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When St. John Rivers demands that his cousin Jane Eyre marry and accompany him to India, not only does Jane determine that it would be utterly impossible for her to bind herself to him in marriage, but she also realizes that to serve him even just as a fellow missionary would drain the very life out of her. Upon her return to Mr. Rochester, however, Jane finds true fulfillment in giving herself wholly to him, serving him without stint, and remaining with him relatively isolated from the rest of the world. Mr. Rochester insists that she must “delight in sacrifice” to be willing to stay with him as his wife, companion, and nurse (445). If Charlotte Bronte’s *Jane Eyre* centers as a whole on the development of the character of her protagonist—on Jane’s search for love and on her need to fortify the integrity of her self—then the type and degree of Jane’s sacrificial submission in her relationships with these two men—souls with an inherent strength and nobility which she sincerely reveres—affects at a fundamental level any reading of Bronte’s presentation of what it means for a soul truly to be free. During the time between her two engagements to Mr. Rochester, Bronte’s *Jane Eyre* undergoes a profound spiritual development which leads her from inner fragmentation and turmoil, through a refining of her own moral judgement in her
interaction with St. John Rivers, to the wholeness and freedom which she finds in her divine calling to serve and love her master at Ferndean Manor.

Throughout her first engagement to Mr. Rochester and at the height of the development of her relationship with St. John Rivers, Jane finds herself dangerously and powerfully drawn to allow her identity, her very selfhood, to be lost in the personality of her lover. In the midst of her last interview with St. John, Jane describes her impulse with a metaphor:

I was tempted to cease struggling with him—to rush down the torrent of his will into the gulf of his existence, and there lose my own. I was almost as hard beset by him now as I had been once before, in a different way, by another. I was a fool both times. To have yielded then would have been an error of principle; to have yielded now would have been an error of judgment. (418)

With her reference to “once before,” Jane alludes to the previous crisis of temptation which she faced in her overwhelming desire to remain with Mr. Rochester as his mistress, a decision which would have violated the divine moral code to which she continues to cling throughout the novel. For Jane, however, the serious consequences of what she terms “an error of principle” encompass much more than merely a fear of divine retribution in this life or in the hereafter. To have given up her moral principles for the sake of Mr. Rochester, she asserts, would have resulted in the annihilation of her selfhood, just as now to capitulate to “the torrent of his will,” would engulf her in the “existence” of St. John Rivers.

Indeed, when upon learning of Mr. Rochester’s extant marriage to Bertha Mason Jane determines she must flee Thornfield, she insists to herself that her temptation to remain with Mr. Rochester stems from her own lack of internal wholeness, indicative of a descent into insanity. Only by choosing to “hold to the
principles received by me when I was sane, and not mad—as I am now" is Jane able to preserve her personal integrity and escape the temptation to give up her own identity to the will of her lover (317).

As Jane has learned by this time, moreover, the entirety of her romantic relationship with Mr. Rochester up to this point has been defiled by the immorality of his intention to lead her into bigamy and by the controlling possessiveness of his love. By tying together the identity of her self with her ability to live in moral rectitude, Jane’s words imply that the dangers posed by Mr. Rochester to her soul’s integrity permeated their entire relationship. Arnold Shapiro interprets the Mr. Rochester of their first engagement as an agent of oppression, paralleling the tyranny, embodied in Mr. Brocklehurst and Mrs. Reed, of conventional religious practices which impose upon the individual an identity that suffocates his own personality. According to Shapiro, by imposing on Jane an identity foreign to her nature and becoming more and more dehumanized himself, Mr. Rochester increasingly takes on the character of “the completely petrified man, the counterpart of Mrs. Reed and Brocklehurst” (690). While my argument focuses less than does Shapiro’s on the social implications of what he terms Bronte’s representation in the character of Jane of the triumph “of humanity, the feeling heart ... over the social forces which have tried to suppress them” (681), I highly respect his overall reading of the novel as a Bildungsroman of human compassion.

During their first proposal scene, Jane repeatedly attempts to affirm the spiritual equality of the two lovers, an equality which Mr. Rochester
acknowledges with his words but proves incapable of honoring in his behavior to her. In a poignant metaphor, Jane defies Mr. Rochester to impose himself upon her own spiritual freedom. She insists, “I am no bird; and no net ensnares me: I am a free human being with an independent will; which I now exert to leave you” (253). On the one hand, Jane’s declared ability to leave Mr. Rochester proves only a few chapters later to be the ultimate test of her personal autonomy and spiritual integrity. At the same time, the imagery with which she identifies herself as a bird narrowly escaping a net leaves Mr. Rochester in the place of the hunter, a figurative role with the two possible motives of either killing the bird or keeping it as a pet. Neither implication bodes well for Jane. At the moment of her vehement declaration, Jane believes that Mr. Rochester is betrothed to Blanche Ingram and that she herself must soon leave Thornfield, a fate which she describes as the equivalent of her own death: “It strikes me with terror and anguish to feel I absolutely must be torn from you for ever. I see the necessity of departure; and it is like looking on the necessity of death” (252). If Mr. Rochester is the huntsman in her imagination, Jane considers him to have ensnared her for the purpose of killing her outright. As she soon finds out, however, Mr. Rochester has absolutely no intention of allowing her to leave him or Thornfield. Instead, the other remaining fate for the hunted bird, that of becoming the pet of her lover, proves a singularly apt image for their ensuing engagement.

Although Rochester verbally acknowledges Jane’s equality with him, calling her his “equal” and his “likeness” (254), because of the dismal failures of his previous romances, Rochester is driven to remain in control of his relationship
with Jane, and his passionate language during their engagement scene reveals his all-consuming desire to possess Jane completely and to keep her in a state of dependency upon him. Paul Pickrel emphasizes Mr. Rochester’s desperate need “to regain autonomy, to reclaim or reoccupy himself” from the internal estrangement he has suffered due to the cruelty and injustice with which his family and society itself has treated him (165). During their first engagement, Rochester’s internal discord and spiritual brokenness leave him unable to love Jane selflessly and protect her own integrity of soul. Rather than submit himself to the vulnerability of a relationship of true equality, he insists to Jane, “I must have you for my own—entirely my own. Will you be mine? Say yes, quickly” (255). Internally unstable himself, Rochester longs for the security of a relationship of true love, but he has not yet learned to distinguish between the love that destroys the freedom of the beloved by its overpowering desire to possess and the love which gives itself to the beloved in joyful service. As he strives to justify his desire for Jane, Rochester asks, “Have I not found her friendless, and cold, and comfortless? Will I not guard, and cherish, and solace her?” (256). The three adjectives with which Rochester describes Jane reduce her to a state of dependency on him for the most basic human needs of companionship and a sheltering home. All of his verbs, moreover, reflect the attitude of a superior who stoops to care for his dependent, foreshadowing his behavior to Jane throughout the extent of their engagement. Repeatedly, Rochester attempts to make Jane his “pet,” lavishing expensive clothes and
jewelry on her and intending to remove her from the role of governess which provides her with her only means of a meager financial independence.

Jane, on the other hand, defies Rochester's proclivity to subjugate her to his love, accusing him of allowing his perception of their relationship to be confined by their physical and material inequality. She passionately demands,

Do you think, because I am poor, obscure, plain, and little, I am soulless and heartless?—You think wrong!—I have as much soul as you,—and full as much heart!...I am not talking to you now through the medium of custom, conventionalities, nor even of mortal flesh:—it is my spirit that addresses your spirit; just as if both had passed through the grave, and we stood at God's feet, equal—as we are! (253)

In the sight of God, Jane declares, and in their created essence, neither she nor Rochester can claim any sort of legitimate superiority over the other. Although they differ in appearance, wealth, and social status, Jane demands that in their relationship both she and Rochester must look beyond these sources of artificial inequality and allow their spirits to commune in the equality which they share apart from physical and temporal boundaries. Notably, Jane enters this engagement with a clear conscience, seeing herself and Rochester figuratively at the feet of God and under His blessing. While Jane actively works to resist being suffocated by the violence of his possessive love, her inability to understand the full import of Rochester's cryptic self-apologies prevents her from recognizing the perilous danger which her lover poses to her own personal integrity.

While Rochester recognizes the truth of their spiritual equality, his overwhelming desire to possess Jane in defiance of the moral code of God leads him to treat her not in the freedom and truthfulness of true equality, but with
deception and duplicity. In order to secure Jane to himself, Rochester determines to keep her ignorant of his extant marriage, again refusing the personal vulnerability which he would face if he chose to respect Jane’s spiritual and moral autonomy. From her own recognition of their spiritual equality, Jane believes she has come to know Mr. Rochester fully. Convinced that she must leave Thornfield on the approaching marriage of Rochester and Blanche Ingram, she laments, “I have talked, face to face, with what I reverence; with what I delight in,—with an original, a vigorous, an expanded mind. I have known you, Mr. Rochester” (252). Her use of the perfect tense, “I have known,” carries a sense of completion and even of comprehensiveness. Her quotation of the phrase “face to face” in this context alludes to 1 Corinthians 13:12, in which the Apostle Paul asserts, “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.” Jane sees herself already in St. Paul’s “then,” having moved beyond partial knowledge to the full, reciprocal knowledge of two souls who have transcended the confines of temporal reality and can commune with each other directly. The coming revelation of Mr. Rochester’s guilt, however, will soon show Jane just how incapable he is of living in her paradisal “then” of free spiritual intercourse.

At the same time, however, Jane’s own overpowering desire to idolize her lover contributes to the spiritual enslavement to which she begins to succumb during her first engagement to Mr. Rochester. She admits to her reader,

My future husband was becoming to me my whole world; and more than the world: almost my hope of heaven. He stood between me and every thought of religion, as an eclipse intervenes between man and the broad sun. I could not, in those days, see God for his
creature: of whom I had made an idol. (274)

In light of her later-acknowledged need to fortify the integrity of her self by adhering to the moral principles of “sanity,” Jane’s confession to breaking the first commandment of the Decalogue evinces the serious threat to her own spiritual wholeness which her relationship with Mr. Rochester has created. As she now admits seeing in Rochester her only “hope of heaven,” her words also reflect back on her previous allusion to Paul’s prophetic vision of the complete “knowing” of which heavenly souls will be capable. In the garden, her words to Rochester implied that by knowing him fully, by communicating “face to face” with his mind and spirit, she saw herself as having achieved a state of paradise at Thornfield. Now, in her address to the reader, she admits explicitly that only through Rochester can she envisage eternal happiness. At the moment, Jane appears to have succumbed to the sin for which Helen Burns remonstrated her as a child: “Hush, Jane! you think too much of the love of human beings” (69).

Although in the final chapters of the novel Bronte will redeem the value which Jane places on human love and affection, her own susceptibility to idolatry poses a threat to Jane’s personal wholeness arguably the most effective of all those which she faces in her relationships with the men whom she most loves and respects.

As she suggests in her consideration of her “two errors,” in the person of St. John Rivers Jane encounters dangers to her personal integrity of equal magnitude with those posed by Mr. Rochester. Although St. John’s demand that she accompany him to India does not overtly transgress any moral law, Jane
comes to realize that to succumb to "the torrent of his will" would result in the fragmentation of her selfhood just as surely as would a capitulation to the immoral desire of Mr. Rochester. "If I join St. John," she is convinced, "I abandon half myself" (404). While St. John utilizes every argument he can summon to persuade Jane that her true vocation lies with him, Jane cannot believe that her Creator intends her for this purpose:

I was no apostle...I could not receive his call.... "My powers—where are they for this undertaking? I do not feel them. Nothing speaks or stirs in me while you talk. I am sensible of no light kindling—no life quickening—no voice counselling or cheering. Oh, I wish I could make you see how much my mind is at this moment like a rayless dungeon, with one shrinking fear fettered in its depths—the fear of being persuaded by you to attempt what I cannot accomplish!" (402-403)

Although she identifies St. John's demand as a "calling," Jane cannot accept it for herself or consider it divinely sanctioned as long as she is unable to feel that call internally. The voice from outside her must be met with the "voice" or "call" of her own nature within her.

Instead, as her relationship with St. John develops, Jane becomes increasingly stifled by his overwhelming personality and by her consuming desire to please him. Repeatedly identifying their natures with the two opposed metaphors "fire" and "ice," Jane describes her developing relationship with St. John thus:

I fell under a freezing spell. When he said "go" I went; "come," I came; "do this," I did it. But I did not love my servitude....I daily wished more to please him: but to do so, I felt daily more and more that I must disown half my nature, stifle half my faculties, wrest my tastes from their original bent, force myself to the adoption of pursuits for which I had no natural vocation. (398)
As with Mr. Rochester, during her time at Marsh End Jane again begins to slip into the temptation to enslave herself to a man whom she loves and respects. At the initiation of her relationship with Rochester, he informed her, “I am used to say ‘Do this,’ and it is done: I cannot alter my customary habits for [you]” (124). Describing her servitude to St. John, Jane uses the same peremptory biblical wording as did Rochester. The language of each echoes that of the centurion in Matthew 8:9. With both of these men, Jane finds herself in a state of stifled subservience. Although she is never tempted to idolize St. John as she did Rochester, her tendency to magnify the good qualities in those she loves and almost to worship them causes her to stand in awe of her cousin and to regard him even as something superhuman. Only during their conversation in the glen does Jane discover what she terms “his fallibilities...I sat at the feet of a man, erring as I....I felt his imperfection, and took courage. I was with an equal—one with whom I might argue—one whom, if I saw good, I might resist” (406). Sitting symbolically at his feet, Jane discovers that the man who calls her to the life of a missionary is not divine, but her own equal. Interestingly, Maria Lamonaca points to Jane’s development of a “direct, unmediated relationship with her Creator” as the necessary antidote to the dangerous potential which she faces in her relationships with both St. John and Mr. Rochester—that of mistaking the husband or lover for God Himself (246-247). Arguably, Jane’s newly developing ability to distinguish between St. John’s godly qualities on the one hand and his fully human imperfections on the other depends on her growing understanding of the character of God as she can perceive him unobscured by her human idols.
Just as she once informed Mr. Rochester that she had no intention of dying with him like an Indian suttee (273), she can now refuse to sacrifice her life in India and her very selfhood in marriage by taking on herself the mission of St. John Rivers. For a second time, Jane narrowly escapes her besetting tendency to blind herself to her own spiritual equality with the men she loves.

Due to her interaction with St. John Rivers, however, Jane comes to recognize her own need and desire for a divine vocation. She identifies her temptation to submit to the demands of her cousin as an “error of judgment,” rather than one of “principle.” No longer desiring something adverse to the moral law of God, Jane desperately longs to do his will, to fulfill his purpose for her life. At the moment of her strongest temptation to answer the “call” of St. John, Jane describes her sincere yet perplexed state of mind:

I had now put love out of the question, and thought only of duty...I contended with my inward dimness of vision, before which clouds yet rolled. I sincerely, deeply, fervently longed to do what was right; and only that. “Shew me—shew me the path!” I entreated of Heaven. (419)

In a complete reversal of her former temptation to sacrifice her moral principles for the sake of her lover, Jane now voluntarily sets aside her compelling desire for human affection in her yearning to fulfill her duty and to follow the path ordained for her by Heaven. Yet she frankly admits that her judgement is obscured, like the sun hidden by rolling clouds. Her imagery reflects that which she earlier used to describe Mr. Rochester as an eclipse hiding divine truth from her spiritual sight. This time, however, her confusion results not from a conflict of morals, but from a conflict in her own understanding. Believing she must now
choose between love and duty, Jane is split within herself; while she longs to recognize her true vocation, she assumes that it must be divorced from the love which has been the central object of her soul’s craving throughout her life. With her sense of duty apparently at odds with or at least divided from her own nature, Jane’s “inner voice” can no longer help her. She knows not where to turn to validate her calling.

At this moment comes her summons back to Thornfield, the call which she terms nature’s best work (420), and without hesitation, Jane recognizes this voice as the symbol of her true divine vocation. Although the call comes from outside her, her whole being rises up to meet it with “an inexpressible feeling that thrilled it through” (419). This call not only originates in the external nature created by God and wielded as his instrument to reveal “the path” Jane longs to recognize and pursue, but it is also validated from the very core of her own nature. Lamonaca writes that Jane determines to marry Mr. Rochester, “because it is her vocation—the divine call that only she herself can hear” (246). No longer must she distinguish duty from love, conscience from feeling. Her summons back to Mr. Rochester reconciles the conflict between what she considered the opposing “calls” of God and of her nature, and Jane responds with joyous thanksgiving to the “Mighty Spirit,” recognizing at once her suitability for this vocation: “It was my time to assume ascendancy. My powers were in play, and in force” (420).

It is worth noting that my argument here has been influenced by John Hagan’s claim that Jane’s unique definition of freedom necessarily involves both
self-sacrificial love for the man who truly loves her and unwavering fidelity to the moral code of God. Hagan asserts that as Jane moves towards the freedom which she finally achieves by reconciling her loving service to Rochester with that which she owes to God, her progress consists in "a succession of escapes from a series of prisons or conditions of servitude which ... would have imposed an alien role on her, and ... denied her one or both of these necessary conditions of her liberation" (353). While Hagan focuses on the external threats to her freedom, however, I have striven also to keep in mind the dangers which Jane's own powerful nature poses for herself. If Jane has previously been beset by the tendency to "think too much of the love of human beings," that impulse has now been corrected by her willingness to relinquish it if necessary, and it can now find its true purpose in loving and caring for Mr. Rochester. As Jane will soon discover, no longer must she remain divided from him by her moral principles.

Not only has Bertha Mason been removed, but Rochester himself has been humbled and has turned in repentance to his Maker. Notably, Ruth Bernard Yeazell extends the typical reading of Thornfield's metaphorical destruction:

Bertha’s death and Rochester’s maiming are not simply convenient twists of plot—they themselves, in this intensely autobiographical work, become metaphors for the transformation within Jane. The madness which she fought has at last been destroyed; the passion whose consuming force she resisted has finally been controlled (142).

In the midst of the wood surrounding Ferndean, Rochester admits to Jane,

I did wrong: I would have sullied my innocent flower—breathed guilt on its purity: the Omnipotent snatched it from me....His chastisements are mighty; and one smote me which has humbled me for ever. You know I was proud of my strength: but what is it now, when I must give it over to foreign guidance, as a child does
its weakness? Of late, Jane—only of late—I began to see and acknowledge the hand of God in my doom. I began to experience remorse, repentance; the wish for reconcilement to my Maker. I began sometimes to pray: very brief prayers they were, but very sincere. (446)

The suffering that Rochester has undergone in Jane’s absence has taught him both remorse and humility. Not only newly conscious of his own guilt, Rochester has also come to recognize the transience and fragility of his personal prowess. No longer able to pride himself on his physical superiority, Rochester sees himself in the position of “a child,” a simile filled with biblical significance. His physical dependency mirrors his newfound humility, and his and Jane’s spirits can now be guiltlessly reunited before the feet of God, as she originally envisioned.

In the context of their distinctly political reading of the novel, Judith Leggatt and Christopher Parkes understand Jane’s final actions which bring civilization to Ferndean as indicating her new employment as an agent of the British state, bringing “the wilderness [into] the social order” in a “new kind of middle-class society,” which provides a more substantial and liberating role for women than did “aristocratic patriarchy” (187). I read Jane’s transition to homemaker, on the other hand, as a result of her newfound vocation to the service of the kingdom of heaven, a focus which I believe much more likely to have been directly on Charlotte Bronte’s mind, as the strictly political reading must be imposed on the novel from its historical and sociological context, while the religious one can be drawn explicitly from the language of the text. In the final chapters of the novel, Bronte affirms with beautiful imagery and with Jane’s own account of her married
life the perfect fulfillment of her inner nature which Jane finds in responding to her divinely sanctioned mission to create an earthly home for Mr. Rochester. In contrast to the “freezing spell” cast upon her fiery nature by the “ice” of St. John Rivers, the newly dependent Rochester, whose “countenance reminded one of a lamp quenched, waiting to be relit,” offers Jane the perfect receptor for the fires of her love (439). With delight Jane tells her reader, “I knew I suited him ... Delightful consciousness! It brought to life and light my whole nature: in his presence I thoroughly lived; and he lived in mine” (437). Rochester and Jane have both undergone an education of suffering which has brought them to a state of humble dependence on the will of their Maker. As a result, they each find the true fulfillment of their created natures in the perfect spiritual harmony which they share. Jane repeatedly rejoices in her knowledge of the suitability of their natures, which can now live in perfect unity, unimpeded by his guilt and pride and her temptation to idolatry. Even Jane’s original ominous image of the bird ensnared to its own destruction is replaced by a beautiful new avian simile for their relationship, in which Rochester has been transformed from the threatening hunter to “a royal eagle, chained to a perch ... forced to entreat a sparrow to become its purveyor” (439). Reflecting his new humility which allows him to recognize Jane’s spiritual equality with himself, Rochester as an eagle now shares the nature of his fellow bird, Jane. Any inequality between them lies only in their external, physical differences. John G. Peters argues that the non-human labels given by various characters to both Rochester and Jane throughout the novel symbolize the exclusion from society and from conventional practices
which they share and which allows them both to participate in a relationship of “mutual respect and spiritual equality” (63). Peters’s emphasis on Jane’s and Rochester’s shared isolation and alienation from society offers one possible explanation for Jane’s conviction of the reciprocal suitability of their natures.

Further, the “perfect concord” which results from their natural suitability transforms Rochester’s utter dependency on Jane for the basic necessities of life into a joyful avenue for their sincere love for each other. Jane writes,

There was a pleasure in my services, most full, most exquisite, even though sad—because he claimed these services without painful shame or damping humiliation. He loved me so truly, that he knew no reluctance in profiting by my attendance: he felt I loved him so fondly, that to yield that attendance was to indulge my sweetest wishes. (451)

At Ferndean, Jane achieves the paradox of free servitude, and in caring for Mr. Rochester and guiding him “homeward” (448), she has at last accomplished a reconciliation between the two halves of her nature, her desire to love and serve and her need to retain the autonomy of her self. All along, Jane has identified her ideal of true love with just this free and joyful offering of the self to another, sharply contrasting with what she termed the “counterfeit sentiment” offered by St. John, whose “every endearment [bestowed] is a sacrifice made on principle” (405). To live in such a state of forced love Jane could only imagine as the most unendurable form of enslavement.

As she makes clear in her final paragraphs, however, Jane continues to respect her cousin St. John, with all his human faults, for he, like herself, has found and passionately pursued the divine vocation befitting his nature. St. John strives to serve his heavenly “Master” just as faithfully as Jane does her earthly
one. Jane envisions her cousin at the head of the human race, with his face unwaveringly directed towards Heaven, himself standing “before the throne of God,” in direct discourse with his “Lord Jesus” (452). On the other hand, Jane’s response to St. John’s letter, which “drew from my eyes human tears, and yet filled my heart with Divine joy,” exemplifies her own divine vocation as mediator between Heaven and earth (452). With her natural capacity to be filled simultaneously with human and divine emotion, Jane has responded to the call of her heavenly Master to serve and care for her earthly one. In the woods of Ferndean, Rochester and Jane enact a beautiful image of their final reunion at the feet of God. After bowing his head in silent, grateful prayer, Rochester says aloud, “I humbly entreat my Redeemer to give me strength to lead henceforth a purer life than I have done hitherto!”, and he then reaches out to be led home by the hand of Jane (448). Jane’s divine Master has called her to lead her beloved earthly master homeward, to strengthen and support him, and to guide him into the life of guiltless purity before God which he so desires. Philip C. Rule points out a similarly poignant metaphor in the earlier scene of this chapter when Jane combs out Rochester’s tangled mass of hair. Here, Rule demonstrates, Bronte presents a reversed and sanctified allusion to the story of Samson and Delilah. Like Samson, Rochester is blinded, but with Jane’s help, he is saved, humanized, and he gains “renewed moral vision” (168).

No reader of Charlotte Bronte’s Jane Eyre can help but puzzle over her novel’s seemingly fairy-tale resolution and her choice to devote her final page to St. John Rivers, the lover whom Jane scorned. By focusing my attention on
Jane’s spiritual development as a Christian Victorian striving to reconcile the needs of her own nature with her perceived moral duty, I have attempted to offer one possible explanation for several of the tensions implicit in the novel’s final chapters. With her moral judgement purified in the fire of suffering, Bronte’s protagonist has received new powers of spiritual vision which allow her to love Rochester as the powerful yet humble creature of God that he is, to become an agent of sight for her husband, both physically and spiritually, and to perceive in her inspiring yet fallible cousin a sincere response to his divine calling to free servitude—one that parallels her own. From the perspective of healing charity which pervades Bronte’s conclusion, I believe it may even be appropriate to read Rochester, Jane, and St. John Rivers as three different fallible human beings each responding in his own way to the call of his Creator to become a figure of Christ on earth: “Even so come, Lord Jesus!” (452).
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