its own Fire. But if you have watched over that Instinct of Goodness which God planted in your Soul, and have exercised yourself in that Penitence for your Sins, and humble Faith in the Mercy of God … then when your Body falls off from you, you will feel and know what a Kingdom of God lay hid in your Soul, you will see that you have a Life and Strength like that of Eternity, and the Fulness of God himself will be your everlasting Enjoyment. For Heaven and Hell stand ready to awake in you.

Law then adds “You are now your own Carver, and must be that which you shall have made of yourself,” for:

> If the Depth of your Heart has not in this Lifetime its proper Cure; if it has not something done to it, which your Reason can no more do, than it can create the Light, your Heart will become your Hell. And if you let the Light of the Gospel shine into it, and revive the good Seed of Life in it, then it will become the Seat and Habitation of your Heaven. 468

For William Penn’s use of the word “carver”, see below.

**Boehme and the Quakers**

As I have earlier suggested, Richardson’s father may have had connections with the Quakers. We know that Richardson was certainly interested in them, since he printed in 1736 the *Papers Relating to the Quakers’ Tythe Bill*. The Quakers also read Boehme, though some Quakers criticized the Behmenists, especially because the latter continued to use the sacraments, i.e. the “Water of Baptism” and “the Bread and Wine of the Supper”. If there were early con-

---

468 Works, V, p. 100.
nnections with the Quakers, Richardson may have come across Boehme’s works rather early in life.469

In *A Looking Glass for George Fox*, published in 1667, we are informed that “Jacob Behmont’s Books” were the chief books that the Quakers bought, because they contained “the Principle or Foundation of their Religion”.470 Although according to R.M. Jones, Fox never mentions Boehme or the Behmenists, it is Richard Baxter, who in describing the sect of the Behmenists, informs his readers that they are very similar to the Quakers for “the sufficiency of the Light of Nature, Inward Light, the salvation of the Heathen as well as Christians, and a dependence on revelations.” Baxter adds that there are fewer Behmenists than Quakers, and that they show a greater “meekness” and “conquest of the passions” than the Quakers. He adds that their doctrines can be found in “Jacob Behmen’s Books”, by those who have “nothing else to do, than to bestow a great deal of time to understand him that was not willing to be easily understood.”471

Francis Ellington, a Quaker of some importance, regarded Boehme as the “Prophet of the Lord” and quotes Boehme’s words from *The Three Principles of the Divine Essence*, translated by Sparrow in 1648, as to how a lily would blossom in the “Northern Countries” and how, if not destroyed by the sectarian contention of the learned, it would become “a great Tree among you”. Ellington believed that the lily referred to George Fox and the Quakers, and, moreover, Ellington stressed the similarities between Boehme’s prophecies of spiritual religion and the “Children of the Light”.472 Perhaps the broken-lily image in *Clarissa* also refers to the persecution of the Quakers.

It is therefore interesting that Richardson mentions Pennsylvania several times in *Clarissa*. There is for instance the scene in which Richardson touches upon the possibility of Clarissa going to the “Plantations”: “all your friends here ... now seem set upon proposing to you to go to one of the plantations” (IV. 107), or, more particularly, Pennsylvania (IV. 188, 270). In Arabella’s words:

I have another proposal to make to you, and that in the name of every one in the family; which is, that you will think of going to Pennsylvania to reside there for some few years till all is blown over; and, if it please God to spare you, and your unhappy parents, till they can be satisfied that you behave like a true and uniform penitent; at least till you are twenty-one; and you may then come back to your own estate, or have the produce of it sent you thither, as you shall choose. A period which my father fixes, because it is the custom; and because

---

472 Francis Ellington quotes several passages from Boehme to show parallels between him and the Quakers in *Christian Information concerning these Last Times*, London, 1664, pp. 10-12. For details about this book and its connection with Ellington, see Buddecke, Op. cit., nr. 73, pp. 98-99.
Boehme’s Direct Influence on Richardson

During the 1670s the Quaker William Penn became increasingly interested in establishing a colony in America which would assure liberty of conscience for Quakers and others. In 1682 he founded Pennsylvania, not named for Penn the Quaker, but for his father, the admiral Sir William Penn, who had received the land from Charles II. Penn drew up a constitution for Pennsylvania which permitted all forms of worship compatible with monotheism and religious liberty and sailed for America. In his *Primitive Christianity* (1696) Penn upholds the identity of Quaker principles with those of the early Church. How advanced his ideas were, appears from an earlier publication called an *Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe* (1693), advocating the establishment of a European Parliament.

It is striking, and indeed additional proof that the Quakers read Boehme, that Penn uses the word “carver” in the following context:

> There appears to me but three things upon which peace is broken, viz. to keep, to recover, or to add. First, to keep what is one’s right, from the invasion of an enemy; in which I am purely defensive. Secondly, to recover, when I think myself strong enough, that which by violence, I, or my ancestors have lost, by the arms of a stronger power; in which I am offensive: or, lastly, to increase my dominion by the acquisition of my neighbour’s countries, as I find them weak, and my self strong. To gratify which passion, there will never want some accident or other for a pretence: and knowing my own strength, I will be my own judge and carver.

473 When in prison, William Penn wrote *No Cross, no Crown* (1669), a recognized classic of Quaker practice.

474 William Penn, *The Peace of Europe, The Fruits of Solitude and Other Writings*, London, 1993, p. 10. In *The Fruits of Solitude* Penn mentions “the voice of the dove” and “the olive branch of peace” on p. 15. He stresses the importance of education on p. 15: “The government [should be] solicitous of the education of their youth: Which, next to the present and immediate happiness of any country, ought of all things, to be the care and skill of the government. For such as the youth of any country is bred, such is the next generation, and the government in good or bad hands.” And on p. 25 he criticizes contemporary education: “We are in pain to make them scholars, but not men! To talk, rather than to know; which is true canting.” Penn describes wars as “duels of princes” on p. 21. He writes that the world is a “great and stately volume of natural things” and may be not improperly “styled the hieroglyphics of a better [world]” (p. 25). He discusses the equality of the sexes on p. 34. In his eyes the humble, meek, merciful, just, pious and devout souls are everywhere of one religion” (p. 60). He calls a man who does not have the feeling of the wants or needs of his own flesh and blood, a monster and hopes he may “never be suffered to propagate such an unnatural stock in the world” (pp. 85-86). The use of the word “monster” is reminiscent of Boehme’s fifth question in the *XL Questions*, in which Boehme describes the “monstorum”, or moon monster. He writes: “When a mother bringeth forth a child, it is an image of her, ... unless it belongeth to the *turba*, which many times awakenneth a monster according to the spirit of this world”. (Cf. *XL Questions*, 5:1-2) These issues, reminiscent of Boehme, recur in the works of Cheyne, Law and Richardson.
Moreover, it is interesting that Daniel Leeds and William Bradford published in 1688 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, a work called *The Temple of Wisdom for the Little World, in Two Parts*; in which Leeds in the preface to the first part writes that “most of what the diligent Searcher ... shall find dispersed in the whole Works ... of Jacob Behme [sic]”, he will find here “collected, contracted and comprised in a little room”. The second part of *The Temple of Wisdom* contained “A Collection of Divine Poems from Fr. Quarles”, as well as the “Essays [sic] and Religious Meditations of Sir Francis Bacon”. All were “Collected, Published and Intended for a general Good”. These facts, and the connection between Penn and James II, as I have shown earlier, convince me that the mentioning of Pennsylvania in *Clarissa* is more than a mere happy coincidence and that Richardson was seriously interested in the activities of the Quakers.

What stands out in the above account is the dream or vision of a united Christendom. It was equally the dream of Comenius (who belonged to the Bohemian Brethren or Unitas Fratrum), who hoped for a Utopian Church which would unite all religions in Christian love, the “unum necessarium” with education as the surest way to its fulfilment. It is also the Utopian dream which the pietist Zinzendorf, founder of the eighteenth-century “Brüdergemeine”, tried to realize first at Herrnhut and then Zeist in the Netherlands as well.

476 William Bradford (1663-1752) was apprenticed to Andrew Sowle, chief London Quaker printer, and became a Quaker as well. It has been assumed that he accompanied Penn to America in 1682. He established a printer business at Philadelphia and opened a bookstore as well. In 1688 he printed the above mentioned *Temple of Wisdom*. He became involved in the turbulence caused by the schism led by George Keith, whose propaganda he printed. Though beyond the scope of my study, George Keith (c. 1638-1716), the founder of the “Christian Quakers”, was born at Peterhead, Aberdeenshire, Scotland (like Dr James Keith, friend of the Garden brothers and Cheyne). Keith is of much importance in the history of American Quakerism. He was a scholar of marked ability, especially in mathematics and Oriental studies. Originally intended to enter the ministry of the Church of Scotland, he became a convinced Quaker in 1664. He and his wife travelled in 1677 with George Fox, William Penn and Robert Barclay on a missionary expedition through Holland and Germany. For refusing to take the oath he was imprisoned in 1682. Some five years later he emigrated to America and settled in Philadelphia in 1689 where he became head master of the school which William Penn was founding. He had been influenced by the teaching of Francis Mercurius van Helmont and had become a mild advocate of the transmigration of souls. After a serious quarrel with the Quaker leadership in Pennsylvania, Keith returned to London in 1694 where he rented a hall in London in 1695. Still wearing the Quaker garb, he preached and administered baptism and the Eucharist, issuing pamphlets against prominent Friends, especially against William Penn. In 1700 he conformed to the established Church and was ordained by Henry Compton, bishop of London. (Sources: Henderson, *Op. cit.*, pp. 57-58; *Dictionary of American Biography*, 1946, Vols. IX-X, pp. 289-290 as well as the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Also Charles F. Keith, *Chronicles of Pennsylvania from the English Revolution to the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle 1688-1748*, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1917.)

477 Much impressed by the Herrnhut settlement, the pious Dutch princess Maria Louise allowed Zinzendorf to create a second Herrnhut in Ijsselstein in 1735, plans which did not fully materialize as a result of which the settlement at Zeist was built several years later. (Cf. A. de Groot and Paul Peucker, *De Zeister Broedergemeente 1746-1996: Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de herrnhutters in Nederland*, Zutphen, 1996, pp. 31-32. For the connection between Zinzendorf and certain Mennonites in Amsterdam, e.g. the minister Joannes Deknatel, the widow Geertruid Beuning...
as in Georgia, offering a place of refuge against the threat of persecution. Finally, it was the vision Richardson tried to convey in *Sir Charles Grandison*. These visions contain elements of radical Pietism within the circle of which we sometimes find millenarian expectations, as well as more or less unorthodox doctrines. But does that make these visionaries millenarians? I will explore this issue in the next chapter.
Richardson’s Millenarian Ideas

An important question which we have to ask ourselves is whether Richardson was depicting in *Sir Charles Grandison* a vision of millennial love, justice and reform as suggested by Jocelyn Harris.\(^{478}\) She writes that Richardson’s words that he “always gave that Preference to the Principles of LIBERTY, which we hope will for ever be the distinguishing Characteristic of a Briton”, specifically refer to the “traditional hope of seventeenth-century revolutionaries that England would be relieved of the Norman yoke and restored to its ancient Anglo-Saxon birthright of liberty.” Suggesting that Richardson was not untouched by the millenarian dreams that his father must have known, Harris adds that Richardson’s own work expressed millenarian hopes. For Harris sees *Pamela* as the overthrow of wickedness and the return to a prelapsarian state, and *Clarissa* as goodness confronting avarice, Anti-Christ, hierarchy, and clerical privilege, while she interprets *Sir Charles Grandison* as a vision of millennial love, justice and reform. Harris seems to relate the millennial vision in *Sir Charles Grandison* specifically to those revolutionaries who in the seventeenth century wanted to restore England to its “ancient Anglo-Saxon birthright of liberty”, a view with which I do not agree.

However, if *Sir Charles Grandison* should indeed represent a vision of millennial love, does that make Richardson a millenarian? To answer that question, we must first define “millenarian”. In its proper sense, a millenarian is someone who believes that the thousand years of Christ’s eschatological reign (Rev. 20:2-7) is near. To avoid any confusion it is necessary to elaborate a little, for the concept of the millennium (and the related one concerned with the kingdom of God)\(^{479}\) is complex, and it has not only been taken literally but has also often been spiritualized.

According to the Book of Revelation, chapter 20, Satan is imprisoned in the bottomless pit for a thousand-year period while the Christian martyrs are raised to live and reign with Christ. After this period Satan will be briefly released. Then there will be a general judgment followed by a “new heaven and earth” (Rev. 21:1). There are different views concerning this thousand-year period. The post-millennialists maintain that the millennium occurs before the Parousia (the Second Coming), and that indeed the millennium prepares the


\(^{479}\) “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever”, Rev. 11:15, “the kingdom of our God”, Rev. 12:10.
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way for it by the spread of righteousness over the earth, while the pre-millennialists believe that the millennium will follow the Parousia. The latter argue that first Christ will return to judge the living and the dead in a final General Judgment, after which the present world order will end. Then the millennium will follow. They are not sure, however, whether this thousand-year period will be spent by the saints in heaven or upon earth.

Much more important for our discussion is the amillennial viewpoint, which interprets Rev. 20 symbolically rather than literally. According to the amillennial point of view, the Christians who have come to life and reign are those who experience the new birth of faith in Christ and who feel the activity of his kingdom now. They interpret “one thousand” metaphorically, not literally. This is the view Cheyne adhered to as expressed in his letter to Richardson of 30 June 1742. Cheyne had experienced the transition or rebirth (regeneration) of the old man into the new man, and, consequently, felt the kingdom of God within. For Cheyne the kingdom of God was not directly related with the establishment of the kingdom of God upon earth as a political reality. Richardson may have shared this view, for Cheyne writes in the same letter that he was not afraid Richardson would misinterpret his “Insinuations” and adds: “[y]ou have always shown a Relish for Spiritual and internal Religion.”

But now let us turn to the literal interpretation of the millennium. Wiles argues that forecasts of the coming of the millennium on the basis of scriptural prophesies were a common feature of the first half of the eighteenth century, and not necessarily a mark of eccentricity. He refers to Newton who made many calculations of the time of the millennium, placing it, however, much later, even to the twenty-first century. Wiles describes the ambivalent attitude of for instance Edward Young who wrote in a letter of 6 April 1746:

The famous Mr Whiston called on me, who prophesied severe things to this poor nation; he pretended to support himself by scripture authority; how just his pretence is I cannot absolutely say, but I think there are so many public symptoms on the side of his prophecy as to hinder it from being quite ridiculous.

In the same year Whiston was said to have read out a paper at a public meeting in Tunbridge which concluded:

480 The General Judgment, or the Last Judgement, is held to be God’s final sentence on mankind as a whole, as well as His verdict on both the soul and the body of each individual, in contrast with the Particular Judgment on souls immediately after death.
481 Because millenarianism more and more stressed the carnal pleasures to be enjoyed during the thousand-year reign of the saints on earth, it was Origen who in the third century decided to put a stop to it, a process finally completed by St Augustine in the fifth century.
482 See pp. 42 and 43 above.
484 Ibid., p. 109.
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If I be right in my calculation as to our Blessed Saviour’s coming to restore the Jews and begin the Millennium twenty years hence, I cannot but conclude that after those twenty years are over, there will be no more an infidel in Christendom, and no more a gaming-table in Tunbridge.\footnote{Ibid., p. 109.}

This concurs with Richardson’s meeting with Whiston in Tunbridge two years later.\footnote{See p. 28 above.} According to Richardson, “this extraordinary old man”, now an Anabaptist, was still preaching the millennium in 1748.

To ascertain Richardson’s millenarian ideas, it could help if we tried to examine Cheyne’s views on this subject, who, as we have seen, had been labelled by some critics as a millenarian. But was he indeed? Or are Cheyne’s millenarian ideas more complex? In the \textit{Philosophical Principles} Cheyne discusses the origin of the “present State of Things”. He is surprised to find that people frequently wrangle about the origin of their families, whereas hardly anybody ever seriously wonders how the whole race at first came to be: “whether it sprang from the \textit{Earth} or dropped from the \textit{Clouds}”.\footnote{Ibid., Chapter IV, pp. 142 ff.}

Cheyne does not believe that the universe and all it contains is “from all \textit{Eternity} of itself”.\footnote{Ibid., Part I, p. 111.} He argues that when a thing depends upon another thing as its cause, this implies that the first thing exists that the second may exist: remove the sun and there will be no fruit, take away the moon and the seas would stagnate, destroy our atmosphere and we would “swell like poison’d Rats”.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 145-146.} Cheyne is also convinced that the quantity of water on earth is daily “impaired and diminished” and that the light of the sun is daily decreasing as the body of the sun is growing cooler and he suggests that the “Specks and Clouds on the Face of the \textit{Sun}” are perhaps vapours which fume away.\footnote{Ibid., p. 152.}

He writes:

\begin{quote}
Far be it from me from suggesting the least Hint towards lessening or depreciating the infinite Wisdom, Beauty and \textit{Harmony}, undeniably appearing in all the Works of \textit{GOD}: All I would insinuate is, that there seems to appear \textit{Vestiges} of some Alterations in the Constitution and Frame of the Universe, (at least of that Part of it which principally respects the Human Race) from its primitive Lustre and Beauty, and that \textit{Paradisaical} state wherein our Holy Religion informs us it was originally constituted. The Scripture Account of the Nature of glorify’d Bodies, and of the \textit{Paradise of the Faithful}, as also, of the Labour and Groans of the whole Creation under its present State, accounts for what one who soberly and attentively looks into the natural Pravity of his own Heart, or into the present (in some small Degree) Gloominess, Perplexedness,
\end{quote}
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and Distortion of our System, cannot help to observe. All which seems evidently to hint to us, that the present Constitution neither has lasted, nor is to last for ever.491

Moreover, Cheyne argues that, if the world had been from all eternity as it now is, the arts and sciences would have advanced to a much higher level and greater perfection than they are now. As an example Cheyne mentions mathematics and its improvement over the previous two hundred years compared to all the time before that. He suggests that two or three hundred years more may carry them to a height which he could not now imagine. If the world had been from all eternity, “this Science” would by now have been perfect.492

In the Essay on Regimen Cheyne pursues the subject further and writes that, according to him, and contrary to George Rousseau’s statement,493 he did not believe that the millennium (that thousand-year-period of blessedness on earth) had begun. On the contrary, Cheyne perceived the earth (“this defaced and spoilt Planet”) rather as a jail for a certain period of time, like Siberia, the Bastille or the Plantations. And he wrote that our whole creation labours like slaves at the oar, “is in Travail”, working for a “Crise and Delivery”. He believed that some individuals might be delivered sooner, some later, “according as their Expiation and Purification is perfected”. But he was convinced that, at last, the “whole System, and all its Inhabitants, must naturally and necessarily, but harmoniously or anagogically,” undergo some great and violent crisis and a “universal Gaol-Delivery”. As to how and when this would be accomplished, Cheyne could not tell, for “a Thousand Years are but as a Day here, and the Ways of the Almighty are past finding out”.494

Yet Cheyne uses the words “universal Gaol-Delivery” which may point at the Parousia, the last Judgment and a future millennium. Later Cheyne writes again that there is no paradise on earth. He is certain that such “a Place as Paradise” is now “no-where to be found on it”, adding that it could perhaps be on some other planet.495

491 Ibid., pp. 162-163.
492 Ibid., p. 170.
493 George Rousseau claims that in 1709 or 1710 Cheyne “believed that the millennium had begun” and “that recent political and social events were sufficient proof, and that [Cheyne] bore a special mission in its commencement.” (Cf. “Mysticism and Millenarianism: ‘Immortal Dr. Cheyne’, in Millenarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought 1650-1800, Leiden, 1988, p. 98). See also footnote 203 above.
494 Philosophical Principles, Part I, p. 27.
495 In the Essay on Regimen Cheyne conjectures that our earth, the moon and the other planets in our system with their satellites, could be “Bettering-houses”, according to the “Dutch” manner of speaking. They could be prisons, dungeons and places of punishment for trial, expiation or progressive purification of the several sorts and degrees of “lapsed intelligent Beings”, though not meant for eternal duration. He is sure that the planets are most certainly not “Pleasure-Houses”, nor paradises or happy mansions for perfect and glorified “Intelligences”. Perhaps this concept of “Bettering-houses” reflects Cheyne’s understanding of apocatastasis or the “universal restoration” of all free moral creatures. (Essay on Regimen, 1740, pp. 105-106, 220).
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Balancing the Inconveniences with the Advantages, of want of Light and Sun, and of cold, uncertain and various Seasons, of Barrenness, and Mountains cover’d with ice and Snow, of the one Part, with the Hurricanes, Tempests, Volcano’s, Earthquakes, Thunder and Lightning, poisonous Insects, and ravenous and savage Beasts, scorching Heats, and pestilential Winds, Blasts or Damps, of the other, the whole Globe is pretty near equal in Conveniences; and no particular Place without its Comforts and Inconveniences. So that either Paradise was on some other Planet, or (which is most natural to suppose) Crime, Rebellion and Disorder have had a physical and necessary Influence, on the Matter or Vehicle belonging to each human Spirit.496

We may safely conclude that in 1740 Cheyne did not believe that the millennium, that thousand-year period of blessedness, had arrived on earth.

Discussing the future political state, the “New Jerusalem”, as it appears in the Book of Revelation, Cheyne points at the “Elect”.497 According to Cheyne the “Elect” seems to imply “the Officers and Governors of this new Jerusalem, this political future State, this universal Restoration498 Monarchy of the Father of all.” Cheyne further explains that the duration of this “probatory State of the System of Saturn” seems confined and limited in the Book of Revelation, to the “Number of the Elect’s being accomplished” or to the “Time when all the necessary Officers, Governors or Magistrates of this new universal Government is formed, finished and accomplished”. And only then will be the “End, Crisis and Period of this probatory State”.499

Cheyne’s conjectures about the New Jerusalem may have influenced Richardson to write Sir Charles Grandison, in which we find Sir Charles explaining that “The Church of God … will be collected from the sincerely pious of all communions” (V. 616). The “sincerely pious of all communions” may represent Cheyne’s “Elect”. 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

496 Essay on Regimen, p. 144. On pp. 221-222 Cheyne writes: “It is highly reasonable and philosophical to suppose, that our whole System was design’d by our Creator to last in its present Situation, only so long as was requir’d for the Probation, Purification and Expiation of lapsed Sentient and intelligent Beings, which both Revelation and Philosophy shew cannot be an infinit Duration; but that the whole planetary System, within the Orbit of Saturn, is progressively and by general Laws verging towards some grand Catastrophe and Jail-Deliverance.”

497 According to Calvin certain persons are elected by God without relation to faith or works. For Arminius, however, election was God’s choice of those who believe and persevere by grace in faith and works. According to Schleiermacher, whose parents were Herrnhuters, election included all humanity, but he believed that on earth only certain men and women are elect.

498 See p. 115 above.

499 Essay on Regimen, p. 222. Cheyne added that “the Comets cannot be the Seats of the Bless’d, ... seeing their Orbits are so excentric to the Sun, the Foci of their Ellipses so vastly distant ... and consequently they probably are the Prisons, Condemn’d-Holes and Dungeons of God’s Kingdom, and universal Monarchy.
Richardson’s Millenarian Ideas

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)

I will return to this subject in chapter 7.

George Garden’s Interpretation of the Millennium
Cheyne’s friends equally struggled with the concepts of the millennium and the elect. In a letter of George Garden to James Cunningham, dated 10 March 1710/11, in which Garden tried to dissuade Cunningham from becoming a follower of the French Prophets,500 Garden writes as follows:

Since you have the same esteem that you had formerly for the writings of A.B. [Antoinette Bourignon] you may easily perceive that [your arguments for the Prophets are] not conclusive, there being nothing in which she is more peremptory (and I think not without reason) than that God will send none as prophets and ambassadors in this last age of the world, but such as are regenerated into his spirit, as have the gifts and fruits of the same, and the qualities of true charity, and are partakers of the Divine nature in righteousness, goodness and truth.501 (Italics are mine)

Cheyne’s speculations about the “Elect” are reminiscent of Bourignon’s “prophets and ambassadors”, sent in “this last age of the world”. Bourignon’s prophets and ambassadors are to be “regenerated” into God’s spirit.

Like Cheyne, Garden uses the words “charity” as well as “righteousness, goodness and truth” to describe those “regenerated”. Garden’s warnings against the French Prophets were quite explicit, for he writes “beware of the false prophets of the last days, and [do] not go after them”.502 He wants to be a follower of Christ only:

Let us labour to be the true followers of J. Christ, in the spirit of penitence, self-denial, humility and charity without respect to any party, and live in the midst of parties [sic] without being of a party. We are call’d to be the followers of our Lord J. Christ, and not either of Luther or Calvin or A.B. or J.B. or the prophets. This is one true shepherd who calls us to one sheepfold. Let us hear his voice and follow him. In so far as any of our fellow creatures do excite us to this by word or deed, they are to be regarded by us: but in so far as they lead

500 The movement of the French Prophets had created interest, but also alarm in the circle. After investigation Garden, Forbes, Keith and Ramsay all became hostile to it, cf. G.D. Henderson, Mystics of the North-East, Including I. Letters of James Keith, M.D., and Others to Lord Deskford; II. Correspondence between Dr. George Garden and James Cunningham, Aberdeen, 1934, p. 197.
501 Henderson, Op. cit., p. 262. The correspondence between Dr. George Garden and James Cunningham as well as an introduction on the French Prophets in Scotland are on pp. 191-262. It is interesting mainly because of the connection between Cunningham and Cheyne, who was Cunningham’s physician.
502 Ibid., p. 219.
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us to espouse their party's views, we have need to watch and pray that we enter not into temptation. We have one great enemy and that is self, and if that were subdued, nothing could hurt us. May we deny ourselves and take up the cross and follow Jesus. ... By this let it be known that we are the Disciples of Jesus that we love one another.503

James Cunningham was one of Cheyne's patients in Bath, in whom he confided, for Cunningham wrote to Garden in a letter from about 1710/11 that there were things he "never told any mortal of it but Dr. Cheyne".504 In the same letter Cunningham refers to Garden's remark, reminiscent of Fiore, about the three different periods of reigns of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, which Cunningham finds confusing. Cunningham writes regarding the passage about the Son's judging and reigning that he does not understand the mysterious speculation about the different periods of reigns of the Three Persons, which Garden had cited. He agrees that it is plain from 1 Cor. 15:27 that it is the Father, who puts all things under the foot of the Son and adds that this also appears in Heb. 2:8 where it is said that we do see not all things put under him. From all of this and what he had read in the Book of Revelation, it seemed to him that the reign of the Son would not begin until what is "call’d the Millenium [sic]", but he feels that, "either way it makes little either for or against the present Appearance".505

Garden's reaction to Cunningham's letter is important, because it shows Garden's views about a future millennium. He writes in answer to Cunningham that as to the speculation of the different periods of the reign of the three persons of the Trinity, he had no clear thoughts about them. And as for the millennium, Garden writes, perhaps there is no such thing. He refers to an unidentified Mr. J., who could tell Cunningham that Jacob Boehme had "no opening about it" and did not believe in a sudden approach of it.506 Then Garden asks Cunningham whether he had heard the famous story of Mr. Mason, a Minister of the Church of England "in our days", who was a man of great piety and devotion, and firmly persuaded "by Divine inspiration" that Jesus Christ was to come upon the earth within a very short time, in "half a year or so". Upon this Mr. Mason gathered a number of believers who left everything and lived for some time in tents with him, "to attend our Lord's Coming". But Garden tells Cunningham that since the period was short, "the mistake was soon laid open".507

Cunningham's answer to Garden is interesting in this context, for he

503 Ibid., p. 220.
504 Ibid., p. 203.
505 Ibid., p. 206.
506 See for instance Boehme's Epistles in which he wrote: "For the time is come [born], of which it was told me ... by a vision, namely, OF REFORMATION. The end [event or time when it shall come to pass] I commit to God: I know it not yet perfectly." (Epistles, 34:29)
refers to Boehme’s time of the Lily and the opening of the seven seals in the Book of Revelation (Rev. 6:12):

Many obscure and mysterious places of the Holy Write [sic] are also thereby explained and we see from thence an easy way how many dark prophecies of the Scriptures should come to be accomplished, and also those of other inspired writers; as what J.B. speaks of the time and the Lily [sic] and the Enochian Life and spirit of prophecy to be restored immediately before the sixth period.508

This last letter was addressed to George Garden “at Rosehearty”, where he lived at the time in semi-monastic retirement.

**Law’s Millenarian Ideas**

Indications of millenarian tendencies in Law became apparent upon the earthquake in Britain of 1750 which, he thought, was an instance of God’s anger. It was thought that a recurrence would obliterate London.509 Law used the earthquake as a reason to stress the need for repentance.510 He did indeed expect the end of the world, but he rejected “scripture arithmetic” to calculate the time, believing that “signs” would indicate the event.511 Just like Boehme a century earlier, Law was convinced that a new day was dawning and that the formation of new sects testified to the unhappiness many people felt with the established Churches, although he expressed his love for all Christians and maintained that he, though still a member of the Church of England, was neither Catholic nor Protestant.

From the above we may conclude that none of the men and women

508 Ibid., p. 232.
510 In 1756 Law’s friend Peter Peckard (1718-1797) wrote a dissertation on Revelation 11:13 (“And the same hour was there a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city fell, and in the earthquake were slain of men seven thousand: and the remnant were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven”) in which he tried to show that there was some reason to believe the prophecy contained in this chapter to have been completed by the great earthquake in Lisbon on 1 November 1755 (All Saints’ Day). The dissertation was printed by Richardson. In his letter to Richardson, Peckard wrote that when he showed the sheets to his friend William Law, the latter insisted that he should print them. Peckard added: “I fancy you may make this a twelvepenny affair.” Richardson was convinced “of the necessity of publishing soon the Dissertation”, but he suggested that Peckard should reconsider his remarks about Bolingbroke and Hume, (whom he had advised to “hang himself”), even though Richardson himself thought both men “very mischievous writers”, despising the one and very much disliking the other. (See Barbauld, *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, Volume V, London, 1804, pp. 105-112). In 1756 Richardson also printed Peckard’s *Observations on the doctrine of an intermediate state between death and resurrection*, which was the subject of a letter from Peckard to Richardson dated 14 May 1756 (cf. Barbauld, *Op. cit.*., pp. 113-114). (For this and other works, see Sale, *Op. cit.*., pp. 192-193). Peckard was considered heterodox upon the question concerning an intermediate state of conscious existence between death and resurrection and ultimately had to modify his views to some extent which made a bishop say that “Peter Peckard [had] escaped out of Lollard’s tower with the loss of his tail.”
referred to believed that the millennium had actually arrived. Moreover, they did not seem to expect a sudden approach, but were rather more interested in Fiore’s or Boehme’s Age of the Holy Spirit: a period of peace and righteousness with tolerance and freedom of conscience, preceding the millennium.

**Fiore’s Millenarianism**

During the Middle Ages Joachim of Fiore was the chief exponent of chiliastic ideas. His visions continued to captivate the imagination of many throughout the later medieval and Renaissance period. I will briefly explore Fiore’s concept of the three reigns. Joachim’s central doctrine is a Trinitarian conception of the whole of history, viewed in three great periods (status). The first was the Age of the Father in which mankind lived under the Law until the end of the Old Testament dispensation. The second is that of the Son, lived under Grace and covering the New Testament dispensation. The third is the Age of the Spirit (its symbol is the lily, similar to Boehme’s *Lilienzeit*), to be lived in the liberty of the “Spiritualis Intellectus” (the miraculous gift of spiritual understanding) proceeding from the Old and New Testaments.

In 1183 Joachim began his great trilogy in which he further developed the world-week chronology of the seven ages (etates) corresponding to the seven days of creation, already worked out by Augustine, with five before the Incarnation, the sixth from the Incarnation to Augustine’s own time, and the seventh, the Sabbath Age of rest and beatitude in the future, as yet undefined but certainly beyond world history. Joachim’s addition to the Augustinian view was his envisioning the Sabbath Age within history, perceiving it as a new world order: a New Age of guidance by the Holy Spirit acting through a new order of meditative or spiritual men. The Holy Spirit would complete the teachings of Christ and unlock God’s last revelation before the end of time. This New Age would be followed by the Second Advent and a period of peace and tranquility, beyond world history.

The New Age of guidance by the Holy Spirit would see the rise of new religious orders to convert the whole world and to usher in the Ecclesia Spiritualis. Joachim believed that this age had not yet arrived and he explains:

---

512 Valuable research on Fiore has been done by Marjorie Reeves and others, see the Introduction of this study, footnote 10.
514 In the first book of the trilogy, the Liber Concordie novi ac veteris Testamenti (Harmony of the New and Old Testaments), Joachim tried to point out the correspondence of each person, event and period between the Old and the New Testament. In the second book, the Expositio in Apocalypsim (Exposition of Apocalypse), he summarized his ideas about the three ages, the seven seals, and the concord between the two Testaments and he goes into great detail to explain the symbols, visions and figures of the Apocalypse. In the third, the Psalterium decem chordarum (Psaltery of Ten Strings), he explained how the ten-stringed psaltery or lyre represented the Trinity, or his three historical stages. The body of the instrument represents the Father, the psalms sung with the aid of the instrument represent the Son and the melody produced by both represents the Holy Spirit. He would spend the rest of his life refining these ideas.
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The first epoch was that in which we were under the law, the second when we were under grace, the third when we will live in anticipation of even richer grace. … The first epoch was in knowledge, the second in the authority of wisdom, the third in the perfection of understanding. The first in the chains of the slave, the second in the service of a son, the third in freedom. … The first in fear, the second in faith, the third in love. … The first in starlight, the second in moonlight, the third in full daylight. The first in winter, the second in spring, the third in summer. The first the seedling of a plant, the second roses, the third lilies. 515

Though Joachim believed that the New Age would be ushered in somewhere in the thirteenth century, he never tried to “tie God to any exact timetable: ... cuius terminus erit in arbitrio Dei.” 516 He summerized his vision in the Liber Concordie as follows:

The third [status] will be the age of the Holy Spirit, of whom the apostle said: Where there is the Spirit of the Lord, there is liberty. 517

The New Age of the Holy Spirit is reminiscent of Richardson’s vision described in Sir Charles Grandison. Fiore’s expectations concerning history had a far-reaching influence in the next centuries, especially among Franciscans and Fraticelli, and, as I have stated above, there are obvious similarities between Fiore’s Age of the Lily and Boehme’s Lilienzeit.

Although general millenarian expectations are no proof of Joachim’s influence, because these could have come directly from the Apocalypse, the true mark, however, of a Protestant Joachimism is, according to Reeves, the third historical status, with the Old and New Testaments representing the first and second status. The third status may be ushered in by an intermediate coming of Christ, not in the flesh but in an outpouring of the Spirit, not to be confused with the Parousia at the end of world history. Some church historians have argued that in the absence of direct evidence it is probable that the parallels with Joachim of Fiore’s ideas spring from a particular type of religious experience and hope. 518 Carl Jung discovered Joachim of Fiore as a psycholog-

516 Ibid., p. 25.
517 Ibid., p. 29.
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The people discussed above all held certain themes in common, especially the expectation of an immediate catastrophe in the near future combined with an optimistic attitude towards the future within history, and an ecumenical belief in the possibility of a concordia mundi, a reign of peace both ecclesiastical and political: a progress towards the light. It is the same theme that occupied Richardson when writing Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison.

Boehme’s Millenarianism

Boehme’s views of the true Church and his millenarian beliefs are relevant, not only because they are in some ways reminiscent of Fiore, but also because they show certain similarities with those of the Quakers, Cheyne, Law, Richardson as well as the Moravians. In the Mysterium Magnum Boehme showed that he believed the “sixth seal” was now “at hand” and “had already opened itself” and he warned his readers “to go out from Babel”. In chapter 43, “Ruin of Sodom and Gomorrah”, he informs the reader that the “sifting sword is already active” in this present world:

In this figure this present world may behold itselfe, and take warning: for as certain, and as true, that the Preaching of Lot was true; and the punishment followed thereupon; so certainly also shall the punishment of the Sixt Seals Time (which Seal is even now at hand, and hath already opened itselfe) suddenly follow. But that the warning thereof came so long age, declareth that the time of the Sixt Seal, in its manifestation, is the most wonderful of all the Six Seales; till the Seventh Number which is yet more wonderfull; for it is the end of this world, and the Last Judgement. Let this be declared unto thee Babel, under the voice of the open Seal of this Sixt time, although thou contemnest, and deridest it, it hitteth thee, and hath already strucken thee with the obdurate obstinacy of wrath, which hath thoroughly sifted thee in the appearance of the Message of these two Angels, and shall now be hinted onely to some few, which shall go out, and be delivered with Lots daughters. The hardened surprized and apprehended crew is already Judged; for the Dolefull sifting Sword hath taken hold of them; they run now in a raving raging manner, as mad people in Pride, Covetousness and Envy, and contem what the Angels trumpet soundeth. The Cry which the angels trumpet soundeth is this; Go out from Babel; Go out from Babel; Go out from Babel. Shee stands apprehended and captivated in the Flaming Sword. Amen. (Mysterium Magnum, 43:67-71)
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Yet Boehme's attitude towards the concept of the millennium is rather vague, as confirmed by Garden. Nils Thune quotes Boehme's millenarian view as follows:

As to the first resurrection from the dead to a millennial Sabbath, recorded in Revelation ... I am not sufficiently acquainted with what it implies, ... whether it means a thousand solar years, or not. Since I have not been able to comprehend it, I will leave it to God and those whom God might reveal it to.

Equally vague is Boehme's answer to the thirty-eighth question in the XL Questions concerning the Soule as to "what are the things that shall come to passe at the End of the World?" Boehme writes that he was not the right person to answer this question and that, moreover, it is not fit for anyone to ask it, for it is "the secret counsell of God". He adds that "none should endeavour to be equall with God, and to foreknow all things", reminding the reader of what Daniel, Ezekiel, and David have said in their prophecies. In addition he especially mentions "the Revelation of Jesus Christ". But Boehme does inform the reader that "the time is now nearer at [sic] end" as a result of which "it appeareth the more plainly what shall be done at the end" (XL Questions, 38:1; 9-10).

From the above it is clear that we should not confuse Boehme's Age of the Holy Spirit with the millennium. What Boehme was looking forward to was not a millennium on earth, but a paradisaical world ruled by the inner light, a stage before the coming of Christ and the subsequent end of the world. In answer to the thirty-ninth question "What, and where is Paradise, with its Inhabitants?", Boehme answered that it is in this world, though withdrawn from our sight and our source. He believed that if only we would open our eyes, we should see it. He added that "God in his Ternary is with us", so he wondered "how then should paradise be lost?" And he referred to the seekers who have sought this paradise: "For every age hath its Seekers, who have sought the Mysterium" (XL Questions, 39:1; 4; 6-8).

520 See p. 170 above.
522 See the Threefold Life of Man in which Boehme writes: "For this Time [from the beginning of the world to the end] is as the soyle [or ground], and is the seventh Seal of the Eternall Nature, wherein the six Seales, with their Powers and Wonders, disclose themselves, and powre forth their wrath ... where one Seale hath been opened after another: but humane Reason hath not understood the powers of the Seales (3:41). Also: "Behold! When the seventh Seale shall be opened, then the Arch-Shepheard will feed his sheepe himselfe, in his greene Pasture: he leadeth them to the springing Waters, and refresheth their Soules, and bringeth them into his right Path, and is a good Shepheard, and the sheepe follow him, and he giveth them Eternall life .... Therefore hearken, you that are drowsie, and awake, the Day breaketh, it is high time; that you may not be captivated by the Anger in Babel ... leave off your contention about the Cup of Christ, else you will be found to be but fooles in the presence of God: your Decrees availe nothing .... And another party gainsayeth; and they call one another Heretics, and so you lead the blinde Layity, captive in your Devellish Contention, in your Pride." (3:80-82).
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Boehme perceived it as his task to bring about a new Reformation, symbolized as the Lilienzeit. Beyreuther quotes Boehme’s words in the Aurora: “Es ist mir [Boehme] diese große und schwere Arbeit auferlegt worden, der Welt zu offenbaren und anzukündigen den großen Tag des Herrn.”523 And Beyreuther explains that:

Die Zeit ist zugleich reif geworden für eine neue, umfassende und durchgreifende Reformation, denn die alte und erste ist steckengeblieben. ... Die Morgenröte eines neuen hellen Tages, der die nächtlichen Schatten verscheucht, ist bereits in Sicht. Der Geist des Herrn wird eine neue Gemeinschaft aller echten Gotteskinder quer aus allen Konfessionen hindurch ins Leben rufen. Die Kirchen werden bleiben, doch ein Neues, das niemand mehr hindern kann, kommt und wird einen neuen Tag noch vor dem Erscheinen des Herrn für die ganze jetzt so verdorbene Christenheit bereiteten.524

Boehme’s words written down in the Aurora were to influence so many people looking for a religion of the heart, ranging from the Quakers to Zinzendorf and the Moravians to Cheyne, Law and Richardson, who gave expression to Boehme’s vision. Richardson did so in a preparatory way first in Clarissa (the broken lily) in the postscript of which he reflected upon the age in which he lived:

It will be seen by this time that the author had a great end in view. He has lived to see scepticism and infidelity openly avowed, and even endeavoured to be propagated from the press: the great doctrines of the gospel brought into question;525 those of self-denial and mortification blotted out of the catalogue of Christian virtues: and a taste even to wantonness for out-door pleasure and luxury, to the general exclusion of domestic as well as public virtue, industriously promoted among all ranks and degrees of people. In this general depravity, when even the pulpit has lost great part of its weight, and the clergy are considered as a body of interested men, the author thought he should be able to answer it to his own heart, be the success what it would, if he threw in his mite towards introducing a reformation so much wanted. (IV. 553) (Italics are mine)

Then, finally, in its full-blown form we find Boehme’s vision in Sir Charles

523 Cf. Erich Beyreuther, Geschichte des Pietismus, Stuttgart, 1978, p. 26. The English translation of the first line is to be found in the Aurora, 23:92: “This great, weighty and hard Labour was laid upon me, which is, to Manifest and reveal to the world, and to make known, the great day of the LORD; and, being they seek and Long so eagerly after the Root of the Tree: to reveal to them what the whole Tree is, thereby to intimate that it is the Dawning, or Morning-Redness of the Day, which God hath long ago Decreed in his Council.”
525 See Lovelace’s remark that “Law and Gospel are two very different things” (Clarissa, II. 471).
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*Grandison*, in which Sir Charles builds the Temple of Christ into “Wall-Churches”.

As to the true Church, Boehme believed that this was not limited to any definite space: the saints always have their Church with them. Moreover, he argued that the true Church is not confined to any special denomination. He writes that a Christian has no sect, though he may live among sects and also attend their divine services. A Christian does not belong to any sect, for he has “only one science” - Christ in him. It was not that Boehme wished to abolish “Wall-Churches”, but, as he said in the *Mysterium Magnum*, to teach the “Temple of Christ”, to be brought along in the heart. 526

Hence Boehme’s goal was not to found a new church or sect, but a mutual fellowship, a communion based on brotherly love unlimited by space and time which would put an end to all contention between human beings. We will see in chapter 7 how Richardson used this concept in *Sir Charles Grandison* when he had Sir Charles build a little temple to “consecrate” the friendship between him (God, or the Ternary), Harriet (the Church of England) and Clementina (the Roman Catholic Church). For Boehme writes in the *Mysterium Magnum* that “when the branches shall know that they Stand in the Tree they will never say that they are peculiar and Singular Trees”. They will then “rejoyce in their Stem”, and they will see that they are all boughs and branches of one tree, and that they do all receive “power and life from one Onely Stem” (*Mysterium Magnum*, XXX:52).

The discord between the various churches or sects is one of the main issues in *Sir Charles Grandison*, which contains Richardson’s vision of a united Christendom as we shall see in the next chapter.

---

526 Boehme wrote: “Not that we would hereby wholly abolish and race down the Stone-Churches; but we teach the Temple of Christ, which ought to be brought along [in the heart] into the Stone-Church, or else the whole business of the Stone-Church is onely a hypocriticall antichristian whoredome, a Cains offring, both of the Preacher and the hearer: so that one is not a whit better than another, unlesse he enter through the true doore, Christ in Spirit and power in the Temple of Christ, into the Stone-Church, or at least resolve to fix betake and fasten him selfe there, into such an earnest desire [that he will take and hold fast that which is good onely for the amend- ment of his life]” (*Mysterium Magnum*, XXVII:49). Cf. also Nils Thune, *The Behmenists and the Philadelphians*, Uppsala, 1948, pp. 30-31. Boehme compared the true Church with Abel.
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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

---
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---

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? (ILL. 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-
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... failed, yet she achieved illumination as a result of which came the active Mediator, the Inner light or Holy Spirit, Sir Charles Grandison.\(^{531}\) 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 *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 *The English Malady* (Plate XIX).\(^{532}\) 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

---

\(^{531}\) See for the composition of *Sir Charles Grandison*, Eaves and Kimpel, Op. cit., pp. 365-386. 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 *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., *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 *Sir Charles Grandison* which was published in 1972 (it is now out of print, but there is a reprint of *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.

\(^{532}\) Plate XIX from *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).533

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 to Charlotte 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.
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As I have mentioned above, we may explain Grandison’s name as follows. Grand(ison) 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.534

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 of 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 Patriach 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

534 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).
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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.
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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 “philadephischen 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 Unwürdigen zu einem Werkzeug und Mitarbeiter in seiner philadephischen Gemeine versehen habe.

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. 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. In his relation with these two women Sir Charles represents the...
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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” (l. 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” (l. 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

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 £ 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 “thrice546 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).547 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)

546 “Thrice” is a word Richardson uses 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.

547 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 Niclaes) 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.)
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 real-
izes 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 impu-
tation”, 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 moni-
tor 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 con-

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 pub-
lished 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 pro-
vided 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).
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 LesserUniversity 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.
ble, but do not have sufficient means. Sir Charles wants Dr Bartlett to be involved, for they are both “actuated by one soul” (III. 12). In short, in Sir Charles’s mind, there is no discrimination against women nor against different persuasions.

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 “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-

554 See footnote 383 above.
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.
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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).556

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 genteely brought up, how can they, when family-connexions 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 genteely, 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. There are more similarities between Zinzendorf and Sir Charles Grandison. In his own particular style Ronald Knox writes:

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.

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.

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. 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.
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Disputes, and Controversies. 564

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 in the exercise of their parental authority her parents “have gone so far that they know not how to recede” (Clarissa, IV.192), 565 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. 566

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. 567 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’ver” (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 (L. 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 (L. 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).
567 See p. 55 above.
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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 generally 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 marriage in her reveries. 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 “narrow zeal” and “sweet enthusiast” crop up. Even so, he insists in another conversation 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 duty: “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 confirms 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 morning, 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 discomposed. I bowed to both Ladies, in silence; retired; and, without endeavouring
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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.”

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) 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) stop’t him in his way to me; but Sir Charles would not long be stop’t: 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 hastilyng 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 reflection. ... 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:
Something here, in my inmost bosom [Is it Conscience?] strike [sic] me, as if it said. Ah Harriet! - Triumph not; rejoice not! Check the overflows 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).
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 ὕπνος, in Latin somnium; second, there is the prophetic vision, in Greek ἱερομανία, in Latin visio; third, there is the oracular dream, in Greek χρηματισμὸς, in Latin oraculum; fourth, there is the nightmare, in Greek ἐνυπνίον, in Latin insomnium; and last, the apparition, in Greek ψάντασμα, which Cicero, when he has occasion to use the word, calls visium.575

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.”
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

---

576 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”.577 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 depreciate 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).
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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.
Richardson’s Utopian Vision in Sir Charles Grandison

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,580 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.
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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 pears. 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
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.\textsuperscript{581} 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.\textsuperscript{582} 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 earthy 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 controled, and treat-

\textsuperscript{581} Cf. Clarissa’s remarks as to "stewardship" of the estate left to her by her grandfather: “It is true ... that I have formed agreeable schemes of making others as happy as myself by the proper discharge of the stewardship entrusted to me [are not all estates stewardships?]” (Clarissa , 1. 92).

\textsuperscript{582} Geschichte des Pietismus: Der Pietismus im 18. Jahrhundert, Band 2, Göttingen, 1995, p. 18. Zinzendorf had written about his marriage with Erdmuthe Dorothea von Reuss-Ebersdorf: “Christus ist mein Brautigam so gut als der ihre, und ich verlange Sie nur in der Göttlichen Ordnung zur Leid- und Freudengenossin. Solte ... dieses getadelt werden können, dass ich mich nach einer solchen umsehe, die einen Mann haben kan, als hätte sie keinen, und die Jesum Christum über alles liebet?”
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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.” Later Harriet will write to Mrs Shirley what a pity it is that

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.584 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 com-

---

584 This was of course the greatest problem in Clarissa. Clarissa gave her motives (I. 91-93) for handing over to her father the control of the estate left to her by her grandfather (I. 21). However, Miss Howe urged her over and over again to keep the control in her own hands: “Had you done so, it would have procured you at least an outward respect from your brother and sister, which would have made them conceal the envy and the ill-will that now are bursting upon you from hearts so narrow” (Clarissa, I. 66). Even Lovelace advised her to resume the control (II. 76).
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

585 See p. 71 above.
586 See p. 129 above.
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-
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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 perception of (the Church of) England and (the Roman Catholic) Italy as “one country”, clearly shows the influence of Boehme’s quest for universal harmony, 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”.

Conclusion

As set forth in the Introduction my objective was to investigate the spiritual side of Samuel Richardson. I started with discussing certain books Richardson had printed which reflect his fascination with spiritual or mystical matters as well as his interest in science and history. Then I explored Richardson’s relationships with Cheyne and Law, whose works he printed. He printed some of Byrom’s work and kept two poems by Byrom among his treasured possessions. I found that Richardson was familiar with the ideas of Boehme, Fénelon, Bourignon and Guyon, and possibly even with Fiore’s trinitarian conception of the whole of history, viewed in three great periods. Moreover, I found that he was acquainted with the works of Poiret, whose books had been published by Wetstein. He may have read the Theologia Germanica. Richardson was also interested in the East and even printed some books relating to this subject.

Richardson worked with the bookseller James Hutton, the man responsible for the beginning of the Moravian work in London, and received an invitation from the Moravians, who admired his work. He also worked closely with Bishop Thomas Wilson and his son.

All of the above mentioned influences permeate Richardson’s work, especially that of Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison. As I have shown, Clarissa represents the quest for the freedom of conscience or religious freedom, the right to choose. In imitation of Christ, she suffers all the trials and mortifications on earth, which are followed by a reward in heaven. At the same time, Clarissa is concerned with the quest for perfection, depicting the process of regeneration or rebirth. Clarissa symbolizes the enlightened soul, representing heaven. Very important in Clarissa is the fire-scene in which Lovelace, in Boehme’s terminology the Turba or destroyer of the soul, opts for “hell”, or darkness, as confirmed in Lovelace’s dream. For Lovelace does not merely represent hell, but, having a free will which he exercises, he actively chooses hell over heaven after the crucial fire-scene. It is essential for the correct understanding of Clarissa that Lovelace had a choice, he could “choose or refuse” as Cheyne put it. Lovelace lives on in a self-created hell, (a hell within), though briefly, but is finally lost, whereas Clarissa dies and becomes the Bride of Christ.

It is this free will to which Law refers when he asserts that an angel naturally possesses “a strong Will”, a spark of the Divine omnipotence, since he could not be an angel of light with less freedom. What he desired, he had: as his imagination worked, so he came to be. This is why Law concluded that everybody is his own maker, his own “carver”, everybody is that which he
wills.\textsuperscript{587} Or, in Cheyne’s words, one can choose or refuse.\textsuperscript{588}

Clarissa is depicted as a broken lily (”the lily will not be found in strife or wars”),\textsuperscript{589} for she did not achieve freedom of conscience in this life. However, in the mystical sense we find that Clarissa has reached the final stage, or Illumination (light), as the Bride of Christ, and as such she becomes a source, a parent of the fresh, active, spiritual life. In other words we find that “death” on the literal level is “life” on the mystical level. We have seen how Richardson kept among his manuscripts a poem which deals with this issue. Clarissa, the light, returns to earth in the form of the Holy Spirit, represented by the irenic Sir Charles Grandison, whose task it is to spread righteousness and the freedom of conscience for which Clarissa had died.

Grandison’s main objective as the comforter is to heal the breaches and to unite the divided branches of Christianity. If Clarissa represented the Second Age of the New Testament (or Christ), it is Sir Charles Grandison which represents the Third Age of the Holy Spirit or Boehme’s Lilienzeit. This image is also reflected by Law’s comparison of fire, light and air with God, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

It is Sir Charles who gathers the truly pious and harbours them at Grandison Hall, a holy spot or a place of refuge in the world’s last tribulations: a remnant to be saved for the impending millennium, as depicted in the Book of Revelation. When the Holy Spirit has achieved his objective, Christ will return (the Parousia). Immediately thereafter, the Last Judgment will take place, to be followed by the end of world history. It is only then that the millennium will begin, beyond world history.

Richardson depicted an ecumenical vision similar to the one which made William Penn set out to establish Pennsylvania in the seventeenth century, and which in the eighteenth century caused Zinzendorf to establish his settlement at Herrnhut from which sprang the Moravian Church. Both men were guided by the Inner Light, pursuing a religion of the heart, and tried to achieve their goal: the Philadelphia dream of “brotherly love” among men and women, liberty and freedom of conscience, tolerance and peace.

Sir Charles Grandison contains Richardson’s Utopian vision of a new world, a vision which seemed not to be limited to the Christian world, but extended perhaps to the whole world. It was to be his Magnum Opus, evolved out of his two earlier novels. In it he depicted his vision by a combination of his great imagination and his deep insight into human nature, tinctured with mysticism and Behmenism. Since truth lies in the whole, it is against the background of the three ages of world history that, as I have argued in this study, we should interpret Richardson’s novels. For though, as I have mentioned in the opening lines of the Introduction, his novels were hugely popular in

\textsuperscript{587} William Law, Works, V, p. 100.  
\textsuperscript{588} Philosophical Principles, Part II, p. 68.  
Conclusion

England and abroad, both in the eighteenth century and afterwards, and had a distinctive influence on subsequent writers of fiction, this was mainly for other reasons than those discussed in this study. Most readers, as “carvers” of his novels, seemed unable to go beyond the literal interpretation.

The prevalent tendency to secularize his novels and to deny any spiritual meaning to them explains Richardson’s disappointed reaction that he would never write again until his last two novels were properly understood. In a letter to Susanna Highmore, dated 31 January 1754, he wrote that he would only think of another work, as some people had requested, when he had “reason to believe” that Sir Charles Grandison as well as Clarissa were “generally understood and attended to”. And he added that a man must be a “duce” always to be writing without “hope of amending the inconsiderate”, even though he had “the good fortune to please those who want not his instructions”.591 In a letter to Lady Bradshaigh, dated 14 February 1754, he wrote that if “this hasty-judging world” would be convinced that they had seen “the last work of this too-voluminous writer”, they would give it perhaps more attention. And he added that his own interest had been “less his motive” than that of their children. For only then would be discovered that he was not a “false prophet”.592

590 Richardson’s influence on for instance Jane Austen, the Bröntes, George Eliot and Charles Dickens has been extensively discussed by critics such as Gordon Haight, Jocelyn Harris, Marijke Rudnik-Smalbraak, Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, and, of course, Eaves and Kimpel. Brian W. Downs mentions that the correspondence files, which are now at the Victoria and Albert Museum (six folio volumes), were collected by Mrs Barbauld and were passed into the hands of John Forster, the friend and biographer of Charles Dickens. (Cf. Brian W. Downs, Richardson, (1928), London, 1969, p. 3). The Cambridge University Press announced in October 2002 that the first ever scholarly edition of the Works and Correspondence of Samuel Richardson will be published in 25 volumes beginning 2007. It is to include the whole of Richardson’s correspondence for the first time.


592 Ibid., pp. 289-290.
Deze dissertatie bestudeert de spirituele kant van Samuel Richardson, een actieve en succesvolle boekdrukker in Londen en tevens de auteur van drie romans, *Pamela*, *Clarissa* en *Sir Charles Grandison*, die een belangrijke invloed uitoefenden op de Europese literatuur. *Pamela* is niet relevant voor mijn verhandeling van de “spirituele” Richardson, terwijl *Clarissa* en *Sir Charles Grandison* wel van groot belang zijn. Het laatste werk beschouwde Richardson zelf als zijn *magnum opus*.

Om mijn doel te bereiken heb ik een onderzoek gedaan naar de Engelse religieuze en filosofische gedachtenwereld gedurende de eerste helft van de achttiende eeuw, waarbij ik mij allereerst richtte op Richardson en de boeken die hij drukte. Maar ook zijn vrienden spelen een belangrijke rol in mijn onderzoek. Deze zocht hij niet onder de belangrijkste literaire schrijvers van zijn tijd, aangezien hij vond dat zij hun talent verkeerd gebruikten. Ik heb mij in het bijzonder geconcen treerd op Richardsons relatie met de Newtoniaanse arts en Boehmist George Cheyne en de theoloog en spirituele schrijver William Law. Met beide mannen onderhield Richardson een warme en langdurige vriendschap en tevens drukte hij hun boeken. Daarnaast heb ik Richardson benaderd vanuit een internationaal perspectief, niet alleen om een beter beeld te verkrijgen van Richardsons doelstellingen, maar ook om een dieper inzicht te geven van de relaties tussen Engeland, Schotland, Nederland, Duitsland, Zwitserland, Frankrijk en Italië aan het eind van de zeventiende en in de eerste helft van de achttiende eeuw, met name op het terrein van het mystiek-spiritualisme. Eveneens wordt Richardsons belangstelling voor Amerika en het Oosten belicht.

Uit deze studie blijkt dat Cheyne een belangrijke schakelfiguur was tussen bepaalde zeventiende-eeuwse mystiek-spiritualistische gedachten zoals die werden verkondigd door Jakob Boehme, de Quakers, Madame Guyon, Antoinette Bourignon, aartsbisschop Fénélon, Pierre Poiret, en die welke we terugvinden in de werken van Law, vooral na 1735, evenals in Richardsons laatste twee romans. Bijzonder actief op het mystiek-spiritualistische gebied was de zeer vakkundige en geleerde Zwitserse uitgever Henry Wetstein die zich
sinds 1676 in Amsterdam had gevestigd als boekhandelaar. In Cheyne’s bibliothek treffen we diverse boeken aan die Wetstein heeft uitgegeven.

Cheyne’s eigen werken tonen duidelijk dat sommige doelstellingen van de Verlichting vermengd waren met de laat zeventiende- en achttiende-eeuwse tegenbeweging van het mystieke of radicale piëtisme. Deze mystieke vroomheidsbeweging benadrukte het werk van de Heilige Geest in het hart van mensen. Ik laat in deze dissertatie zien dat het uiteindelijke doel van Richardson was om een boodschap van liefde en universele harmonie over te brengen, afgeleid van het gedachtengoed van Cheyne en Law, maar ook, direct en indirect, van het theosofische systeem van Boehme, de “philosophus Teutonicus” die de bovengenoemde piëtistische beweging diep heeft beïnvloed.

Een studie van Richardsons boeken stelt ons in staat om de organische ontwikkeling van Richardsons spiritualiteit te volgen door de drie romans, Pamela, Clarissa en Sir Charles Grandison, anagogisch te interpreteren. We zien dan dat ze drie stadia, of tijdperken, vertegenwoordigen: het eerste tijdperk van de Vader (het Oude Testament of de wet), het tweede tijdperk van de Zoon (het Nieuwe Testament of genade en vergevensgezindheid) en het derde tijdperk van de Heilige Geest (vrijheid en tolerantie). Dit laatste tijdperk zou de mensen voorbereiden op het einde van de wereld, de tweede komst van Christus en het millennium, het duizendjarige rijk dat zich buiten de wereldgeschiedenis ontvouwt. Deze verdeling van de wereldgeschiedenis in drie tijdperken gevolgd door het millennium was ontwikkeld door de twaalfde-eeuwse mysticus Joachim van Fiore, wiens ideeën mogelijk invloed hebben gehad op Boehmes concept van het derde tijdperk van de Heilige Geest. Ten aanzien van het duizendjarige rijk moet worden opgemerkt dat er bij Richardson een grootere nadruk ligt op het “inwendige” rijk van Christus dan op het “uitwendige” rijk dat volgens de chiliasten in de toekomst zal worden gevestigd. Hierin volgt Richardson Boehme.

De bovenstaande benadering van Richardsons romans maakt het mogelijk om in zijn eerste roman Pamela de strenge moralist te herkennen, of het tijdperk van de Vader. In Clarissa beschrijft Richardson de botsing tussen autoriteit (de uiterlijke autoriteit: de macht of het recht om individuen of groepen te dwingen om voorschriften of geboden en aanbevelingen te volgen) en geweten (inwendige autoriteit: kennis van goed en kwaad, in het Nieuwe Testament geassocieerd met geloof en de Heilige Geest). Richardson geeft uitdrukking aan het dilemma dat het dienen van twee meesters, autoriteit en geweten of de wereld en God, met zich mee brengt via een proces van lijden waarbij Clarissa uiteindelijk verlichting bereikt (zonder kruis geen kroon), een proces dat herinnert aan het tijdperk van de Zoon.

Belangrijk in Clarissa is Richardsons behandeling van goed en kwaad, vertegenwoordigd door respectievelijk Clarissa (licht en liefde) en Lovelace (duisternis en liefdeloosheid). Zij vertegenwoordigen de hemel en de hel. Ook hierin volgt Richardson de dualistische Boehme, die geloofde dat de hemel en de hel zich in de mens bevinden. De vrije wil stelt de mens in staat een keuze
tussen beide te maken. Deze keuze is van belang voor het hier en nu, maar strekt zich ook uit tot in de eeuwigheid. Het is duidelijk dat Boehme en zijn volgelingen veel waarde hechtten aan zelfkennis die de mens in staat zou stellen een dergelijke keuze te maken. In Clarissa herkennen we ook de invloed van de Theologia Germanica, een veertiende-eeuws werk dat de geboorte van God in de ziel beschrijft alsook de eenwording van de menselijke ziel met die van God. Impliciet bevat Clarissa Richardsons kritiek niet alleen op geloofs- en gewetensdwang, maar ook op excommunicatie en vervloeking.

In Sir Charles Grandison treffen we tenslotte Richardsons visioen van liefde en harmonie aan, het tijdperk van de Heilige Geest, dat het resultaat van het vervlochten van Christus is. In Clarissa schetst Richardson in Sir Charles Grandison een oecumenisch visioen dat de Quaker William Penn ertoe bracht in de zeventiende eeuw Pennsylvanië te stichten en dat in de achttiende eeuw aanleiding was voor Zinzendorf om de vluchtelingen uit Moravië op te vangen op de nieuwe nederzetting bij Berthelsdorf, beter bekend als Herrnhut, “onder de hoede van de Heer”. Zij waren allen geïnspireerd door het “inwendige Licht” en be- nadrukt het hart en gevoel in plaats van het kille verstand. Hun doel was het realiseren van een filadelfische droom van “broederlijke genegenheid” tussen mannen en vrouwen, onafhankelijkheid, geloofs- en gewetsvrijheid, tolerantie en vrede.

Richardson was bijzonder geïnteresseerd in het oecumenische doel van de Herrnhutters of Broedergemeente en we zien overeenkomsten tussen Zinzendorf en Sir Charles Grandison. Sir Charles, de Heilige Geest, en Harriet, zijn bruid, brengen de ware christenen (in tegenstelling tot de “naam-christenen” die een levenloos, formeel geloof aanhangen zonder praktische vroomheid) samen en verlenen onderdak aan hen op Grandison Hall, een veilige haven die bescherming biedt tijdens de rampsvoorstelling. Deze keuze is van belang voor het hier en nu, maar strekt zich ook uit tot in de eeuwigheid. Het is duidelijk dat Boehme en zijn volgelingen veel waarde hechten aan zelfkennis die de mens in staat zou stellen een dergelijke keuze te maken. In Clarissa herkennen we ook de invloed van de Theologia Germanica, een veertiende-eeuws werk dat de geboorte van God in de ziel beschrijft alsook de eenwording van de menselijke ziel met die van God. Impliciet bevat Clarissa Richardsons kritiek niet alleen op geloofs- en gewetensdwang, maar ook op excommunicatie en vervloeking.

In navolging van Boehme, Cheyne en Law, behandelt Richardson in Clarissa en Sir Charles Grandison de wedergeboorte en de nieuwe mens. Volgens Boehme is de kracht van deze wedergeboorte de kracht van God via het leven en de dood van Christus, de tweede Adam, die op aarde kwam om de mens te redden, om de mens opnieuw te “tincteren” (een symbool dat Boehme had overgenomen van de alchemisten) met de verdwenen goddelijke natuur. Het doel van de alchemisten was om de steen der wijzen te produceren, een
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perfecte en zuivere, edele “tinctuur”, die alle lagere metalen zou reinigen en doen veranderen in goud. De jacht op de steen der wijzen was het symbool voor de zoektocht van de mens naar perfectie, gebruikt door de “hermetische filosofen” of “spirituele alchemisten” die de steen, de lapis philosophorum, identificeerden met de “inwendige Christus”, de Zoon of Zon van de rechtvaardigheid. De geest van Christus (ahistorisch en pansofisch) was de edele “tinctuur” die een imperfecte wereld zou herstellen in haar oorspronkelijke staat.

Het is belangrijk in te zien dat Richardson de anarchistische ideeën afwees van bepaalde zeventiende-eeuwse chiliasten, die de gevestigde maatschappelijke orde omver wilden werpen. Hij gaf er de voorkeur aan de politieke en sociale orde te verbeteren via een pleidooi in Clarissa voor tolerantie en onpartijdigheid, dat nog sterker en nadrukkelijker is uitgewerkt in Sir Charles Grandison. Hij had sterke kritiek op vooroordelen en op de ongunstige acceptatie van tradities, evenals een intense afkeer van oorlog en schisma. Hij bleef lid van de Anglicaanse kerk, omdat hij op zich niet tegen de institutionele kerk was, maar via Clarissa en Sir Charles Grandison worden we ons toch bewust van Richardsons belangstelling voor de mystiek en zijn voorkeur voor een universele, inwendig doorleefde religie (Gods aanwezigheid in de mens), waarbij hij aangeeft dat godsdienst een persoonlijke zaak is.

Richardsons bovenconfessionele aard wordt beknopt omschreven in een gedicht van John Byrom, dat werd gevonden tussen Richardsons manuscripten. Het geeft uitdrukking aan Richardsons interesse in het concept van universele liefde en zijn afwijzing van de twisten tussen de verschillende christelijke sekten. Het gedicht, gebaseerd op een werk van Law en getiteld “A Catholic Christian’s Dying Speech”, beschrijft een katholieke (algemene, universele) christen die, hoewel lid van de Engelse staatskerk, bovenal “in hart en ziel een trouw lid is van de onverbroken eenheid”. Deze “katholieke christen” richt zijn gebed tot de “God van alle kerken” die met “onbegrensde en onveranderlijke liefde de gehele mensheid omarmt”. Dit is de boodschap die Richardson met name via Sir Charles Grandison wilde overbrengen op zijn lezerspubliek.
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