

Date: 19.07.21

Richard Lovelace (1618-1658)  
Lovelace is the least important of the four some of Cavalier poets. He was a very well educated courtier and was even sent to prison for favouring the King actively in the Civil War. It was in 1648 that while in ~~prison~~ ~~to~~ prison he prepared for the press his volume entitled 'Lucasta': Epodes, odes, sonnets, songs etc. to which is added 'Amarantha a Pastoral' (1649). Though his poems are full of freshness and exuberance he lacks the fancy of Herrick, the force of Suckling and the polish of Carew. "He was", says Harding Craig, "not so skilful and sustained as Carew, perhaps not so forceful as Suckling but had the greatness of having achieved a few immortal utterances". His "Ellinda's glove" is the prettiest of his short pieces.  
"Thou snowy farm with

of things, even of the situations he himself created. He creates the picture and leaves it without comment. The mysterious beauty of that watch on the battlements of the castle of Elsinore, the cold, the silence, the hushed voices, 'not a mouse stirring', save for that 'portentous figure', the 'prologue to the omen coming on' - all this is left to speak for itself.

What Shakespeare loves as an artist is power-intensity in human character. It may be power of intellect or moral power or power of passion or of grace, or the intensity of the exquisite as in Ariel, or power of love as in Imogen, or power of will as in Benedick, or intensity of stupidity as in Sir Andrew Aguecheek, whose silliness approached the sublime, but it is always the intense, the perfect in some kind, that he dwells upon. and makes contrast

Splendid and puissant personalities are the primary material of his tragedies, giants of wit or silliness of his comedy. If we put aside the morbid, there is only one form of the extreme in human character which he never makes use of, and that is the extremely brutal. The merely bestial he disregards entirely. Yet his characters, splendid or extreme as they are, are never extravagant or abnormal in their nature, they are rather perfected types of the normal. We may fairly say that Shakespeare sought for the highest expressions of the normal in humanity. But mere mediocrities Shakespeare makes little use of. He relegated them to the background, and used them as foils and explanatory notes. Mediocrity may be complex, but Shakespeare had not the modern love of the complex as such, though he masters it when

(04)  
ivalent of dramatic spectacles  
while going through 'Clarissa'  
or 'Sir Charles Grandison'  
we experience the something  
as if watching a play or a  
film in continuous present,  
always with the characters  
in their present pleasure  
or distress. The letter form  
produces greater immediacy  
and intensity. The success  
of Richardson owes much to  
the great length at which  
he describes the events like  
a slow motion film. The  
characters scrutinise them-  
selves as if they are their  
own subjects. Hazlitt calls  
Richardson's word as "arti-  
ficial reality". Smollett's  
Humphrey Clinker has also  
been told through letters  
but the aim is quite diffe-  
rent from that of Richard-  
son. There is no plot in  
the novel and the letters  
have been designed partly  
to present the characters

with their tastes, morals, manners etc. and partly to make us acquainted with the places they visit. Two more novels written in this manner are Frances Burney's 'Evelina and Cecilia'. It is true that she adopted the epistolary method of Richardson but rejected melodrama for comedy. Evelina narrates the adventures of a young girl on her entrance into the world. Her comic characters are life like and not mere caricatures like those of Smollett. She has less delicacy than Jane Austen but creates more humour and presents more animated scenes.

The end.

Munni Bhushan Sinha  
Deptt. of English  
S.S. College, Tehana, Bawal