

THE NOVELS OF THOMAS LOVE PEACOCK AS GUIDEBOOKS TO A STUDY
OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY SPECULATIVE IDEAS: A CRITICAL
FOCUS WITH AN ANNOTATED, ENUMERATIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY
OF WORKS BY AND ABOUT PEACOCK FROM 1959 TO 1972

4106
1226-5600

by

GERALD THOMAS MCLAUGHLIN

B.A., Mansfield State College, 1971

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1973

Approved by:


Major Professor

LD
2668
R4
1973
M3
C.2
Doc.

THE NOVELS OF THOMAS LOVE PEACOCK AS GUIDEBOOKS TO A STUDY
OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY SPECULATIVE IDEAS: A CRITICAL
FOCUS WITH AN ANNOTATED, ENUMERATIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY
OF WORKS BY AND ABOUT PEACOCK FROM 1959 TO 1972

It is unusual to find a writer whose career spans the greater part of two important literary periods. Contemporary with both Wordsworth and Tennyson, Thomas Love Peacock (1785-1866) read each of these poets and commented upon them in the pages of his satiric fiction. Peacock is noted for his early influence upon his friend, Percy Bysshe Shelley, as well as for his later influence upon his son-in-law, George Meredith.¹ He lived in an age of intense ideological speculation, a time which fostered among other theories the transcendentalism of Coleridge, the "origin of species" theory of Darwin, the sociology of Malthus, the political reforms of Brougham, and the economic speculation of Godwin. Peacock gave critical notice of these movements in his works also.

However, it remains that Peacock's own literary productions have received scant critical attention. The great majority of nineteenth-century critics afford his work little more than shallow appraisal, while early twentieth-century critics largely spend their efforts lamenting that his work is no longer widely read. Informative critical studies are relatively few. We can, however, point to James Spedding's "Tales from the Author of Headlong Hall" as the best contemporary review of Peacock, along with George Saintsbury's "Thomas Love Peacock, Satirist," and John W. Draper's "The Social Satires of Thomas Love Peacock" as the better, late nineteenth-century articles. We can also

¹Carl Van Doren, The Life of Thomas Love Peacock (New York: Russell and Russell, 1966), pp. 54-77, 265-266.

acknowledge Carl Dawson's His Fine Wit and Ian Jack's English Literature, 1815-1821 as good starting places for the Peacock scholar.²

But as one general result of overall critical neglect, there is both disagreement and uncertainty among these critics concerning both the intent of Peacock's fiction and the value of his contribution to the collective nineteenth-century literary achievement. Indeed part of the problem arises from a lack of specific critical focus on the part of Peacock scholars. Ian Jack, devoting an entire chapter to Peacock, cautions us not to label his fictional works as novels. Lionel Stevenson, allotting Peacock only two pages in The English Novel, suggests that instead his work might best "be classified as personal essays disguised as fiction."³ Carl Dawson underlines comedy as provoking the general effect of the novels.⁴ The critics scratch the surface and suggest to us basic approaches, but no one has synthesized the ideas from the Peacock novels to ascertain whether these follow any definite pattern or form any consistent statement about the age in which the writer lived.

Nevertheless, we can discover an order in the Peacock criticism by noticing that there are three distinctive patterns of critical approach: (1) attempts to identify and evaluate Peacock's supposed caricatures of

²James Spedding, "Tales by the Author of Headlong Hall," Edinburgh Review, 68 (January, 1839), 432-459; George Saintsbury, "Thomas Love Peacock, Satirist," Macmillan's Magazine, 53 (April, 1886), 414-427; John W. Draper, "The Social Satires of Thomas Love Peacock, Part I," Modern Language Notes, 33 (December, 1918), 456-463; Carl Dawson, His Fine Wit: A Study of Thomas Love Peacock (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), 330 pp; Ian Jack, English Literature, 1815-1832 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 213-224.

³The English Novel: A Panorama (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960), pp. 208-209.

⁴Pp. 159-173 gives background for Peacock's comedy.

nineteenth-century individuals; (2) efforts to place Peacock neatly within certain schools of writing; that is, to identify him with Ben Jonson, Samuel Johnson, Voltaire, or the eighteenth-century English satirists; (3) attempts to discover the overall intent of Peacock's "novel of ideas."

Traditionally critics place the Peacock novels into two particular groups; the satiric symposium, which includes Headlong Hall (1816), Melincourt (1817), Nightmare Abbey (1818), Crotchet Castle (1831), and Gryll Grange (1860), and the satiric romance, which includes Maid Marian (1822), and The Misfortunes of Elphin (1829).⁵ Both types rely almost wholly upon the various ideas which the characters discuss and pay only cursory attention to plot, characterization, and other technical aspects of the standard novel; that is to say, the major organizing principle within and between the novels is a dialectical progression of some particular ideas.

Satiric comedy, however, revolving around these nineteenth-century ideas, is at the base of every Peacock novel. The only difference between forms is that while the symposium relies upon the reader's recognition of folly in the conversation of contemporary characters, the romance depends upon pointing to folly in customs of one age to satirize, by analogy, customs in the nineteenth century. Recognition of this difference allows us to focus upon that which is unique in Peacock's satiric commentary. His satiric darts are aimed in one general direction, toward the center of contemporary speculative thinking. Ian Jack quotes William Hazlitt's statement concerning the intellectual tenor of the

⁵ Jack, p. 214.

nineteenth century: "The present is an age of talkers and not of doers."⁶ To illustrate a similar observation is one purpose of Peacock's fiction.

The purpose, then, of this study is to gather into some coherent patterns what has been written about the seven Peacock novels and to suggest a more focused approach for further critical investigation. In an age not noted for its satire, Peacock is "the great satiric commentator,"⁷ and thus his novels serve as guidebooks to a study of speculative, impractical aspects of nineteenth-century literary, scientific, social, political and economic ideas, written by a dissatisfied, very interested onlooker. His satiric jabs at excess in all phases of nineteenth-century English life leave us with a personal, but nonetheless objective commentary (which has been called a laughing philosophy) built about the daily cares of those we call Romantics and Victorians.⁸ His characters are never able to put their theories into practice because they are so involved in debates that advocate prevailing philosophies of the day.

II

Behind theories are the men who formulate them, and each of the Peacock characters resembles in some way an actual nineteenth-century figure. In these character sketches, though, Peacock takes only a few traits of his subjects, exaggerates these, and then moves some distance

⁶Jack, p. 213.

⁷Jack, p. 213.

⁸Van Doren, p. 67, points to Peacock's reputation as a "laughing philosopher."

from an actual portrait. As Saintsbury confirms, "When he satirizes persons he goes so far away from their real personalities that the libel ceases to be libellous."⁹ It is true that prominent figures of the age could recognize their reflected image in the pages of the Peacock fiction. Shelley, for example, both acknowledged and enjoyed his own caricature, sketched by Peacock in the personality of Scythrop Glowry.¹⁰ But in most cases the traits are so carefully obscured that ultimately we can only note a resemblance. Saintsbury further maintains that it is "difficult to say whether Mr. Mystic, Mr. Flosky, or Mr. Skionar is least like Coleridge; and Southey, intensely sensitive as he was to criticism, need not have lost his equanimity over Mr. Feathernest."¹¹ In his caricatures Peacock is more interested in displaying types rather than making accurate sketches. To ascribe the portraits to any particular persons by more than their mere suggestive quality amounts to little more than a critical miscue.

However, many early critics are guilty of such a mistake and thus object to Peacock's criticism of popular literary figures. We find one reviewer violently protesting that "She [that wicked goddess, Dullness] has conjured up these phantoms, Vamp, Feathernest, Derry-down before his [Peacock's] eyes and has made him believe that they are Gifford, Southey, and Wordsworth."¹² Because the Peacock character's primary function is

⁹P. 416.

¹⁰Howard Mills, Peacock--His Circle and His Age (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 135.

¹¹P. 416.

¹²Review of Melincourt, British Critic, 8 (October, 1817), 441.

to embody a particular attitude, such critical statements stray from the actual focus of the works.

Peacock's type-casting of characters and ideas suggests to other critics that the novels may be placed into certain schools of writing or identified with works of other writers. Saintsbury leads in such a direction by classifying Peacock in a school which he calls "dealers in humours," following after the fashion of Ben Jonson. He explains that the "dealer in humours takes some fad or craze in his characters, some minor ruling passion and makes profit out of it."¹³ The critic proceeds further to say that "Generally (and almost always in Peacock's case) he [the dealer in humours] takes if he can one or more of these humours as a central point, and lets the others play and revolve in a more or less eccentric fashion around it."¹⁴

There is also an attempt to associate Peacock with the satirists of the eighteenth century. Lord Houghton has defined and explained Peacock's literary idiosyncrasy as that of a man of the eighteenth century belated and strayed in the nineteenth,¹⁵ and this particular type of criticism has been continued in the twentieth-century by other critics as well. Philip Pinkus argues that "Peacock satirized Augustan targets, however, not merely to invoke the satiric tradition but for the obvious reason that the same evils that disturbed the Augustans disturbed him also. . . . the Augustan satirists dealt with a wide range of targets, including stockbutts like the philosopher-pedant, the lawyer, the doctor, the

¹³ P. 417.

¹⁴ P. 417.

¹⁵ Saintsbury, p. 425, points to Lord Houghton's statement in the introduction to the Henry Cole 1875 edition of Peacock's Works.

soldier, the fop, the politician, and a whole army of hypocrites who are the staple diets of all satirists. Peacock took his share from the general storehouse."¹⁶ Numerous other critics make one-line comparisons between the Peacock novels and Dr. Johnson's Rasselas and Voltaire's Candide, but these kinds of critical approaches ignore the overall plan of dialectical progression indicated by the continuity within and between each symposium novel.

However, there are critics who arrive at some notion of the scheme behind Peacock's fiction and refer to the works as "novels of ideas." Among these, James Spedding warns that "the business of the fiction lies in the dialogues, and would only be injured and embarrassed by any independent interest that might be combined with it of an exciting or pathetic nature."¹⁷ The characters, he notes, are thus reduced to mere opinions, and Peacock, he says, asserts a very superficial attitude toward them. Spedding comments that in the novels,

[Peacock] stands among the disputing opinions of the time a disengaged and disinterested looker-on; among them, but not of them, showing neither malice nor favour, but a certain sympathy, companionable rather than brotherly, with all; with natural glee cheering on the combatants to their discomfiture, as each rides his hobby boldly to the destruction prepared for him, regarding them all alike with the same smile of half compassionate amusement.¹⁸

It is exactly this type of argument which dominates the better nineteenth-century criticism. The Peacock characters are regarded as being synonymous with the opinions to be satirized. R. B. Johnson, in

¹⁶"The Satiric Novels of Thomas Love Peacock," Kansas Quarterly, 1 (Summer, 1969), 64-65.

¹⁷P. 445.

¹⁸P. 438-439.

"Thomas Love Peacock, Satirist," remarks that the novels are "without plot or passion, almost without character-drawing, for the satire is more often directed against ideas and classes of men than against individuals."¹⁹ The Peacock character then, at best the embodiment of a particular nineteenth-century idea, can only function in the novel as an illustration of his schemes. The idea which each character represents becomes, for him, a ruling passion which prohibits him from evaluating or responding to his world in any other terms but those which constitute his guiding value. Moreover, the aspect of plot in the symposium becomes negligible for Peacock since "a hospitable house, a variety of guests, and an occasion which may bring them [his characters] together on easy terms, are all he wants: no matter whether it may be a Christmas party, a wedding party, a party of speculators in philosophy or in the stocks, or a party of rival suitors to an attractive heiress."²⁰

Peacock's plan for each of the symposium novels is to gather together groups of these stereotyped characters and allow their dialogues to consistently undo their arguments. Blinded by his ruling philosophy, each of the characters is unable to deal practically with the outside world. Herbert Paul observes that the characters "are always playing a part, never simply themselves, except under the influence of some sudden catastrophe, such as the appearance of a spectre, or bodily concussion with a tangible object, or the advent of a plentiful meal."²¹ Peacock freely introduces such catastrophes in haphazard progression

¹⁹ Novel Review (August, 1892), p. 407.

²⁰ Spedding, p. 445.

²¹ "The Novels of Thomas Love Peacock," Nineteenth Century, 53 (April, 1903), p. 653.

chiefly when the dialogue begins to become tedious or when the question at hand proves to be imponderable. For example, Mr. Flosky's discussion of the nature of ghosts in Nightmare Abbey ends abruptly when what appears to be a spectre marches into the room. Calamity follows in chain-reaction as Flosky and friends exit through the nearest windows and doors. The narrator then explains the apparition, and we move on to another chapter and a new set of dialogues.

Thus plot in the Peacock symposium serves only as a convenient way to establish conversations, and it is attended to in a very light, careless, and amusing manner, requiring little scrutiny on the part of the reader. After each transitory narrative, our attention is returned to the mock seriousness of the ideas being expressed in the dialogues. As Spedding confirms, we are brought back to imaginary conversations where "Projects for the diffusion of knowledge, the suppression of vice, the advancement of science, the regeneration of philosophy, or the purification of politics are entertained as amusing vanities."²²

III

The specific "amusing vanities" entertained in Headlong Hall, the first of the symposium novels, are introduced primarily through three distinct Peacockian types. The speculative discussions of a "perfectibilian" named Mr. Foster, a "deteriorationalist" named Mr. Escot, and a "statu-quo-ite" named Mr. Jenkinson create the central matter of the novel. The character types are easily explained. The perfectibilian of the Peacock novels believes emphatically in the ultimate and steady

²²P. 440.

progress of mankind. In a retort to Mr. Escot's notion that only uncivilized man possesses true happiness, Mr. Foster asks the following question:

Do you suppose the mere animal life of a wild man, living on acorns and sleeping on the ground, comparable in felicity to that of a Newton, ranging through unlimited space, and penetrating into the arcana of universal motion--to that of a Locke, unraveling the labyrinth of mind--to that of a Lavoisier, detecting the minutest combinations of matter, and reducing all nature to its elements--to that of a Shakespeare, piercing and developing the springs of passion--or of a Milton, identifying himself, as it were, with the being of an invisible world?²³

Foster believes that happiness and virtue of which Escot speaks is independent of the external environment, that world outside man. Human advancement, then, culminating in nineteenth-century progress, does not hinder the intrinsic nobility of man. However, the deteriorationalist constantly sees the darker side of the question:

On the score of happiness, what comparison can you make between the tranquil being of the wild man of the woods and the wretched and turbulent existence of Milton, the victim of persecution, poverty, blindness, and neglect? The records of literature demonstrate that Happiness and Intelligence are seldom sisters . . . the many are always sacrificed to the few. Where one man advances, hundreds retrograde; and the balance is always in favor of universal deterioration. (p. 28)

Neither combatant can secure an argumentative alliance from the statu-quo-ite. Jenkinson considers both sides of every problem presented to him, finds each satisfactory, and therefore makes no decision to uphold either. His characteristic logic is amusingly displayed in his decision upon whether or not to dance in the ballroom of Headlong Hall:

The universal cheerfulness of the company induces me to rise; the trouble of such exercise induces me to sit still . . .

²³David Garnett, ed., The Novels of Thomas Love Peacock, 2 Vols. (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1963), p. 28. Further citations from the text of the novels will be incorporated in the body of the paper.

I have been weighing these points, pro and con, and remain in statu-quo. (p. 71)

Jenkinson on this occasion, as well as others, consistently shows his inability to arrive at any decision to take a particular and definite stand. Thus, his only answer to the argument between Foster and Escot is that

you must make [the wild man] a profound metaphysician, and thus transfer him at once from his wild and original state to a very advanced stage of intellectual progression; whether that progression be towards good or evil, I leave you and our friend Foster to settle between you. (p. 73)

The ideas which each character embodies are of a particular sort either inherited by or generated by early nineteenth-century speculative thinkers. Taken ostensibly from the eighteenth-century concept of the noble savage, and arranged into form by Lord Monboddo, the notion of man's deterioration becomes, for Peacock, a subject for ridicule.²⁴ The idea of perfectibility comes from Godwin and Shelley. As A. B. Young alleges, "the idea of the perfectibility of mankind, as advocated by William Godwin in Political Justice and Enquirer [sic], was as much an integral part of Shelley's creed as that of Mr. Foster."²⁵ It is a speculative theory which Peacock believes to be impractical. The two opposing theories are argued throughout the work, but neither representative character can put his theory to a definite use. Meanwhile,

²⁴ Christopher Hibbert, The Personal History of Samuel Johnson, (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971) pp. 219-220, gives a good synopsis: "Lord Monboddo talked 'a great deal of nonsense' about savages, Johnson had told Boswell several years before; so, too, did Rousseau, 'but Rousseau knew he was talking nonsense and laughed at the world for staring at him.' 'Why, Sir, a man who talks nonsense so well must know that he is talking nonsense. But I am afraid . . . that Monboddo does not know that he is talking nonsense.'"

²⁵ "Shelley and Peacock," Modern Language Review, 2 (April, 1907), p. 228.

Jenkinson, interested in all speculation but partial to none, acts the part of a "do-nothing" audience.

Mr. Cranium, the phrenologist, and Mr. Milestone, the landscape planner, are two minor characters who also deserve our attention. Both are constructed to illustrate nineteenth-century impractical fads. Cranium's hypothesis, that a man's temper may be deciphered by an examination of his skull, is illustrated by his use of ludicrous analogies:

Here is the skull of a beaver, and that of Sir Christopher Wren.
You observe in both these specimens, the prodigious development
of the organ of constructiveness.
Here is the skull of a bullfinch, and that of an eminent fiddler.
You may compare the organ of music. (p. 68)

Cranium, as speculator in science, propounds a theory which is neither practical nor advantageous in any event. His audience leaves the room "having just understood as much of the lecture as furnished them with amusement for the ensuing twelvemonth in feeling the skulls of all their acquaintance" (p. 70). In a similarly misdirected manner, Milestone hopes to replace the natural wilderness surrounding Headlong Hall with "Pagodas and Chinese bridges, gravel walks and shrubberies, bowling-greens, canals, and clumps of larch . . . " (P. 23) upon the theory that each of these improvements will be symbolic of an age and signify the progress of the universe:

. . . one age, sir [Squire Headlong], has brought to light the
treasures of ancient learning; a second has penetrated into the
depth of metaphysics; a third has brought to perfection the
science of astronomy (p. 23)

His reasoning, we see, is as ridiculous as his planning, and the result will turn a natural landscape into an ill-wrought horror.²⁶

²⁶Garnett, ed., p. 18. See Peacock's footnote number one which links Milestone to an actual nineteenth-century landscape planner, Mr. Knight.

Melincourt brings to us a similar pattern of ideas. A host of speculators and faddists are assembled in the hope of winning the hand of the fair Anthelia Melincourt, and among them is another deteriorationalist named Mr. Forester. But unlike Mr. Escot of Headlong Hall, Forester is more convincing to his fictional audience because he brings his specimen of the "wild man" with him in the person of his friend, Sir Oran Haut-ton. With Peacock's farcical introduction of Oran, we begin to see Monboddo's theories become fused with the pre-Darwinian speculation of Linnaeus and Buffon.²⁷ Forester calls Oran "a specimen of the natural and original man--the wild man of the woods; called in the language of the more civilized and sophisticated natives of Angola, Pongo, and in that of the Indians of South America, Oran Outang" (p. 127). Peacock, here, has acted upon Mr. Jenkinson's suggestion and brought the wild man into society where indeed he functions well enough (to the horror of many nineteenth-century critics) to gain a title and a seat in Parliament. As Leo Henkin, in Darwinism in the English Novel, suggests, "with dry humor Peacock presents to contemporary civilization its own scientific discovery, and seems bent on persuading that the unobtrusive, well mannered gentleman with the dark complexion and the bushy whiskers was really progressing toward perfectibility from an intellectual order of apes."²⁸ Indeed the idea becomes clear when we recognize by observing Oran's exceptional deportment, that he really is the most "perfected" of the Melincourt characters.

²⁷Garnett, ed., p. 129. See Peacock's footnote number two.

²⁸Darwinism in the English Novel, 1860-1910, (New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1963), p. 35.

But although Forester and Sir Oran dominate the intellectual speculation of the novel, Melincourt provides us as well with caricatures of both a nineteenth-century transcendentalist and Malthusian, respectively Mr. Mystic and Mr. Fax. Mystic invites Forester, Fax, and friends to visit his home,

to step into the boat, and cross over his lake, which he called the Ocean of Deceitful Form to the Island of Pure Intelligence, on which Cimmerian Lodge was situated: promising to give them a great treat in looking over his grounds, which he had laid out according to the topography of the human mind; and to enlighten them through the medium of "darkness visible," with an opticothaumaturgical process of transcendentalizing a cylindrical mirror, which should teach them the difference between objective and subjective reality. (p. 275)

However, the mariners cross this transcendental ocean only to become lost in a thick fog:

the fog penetrated into all the apartments: there was fog in the hall, fog in the parlour, fog on the staircases, fog in the bedrooms;
"the fog was here, the fog was there, the fog was all around." (p. 280)

Peacock is saying cogently that the theory has no practical value and is therefore in Scythrop Glowry's words "Philosophical Gas."²⁹ The transcendentalist type, lost in the vapor of his impractical speculation, can only succeed in having himself blown down a flight of stairs in an explosion caused by a leak of inflammable gas from his synthetic fog machine. As Forester explains,

. . . the symbol, as you may call it, may operate as a warning to the apostles of superstitious chimaera and political fraud, that it is very possible for smoke to be too thick; and that, in condensing in the human mind the vapours of ignorance and delusion, they are only compressing a body of inflammable gas, of which the explosion will be fatal in precise proportion to its density. (p. 282)

²⁹ See Nightmare Abbey, Garnett, ed., p. 364.

Like the rest of the characters Mr. Fax, the Malthusian, has an impractical plan to end what he calls the cause of all evil in human society: "the cause is the tendency of population to increase beyond the means of subsistence. The remedy is an universal social compact, binding both sexes to equally rigid celibacy, till the prospect of maintaining the average number of six children be as clear as the arithmetic of futurity can make it" (p. 141-142). Later in the novel, Fax's only attempt to put his theory into practice is thwarted abruptly by a rustic couple named Robin and Zurkey. When Fax suggests that because of their poverty the two should not marry, Robin's response is " . . . that be al mighty voine rigmarol; but the short and the long be this: I can't live without Zurkey, nor Zurkey without I . . . " (p. 297). Fax's social compact works well in theory, but its application, to his surprise, is more difficult.

Early nineteenth-century poetry is the central topic which is satirized in Nightmare Abbey. The Monthly Magazine, 1819, tells us that in this novel "the gloomy philosophy and metaphysical poetry of the present day are exposed with [a] humorous and masterly . . . hand."³⁰ Surrounded by the caricature which is suggestive of Shelley, the conversations reveal Peacock's criticism of contemporary poetry. The perfectibilian, Scythrop, the deteriorationalist, Toobad, and the transcendental poets, Flosky and Cypress are gathered together for speculative discussion. Peacock, with tongue-in-cheek, has Flosky elaborate upon his poetical theory in the following manner:

. . . the enthusiasm for abstract truth is an exceedingly fine thing, as long as the truth, which is the object of the enthusiasm,

³⁰ Review of Nightmare Abbey, Monthly Magazine, 90 (November, 1819), p. 327.

is so completely abstract as to be altogether out of the reach of the human faculties; and, in that sense, I have myself an enthusiasm for truth, but in no other, for the pleasure of metaphysical investigation lies in the means, not in the end; and if the end could be found, the pleasure of the means would cease. (p. 381)

Flosky's theory has no direction. It exists without any organized goal. As he says, "I pity the man who can see the connection of his own ideas. Still more do I pity him, the connection of whose ideas any other person can see" (p. 381). This is not to say that Peacock disliked the poetry of the age. Indeed he enjoyed the poetry of Coleridge and defended the poet from his critics in a later "Essay on Fashionable Taste."³¹ But again, speculative theory without any practical focus is an open target for Peacock's satire.

The fourth symposium, Crotchet Castle, contains what is probably Peacock's most vehement attack against the speculators. His attack upon "the learned friend," strongly suggestive of Lord Brougham, stems not only from the liberal politician's inability to put his theories into practice, but also from Peacock's genuine mistrust of the man.³² The Rev. Dr. Folliot, as spokesman for the general attack, complains that the liberal "learned friend deals in: everything for everybody, science for all, schools for all, rhetoric for all, law for all, physic for all, words for all, and sense for none" (p. 647). Among Broughman's many idealistic schemes for the distribution of learning to the general public was his "Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge," which came to

³¹Howard Mills, ed., Thomas Love Peacock: Memoirs of Shelley and Other Essays and Review, (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1970), 93-113.

³²"Introduction to Crotchet Castle," Garnett, ed., p. 647. See also, Chester W. New, The Life of Henry Brougham to 1830, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), for substantial information regarding Brougham's liberal reform proposals.

be called the March of Mechanics, the March of Intellect, and the March of the Mind. His attempt to provide specialized mass education for mankind is derided by Folliot who believes that "useful knowledge" makes mankind forget practical duties. He explains the situation in the following manner:

"I am out of patience with this march of mind. Here has my house been nearly burned down, by my cook taking it into her head to study hydrostatics, in a sixpenny tract, published by the Steam Intellect Society, and written by a learned friend who is for doing all the world's business as well as his own, and is equally well qualified to handle every branch of human knowledge. I have a great abomination of his learned friend; as author, lawyer, and politician, he is triformis, like Hecate . . . the true Mr. Facing-both-ways of Vanity Fair. My cook must read his rubbish in bed; and as might be expected, she dropped suddenly fast asleep, overturned the candle, and set the curtains ablaze."

(p. 656)

For Peacock, "useful knowledge," as Brougham proposes it, is misdirected and takes the working class from their labors. Its ultimate end, as projected in the final chapters, is a revolution of misapplied minds and inactive bodies.

In a chapter entitled "Theories," Peacock further attacks the speculative attitudes of the day. When money is offered to finance the best scheme possible, the proposals are as follows:

Mr. MacQuedy. Build lecture rooms and schools for all.

Mr. Trillo. Revive the Athenian theatre: regenerate the lyrical drama.

Mr. Toogood. Build a grand co-operation parallelogram, with a steam-engine in the middle for a maid of all work.

Mr. Firedamp. Drain the country, and get rid of malaria, by abolishing duck-ponds.

Mr. Morbific. Found a philanthropic college of anticontagionists, where all the members shall be inoculated with the virus of all known diseases. . . .

Mr. Chainmail. Build a great dining-hall: endow it with beef and ale, and hang the hall round with arms to defend the provisions.

Mr. Henbane. Found a toxicological institution for trying all poisons and antidotes.

(p. 689-690)

Peacock's parody of nineteenth-century innovators and speculators is again made clear. The inability of these characters to agree on any one of the proposals causes them to quit the discussion of theories for the consolation of wine and song, as the narrator tells us that the "schemes for the world's regeneration evaporated in a tumult of voices" (p. 694).

IV

The two romances are also primarily concerned with a clash of ideas, but in a more general sense than we find in the symposium. In each romance we find as central characters idealistic reformers whose plans are constantly being thwarted by the practical world as it is. Plot does play a more recognizable role here, but again its major function is to act as a framework for the central ideas. The climax of the novel is essentially the statement of a particular concept. There is rising action to the central point (Chapters XI and XII in Maid Marian, Chapter II in The Misfortunes of Elphin) and then denouement as Peacock amuses himself with the events of the tale. The characters, as Dawson points out "are largely featureless, their actions conventional."³³

The forest reformers of Maid Marian, constructing their ideal utopia in Sherwood, adopt a political and social order similar to that from which they are escaping. Living by the "six principles of society," they formulate a code of laws, we are told, upon the vows of Legitimacy, Equity, Hospitality, Chivalry, Chastity, and Courtesy. But in reality we notice that their government is instead based upon force of arms. Friar Tuck tells Baron Fitzwater,

³³P. 227.

There is no right but might: and to say that might overcomes right is to say that right overcomes itself: an absurdity most palpable. Your right was the stronger in Arlingford, and ours is the stronger in Sherwood. (p. 499)

The characters are set up again to act as puppets and are manipulated to undo the theories which they propound. Throughout the work "Peacock is laughing at the theories of might, of wealth, of justice, by making his 'outlaws' spokesman for reapplied, but not therefore legitimate, laws; laws that in fact are unjustifiable whether defended by a Walpole, a Castlereagh, or a Robin Hood."³⁴ The band of foresters with all their idealistic claims and goals create a society which in reality is not much different than the surrounding one.

On the other hand, the reformers in The Misfortunes of Elphin are thwarted early in the work when they encounter the obstinance of the drunken Prince Seithenyn ap Seithyn, Sadi. Elphin and Teithrin, trying to persuade Seithenyn to repair the ancient wall (symbolic of tradition), which protects the land from the raging sea, are greeted with the following answer:

The embankment is old, I am free to confess; that it is somewhat rotten in parts, I will not altogether deny; that it is any worse for that, I do most sturdily gainsay. It does its business well: it works well: it keeps out the water from the land, and lets in the wine upon the High Commission of Embankment. . . . I say, the parts that are rotten give elasticity to those that are sound . . . If it were all sound, it would break by its own obstinate stiffness: the soundness is balanced by the rottenness and the stiffness is balanced by the elasticity . . . It was half rotten when I was born, and that is a conclusive reason why it should be three parts rotten when I die. (p. 561)

Seithenyn is much like the statu-quo-ite of Headlong Hall, incapable of making decisions and content with his immediate state of doing nothing.

³⁴Dawson, p. 232.

While Seithenyn is preoccupied in his wine and song, the wall breaks and the sea innundates the land:

"Who has done this?" vociferated Seithenyn. "Show me the enemy."
 "There is no enemy but the sea," said Elphin, "to which you, in your drunken madness, have abandoned the land. Think, if you can think, of what is passing in the plain. The storm drowns the cries of your victims; but the curses of the perishing are upon you."
 (p. 569)

Seithenyn is that "great, amoral hulk"³⁵ of English society who has abandoned tradition to the chaos and roar of speculation. Like Jenkinson, he is content to sit back to enjoy the food, the wine, and the song. Yet, all the while, Peacock remains at once both critical and sympathetic with all his speculators, reformers, and statu-quo-ites. Even the amusing villain Prince Seithenyn who is lost, presumably drowned, in the third chapter, is allowed to return, with the help of two floating wine barrels, to continue his statu-quo-ite arguments in chapter eleven.

In each romance we are led to see a similar theme and are instructed, by analogy, that people of the nineteenth century should respect tradition. The author's attitude, as George Saintsbury argues, "is based simply upon the very sober and arguable ground that human nature is always very much the same, liable to the same weaknesses; and that the oldest things are likely to be best, not for any intrinsic or mystical virtue of antiquity, but because they have had the most time to be found out in, and have not been found out."³⁶ John W. Draper suggests that in these last novels Peacock sees society "filled with corruption: family,

³⁵ Dawson, p. 247.

³⁶ P. 425.

church, and state. None of the parts function properly; for the individuals composing each class are sunk in selfishness."³⁷ What we view in the romances is a world abandoning tradition, and it is a final product of the resulting decline which we see in Gryll Grange.

V

The last of Peacock's symposium novels, Gryll Grange is itself a culmination of the dialectical progression of ideas. The novel provides us with a final statement of Peacock's personal opinion. Assembled at Gryll Grange, is another hearty gang of speculators, notably including Mr. Falconer, a spokesman for literary reform, the Reverend Doctor Opimian, a deteriorationalist, Lord Curryfin, a spokesman for socio-political reform, and Mr. MacBorrowdale, a statu-quo-ite. But although most of the important character types are once again assembled, this novel is more directly concerned with the outcome of their years of speculation. David Garnett contends that as the "satire of the earlier novels was largely at the expense of Peacock's very good friends and companions, the system mongers; in Gryll Grange it is rather at the expense of the world that they are rapidly creating" ³⁸ The concept is perhaps best illustrated by the words of Mr. Falconer when he notes that in this new world,

Everything is too deeply touched with sordid vulgarity. There can be no intellectual power resident in a wood, where the only inscription is not "Genio loci," but "Trespassers will be prosecuted;" no Naiad in a stream that turns a cottonmill; no Oread in a mountain dell, where a railway train deposits a cargo of Vandals; no Nereids or Oceantides along the seashore, where

³⁷ P. 462.

³⁸ "Introduction to Gryll Grange," Garnett, ed., p. 769.

a coast-guard is watching for smugglers. No; the intellectual life of the material world is dead. Imagination cannot replace it. (p. 817-818)

The difference, then, between Gryll Grange and the earlier novels lies chiefly in the focus of the subject matter.

In Gryll Grange Peacock asserts that the years of speculation and reform have yielded no positive or practical results. The Reverend Doctor Opimian, for example, remarks that the progress of science has only contributed to universal deterioration:

If you look at the results which science has brought in its train, you will find them to consist almost wholly in elements of mischief. See how much belongs to the word Explosion alone, of which the ancients knew nothing. Explosions of powder-mills and powder-magazines; of coal-gas in mines and in houses; of high-pressure engines in ships and boats and factories. See the complications and refinements of modes of destruction, in revolvers and rifles and shells and rockets and cannon. See collisions and wrecks and every mode of disaster by land and by sea, resulting chiefly from the insanity for speed, in those who for the most part have nothing to do at the end of the race, which they run as if they were so many Mercuries speeding with messages from Jupiter. (p. 877)

Indeed we might find the deteriorationalist of any other Peacock novel mouthing a similar speech, but in Gryll Grange such speeches assume a more serious tone.

Lord Brougham's "Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge" appears in Gryll Grange as the "Knowledge-is-Power Club," and is subjected to the most vehement attack which we have seen thus far. Mr. MacBorrowdale keeps in his possession "a very large, and consequently very demonstrative, specimen of dialectical granite" (p. 872-873) which was thrown through one of his father's windows by members of the "Knowledge-is-Power Club." MacBorrowdale notes that his father preserved the stone carefully,

and mounted it on a pedestal, inscribed with THE POWER OF PUBLIC OPINION. . . . I look on it with veneration as my principle tutor, for it had certainly a large share in the elements of my education. If, which does not seem likely, another reform lunacy should arise in my time, I shall take care to close my shutters against THE POWER OF PUBLIC OPINION. (p. 873)

We are reminded of the riotous action which "The March of Intellect" provokes in Crotchet Castle.

In their attempts to re-create an Aristophanic comedy, the Gryll Grange characters project Peacock's final parody of a world created by impractical speculators and reformers. Gryllus, the central character in the comedy, is brought from Circe's island to view the improved world of the nineteenth century. In the comedy, the narrator tells us that "Reformers, scientific, moral, educational, political, passed in succession, each answering a question of Gryllus. Gryllus observed, that so far from everything being better than it had been, it seemed that everything was wrong and wanted mending" (p. 920). Thus, we see Peacock finally adopt an attitude not much unlike that of his deteriorationists.

In the final analysis, critical focus upon the novels can only come when we recognize the connection between the various literary, scientific, social, political, and economic ideas which recur in Peacock's fiction. Headlong Hall begins with the literary and sociological discussions of Foster and Escot. Melincourt blends these discussions with pre-Darwinian speculative theories and Godwin's theory of economics. Also in Melincourt is Peacock's first satiric parody of the theories of Coleridge and Malthus. Deteriorationist Toobad, perfectibilian Scythrop, and transcendentalists Flosky and Cypress continue all of these speculative discussions through Nightmare Abbey.

The reform movements of Malthus and Brougham become fused in the two romance novels, and in Crotchet Castle. And finally in Gryll Grange, deteriorationist Opimian leads the last attack against all of the speculators, reformers, statu-quo-ites, and faddists, along with the world which they have created.

Taken collectively, the novels form a series of satirical skirmishes between theories in an "age of talkers." Followers of Coleridge, Darwin, Malthus, Brougham, and Godwin are looked upon with the wry smile of an interested observer who is at once arch-critic of things-as-they-are, and arch-critic of reforms-as-they-are-proposed."³⁹ Peacock's call is for practicality, common-sense, and in this respect he parallels later writers of the age. As Draper remarks, "he might have written a philosophy of clothes, had his temperament been such; instead he has left us a series of argumentative house-parties for which he is not without honor."⁴⁰ For Peacock, order in nineteenth-century society is ultimately lost in a tumult of voices. In his own words,

Perfectibilians, deteriorationists, statu-quo-ites, phrenologists, transcendentalists, political economists, theorists in all sciences, projectors in all arts, morbid visionaries, romantic enthusiasts, lovers of the picturesque, and lovers of good dinners, march, and will march for ever pari passu with the march of mechanics, which some facetiously call the march of intellect.⁴¹

Indeed, these impractical theorists march through all of the Peacock novels.

³⁹ Draper, p. 457.

⁴⁰ P. 463.

⁴¹ Headlong Hall, Nightmare Abbey, Crotchet Castle, (London: Richard Bentley, 1837), p. 2-3.

AN ANNOTATED ENUMERATIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS BY
AND ABOUT THOMAS LOVE PEACOCK FROM 1959 TO 1972

The following bibliography is not essential to understanding footnotes to the text of this study since each footnote gives full reference to the specific works cited in the body of the paper. Instead, the bibliography serves as a guide to more recent additions to primary and secondary materials. Using Bill Read's "The Critical Reputation of Thomas Love Peacock With an Enumerative Bibliography of Works By and About Peacock From February, 1800 to June, 1958" as its base, the bibliography begins with 1959, and is arranged as follows:

Part I: A bibliography of bibliographies (1959-1972)

Part II: A bibliography of primary works (1959-1972)

Part III: A bibliography of secondary works (1959-1972)

Part IV: An addition to Bill Read's bibliography (1950-1958)

Part I

Bibliographies

1959

- B 1 Keats-Shelley Journal: Annual Bibliography. Vols. 9-19, Ed. Robert G. Kirkpatrick and Edwin Graves Wilson. New York: Keats-Shelley Association of America, Inc., 1959-1970. This bibliography of Keats, Shelley, Byron, Hunt and their circles includes a very thorough bibliography of works by and about Peacock since 1950.
- B 2 Read, Bill. "The Critical Reputation of Thomas Love Peacock With an Annotated Enumerative Bibliography of Works By and About Peacock from February, 1800 to June, 1958." (Doctoral Dissertation: Boston University, 1959), DA, 20 (October, 1959), 1355-1356. Currently the only complete bibliography of Peacock materials, Read's study is a good starting place for the Peacock scholar.

1963

- B 3 Read, Bill. "Thomas Love Peacock: An Enumerative Bibliography." Bulletin of Bibliography, 24 (September-December, 1963), 32-34, is the first of a series of three reprints of Item B 2.

1964

- B 4 Read, Bill. "Thomas Love Peacock: An Enumerative Bibliography." Bulletin of Bibliography, 24 (January-April, 1964), 70-72; (May-August, 1964), 88-91.

1967

- B 5 Ward, William S. "Contemporary Reviews of Thomas Love Peacock: A Supplementary List For the Years 1805-1820." Bonner Beitrage, 25 (1967), 35.

1969

- B 6 Mills, Howard. Peacock: His Circle and His Age. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969, pp. 241-254, contains a selected bibliography which adds some new selections to Read.

Part II

Primary Works

1959

- P 1 A Book of Happiness. Comp. Gilbert Harding. London: Michael Joseph, 1959,
contains selections from the Peacock novels.
- P 2 The Gardener's World. Ed. Joseph Wood Krutch. New York: Putnam's, 1959, pp. 279-280,
contains a selection from Headlong Hall.

1960

- P 3 Letters of English Authors from the Collection of Robert H. Taylor: A Catalogue of an Exhibition in the Princeton University Library, May 13 to September 30, 1960. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960,
includes excerpts from Peacock's letters; also printed with an introduction by William S. Dix, Princeton University Library Chronicle, 21 (Summer, 1960), pp. 200-236.
- P 4 Parodies: An Anthology from Chaucer to Beerbohm--And After. Ed. Dwight Macdonald. New York: Random House, 1960.
Peacock is included among the parodists.
- P 5 A Partridge in a Pear Tree: A Celebration for Christmas. Comp. Neville Braybrooke. Westminster, Maryland: Newman, 1960, pp. 47-48,
contains poems by Peacock.

1961

- P 6 A Book of Science Verse: The Poetic Relations of Science and Technology. Ed. W. Eastwood. London: Macmillan, 1961,
includes one poem by Peacock.
- P 7 English Romantic Poetry: An Anthology. Ed. Harold Bloom. Garden City: Doubleday, 1961, pp. 269-272,
includes poems by Peacock.
- P 8 Everybody Ought to Know. Comp. Ogden Nash. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1961,
includes one selection from Peacock.

- P 9 Famous Last Words. Ed. Barnaby Conrad. Garden City: Doubleday, 1961.
- P 10 Headlong Hall; Nightmare Abbey. London: F. M. Dent & Sons, New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1961.
P. M. Yarker wrote an introduction for this edition, number 327 of the Everyman's Library Series.
- P 11 Green, David Bonnell. "Two Letters of Thomas Love Peacock." Philological Quarterly, 40 (October, 1961), 593-596, contains one letter to his daughter, January 15, 1857, and one to Henry Cole, March 16, 1860.
- P 12 The Wind and the Rain: An Anthology of Poems for Young People. Ed. John Hollander and Harold Bloom. Garden City: Doubleday, 1961, includes three poems by Peacock.

1962

- P 13 Biography As An Art: Selected Criticism, 1560-1960. Ed. James L. Clifford. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962, p. 94, includes a passage from Peacock's Memoirs of Shelley.
- P 14 A Junior Anthology of English Verse, Part III. Jupiter Records, JVR 00 B5, 10 in LP, contains poems by Peacock. Reviewed by Margaret Willy in English, 14 (Summer, 1962), 61-62.
- P 15 Pegasus: An Anthology of Verse. Comp. Nora Grisenthwaite. Huddersfield: Schofield and Sims, 1962.
- P 16 Viewpoint: An Anthology of Poetry. Ed. Robert Skelton. London: Hutchinson, 1962, pp. 82-83, includes one poem by Peacock.
- P 17 The Viking Book of Aphorisms: A Personal Selection. Ed. W. H. Auden and Louis Kronenberger. New York: Viking Press, 1962.

1963

- P 18 A Book of Marriage. Ed. Ivor Brown. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1963, includes selections from Peacock's novels.
- P 19 The Complete Novels of Thomas Love Peacock. 2 Vols. Ed. David Garnett. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1963.
This excellently annotated edition of the novels is at present the best available. First published, 1948.

- P 20 English Literary Criticism: Romantic and Victorian. Ed. Daniel G. Hoffman and Samuel Hynes. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1963.

1964

- P 21 Ambrosia and Small Beer: A Record of a Correspondence Between Edward Marsh and Christopher Hassall. Arranger, Christopher Hassall. London: Longmans, 1964.
- P 22 Crotchet Castle. London: Folio Society, 1964,
contains an introduction by Kenneth Hopkins and wood engravings by Peter Reddick.
- P 23 Nightmare Abbey. New York: Norton, 1964.
- P 24 Nightmare Abbey and Crotchet Castle. New York: Capricorn, 1964,
includes an introduction by J. B. Priestly.
- P 25 The Oxford Book of Nineteenth-Century English Verse. Ed. John Haywood. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- P 26 Romantic Perspectives: The Work of Crabbe, Blake, Wordsworth and Coleridge as Seen by Their Contemporaries and by Themselves. London: Harrap, New York: Barnes and Noble, 1964.
- P 27 Selected Prose and Poetry of the Romantic Period. Ed. George R. Creeger and Joseph W. Reed, Jr. New York: Holt, 1964.

1966

- P 28 Nightmare Abbey. Ed. A. R. Tomkins. London: Blackie, 1966.
Tomkins includes an introduction and notes.
- P 29 19th Century British Minor Poets. Ed. W. H. Auden. New York: Delacorte, 1966.
- P 30 A Peacock Selection. Ed. H. L. B. Moody. London: Macmillan, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966.
Moody supplies an introduction and notes. English Classics, New Series.

1967

- P 31 English Romantic Writers. Ed. David Perkins. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1967,
includes Peacock's essay "The Four Ages of Poetry."

- P 32 Nightmare Abbey; Crotchet Castle. Ed. Raymond Wright. Hammonds-
worth: Penguin, 1969.
Wright supplies an introduction. Penguin English Library
Series.

1970

- P 33 Memoirs of Shelley and Other Essays and Reviews. Ed. Howard Mills.
London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1970.
A very good collection of selected non-fiction prose by
Peacock.

1972

- P 34 The New Oxford Book of English Verse 1250-1950. Ed. Helen
Gardner. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972,
pp. 560-563,
contains three of Peacock's poems.

Part III

Secondary Works

1960

- S 1 Peake, Charles. "Cords of Identity; An Intellectual Satire." Literary Half-Yearly, 1 (July, 1960), 49-58.
- S 2 Stevenson, Lionel. The English Novel: A Panorama. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1960.
Stevenson contends that the Peacock novels may best be described as "personal essays disguised as fiction."

1961

- S 3 Barber, R. W. Arthur of Albion: An Introduction to the Arthurian Literature and Legends of England. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1961,
discusses Peacock's use of Arthurian materials.
- S 4 Izzo, Carlo. Storia della Letteratura Inglese. 2 Vols. Milan: Nuova A Cademia Editrice, 1961-1963.
Volume 2 contains a section on Peacock.

1962

- S 5 Davies, Hugh Sykes. The Poets and Their Critics. Vol II: Blake to Browning. London: Hutchinson, 1962.
- S 6 Highet, Gilbert. The Anatomy of Satire. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- S 7 Kuntz, Joseph M. Poetry Explications: A Checklist of Interpretation since 1925 of British and American Poems, Past and Present. Denver: Alan Swallow, 1962,
includes discussion of several Peacock poems.
- S 8 Owen, A. L. The Famous Druids: A Survey of Three Centuries of English Literature on the Druids. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962,
claims Peacock defended the Druids.
- S 9 Tillyard, E. M. W. "Thomas Love Peacock." Essays Literary and Educational. London: Chatto and Windus, 1962, pp. 114-129.

1963

- S 10 Armour, Nicholas. Review of David Garnett's Edition. Time and Tide, 44 (July 25-31, 1963), 24.
See Item P 19.
- S 11 Beyer, Werner W. The Enchanted Forest. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1963.
Appendix 7 discusses Peacock's "Rhododaphne."
- S 12 Freeman, John. Literature and Locality: The Literary Topography of Britain and Ireland. London: Cassell, 1963,
discusses places associated with the Peacock novels.
- S 13 Green, Roger Lancelyn. Authors and Places: A Literary Pilgrimage. London: Batsford, 1963.
- S 14 Jack, Ian. English Literature 1815-1832. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963, pp. 213-224,
devotes an entire chapter to the Peacock novels.
- S 15 King-Hele, Desmond. Erasmus Darwin. London: Macmillan, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963,
includes discussion of Melincourt.
- S 16 Manning, Olivia. Review of David Garnett's edition. Spectator, (September 6, 1963), 293.
See Item P 19.
- S 17 Merriman, James Douglas. "The Flower of Kings: A Study of the Arthurian Legend in England Between 1485 and 1835."
(Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University), London: Routledge, 1963.
- S 18 Mill, John Stuart. The Earlier Letters of John Stuart Mill, 1812-1848. Ed. Francis E. Mineka. 2 Vols. Toronto: Toronto University Press, London: Routledge, 1963.
- S 19 Stewart, J. I. M. Thomas Love Peacock. London: Longmanns, New York: Green, 1963.

1964

- S 20 Barnett, George L. Charles Lamb: The Evolution of Elia. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.
Number 53 of the Indiana University Humanities Series,
contains references to Peacock.
- S 21 Bibliotheca Bibliographici: A Catalog of the Library formed by Geoffrey Keynes. London: Trianon Press, 1964.

- S 22 Bilder, John Raban. "The Minor Tradition in English Prose Fiction: The Novel of Ideas." (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1964), DA, 25 (December, 1964), 3565.
- S 23 Brophy, Brigid. Mozart the Dramatist: A New View of Mozart, His Operas and His Age. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1964,
includes discussion of Peacock.
- S 24 Edwards, Oliver. "Shelley's Peacock." The Times. London, July 30, 1964, 13.
- S 25 Mills, Howard. "Subject of Curious Speculation." Delta, 33 (Summer, 1964), 16-20.
- S 26 Saunders, J. W. The Profession of English Letters. London: Routledge, Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1964.
- S 27 Warner, Oliver. English Literature: A Portrait Gallery. London: Chatto, 1964.

1965

- S 28 Altick, Richard D. Lives and Letters: A History of Literary Biography in England and America. New York: Knopf, 1965,
includes comments on Memoirs of Shelley.
- S 29 Baker, Joseph E. Shelley's Platonic Answer to a Platonic Attack on Poetry. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1965.
Baker supplies much information on Peacock's essay, "The Four Ages of Poetry."
- S 30 Brand, C. P. Torquato Tasso: A Study of the Poet and His Contribution to English Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- S 31 Chandler, Alice. "Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns: Peacock and the Medieval Revival." Bucknell Review, 13, 3 (1965), 39-50.
- S 32 Dyson, A. E. The Crazy Fabric: Studies in Irony. London: Macmillan, 1965.
- S 33 Fain, John T. "Peacock on the Spirit of the Age." All These to Teach: Essays in Honor of C. A. Robertson. Ed. Robert A. Bryan. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1965.
- S 34 Saintsbury, George. A History of English Prose Rhythm. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965,
includes discussion of Peacock, first printed in 1912.

1966

- S 35 Broun, Heywood Hale. "Books: Thomas Love Peacock, A Friend of Shelley's and Mine." Diplomat and the Arts, (May, 1966), 52, 56-57, 62-63.
- S 36 Kennedy, William F. "Peacock's Economists: Some Mistaken Identities." Nineteenth-Century Fiction, 21 (1965), 185-191.
- S 37 King, Francis. "Piquance of Peacock." Sunday Telegraph. London, January 23, 1966.

1967

- S 38 Dawson, Carl. "The Literary Career of Thomas Love Peacock." (Doctoral Dissertation, Berkeley, 1967), DA, (November, 1967), 2867.
- S 39 Kaufman, Violet W. "Thomas Love Peacock." Notes and Queries. 14 (1967), 384.
- S 40 Madden, J. L. "Gladstone's Reading of Thomas Love Peacock." Notes and Queries. 14 (1967), 384.
- S 41 Madden, L. Thomas Love Peacock. London: Evans Brothers, 1967.
- S 42 Millet, Charles F. "The Bee (1790-1794): A Tour of Crotchet Castle." South Atlantic Quarterly, 66 (1967), 70-86.
- S 43 Priestley, J. B. Thomas Love Peacock. London: Macmillan, 1967. Introduction by J. I. M. Stewart.
- S 44 Williams, J. Peter. "Aesthetic Ambivalence in the Work of Thomas Love Peacock." (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan), DA, 28 (1967), 206-207.

1968

- S 45 Coles, William E. "Novelist of Style: A Critical Reading of the Novels of Thomas Love Peacock." (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1968), DA, 28 (1968), 5012.
- S 46 Dawson, Carl. Thomas Love Peacock. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1968.
- S 47 Gallon, David. "Thomas Love Peacock and Wales: Some Suggestions." The Anglo-Welsh Review, 39 (1968), 125-134.
- S 48 Madden, J. L. "Peacock, Tennyson and Cleopatra." Notes and Queries, 15 (1968), 416-417.

- S 49 Straus, P. "Escape From Nightmare Abbey?" Theoria. 30 (1968), 65-68.
- S 50 Van Doren, Carl. The Life of Thomas Love Peacock. New York: Russell and Russell, 1968.
A reprint of the 1911 edition.

1969

- S 51 Gallon, D. N. "T. L. Peacock's Later Years: The Evidence of Unpublished Letters." Review of English Studies, 20 (1969), 315-319.
- S 52 Howells, Carol Ann. "Biographia Literaria and Nightmare Abbey." Notes and Queries, 16 (1969), 50-51.
- S 53 Mills, Howard. Peacock: His Circle and His Age. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
Concerned mainly with the friendship of Peacock and Shelley.
Also contains a bibliography, see Item B 6.
- S 54 Pinkus, Philip. "The Satiric Novels of Thomas Love Peacock." Kansas Quarterly, 1 (Summer, 1969), 63-74.

1970

- S 55 Dawson, Carl. His Fine Wit: A Study of Thomas Love Peacock. Berkeley: University of California Press, London: Routledge, 1970.
An excellent comprehensive study of Peacock's poetry and prose.
- S 56 Colmer, John. "Godwin's Mandeville and Peacock's Nightmare Abbey." Review of English Studies, 21 (1970), 331-336.
- S 57 Fain, John T. "Peacock's Essay on Steam Navigation." South Atlantic Bulletin, 35, 3 (1970), 11-15.
- S 58 Hawkins, Peter A. "Correspondence." Review of English Studies, 21 (1970), 338.
A reply to D. N. Gallon. See Item S 51.
- S 59 Hewitt, Douglas. "Entertaining Ideas: A Critique of Crotchet Castle." Essays in Criticism, 20 (1970), 200-212.

Part IV

Additions to Read's Bibliography (1950-1958)

Primary Works--Chronological List

1951

- A 1 "Musical Memories," Pleasures of Music: A Reader's Choice of Great Writing About Music and Musicians. Ed. Jacques Barzun. New York: Viking Press, 1951, pp. 486-491, includes selections from Peacock's songs.

1952

- A 2 "Manuscripts Acquired During the Years 1941-1950." British Museum Quarterly, 25 (1952), 18-35, contains correspondence of Peacock and Hobhouse.

1953

- A 3 Englische Gusteswelt: von Bacon bis Eliot. Darmstadt: Halle, 1953, pp. 12-22, contains translations of Shelley and Peacock correspondence, 1818.
- A 4 McCleary, G. T. The Malthusian Population Theory. London: Faber, 1953, includes comments of Peacock and selections from the novels.

1955

- A 5 Maid Marian and Crotchet Castle. New York: Macmillan, 1955. Pocket Library Series.

1956

- A 6 Pleasure Garden: An Anthology of Prose and Verse. Comp. Brian Hill. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1956.
- A 7 Prose of the Romantic Period 1780-1830. Ed. Raymond Wright. Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1956.

1957

- A 8 Story Poems New and Old. Ed. William Cole. Cleveland: World, 1957, pp. 154-156,
includes two poems by Peacock.
- A 9 The Golden Treasury of Poetry. Comp. Louis Untermeyer. New York: Golden Press, 1957.
- A 10 Robin Hud: Marijana devojka. Trans. Luka Semenovic. Sarajevo: Džepna Knjiga, 1957.
Maid Marian translated into Yugoslav.

1958

- A 11 A abadía do pessadelo. Trans. Jorge de Sena. Lisbon: Portugalia Editions, 1958.
- A 12 L'abbazia dell 'incubo; Castel Rampino. Trans. Bona della Volpe. Milan: Garzanti, 1958.
"Classici inglesi" Series.
- A 13 A Book of England. Ed. Ivor Brown. London: Collins, 1958,
includes two selections from Peacock.

Secondary Works--Chronological List

1953

- A 14 Chapman, R. W. "Thomas Love Peacock." Johnsonian and Other Essays and Reviews. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953, pp. 96-103.
- A 15 Freeman, John. "Norman Douglas and Peacock." Times Literary Supplement, (September 11, 1953), 581.
- A 16 Mason, Ronald. "Notes for an Estimate of Peacock." The Golden Horizon. Ed. Cyril Connolly. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1953, pp. 516-528.
- A 17 Macauley, Rose. Pleasure of Ruins. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1953.
- A 18 Woolf, Virginia. A Writer's Diary. Ed. Leonard Woolf. London: Hogarth, 1953.

1954

- A 19 Manganelli, Giorgio. "T. L. Peacock." Paragone, (August 5, 1954), 28-36.
- A 20 Robinson, Eric. "Thomas Love Peacock: Critic of Scientific Progress." Annals of Science, 10 (March 1954), 69-71, is largely documentation for Gryll Grange.

1956

- A 21 Priestley, J. B. All About Ourselves and Other Essays. London: Heinemann, 1956, pp. 180-190.
- A 22 Stepanikova, A. "Thomas Love Peacock: Some Aspects of his Human and Literary Character." (Doctoral Dissertation, Brno, 1956).

1957

- A 23 Edwards, Oliver. "Peacock as Poet." The Times, London, July 4, 1957, 13.
- A 24 Edwards, Oliver. Talking of Books. London: Heinemann, 1957, pp. 161-164.

- A 25 Wimsatt, William K., Jr. and Cleanth Brooks. "Peacock vs. Shelley: Rhapsodic Didacticism." Literary Criticism: A Short History. New York: Knopf, 1957.

1958

- A 26 Masterplots Cyclopedia of World Authors. 2 Vols. Ed. Frank N. Magill. New York: Salem, 1958, pp. 822-824, has short biography and bibliography for Peacock.
- A 27 Read, Bill. "Author's Query." New York Times, (July 27, 1958), 17, requests material relating to the literary reputation of Peacock.
- A 28 Stepanik, Karel. "A Source of Keat's 'La Belle Dame sans Merci.'" Philological Progenia, 1 (1958), 104-115, suggests that Keats may have been influenced by Peacock's "Rhododaphne."

THE NOVELS OF THOMAS LOVE PEACOCK AS GUIDEBOOKS TO A STUDY
OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY SPECULATIVE IDEAS: A CRITICAL
FOCUS WITH AN ANNOTATED, ENUMERATIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY
OF WORKS BY AND ABOUT PEACOCK FROM 1959 TO 1972

by

GERALD THOMAS MCCLAUGHLIN

B.A., Mansfield State College, 1971

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1973

The satiric novels of Thomas Love Peacock (1785-1866) have received scant critical attention. The purpose of this study is to gather into some coherent patterns what has been written about the seven Peacock novels and to suggest a more focused approach for further critical investigation. We can discover an order in the Peacock criticism by noticing that there are three distinctive patterns of critical approach: (1) attempts to identify and evaluate Peacock's supposed caricatures of nineteenth-century individuals; (2) efforts to place Peacock neatly within certain schools of writers; that is, to identify him with Ben Jonson, Samuel Johnson, Voltaire, or the eighteenth-century satirists; (3) attempts to discover the overall intent of Peacock's "novel of ideas."

In order to gain a more focused critical approach to the Peacock fiction, it is necessary for us to recognize that the major organizing principle within and between the novels is a dialectical progression of some particular ideas. Peacock's satiric darts are aimed in one general direction, toward the center of nineteenth-century speculative thinking. Each of Peacock's characters advocates a prevailing philosophy of the day, and they are so involved in debate that they are never able to put their theories actively into practice.

In the final analysis, critical focus upon the novels can only come when we recognize the connection between the various literary, scientific, social, political, and economic ideas which recur in Peacock's fiction. Headlong Hall begins with the literary and sociological discussions of Foster and Escot. Melincourt blends these discussions with pre-Darwinian speculative theories and Godwin's theory

of economics. Also in Melincourt is Peacock's first satiric parody of the theories of Coleridge and Malthus. Deteriorationalist Toobad, perfectibilian Scythrop, and transcendentalists Flosky and Cypress continue all of these speculative discussions through Nightmare Abbey. The reform movements of Malthus and Brougham become fused in Maid Marian, The Misfortunes and in Crotchet Castle. And finally in Gryll Grange, deteriorationalist Opimian leads the last attack against all of the speculators, reformers, statu-quo-ites, and faddists, along with the world which they have created. For Peacock, order in nineteenth-century society is ultimately lost in a tumult of voices.

The bibliography included in this study serves as a guide to more recent additions to primary and secondary materials. Using Bill Read's "The Critical Reputation of Thomas Love Peacock With an Enumerative Bibliography of Works By and About Peacock From February 1800 to June, 1958" as its base, the bibliography is arranged to include both materials from 1959 to 1972 and additions to Read's bibliography (1950-1958).