University of New Mexico
UNM Digital Repository

English Language and Literature ETDs | Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-24-1949

Thomas Love Peacock and the Literary Criticism in His Novels with Extensive Bibliographies of Peacock

David DeCamp

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/engl_etds

Part of the English Language and Literature Commons

Recommended Citation
DeCamp, David. "Thomas Love Peacock and the Literary Criticism in His Novels with Extensive Bibliographies of Peacock." (1949).
https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/engl_etds/120

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Language and Literature ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO-GENERAL LIBRARY
A14425 893633

378.789
Un 3 Ode
1949
cop. 2

DE CAMP

PEACOCK AND THE LITERARY CRITICISM IN HIS NOVELS

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

Call No.
378.789
Un30de
1949
cop. 2

Accession
Number
141107

THOMAS LOVE PEACOCK
AND THE LITERARY CRITICISM IN HIS NOVELS
WITH EXTENSIVE BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF PEACOCK

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of English

University of New Mexico

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

David DeCamp

June 1949

THOMAS LOVE PEACOCK

AND THE LITERARY CRITICISM IN HIS NOVELS

WITH EXTENSIVE BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF PEACOCK

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of English

University of New Mexico

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

---

by

David DeCamp

June 1949

This thesis, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the Graduate Committee of the University of New Mexico in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Dean V. Scholes

DEAN

May 24 - 1949

DATE

THOMAS LOVE PEACOCK
AND THE LITERARY CRITICISM IN HIS NOVELS
WITH EXTENSIVE BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF PEACOCK

by

David DeCamp

Thesis committee

C. V. Wicker.

CHAIRMAN

George Arms

D. A. McKenzie

378.789
Un30de
1949
cop.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	13
III.	PEACOCK AS A CREATIVE ARTIST	39
IV.	PEACOCK AS A LITERARY CRITIC	65
V.	THE EXTENT OF THE LITERARY CRITICISM IN THE NOVELS	86
VI.	PEACOCK AND THE ROMANTIC MOVEMENT	108
VII.	PEACOCK AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES	124
VIII.	CONCLUSION	149
BIBLIOGRAPHIES		159
A.	Publications of Peacock's Works, 1800-1948	164
B.	Full Length Studies of Peacock	182
C.	Treatment of Peacock in Periodicals, Books, etc.	184
D.	Treatment of Peacock in Literary Histories	196
E.	Books and Articles about the Period, etc.	199
F.	Reviews and Notices of Works and Editions Published during the Author's Life	203

141107

378.789
No.30de
1944
cop.2

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION . . . . . .

II. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH . . . . . .

III. PEACOCK AS A DRAMATIC CRITIC . . . . . .

IV. PEACOCK AS A LITERARY CRITIC . . . . . .

V. THE EXTENT OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HIM

THE NOVELS . . . . . .

VI. PEACOCK AND THE ROMANTIC MOVEMENT . . . . . .

VII. PEACOCK AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES . . . . . .

VIII. CONCLUSION . . . . . .

BIBLIOGRAPHIES . . . . . .

A. Publications of Peacock's Works, 1800-1945 . .

B. Full Length Studies of Peacock . . . . . .

C. Treatment of Peacock in Particular

Books, etc. . . . . .

D. Treatment of Peacock in Literary Histories . .

E. Books and Articles about the Period, etc. . .

F. Reviews and Notices of Works and Editions

Published during the Author's Life . . . . .

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study is intended to serve two ends. First, it will supply a much-needed study of the critical ideas in Peacock's novels which will be useful in itself. Peacock was an extraordinary individual: he was acquainted with most of the major literary and political figures for more than half a century; he enjoyed a position of public trust which gave him a role as an empire builder; and he had a flair for expression that makes his keen observations a pleasure to read. In his extensive literary acquaintanceships, Peacock resembles Hazlitt; in his official capacity, he resembles Pepys; in mode of expression, he resembles only himself. Peacock's novels have been placed on many college reading lists, largely for the picture which they give of the literary background of the nineteenth century. Yet no competant study has yet been made of that picture which students are supposed to glean from the novels.

Second, this study aims to lay a foundation for a more extensive investigation of Peacock's critical writings, a study which I intend to make at some future date. Chapter IV contains only a brief survey of what eventually will be a full length study. Peacock was closely associated with a number of literary periodicals. Considering the numerous and extensive studies made of Jeffrey, Croker, Lockhart, and

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

others, such an investigation of Peacock's work is certainly justified. This study, therefore, will also serve as general background for future work.

From the above it follows that this study will deal mainly with Peacock's general ideas. In Chapter II, his extensive personal associations with his contemporaries will be discussed, a factor essential essential to proper interpretation of his ideas. In Chapter III, Peacock's role as a creative artist will be discussed and the point emphasized that Peacock was primarily an artist, not a social critic or reformer. Chapter IV will be a brief survey of Peacock's critical prose. Chapter V will discuss the nature of the criticism in Peacock's novels, will more thoroughly discuss the procedure used in this study, and will point out the dangers of carelessly extracting Peacock's ideas from the novels. Chapter VI will investigate Peacock's place in the literary movements of his day, the romantic period. Chapter VII will summarize Peacock's opinions of his contemporaries. The final chapter will draw some general conclusions regarding the criticism in Peacock's novels.

Such a general study will throw more light on the complex of Peacock's total contribution than would a more intensive probing of specific items. No amount of study only of Peacock's specific references to Wordsworth, for example, will in itself reveal his attitude toward that

poet. Once Peacock's general ideas and methods are understood, however, such specific references will become obvious. It is in failing to understand Peacock as a complex whole that previous studies have broken down. I have therefore devoted considerable, perhaps even undue, attention to biography and similar background factors.

Peacock has always had "fit audience though few." Consequently Peacock studies are scattered and are strongly impregnated with the personalities of their authors. In general, Peacock has appealed most to such genial essayists as George Saintsbury, Richard Garnett, Robert Buchanan, and J. B. Priestly, the very sort of men whose own personalities are most projected into their evaluations. Some of these studies, however, are excellent, and a brief survey of the major investigations of Peacock will now be given.

The state of Peacock biography is excellent; of criticism, fair; of evaluation of Peacock's ideas, very poor.[1] The first biography was written shortly after Peacock's death by his granddaughter Edith Nicolls and was included in the 1875 edition of Peacock's Works,[2] after having been privately printed in 1873. The first full-length biography,

---

1 For the present state of Peacock bibliography, see the bibliographical note appended to this thesis.

2 I have not seen this biographical sketch, but from excerpts quoted by subsequent biographers, I find it very unreliable.

that by Carl Van Doren,[3] appeared in 1911. This is an excellent piece of work, exhibiting sound scholarship and great ability and experience in interpretation. Although superseded in places by more recent discoveries, it is by no means invalidated and remains an absolutely essential work. J. B. Priestly's biography[4] in the English Men of Letters Series is valuable as a critical study, rather than as a biography. Priestly includes very little factual material which is not borrowed from Van Doren. Priestly's most important contribution is his recognition of Peacock as an extremely complex individual. He is at his best when disproving earlier and oversimplified interpretations of Peacock.

By far the finest biography is that by Brett-Smith.[5] He combined sound and extensive scholarship with sympathetic appreciation of Peacock as a complex individual and produced a biography which is unsurpassed. Many entire episodes in Peacock's life, such as the Marianne affair, first came to light in his investigations, and all facts were reinterpreted and revaluated. Van Doren's biography is

---

3 Carl Van Doren, The Life of Thomas Love Peacock.

4 J. B. Priestly, Thomas Love Peacock.

5 H. F. B. Brett-Smith, Biographical Introduction, Halliford Edition, Vol. I.

---

3 Carl Van Doren, The Life of Thomas Love Peacock.

4 J. B. Priestly, Thomas Love Peacock.

5 H. F. B. Brett-Smith, Biographical Introduction, Halliford Edition, Vol. I.

still indispensable, but Brett-Smith's is the only one which approaches a complete picture of Peacock as we now know him.

Unfortunately there is no critical study which can match Brett-Smith's biography. The best study is that by Freeman,[6] but this is too much of a specialized investigation. Freeman is primarily interested in tracing the reflection of Peacock's biography in his works. He is tireless in running down the originals of each scene, each incident, each character. Freeman is extremely thorough in this but attempts little purely literary criticism or evaluation. Work in Progress for 1942 lists a proposed doctoral dissertation at Princeton by Roger Fredland, entitled The Backgrounds of Thomas Love Peacock. This dissertation has never been completed, possibly because its subject had already been so thoroughly covered by Freeman.

The earliest full-length study of Peacock was published in 1904 by A. B. Young.[7] Young's work is extremely unreliable. His biographical section contributed a few new facts but very poor interpretation. The critical sections did little more than identify Peacock's caricatures. Young's most useful research was in tracing the sources of

---

6 A. M. Freeman, Thomas Love Peacock, A Critical Study.

7 A. B. Young, The Life and Novels of Thomas Love Peacock.

Maid Marian and The Misfortunes of Elphin. Most of his work has long been invalidated or superseded.[8]

The bulk of Peacock criticism appeared in periodicals and essays. Two men--Richard Garnett and George Saintsbury--deserve credit for keeping Peacock's name alive through years in which it otherwise might have been forgotten. Garnett edited Peacock's works in 1891 and wrote the article which appears in the Dictionary of National Biography. Saintsbury also edited the novels, in 1895-97, and wrote one major article on Peacock;[9] more important than this, he included a "puff" for Peacock in almost everything he wrote which was even remotely connected with the novel or with the nineteenth century. Perhaps it is a remark of no great critical acuity when Saintsbury says, "I think I have read the novels through on an average once a year ever since their combined appearance."[10] Yet, coming from a man of Saintsbury's stature, such remarks carried great weight in their time, and their importance cannot be ignored.

---

8 There are three other full-length critical studies of Peacock, all of which are very difficult to obtain and which I have not yet seen: A. H. Able, George Meredith and Thomas Love Peacock; a Study in Literary Influence; Jean Jacques Mayoux, Un Épicurien Anglais: Thomas Love Peacock; Benvenuto Cellini, Thomas Love Peacock. The last two items are in French and Italian respectively.

9 Macmillan's Magazine, April, 1886; reprinted in George Saintsbury, Essays in English Literature, p. 234.

10 Essays in English Literature, p. 235.

Saintsbury's criticism of Peacock is, in general, sound. He errs in overemphasizing Peacock's Tory leanings, but is sound in his basic premise that Peacock was an amateur who wrote only for enjoyment.

A number of personal essays have been written on Peacock by such men as Clive Bell, Osbert Burdett, J. C. Squire (Solomon Eagle), Lafcadio Hearn, and Robert Buchanan. Buchanan's essay[11] is exemplary of many of these. Intensely personal and sympathetic as they were, the essayists attempted a picture of Peacock himself and tried to draw a well-rounded sketch of his tastes and habits. Although some of these essays, such as Buchanan's, eventually became so non-objective as to be useless as actual criticism, they recognized the complexity of Peacock's ideas and tried to base their conclusions on an understanding of Peacock as a whole. Subsequent, more formal studies were not so cautious.

Some of the best Peacock criticism of recent years is found in studies of a completely different character. For example the best study of Peacock's early poems that I know of is in Eleanor Sickels' The Gloomy Egoist. C. H. Herford's The Age of Wordsworth contains one of the soundest brief sketches of Peacock ever written. In general, such casual

---

11 Robert Buchanan, "Thomas Love Peacock: A Personal Reminiscence," Littell's Living Age, CXXVI (July 17, 1875), 157.

and incidental discussions have been superior in recent years to most of the specialized studies of Peacock.

Interest in Peacock today has been revived by Ben Ray Redman's publication of The Pleasures of Peacock, a one-volume, condensed version of the novels. Redman's influence has, on thw whole, been good. Although lovers of Peacock are loth to see any Reader's Digest cutting of the novels, Redman has undoubtedly introduced many new readers to Peacock. His introduction is very poor, and it is strange that he completely ignores the Halliford Edition, turning back to the 1875 edition (a singularly poor one) for his texts and giving credit only to one biography, Van Doren's. One of the better consequences of Redman's edition was a review by Edmund Wilson.[12] Wilson criticizes Peacock for lacking significance, but is quick to defend him in matters of form. Departing from the conventional cliché of regarding Peacock's novels as formless, Wilson sees in them a very delicate but important structure and objects on these grounds to Redman's having cut the novels.

With the exception of occasional mention in the biographies and in such general works as G. L. Nesbitt's Benthamite Reviewing, I know of nothing whatever that has

---

12 Edmund Wilson, "The Musical Glasses of Peacock," New Yorker, XXIII (August 23, 1947), 72.

been written about Peacock's critical prose. Only four items even touch upon the subject of this thesis--the ideas in the novels--and these are both off the subject and very unsatisfactory in their conclusions.

The first of these is Priestly's biography, which makes one brief effort to grasp Peacock's ideas but fails through too literal an interpretation. Peacock was a "secret and baffled idealist,"[13] Priestly concludes, whose one idea was to escape from the real world.

> He could not possibly hurl his whole mind in one direction as Shelley could. His sense of humour was for ever warning his pride that he was about to make a fool of himself. He could not accept the world and he could not begin to mend it; he could not help being drawn to the idealists and makers of systems and he could not help discovering how inadequate they were; he could not fall out of love with ideas and yet he could not marry them; thus he was left, a Mahomet's coffin, in mid air. So situated a man must either laugh or be laughed at, so Peacock laughed.[14]

The second item is a pair of articles by J. W. Draper.[15] These are the only published systematic attempts I know of to extract Peacock's ideas from his novels. Draper, like Priestly, fails through too literal interpretation. His first article

---

13 Priestly, p. 105.

14 P. 108.

15 J. W. Draper, "The Social Satires of Thomas Love Peacock," Modern Language Notes, XXXIII (December, 1918), 456; XXXIV (January, 1919), 23.

examines Peacock's criticism of society as it is, and he finds that Peacock is bitterly cynical about the world. The second article deals with Peacock's opinions of reform movements. Here Draper's conclusions are equally nihilistic. The only way he can reconcile Peacock's two stands is to conclude that the fault lay not in society but in human nature itself. Peacock had gone sour on humanity.

An unpublished master's thesis by Kathleen Hammond[16] attempts to extract Peacock's opinions of individual contemporaries. Her work is a mere compilation of references from the novels. Bad scholarship, extremely scanty reading of Peacock, and complete misunderstanding of the purpose and structure of Peacock's novels make her work worthless. She too sees Peacock as a rather cynical social critic, out of sympathy with his generation.

Another unpublished thesis by James Frankel[17] reaches the same conclusion through a different route. Whereas Miss Hammond saw Peacock as completely isolated from his world, Frankel has him deeply involved in it, cursed with the modern temper, and grappling with the problem of evil. Later in life Peacock, according to Frankel, realized that he had failed in his struggle with modern problems and retreated

---

16 Kathleen Hammond, Thomas Love Peacock's Satire of his Literary Contemporaries.

17 James Frankel, A Reevaluation of Thomas Love Peacock.

into epicureanism, disillusioned and cynical.

Here then are the only four studies even remotely relating to the ideas in Peacock's novels, and all four conclude that Peacock was maladjusted, baffled, and cynical, interested only in social criticism or in escape from reality. These are conclusions with which I find it impossible to agree.

To avoid such pitfalls in this study, I intend to proceed without any preconception that Peacock was a reformer or that he looked on his world with disillusionment or with any attitude other than that of a healthy normal man. I do assume that he was contented with his lot. He wrote only for his own amusement and for the the delight of others. He was an amateur and a dilettante. These are assumptions which are all supported directly by factual biographical evidence. They are all fundamental to an understanding of Peacock, yet they have been consistently ignored by critics. It seems strange that a thesis must begin by pointing out such elementary facts, and by correcting the specialists in points which to the casual reader are already obvious. It is this misconception regarding the most fundamental elements of Peacock's character which necessitates the large amount of general and background material in the chapters which follow.

Of course the emphasis in this thesis will be on the ideas expressed in the novels, but these will be correlated

with Peacock's critical writings whenever possible, and at all times they will be related to the man himself. Above all, this thesis will attempt to treat Peacock's work as an organic whole.[18]

---

18 For further review of the literature about Peacock, see the annotated bibliographies appended to this thesis. All volume and page references to works by Peacock in the following chapters are to the Halliford Edition, 1924-34.

CHAPTER II

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

On December 8, 1825, for some reason unknown today, Sarah Love Peacock wrote the following document:

> I hereby certify that my son Thomas Love Peacock was born on the eighteenth day of October in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Seven Hundred and Eighty Five, at a quarter past two in the morning, at Weymouth in Dorsetshire.[1]

This is one of the very few documents extant regarding Peacock's life. He was not a great letter-writer and was not in the habit of preserving his correspondence. His circle of illustrious acquaintances was large, but his personal friends were very few. As might be expected, the records of the India House throw little light on his personal and literary life. Biographical facts, then, are scarce. We must depend largely on the letters of Shelley and other friends and on occasional anecdotes which turn up in the work of his contemporaries. The one biography by a near contemporary, that of his granddaughter Edith Nicolls, withholds facts and attempts to whitewash his character. This chapter will attempt only a very brief survey of the scattered materials but will be annotated sufficiently to direct the reader to the best of biographical treatment, treatment far too extensive for the scope of this paper.

---

1 Quoted by Brett-Smith, p. xii; Van Doren, p. 1; Priestly, p. 2.

Of the novelist's father, Samuel Peacock, nothing is known except that in 1778 he was a glass merchant of Holborn Bridge, London. A number of attempts have been made to prove other biographical facts, including the conjecture that he was of Scottish extraction (Thomas was baptized in the Scotch Kirk, London Wall), but these have all been disproved. Edith Nicolls herself gave rise to some of these fallacies.[2]

Of Peacock's mother we know more. Sarah Love was born, 1754, the second child of a retired sea captain, Thomas Love. The family was an old one, with a strong naval tradition. Young Peacock was brought up by his mother and grandfather. It is from them, not from his father, that he received all his early influences. He was always very close to his mother, who was a genuine intellectual companion to him, and he was heart-broken at her death in 1833. Thomas Love we know partly from his grandson's sketch of him as the salty old sea-dog Captain Hawltaught in Melincourt.[3]

In 1788 Samuel Peacock died, and Sarah Love Peacock, until then living in London, took her three-year-old son

---

2 Brett-Smith, pp. xiii-xv; Van Doren, p. 2; Priestly, pp. 1-2; Richard Garnett, Introduction to Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey, 1908.

3 For the most extensive study of family background, see Brett-Smith, pp. xiv-xx. For a study of early influences, see Priestly, pp. 2-5; also see Van Doren, pp. 3-6.

to her fathers home in Chertsey, about twenty-two miles up the river from London. There they were to stay for about twelve years. Old Thomas Love had a cottage there named Gogmoor Hall, which, as Priestly points out, anticipates some of Peacock's own later fantastic halls and castles. Undoubtedly this semi-rural community deeply impressed him, and there are many echoes of his childhood in his later works. Here he had his only formal schooling, at Englefield Green, where the master, John Harris Wicks, highly praised his precocity. Here he played with young Charles Barwell, who lived in the Abbey House he later immortalized, and met Marianne de St. Croix, whom he later almost married.[4]

By 1800 Peacock was in London with his mother, not as a student at the British Museum, as Edith Nicolls claimed,[5] but as a clerk for the firm of Ludlow, Fraser & Co., merchants of Angel Court, Throgmorton Street. Nothing is known about his employment there. It would not even have been discovered had not his employers certified his entry into a literary contest in 1800. His poem in

---

4 The best account of this period is Peacock's own "Recollections of Childhood: The Abbey House." See also Priestly, pp. 3-6; Brett-Smith, pp. xii-xxiii; Van Doren, pp. 7-9.

5 Edith Nicolls, quoted by Brett-Smith, p. xxvi.

answer to the question "Is History or Biography the more improving Study?" was published in the Monthly Preceptor, and won Peacock the prize in a competition in which Leigh Hunt placed fourth.[6]

Peacock may have done some reading at the British Museum outside of office hours. The earliest record of his receiving a reader's ticket was April 14, 1823, but this may have been only a readmission in accordance with new regulations adopted by the museum the year before. Such reading, however, would not be extensive, and the tremendous classical education for which he is famed was probably acquired in Chertsey or on his tramps through Wales and Scotland, for his letters tell us that he never went anywhere without his books.[7] At any rate, Peacock never attended a university. For this reason he has often been accused, and perhaps with some justification, of a sour-grapes attitude in his attacks on the universities. Likewise many have pooh-poohed his scholarship. Van Doren, for example, points out three "crimes" of bad scholarship:

---

6 Brett-Smith, p. xxv; Van Doren, pp. 13-14; Priestly, pp. 6-7; on the literary contest see also Amy Cruse, The Englishman and his Books in the Early Nineteenth Century, p. 193. Garnett, p. 9, made a discovery, and Freeman, pp. 38-41, elaborated on it, that the number of the Monthly Preceptor announcing the competition contained a colored plate of an ourang-outang dressed in human clothing. Both critics interpret this as the source of Sir Oran in Melincourt.

7 Brett-Smith, pp. xxvii-viii; Van Doren, p. 15.

he habitually neglected Greek accents; his translations were often sloppy and sometimes wrong; and he was guilty of "frequent and particularly inaccurate misquotation."[8] But Peacock had no use for the official scholarship, and it is all the more remarkable that all of his wide reading in five languages was done entirely for his own personal enjoyment. His favorite Greek authors he knew by heart.

The next biographical fact of any certainty is the death of Thomas Love in 1805. Peacock and his mother returned to Chertsey and, with the exception of occasional absences, remained there for several years. In 1806 he took a walking tour to Scotland, and in 1808 he began a brief naval career as secretary to Sir Home Riggs Popham aboard the H. M. S. Venerable. But he was unhappy in the navy and was back at Chertsey within six months.[9]

The Monks of St. Mark, Peacock's first published volume of poetry, appeared in 1804, closely followed by Palmyra and Other Poems, 1805. Soon afterward he was at work on a long topographical poem, The Genius of the Thames. To gather material for this work he walked in the summer of

---

8 Van Doren, p. 16. On the effects of his private education, see also Priestly, pp. 8-12.

9 Brett-Smith, pp. xxxv-xl; Van Doren, pp. 32-33; Priestly, pp. 13-15.

1809 to the source of the Thames. Delighted with the taste of highland scenery on this and on his Scotch tour, he visited Wales, arriving in the winter of 1809-10 and staying some fifteen months. Here he became friendly with Dr. John Gryffydh, the parson at Maentwrog in Merionethshire, and with the parson's daughter Jane, who later became Mrs. Thomas Love Peacock.[10]

Those who are accustomed to think of Peacock as a bookish sort of stay-at-home find it difficult to conceive of him tramping through Scotland and Wales. But there are vivid scenic descriptions as well as Greek quotations in his novels. Actually he was always an enthusiastic outdoorsman. Every contemporary account testifies to this. His cousin Harriet maintained that he was best described in his own novel Gryll Grange:[11]

> He would disappear for weeks at a time, wandering in forests, climbing mountains, and descending into the dingles of mountain streams, with no other companion than a Newfoundland dog; a large black dog, with a white breast, four white paws, and a white tip to his tail.

---

10 For more details of this visit and of the background of the Gryffydh family, see Brett-Smith, pp. xlii-xlvii. I am told that the fullest account is in Herbert Wright, "The Associations of Thomas Love Peacock with Wales," Essays and Studies, XII (1926), 24.

11 Harriet Love, quoted by Brett-Smith, pp. civ-cv.

Even the dog fits the description of one owned by Peacock. Peacock toured Wales twice on foot, and twice he travelled up the Thames; indeed, his favorite recreation always was hiking, either alone or with Shelley or Hogg or, in later life, with Strachey or Hobhouse. Herbert Paul goes so far as to call him "a genuine Wordsworthian in his passionate love of woods, and trees, and cataracts."[12]

Peacock returned from Wales in the spring of 1811. We know very little about the next two years except that he often went to London, and that on one of these visits, sometime late in 1812, he met Shelley. Thomas Hookham, Jr., publisher of all of Peacock's early work and brother of his close friend Edward Hookham, sent to Shelley, in August of that year, a copy of The Genius of the Thames, Palmyra, and Other Poems and a copy of The Philosophy of Melancholy. Shelley enthusiastically called the conclusion of Palmyra "the finest piece of poetry I have ever read."[13] The two were probably introduced by Hookham later that year.[14]

The subject of Peacock's influence on Shelley will

---

12 Herbert Paul, "The Novels of Peacock," The Living Age, CCXXXVIII (1903), 158-69.

13 Quoted by Van Doren, p. 56.

14 Brett-Smith, pp. xlix-li; Van Doren, pp. 54-56; Priestly, pp. 18-19. It is interesting that Edith Nicolls wrongly stated that the meeting took place at Nant Gwilt in Wales. This was not disproved for some time.

be discussed later. Both benefited from the relationship. For reasons known only to themselves--reasons which baffled their contemporaries[15] and continue to baffle us today[16]--they became fast friends. From that time until Shelley's death ten years later they saw a great deal of each other. Indeed it is infortunate that Peacock is mentioned in many literary histories only as the friend of Shelley and the father-in-law of Meredith. But during those ten years Peacock did more than follow in Shelley's train. He wrote the first four of his little novels in this time and collected the material for the fifth and sixth. Certainly the Shelley circle provided him with much of his material. Shelley had gathered around him at Bracknell a group of crotcheteers and cranks which even Peacock, had he invented them himself, could not have improved upon. Wherever Shelley was, there was a Headlong Hall or a Crotchet Castle.

Shelley had been in Wales in the spring of 1813 but left for Ireland after his mysterious adventure with an

---

15 Mrs. J. F. Newton, for example, called Peacock a "cold scholar" with "neither taste nor feeling," and was sure that Shelley would soon tire of him. From a letter quoted by Newman Ivey White, Shelley, Vol. I, pp. 318-19.

16 The best account of the basis of their friendship is in Priestly, pp. 19-21.

assailant. Peacock arrived in Wales on his second trip only a few weeks after Shelley had left. It appears that he stayed only a short time, for by early summer he was at Leicestershire. J. A. Roebuck, at whose home Peacock visited, tells us of the amazement of the farmers at seeing the young man reading "two books at once" (a Greek dramatist and a commentator). [17]

Peacock left Leicestershire at the end of the summer to join the Shelleys at Bracknell. Here he laughed long and loud at the various cranks in the Bracknell set. Often Harriet Shelley laughed with him, much to the disapproval of Shelley.[18] Shelley never seemed to resent this laughter from his friend (in fact, Peacock's mockery never did really irritate him, even when it was at his expense), but, needless to say, Peacock was heartily disliked by the other members of the group. Much to their disgust, Shelley asked him to go along on a tour to Edinburgh which the group was planning. Near the end of 1813, however, he returned to his home in Chertsey. The Shelleys took a house at nearby Windsor and saw him often during the winter

---

17 J. A. Roebuck, quoted by Brett-Smith, pp. liii-lv; Van Doren, pp. 58-59.

18 White, Vol. I, p. 326. For an account of the Bracknell crotcheteers, see Priestly, pp. 23-25; Van Doren, pp. 59-61; Brett-Smith, pp. liv-lv.

and early spring.[19]

Late in the spring of 1814, Shelley, then in London, sent a frantic summons to Peacock. With bloodshot eyes, disordered hair, and in his hand a bottle of laudanum, he told Peacock of his new passion for Mary Godwin.[20] Peacock and Harriet had been good friends since the days at Bracknell, and we may assume that he urged her claims; but by the end of July Shelley had left the country with Mary.[21]

Shelley corresponded with Peacock from abroad and made him agent for Harriet's affairs. When she committed suicide in December, 1816, it was he who advised Shelley to marry Mary. During this and his later sojourn abroad Shelley made good use of Peacock as an agent in England. The common conception is that Peacock was one of the most ruthless spongers off Shelley, but Brett-Smith has

---

19 Van Doren, p. 61; Priestly, p. 25.

20 Van Doren, pp. 63-64; Brett-Smith, p. lviii.

21 This is not the place to discuss the moral issues involved in Shelley's leaving Harriet. More than a century of scandalmongering under the guise of criticism has made the subject most distasteful. Peacock, as is well known, always supported Harriet in the affair, but in so doing, he was by no means disloyal to his friend. He never once criticized Shelley's morals or attacked Mary, even in his most vehement defense of Harriet. But neither would he whitewash Shelley, as many of Shelley's "friends" did, by condemning Harriet. Those who wish a more complete account of the affair should see Newman Ivey White, Shelley; Carl Grabo, The Magic Plant; and Peacock's own "Memoirs of Shelley."

Edward Nicolls.[25]

The Marlow years were happy ones for Peacock. He and Shelley read Greek and Italian together, sailed paper boats together, and made a voyage up the Thames together. On March 10, 1818, they attended a performance of Rossini's Barbiere di Siviglia and then went to Shelley's lodgings for supper. Before the guests had gone, Shelley had fallen asleep, and so they crept out without waking him. Shelley left early the next morning. Peacock never saw him again.[26]

Shelley's letters to Peacock are well known for their descriptive beauty and are reprinted in most editions of Shelley's works. In England Peacock managed his friend's affairs, reading proofs, dealing with publishers, and so on. He had written Headlong Hall in 1815. In the next few years followed Melincourt, Nightmare Abbey, and Maid Marian. Shelley's reaction to these works and to "The Four Ages of Poetry" will be discussed in Chapters IV and VII. When Shelley was drowned in July, 1822, Peacock was named joint executor with Byron. Since Byron was in Greece, the entire load fell

---

25 Vol. I, p. 197; Vol. II, pp. 105, 130, 216.

26 Priestly, p. 40; Brett-Smith, pp. lxii-lxxxi; Van Doren, pp. 64-67; Freeman gives a number of anecdotes concerning the two friends in his Chapter V, "Shelley in England," pp. 149-93, and Chapter VI, "Shelley in Italy," pp. 194-225.

on Peacock, and, from all accounts, he worked tirelessly and unselfishly. Mary Shelley found him a loyal friend: except for his efforts in interceding with Sir Timothy Shelley, she and her infant son would have been penniless.[27]

Perhaps Peacock's last service to the Shelleys was in writing the "Memoirs of Shelley." Hogg's biography had been commissioned by the Shelley family; they, however, disgusted by the first two volumes to appear, withdrew their support and themselves published the Shelley Memorials. Peacock seconded their disapproval by writing the "Memoirs," which originated as a review of Hogg's and other biographies of Shelley.[28]

In 1818 some unknown change in the family fortunes put an end to Peacock's liberty. He was considering, among other things, emigrating to America, but a friend of the family, Peter Auber, told him of a vacancy in the Examiner's Office of the East India Company. Peacock applied for the post and was required to prepare a paper on Indian Affairs and to pass an examination. Both were enthusiastically approved, his papers being marked "Nothing superfluous, and nothing wanting," and on May 19, 1819, he was provisionally appointed assistant to the Examiner, along with three

---

27 Brett-Smith, pp. xcviii-cxxvii; Van Doren, pp. 141-42; Priestly, pp. 45-46; Garnett, pp. 30-31.

28 The "Memoirs" as a work of criticism will be discussed in Chapter IV.

other promising young men: Edward Strachey, James Mill, and J. J. Harcourt. After two years' probation the appointments were confirmed; Peacock's salary was raised to eight hundred pounds; and he and his mother took lodgings in Stamford Street, Blackfriars.[29]

Peacock rose to become Chief-Examiner in 1836. In holding what was then one of the most responsible positions in the Empire, he joined the ranks of Chaucer, Milton, Pepys, and the few others who have so adequately mingled the professions of man of affairs and man of letters. Like Pepys, whom he resembles strikingly, he was both able and conscientious. He was Examiner for exactly twenty years, preceded in office by James Mill and followed by John Stuart Mill. During this time he admirably represented the company on a number of recorded occasions, and it was he who first instituted steam navigation to India. For his role as empire builder, his niche in history would be safe had he never written a word.[30]

Having acquired a secure position, his next thought was for a wife. It is only in recent years that the facts of Peacock's courtship and marriage have been discovered.

---

29 Young, pp. 23-28; Van Doren, pp. 137-38; Brett-Smith, pp. xci-xcv; Priestly, p. 47.

30 Young, pp. 23-28; Van Doren, pp. 211-27; Brett-Smith, pp. clvii-clxiv; Priestly, pp. 73-78.

other promising young men: Edward Strachey, James Mill, and J. J. Harcourt. After two years' probation the appointments were confirmed; Pascoe's salary was raised to eight hundred pounds; and he and his mother took lodgings in Bedford Street, Blackfriars.[29]

Pascoe rose to become Chief-Examiner in 1836. In holding what was then one of the most responsible positions in the Empire, he joined the ranks of Chaucer, Milton, Pepys, and the few others who have so adequately mingled the professions of men of affairs and men of letters. Like Pepys, whom he resembles strikingly, he was both able and conscientious. He was Examiner for exactly twenty years, preceded in office by James Mill and followed by John Stuart Mill. During this time he admirably represented the company on a number of respected occasions, and it was he who first instituted steam navigation to India. For his role as empire builder, his niche in history would be safe had he never written a word.[30]

Having acquired a secure position, his next thought was for a wife. It is only in recent years that the facts of Pascoe's courtship and marriage have been discovered.

---

[29] Young, pp. 25-28; Van Doren, pp. 187-88; Brett-Smith, pp. xxi-xxv; Priestly, p. 47.

[30] Young, pp. 23-28; Van Doren, pp. 211-87; Brett-Smith, pp. civii-cixiv; Priestly, pp. 73-78.

The common conception, originated by Edith Nicolls and perpetuated by Priestly,[31] is that there were only three women in Peacock's life--Fanny Falkner, Jane Gryffydh, and "a certain Marianne," occasionally mentioned in letters. It has been known for some time that he wrote a letter of proposal to Jane Gryffydh eight years after he had last seen her. During that time he had communicated with her in no way, and on his second visit to Wales, in 1813, he had made no effort to see her! Most biographies have put this down to Peacock's matter of fact way of doing things. But all the circumstances have only recently been discovered by Brett-Smith.

His first love affair was at the age of seventeen, when he fell in love with a Lucretia Oldham. He wrote some six or seven verses to her in 1802-3, but never again mentioned her.[32] In the summer of 1807 he met Fanny Falkner, to whom he became engaged. Her relatives broke up the affair, however, and hastily married her to someone else. She died the next year. Peacock never forgot Fanny. Until the day of his death he wore a locket containing some of her hair, and in the last few weeks of his life he dreamed of her.[33]

---

31 Priestly, pp. 48-50.

32 Brett-Smith, pp. xxvii-xxx.

33 Brett-Smith, pp. xxv-viii; Priestly, pp. 14-15; Van Doren, pp. 34-36; Garnett, p. 11.

Van Doren, pp. 34-36; Garnett, p. 11.

Some of the references to Marianne are to Marianne Hunt, but most are to Marianne de St. Croix, a girl whom Peacock first met when he was only a child. These references have long remained a mystery. Young interpreted them as referring to the Marian of Maid Marian, and on this basis dated the conception of that book as 1816.[34] Van Doren, unable to identify Marianne, could only disentangle the mysterious entries from those referring to Mrs. Hunt, and Priestly only echoes Van Doren.[35]

The truth is that Peacock was in love with Marianne de St. Croix for a number of years, as early as 1810. In 1814 he talked with the Shelleys about marrying her. At the beginning of 1815, however, he deserted her and was living with a rich heiress named Charlotte. The heiress turned out to have no money, however, and Peacock suffered the humiliation of being jailed for debt. It was Shelley who bailed him out and perhaps effected a reconciliation with Marianne, for later that year Peacock talked of taking her to Canada. Although she had apparently forgiven him for his illicit affair with the supposed heiress, she turned down his proposal in 1819, when, having acquired his post with the East India Company, he felt ready to marry. Nursing a wounded pride, he wrote to Jane Gryffydh, the

---

34 Young, p. 86. Freeman, p. 216, also conjectures that this is the solution.

35 Van Doren, p. 142; Priestly, p. 48.

daughter of the village parson, whom he had met eight years earlier. He proposed--by mail--and she accepted.[36]

These discoveries are startling only to one who misunderstands Peacock's true character. His cousin Harriet Love said that he could best be described by his own words in Gryll Grange: "a sort of universal lover, making half-declarations to half the young women he knew."[37] But his marriage, however begun, was happy, despite Shelley's

---

36 These discoveries, rivaling in interest that of the murderers of Marlowe, were made not through the discovery of new materials, but through revaluation of old ones. A few references actually give Marianne's full name, but these were never matched with the other passages. The clinching clue is a letter from Peacock to Hookham, June 12, 1810, saying, "Mary-Ann's illness, which I had before heard of from Homerton, almost made me ill from sympathy." Brett-Smith was the first to recall that Marianne de St. Croix was living at Homerton at this time. Once this identity was established, the extant references clearly tell their own story. A great deal of credit must be given to Brett-Smith for some of the most fascinating detective work of all scholarship, yet for not exploiting his discovery to the level of pure scandalmongering. Above all, he emphasizes that Peacock's marriage, however begun, was a happy and successful one. He was a good husband and grew to love Jane sincerely. For those who have a further interest in the "Marianne affair," I append here a list of all the references which I have found bearing on it: Brett-Smith, pp. xxxiii, xlvi-xlvii, lx-lxii, ciii-cix; White, Vol. I, pp. 387-88; Thomas Love Peacock, entries in diary for 1818, and miscellaneous poems written in 1805, both printed in the Halliford Edition; MS Notes by Harriet Love, sent to Edith Nicolls, now in the Bodleian [I have not seen this item]; letters: Shelley to Peacock, April 6, 1819, and May 16, 1820; Mary Shelley to Mrs. Hunt, November 24, 1819; Peacock to Hookham, January 12, 1810; entries in Mary Shelley's Journal: September 30, 1814; October 14, 1814; December 1, 1814, December 6, 1814; January 2, 1815; January 3, 1815; January 4, 1815; January 12, 1815; April 17, 1815.

37 Quoted by Brett-Smith, p. civ.

[illegible]

comment that "The affair is altogether like the denouement of one of your own novels."[38]

Four children were born to the couple: three daughters--Mary Ellen, Margaret Love, and Rosa Jane--and a son, Edward Gryffydh. Peacock took a cottage in Lower Halliford for his family and spent weekends with them there. When improved railway service made commuting possible, he returned to his home every night. After his retirement from the India House in March, 1856, he seldom left Lower Halliford except to visit his friend Hobhouse.[39]

Peacock met Hobhouse through his work on the Westminster Review. It now becomes necessary, therefore, to mention Peacock's connections with the literary circles. Relations with individuals will be discussed more in detail in later chapters. Here only a brief discussion of the general groups or "circles" with which Peacock is identified will be attempted. These have never before been discussed together in this manner, and for sake of convenience I have divided them into five general periods: that of the Hookham set, that of the Shelley circle, that of the Benthamite group, that of dramatic and musical reviewing, and that of the Fraser's group.

---

38 Quoted by Garnett, p. 28.

39 Priestly, p. 80.

His first association with a literary group was with the "Literary Assembly" of Thomas Hookham. Here, for some years, many of the minor literati gathered. Peacock became a good friend of Edward Hookham, Thomas' son, and that family's publishing firm printed nearly all of his early work. It was the Hookhams who introduced Peacock to Shelley and, it is assumed, to a number of other literary figures of the day.[40]

The introduction to Shelley began a new period of literary associations. At Bracknell he met Thomas Jefferson Hogg, with whom he was quite intimate for some time and who visited at Halliford occasionally until his death in 1862. In later years Peacock's relations with Hogg were rather strained, however, because of the unfavorable treatment which Hogg had received in the "Memoirs of Shelley."[41] Also during the Shelley period, he met Godwin, but although Peacock and Godwin saw a great deal of each other, we have very little comment from either of them on the opinions of the other. Nevertheless, for some period of time we can place Peacock definitely in the Shelley-Godwin circle, remaining somewhat detached from the group intellectually while participating actively in it

---

40 Brett-Smith, pp. xxviii-ix; Priestly, p. 13; Van Doren, pp. 33-34.

41 Brett-Smith, p. cxcvi.

socially. Sometime during this period Peacock formed a friendship with Thomas Taylor the Platonist. Shelley never mentions Taylor, but Taylor often visited Peacock[42] and it would be strange if Shelley had not also made his acquaintance, especially since at this time Shelley was diligently studying Greek and would have had many common interests with Taylor. Peacock also had rather superficial associations with Leigh Hunt and Byron. As early as February, 1818, Peacock and Shelley had talked of starting a liberal literary periodical with the aid of Byron and Hunt. Shelley was drowned in 1822, and Peacock was tied up in his work at the India House; so Byron and Hunt went on alone and founded The Liberal.[43]

In the India House, Peacock was thrown into close association with James Mill and later with Mill's son, John Stuart Mill. Through the Mills Peacock met Jeremy Bentham, with whom for years he dined every week.[44] We know that for some years he associated regularly with the Mills, Bentham, Grote, Austin, Fonblanque, and other high priests of Utilitarianism.[45] Indeed, it was he

---

42 Van Doren, pp. 129-30.

43 Walter Graham, English Literary Periodicals, pp. 286-87.

44 Van Doren, p. 147.

45 Priestly, p. 61.

who introduced Henry Cole and J. A. Roebuck to the group.[46] To those who have read the vigorous attacks in Crotchet Castle it seems strange that Leigh Hunt included Peacock among the Utilitarians.[47] But Nesbitt reasons that "Though he considered Utilitarianism ridiculous, he approved thoroughly of many of the Benthamite beliefs, and probably thought the Philosophic Radicals less ridiculous than either the Whigs or the Tories."[48]

Peacock's association with the Utilitarians led him to contribute regularly to their literary organ, the Westminster Review. The nature of these articles will be discussed later. The Westminster, founded in 1824 by Mill and Bentham, was edited by John Bowring and Henry Southern and was the most violently radical of the reviews. Peacock fell into step with the policy of the magazine and provided some of the most savage literary attacks ever printed and thus endeared himself to the hearts of the Benthamites. Peacock is the only man I know of who was an active participant in both the Godwinian and Benthamite circles.

Peacock broke with the Westminster group over Crotchet Castle, which ridiculed many of the Utilitarian

---

46 Van Doren, p. 147.

47 Priestly, p. 61.

48 G. L. Nesbitt, Benthamite Reviewing, p. 27.

ideas. In its review of the novel the Westminster coldly remarked, "men are most inclined to satirize that of which they know the most" and urged him "to apply his most trenchant qualities to the extirpation of the great nuisances which prey upon the well-being of society."[49]

In 1834, along with some other disgruntled Utilitarians, Peacock seceded from the Westminster group and joined the group which was centered around the London Review. He contributed four articles to this periodical and then dropped from the Benthamite circle entirely when the London Review merged with the Westminster in 1836.[50] Until then, however, Peacock was an important member of the Benthamite group--more important than his biographers give him credit for being. Nesbitt humorously comments on the consternation of the group at losing Peacock:

> Their party, to be thoroughly respectable and as good as the Whigs and the Tories, sadly needed a poet. We have remarked on the distinct shortage of literary men with Utilitarian bias and the resulting inability of the Westminster to participate in the usual practice of puffing the novels and verses of men of one's own party. Their best candidate, Peacock, had gone and written Crotchet Castle, and what could one do with a man like that? But Tennyson looked promising.[51]

---

49 Westminster Review, July, 1831; quoted by Brett-Smith, p. cli.

50 Van Doren, p. 204; Graham, pp. 251-54.

51 Nesbitt, pp. 158-59.

In Peacock's fourth period, he functioned as a strictly independent reviewer. Although the Examiner at that time was edited by Albany Fonblanque, and the Globe and Traveller by Walter Coulson, Peacock retained little connection with the Benthamites. His work, which consisted mainly of musical and dramatic criticism, was biased only by his own personal prejudices. His rabidly vicious attacks had ended when he left the Westminster. Besides the two periodicals named, he wrote for Bentley's Miscellany, the Guide, and the Edinburgh Review. Of these, only his contributions to the first are of importance. Begun in January, 1837, under the editorship of a promising young writer named Charles Dickens, its prefatory advertisements proudly announced that it had snared the popular author of Headlong Hall as a contributor to the very first number.[52]

In his old age Peacock had only a few intimate friends, the closest of which was Sir John Cam Hobhouse, Lord Broughton, the official biographer of Byron. He had consulted with Hobhouse in writing his review of Moore's Byron for the Westminster and the association had grown into a close friendship. At Hobhouse's home at Erle Stoke, he met such men as Disraeli, Thackeray, and Macaulay.[53]

---

52 Brett-Smith, p. clv; Van Doren, pp. 207-9.

53 Brett-Smith, pp. cxlii-liii, clxxv-xxx; Van Doren pp. 223-26.

Another friend was J. W. Parker, Jr., who was the "son" of the publishing firm of Parker and Son. Peacock used his influence there to get Meredith's poems published in 1851.[54] To Fraser's Magazine, published by the Parkers, he contributed no less than thirteen major articles, including the whole of Gryll Grange. In contributing his best and most mature work to Fraser's Peacock was in good company. Edited by William Maginn and Hugh Fraser, that periodical published Ruskin's Munera Pulveris, Thackeray's History of Samuel Titmarsh and several other novels, and Carlyle's Sartor Resartus.[55] Among its subscribers and regular readers was the laureate Tennyson.[56]

Peacock's last association with anything resembling a literary circle was with this group centered around Fraser's. He had a number of acquaintances, such as Hunt and Trelawny, and a few friends. Robert Buchanan met the old man and struck up a close but peculiar friendship. His account of Peacock as an old man is charming.[57]

---

54 Van Doren, p. 230.

55 Graham, p. 290. For the most complete account of the history of this periodical, see Miriam Thrall, Rebellious Fraser's.

56 Brett-Smith, p. cci.

57 Robert Buchanan, "Thomas Love Peacock: A Personal Reminiscence," Littell's Living Age, CXXVI (July 17, 1875), 157. Another personal sketch of Peacock as an old man is that by Edith Nicolls, quoted in part by Priestly, pp. 93-99.

Finally there was Meredith. In January, 1844, Peacock's eldest daughter, Mary Ellen, married a young naval officer, Edward Nicolls. He died at sea within three months. To this marriage was born one daughter, Edith Nicolls (later Mrs. Clarke), who became Peacock's first biographer. In 1848 the young and beautiful widow was living in London with her brother Edward. At a literary set of which they were members, they met a young clerk named George Meredith. Meredith fell in love with Mary Ellen and married her in August, 1849.[58] As is well known, the marriage was unsuccessful. Forced by poverty to live with her father, the young couple got on old Peacock's nerves and he on theirs. Finally she ran away in 1858 with an artist named Wallis, leaving her son Arthur with Peacock. She died, unhappy and alone, in 1861.[59]

Peacock's later life was marked by a number of other tragedies. In 1826 his daughter Margaret died suddenly. She had long been a favorite with her mother, who was so stricken by the loss that she took to her bed and remained an invalid until her death in 1851.[60]

---

58 Priestly, pp. 81-82; Brett-Smith, p. clxxxi.

59 For the details of this unfortunate marriage see Priestly, pp. 81-84; Brett-Smith, p. clxxxi; J. B. Priestly, George Meredith, p. 16; S. M. Ellis, George Meredith: His Life and Friends in Relation to His Work, p. 78.

60 J. B. Priestly, Thomas Love Peacock, pp. 51, 83; Brett-Smith, p. cxxviii.

Yet Peacock's vigorous habits were not dampened by his misfortunes. He still took his long walks, and his eyes were so clear and strong that he never wore glasses, even though he read several hours a day--mostly Greek--until the day of his death. He learned a new language--Spanish--and mastered a good part of its literature when he was approaching his eightieth year![61]

In the New Year of 1865 Peacock began to suffer from intestinal cramps, and his granddaughter tells how she would hear him "calling upon the immortal gods with reproaches because they persisted in tormenting one who had served them for a lifetime and never wavered in the service.[62] He died on January 23, 1866, at the age of eighty.

---

61 Buchanan, p. 164.

62 Edith Nicolls, quoted by Brett-Smith, p. ccviii.

CHAPTER III

PEACOCK AS A CREATIVE ARTIST

It is impossible to understand Peacock as a critic without understanding him also as a creative artist, for the same dilettante spirit pervades every literary attempt, both critical and creative, he ever made. He was moved by no zeal to reform. There is no better way to dispel the notion of Peacock as a social critic than to demonstrate the position of his novels in his general literary activity. Besides the novels for which he is famed, Peacock dabbled in poetry, drama, and the personal essay. He kept a diary for a short time. He wrote letters which are few in number but are self-consciously arty and reveal the elements of the literary amateur in the man who wrote them. He even wrote a cookbook. Peacock's critical prose will be discussed in the next chapter. Here we will deal with his strictly creative efforts, beginning with his poems and ending with the novels.

Peacock broke into print at the age of fourteen with the publication of his prize poem in answer to the question, "Is History or Biography the more improving Study?"[1] Peacock spoke for history, which outshines biography,

> Like as the morning star, with humble ray,
> Throws a faint glimmer at the dawn of day,
> Soon as the sun begins his beams to shed,
> He shrinks away to nought, and hides his head.[2]

---

1 Halliford Edition, Vol. VII, pp. 157-58.

2 Vol. VII, p. 158.

These verses resemble the few juvenile verse letters which preceded them--precocious but dull.

In 1804 Peacock published The Monks of St. Mark,[3] a rollicking narrative in anapests. Although still immature, so free is the humor that these bibulous monks might well have been transferred straight into Maid Marian.

> 'Stead of singing Te Deums, on ground-pressing knees,
> They were piously bawling songs, catches, and glees.[4]

Peacock's first major volume of verse was Palmyra and Other Poems,[5] 1805. The title poem is a typical eighteenth century reflective ode, complete with footnotes, on the ruins of the city Palmyra. It is the conclusion to the revised version of this poem which Shelley called "the finest piece of poetry I ever read,"[6] a judgment in which few would concur today.[7] The poem has all the conventional trappings of twilight setting, meditation on fallen greatness, and so on. It falls into three parts: a description of the site, narration of events leading to the downfall, and general reflections on the doom of nations. The other, shorter poems in the volume range from imitations of Ossian to a

---

3 Vol. VII, pp. 189-92.

4 Vol. VII, p. 189.

5 Vol. VI, pp. 1-98.

6 In a letter to Thomas Hookham, August 18, 1812; quoted by Brett-Smith, p. li.

7 Eleanor Sickels, however, has high praise for this poem, seeing in it elements of Milton, Gray, and Ossian, The Gloomy Egoist, pp. 123-24. See also Freeman, pp. 47-48.

poem in Hebrew dialect. A few are amusing; none is great. Of one of these--"Fiolfar, King of Norway"--Van Doren aptly remarks, "Fiolfar talks Ossian in anapestic couplets after the manner of Monk Lewis."[8]

The Genius of the Thames was published in 1810.[9] Peacock's most extensive poem, it runs to about 1300 lines, mostly dull but graceful octosyllabic couplets. The first of the poem's two parts is in praise of the river in general. Patriotic pride in the naval superiority of Britain, regret at the passing of the Druids, and sundry other elements are combined in an extensive topographical potboiler. The second part deals with the scenery along the banks of the Thames and is superior to the first part only in that it contains numerous descriptive passages of rather striking beauty.

The Philosophy of Melancholy[10] appeared in 1812. This long meditative poem partly resulted from Peacock's first trip to Wales and his meeting Jane Gryffydh. It contains a great deal of excellent description of Welsh scenery, the one element which makes the poem readable to most of us today. Eleanor Sickels, however, emphasizes the historical interest

---

8 Van Doren, p. 31.

9 Vol. VI, pp. 99-168.

10 Vol. VI, pp. 189-248.

of the poem, calling it the best of all poems for understanding how the classic-Miltonic tradition was perpetuated into the Romantic period.[11] The poem is in the spirit of Gray, rather than of Byron.[12] Unlike Burton, Peacock sees melancholy as a very desirable quality. Part I points out how melancholy prepares one for adversity, Part II how it is essential to the arts, and Parts III and IV how it is the nurse of virtue itself.

Peacock's best-known poem is Rhododaphne, which appeared in 1818, three years after Headlong Hall. This is a long mythological narrative in seven cantos, with the inevitable footnotes. The story deals with the lovers Anthemion and Callirоë. Callirоë is dying, and Anthemion travels to Thespia to pray at the temple of love for her recovery. But there he meets Rhododaphne, a beautiful enchantress, who causes Callirоë to appear to die, and then runs away with Anthemion. They live together for some time, but eventually a statue of Uranian Love, whose temple Rhododaphne had desecrated, comes to life and kills her. At the same instant, Callirоë awakes from her magic sleep. The narrative is clear throughout; the diction is crystal clear, and the lines run smoothly; the imagery is bright and charming. But there is very little more in the poem. It is

---

11 Sickels, p. 85.

12 P. 86.

a light mythological narrative and that is all. To say the poem is dull--the charge usually indiscriminately made against all of Peacock's poems, and certainly applicable to some of them--would be entirely untrue. On the contrary, it is delightful to read. The poem fall down simply because of its lack of depth. Douglas Bush neatly spots this fundamental weakness:

> But while in mythological poems, Keats and Shelley, with their larger vision, did not lose sight of the modern world, Peacock did in Rhododaphne. The critic of modernity who wrote the novels owed much to his commerce with the ancients; the Hellenism of the poem is wholly a romantic dream, a way of escape. . . . Peacock's main interest was in a tale of ancient magic and mystery and beauty. His imagination was too concrete, too simply romantic for the symbolism that Keats and Shelley instinctively found in the antique.[13]

Yet although we would certainly not call it a great poem, it is difficult to condemn this little piece for lack of comprehensive ideas or depth of feeling. Such elements are simply not Peacockian. To expect Rhododaphne to be Prometheus Unbound would be to expect Headlong Hall to be Wuthering Heights.

The fragment of Ahrimanes[14] shows us that Peacock planned another long work in the style of Rhododaphne. Ahrimanes was to have been a poetization of the zodiacal crotchet of his friend J. F. Newton. The fragment has as

---

13 Douglas Bush, Mythology and the Romantic Tradition in English Poetry, pp. 182-83.

14 Not published until after Peacock's death; reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. VII, pp. 265-86.

its subject the strife between Oromazes and Ahrimanes, the principles of good and evil, for domination. Frankel devotes an entire chapter of his thesis to this work,[15] asserting that this is evidence of Peacock's struggle with the problem of evil and that the Ahrimanic philosophy persisted throughout Peacock's works. This is nonsense. There is no original thought in Ahrimanes, only the most conventional of stereotypes. Peacock obviously chose the subject only because he thought it had poetic possibilities. His only other interest in Ahrimanic philosophy was as a subject for ridicule. The motto of Ahrimanes, "The devil is come upon the earth with great power," was later put into the mouth of Mr. Toobad, the Manichean philosopher in Nightmare Abbey, who solemnly repeats it on any and every occasion when it would sound most ridiculous. But Frankel eagerly pounces on Mr. Toobad as another evidence that "Peacock is preoccupied with the old subject of good and evil."[16]

Sir Proteus,[17] published 1814, is a satiric poem after the manner of Byron and with a sarcastic dedication to Byron. The poem is so fustian in its attack on contemporary writers that it loses all force. Among the persons attacked in its ninety odd stanzas are Southey, Byron, Coleridge, Wordsworth,

---

15 Frankel, pp. 15-20.

16 P. 47.

17 Vol. VI, pp. 281-320.

Scott, Montgomery, Carr, Bentham, Campbell, Canning, Jeffrey, Wilson, Moore, and Monk Lewis. The narrative deals with Johnny Raw (Southey), who has suffered a rebuff--Shelley fell asleep during a reading of one of his poems--and in revenge summons Sir Proteus to appear in whatever shapes are most out of keeping with good taste; hence the series of visions of contemporaries. Peacock is certainly not sincere in this bitterness, but neither is he yet mature enough to be witty. He wrote such a satiric poem merely because it was the fashionable thing for a young writer to do to gain publicity. Many of the same ideas, spiced properly by good humor, later appeared in the "Four Ages" and in the novels. As literary evaluations, Peacock's assaults on his contemporaries in Sir Proteus are valuable only when taken comparatively. It is noteworthy that the heaviest abuse falls on Byron and Southey, whom Peacock continued to revile in a good-natured manner throughout his life. But we should not take Peacock's abuse of Wordsworth, for example, very seriously. In fact, in places it exhibits a wit which forshadows the later Peacock:

> The first he chattered, chattered still,
> With meaning none at all,
> Of Jack and Jill, and Harry Gill,
> And Alice Fell so small.[18]

Sir Proteus failed because Peacock had not yet learned to

---

18 Vol. VI, p. 290.

match subtlety with his wit.

The remainder of Peacock's verse is important but not so ambitious. Paper Money Lyrics[19] is a collection of short poems ridiculing the instability of paper currency. Some of them are very clever; most of them are amusing. There is a large body of miscellaneous verse, much of it printed for the first time in the Halliford Edition. Most of these poems are juvenile; few of them are worth re-reading; but all are important to an appraisal of Peacock's character. He wrote poems in Italian, Latin, and Greek, as well as English. He wrote in Spenserian stanzas, blank verse, ballad metre, and a score of other forms. The subjects range from imitations of Ossian and Shakespeare to an ode "On the Death of a Lap Dog call'd Lady." Such a literary output indicates not a caustic social critic but a young man carefully grooming himself to be the well-turned man-about-literature.

Redman is but one of many who have misunderstood Peacock's character:

> There is a portrait of him at the age of eighteen which reveals the youth who was father to the man. In it we see a youngster of obvious and self-conscious intelligence, behind whose smile there lurks profound amusement at the world he is viewing, whose eyes are the keenest, the

---

19 Vol. VII, pp. 95-150.

---

19 Vol. VII, pp. 85-120.

> liveliest a picture ever showed. The whole expression is alert, sharp, shrewd, even impudent, and yet it is tremendously attractive.[20]

Mr. Redman reads a great deal into a picture. Peacock was indeed a lively youth, but at the age of eighteen he was writing love poems to pretty girls when they smiled at him, and odes to melancholy when they frowned. There was very little shrewdness in him. In short, Peacock at eighteen was a Scythrop.

It is generally conceded that Peacock's best short poems are those in the novels. On the slightest provocation Peacock's characters burst spontaneously into song, with a ballad or a catch or a love lyric. These are certainly his most mature work, but his juvenilia and the work of his maturity are markedly similar in spirit. He was only ten when he wrote:

> Dear Mother, I attempt to write you a letter
> In verse, tho' in prose, I could do it much better:
> The Muse, this cold weather sleeps up at Parnassus,
> And leaves us, poor poets, as stupid as asses: . . .
>
> But now I must banish all fun, and all folly;
> So doleful's the news I am going to tell ye:
> Poor Wade! my schoolfellow, lies low in the gravel;
> One month ere fifteen put an end to his travel:
> Harmless, and mild, and remark'd for good nature:
> The cause of his death, was his overgrown stature:
> His epitaph I wrote, as inserted below;
> What tribute more friendly, could I on him bestow.
> The bard craves one shilling, of his own dear Mother;
> And if you think proper, add to it another.[21]

---

20 Ben Ray Redman, Introduction to The Pleasures of Peacock, p. xi.

21 Vol. VII, pp. 153-54. The epitaph mentioned begins:
"Here lies interr'd in silent shade,
The frail remains of Hamlet Wade."

He was a grown man when he wrote:

> In life three ghostly friars were we,
> And now three friarly ghosts we be.
> Around our shadowy table placed,
> The spectral bowl before us floats:
> With wine that none but ghosts can taste,
> We wash our unsubstantial throats.
> Three merry ghosts--three merry ghosts--three merry
> ghosts are we:
> Let the ocean be Port, and we'll think it good sport
> To be laid in that Red Sea.[22]

The second poem is vastly more mature than the first, but both are essentially in the same whimsical spirit. There is no deep thought either sought after or attained, nor should we expect any. Peacock was incapable of writing a Prometheus Unbound. Had he taken himself more seriously and tried to think more deeply, he would only have spoiled the fun. This lightness of tone indicates not inferiority of intellect or creative ability, but merely a complete difference in temperament from Shelley. The precocious young boy had grown up into the precocious young man, but he remained the dilettante to the end.

Any purely critical evaluation of Peacock as a poet must be rather severe, yet, as Professor Saintsbury remarks,

> No Englishman has ever written such drinking songs as Peacock's drinking songs, not merely of the thick-headedly or furiously jovial, but of the higher kind. No man who has written three such pieces in three such different styles as "The War-Song of Dinas Vawr" in The Misfortunes of Elphin, "The Pool of the Diving Friar" in Crotchet Castle, and "Love and Age" in Gryll Grange, need fear to hold up his head in any session of the poets.[23]

---

22 From Melincourt, Vol. II, p. 183.

23 Saintsbury, Prefaces and Essays, p. 215.

Besides his poems, Peacock's miscellaneous literary production includes three two-act plays, translations from Greek and Italian dramatists, a prospectus on classical education, two essays about his childhood and youth, a "Dialogue on Friendship after Marriage," letters, a diary, an article on "Gastronomy and Civilization," a cookbook, a large body of musical and literary criticism, about a dozen fragments of novels begun but never finished, and, of course, the seven novels.[24]

---

24 Of the three plays, the earliest, "The Circle of Loda," is Ossianic in its materials. The others, "The Dilettanti" and "The Three Doctors," are farces and show a strong influence of Moliere and his eighteenth century successors in French drama. All three plays are very poor from a dramatic viewpoint, but they show the development of Peacock's amazing mastery of dialogue (they are reprinted in the Halliford Edition, Vol. VII, pp. 289-412). Peacock translated the Italian drama Gl'Ingannati almost entire (Vol. X, pp. 231-318), but the Greek translations consist of about a dozen metrical renderings from various places in various dramas (these are described, although not reprinted, Vol. VII, pp. 413-19, Appendix I). The "Prospectus" was written at a time when Peacock contemplated taking, for a handsome fee, eight pupils for tutoring in Latin, Greek, French, Italian, etc. (the work is reprinted in Vol. VIII, pp. 427-31). The two personal essays (reprinted in Vol. VIII, pp. 27-36, 143-54) are "Recollections of Childhood. The Abbey House" and "The Last Day of Windsor Forest," two charming sketches in as fine a prose style as any that appeared in the entire nineteenth century. The "Dialogue on Friendship after Marriage" (Vol. VIII, pp. 445-51) purports to imitate classical dialogues, but smacks strangely of Chaucer's "Marriage Group." Peacock's letters (Vol. VIII, pp. 155-260) and his diary (Vol. VIII, pp. 433-44) are not large in volume, but they clearly reveal the self-consciousness of the young amateur author. "Gastronomy and Civilization" (Vol. IX, pp. 339-401) reveals further the variety of his interests and his erudition. For problems of authorship of this work, see the bibliographies appended to this thesis. The cookbook has never been published but is described (Vol. IX, pp. 446-55, Appendix II). Nine of the fragments of Novels, of which the best known is Calidore, are printed, some for the first time (Vol. VIII, pp. 293-422).

The Halliford Edition consists of ten large volumes, of which the novels comprise only four and a half. Much of this large mass of material cannot be discussed in detail here. Peacock's critical prose will be treated in the next chapter; the novels we shall discuss presently. To all of Peacock's work, however, are applicable most of the general conclusions made regarding his poems: his work has great variety; it is good-natured and self-satisfied; it is clearly the work of an amateur; and it is never very deep in thought. Peacock has the honor of joining the ranks of Chaucer and Burns, who come "short of the high seriousness of the great classics."

Peacock is best known for his seven little novels. Two of these, Maid Marian and The Misfortunes of Elphin,[25] are somewhat set off from the other five in subject matter, but not in ideas as is sometimes erroneously stated. These two novels are light historical romances, whereas the other novels are contemporary house party sketches. In ideas they are quite homogeneous with the rest of Peacock's work and certainly cannot by any means be entirely disregarded as they have been by Miss Hammond and others. If special reservations are necessary in the examination of any of Peacock's novels for ideas, it is with Melincourt,[26] Peacock's only attempt to drop his impartiality and write a novel of

---

25 Halliford Edition, Vols. III, IV.

26 Vol. II.

ideas in the ordinary sense, or with Gryll Grange,[27] which was written almost thirty years later that the novel preceding it, and which consequently expresses ideas somewhat mellowed by old age. It is extremely important that we see Maid Marian and The Misfortunes of Elphin in their proper relationship to the other novels, just as it is essential that we see Peacock's novels in their place as a part of a large and varied literary output. Above all, Peacock did not consciously groom himself to become a novelist, nor was he born to reform the world through satire. With him the novels were as incidental as the poems. It was artistic ability, not a burning social purpose, which made them the little masterpieces they are.

Peacock's first novel, published in 1815, was Headlong Hall.[28] This novel set the pattern for most of his later works: the houseparty novel. In what amounts almost to a formula, an amiable crank, proprietor of an abbey or castle or hall situated in some romantic part of England, has as his favorite hobby horse the collecting around him of other students of monomania. These genial crotcheteers talk, talk, and talk, while the host passes the bottle among them. A thread of plot is provided by a few thin love affairs which culminate in a liberal distribution of marriages at the end of the novel. In Headlong Hall the host is Squire Headlong,

---

27 Vol. V.

28 Vol. I.

ideas in the ordinary sense, or with Gerald Grange,[27] which was written almost thirty years later than the novel preceding it, and which consequently expresses ideas somewhat mellowed by old age. It is extremely important that we see Maid Marian and The Misfortunes of Elphin in their proper relationship to the other novels, just as it is essential that we see Peacock's novels in their place as a part of a large and varied literary output. Above all, Peacock did not consciously grow himself to become a novelist, nor was he born to relate the world through satire. With him the novels were as incidental as the poems. It was artistic ability, not a burning social purpose, which made them the little masterpieces they are.

Peacock's first novel, published in 1815, was Headlong Hall.[28] This novel set the pattern for most of his later works: the housepartY novel. In what amounts almost to a formula, an amiable crank, proprietor of an abbey or castle or hall situated in some romantic part of England, has as his favorite hobby bores the collecting around him of other eccentrics of nonsensia. These genial cretobetaers talk, talk, and talk, while the host passes the bottle among them. A thread of plot is provided by a few thin love affairs which culminate in a liberal distribution of marriages at the end of the novel. In Headlong Hall the host is Squire Headlong,

---

27 Vol. V.

28 Vol. I.

who invites for the Christmas season Mr. Escot, the deteriorationist, Mr. Foster, the perfectibilian, and Mr. Jenkinson, who is always so unable to judge between the philosophical extremes of his two friends that he remains perpetually *in statu quo*. Other guests include the Reverend Doctor Gaster, a clergyman who never loses sight of the loaves and fishes; Marmaduke Milestone, a landscape gardener who wishes to transform the mountains of north Wales into a formal garden; Squire Headlong's aunt, Miss Brindle-mew, and his cousin, Caprioletta; the noted craniologist Mr. Cranium, accompanied by his dearest of possessions, a satchel full of skulls, and his second dearest, his lovely daughter Cephalis; five literary personalities: the noted critics Mr. Gall and Mr. Treacle, the poets Mr. Nightshade and Mr. MacLaurel, and the famous woman novelist Miss Philomela Poppyseed; Sir Patrick O'Prism, a painter; Mr. Cornelius Chromatic, who brought with him, besides his fiddle, his two blooming daughters, Miss Tenorina and Miss Graziosa; and finally Mr. Panscope, "the chemical, botanical, geological, astronomical, mathematical, metaphysical, meteorological, anatomical, physiological, galvanistical, musical, pictorial, bibliographical, critical philosopher, who had run through the whole circle of the sciences, and understood them all equally well."[29] These crotcheteers act and react on each other throughout the novel, which concludes with about half of them getting married: Mr. Escot to Cephalis, Squire Headlong

---

29 Vol. I, p. 28.

[29] Vol. I, p. 88.

to Tenorina, Patrick O'Prism to Graziosa, and Mr. Foster to Caprioletta.

This brief resumé would suggest that the novel is formless, and indeed this charge is often made against Peacock's novels. But the work is very intricate in its structure. The delightfully absurd conversation is most carefully patterned. The proper character is always there to say the proper thing and give the proper tone. Only in this manner do Peacock's dialogues keep on the narrow line between bitter quarreling and silly nonsense, between tiresome disquisitions and drunken debauchery. Anyone who believes Peacock's novels formless should try removing any one character from any dialogue or substituting a character from one of the other novels. Each character's crotchet is intricately related to the crotchets of his fellows. Here we have much more than mere dialogues in which one crackpot tries to convince another. Peacock never loses sight of his thread of action, slight as it may be, and all discussions are carefully related to it. The action often grows out of the hobby horses of the characters. In Headlong Hall, for example, Mr. Cranium wants to marry his daughter Cephalis to Mr. Panscope, who is wealthy, but Mr. Escot obtains from a churchyard a very oversize skull which he asserts is the skull of Cadwallader; old Cranium cannot resist such a bargain and is actually surprised that Escot would be foolish enough to trade such a prize for a mere wife.

Melincourt, Peacock's second novel, is slightly disappointing artistically and extremely difficult to correlate with the other novels, yet it contains some of Peacock's best writing. In this work Peacock wrote a true novel of ideas in the usual sense: he proposes certain ideas of his own which are developed by representative characters, and he ridicules all opposing ideas. In doing so, of course, he takes sides. For Peacock this is a step down from absolute humor to satire. It is unfortunate that Peacock's method and his ideas are often judged mainly from this one novel, which is the least representative.

In Melincourt a group of suitors for the hand (and fortune) of Anthelia Melincourt includes Sir Telegraph Paxarett, a gay young gentleman of fashion; Lord Anophel, son and heir of the Marquis of Agaric; the Reverend Mr. Grovelgrub, Lord Anophel's tutor; Harum O'Scarum, Esquire, whose principal plan of courtship is to shoot all his rivals in duels and have the field to himself; and Mr. Derrydown, who writes troubadour ballads to Anthelia and wishes to make her his lady of the lake. Anthelia's heart is won by Mr. Forester, a young man who embodies all the principles of chivalry but is rather tiresome to us, however attractive he may have been to Anthelia. Lord Anophel is a bad loser in the contest and kidnaps Anthelia, swearing never to release her from his castle until she succumbs to his evil desires. And so we

have the excitement of a chase, the pursuers, of course, stopping at frequent intervals for their bottle of Madeira and lengthy discussions of political economy, transcendental philosophy, and other subjects dear to the heart of any red-blooded young man who is hot on the trail of the villain who has his sweetheart captive. The blackguards are apprehended, however, and Anthelia falls into the arms of her beloved, crying,

> "O Forester!" said Anthelia, "you have realized all my wishes. I have found you the friend of the poor, the enthusiast of truth, the disinterested cultivator of the rural virtues, the active promoter of the cause of human liberty. It only remained for you that you should emancipate a captive damsel, who, however, will but change the mode of her durance, and become your captive for life."[30]

The saving grace of Melincourt is Sir Oran Haut-ton, Baronet, an oran-outang who was brought up as a man and who wears clothing, attends the opera, drinks his Madeira with the best of them, and has all the attributes of the most refined gentleman except that he cannot speak. His friend Forester even purchases for him a seat in Parliament from the ancient and honourable borough of Onevote. Every episode in which he participates is delightful.

The treatment of Sir Oran by critics is one flagrant example of misinterpretation of Peacock. Young, representing one common point of view, takes Peacock seriously and claims

---

30 Vol. II, p. 452.

the Sir Oran episodes reveal Peacock's own Rousseauian ideas to which he always "tenaciously clung."[31] Herbert Paul, on the other hand, is offended:

> But Sir Oran Haut-Ton is intolerable. A single scene in which a monkey played the part of a man might be endured in a roaring farce. But a man-monkey as one of the principal characters in a novel; getting drunk, falling in love, and being returned to the House of Commons is purely grotesque, and an insult to the intelligence of the reader. . . . even the great name of Buffon cannot reconcile one to the preposterous and rather disgusting absurdity of an ape taking a lady in to dinner.[32]

Saintsbury is one of the very few with enough critical sense to see Sir Oran for what he is:

> The quadrumanous baronet, indeed, is such an excellent fellow that one almost wishes he could have been discovered to be no Orang at all, but a baby lost early in the woods, could have recovered his speech, improved his good looks, and married Anthelia.[33]

Melincourt is delightful in some spots, tiresome in others. Long and serious discussions fill entire chapters, and only occasionally does Peacock's true comic spirit appear. All readers are pleased that in no other novel did Peacock abandon his mocking, ragging, yet impartial tone.

Nightmare Abbey[34] has more plot than any other of the houseparty novels. Scythrop Glowry, having suffered a

---

31 Young, p. 35.

32 Herbert Paul, "The Novels of Peacock," The Living Age, CCXXXVIII (1903), 158-69.

33 Saintsbury, Prefaces and Essays, p. 251.

34 Vol. III.

disappointment in his first love, swears off women for life, retires to a ruined tower of his family home, Nightmare Abbey, and takes to reading Immanuel Kant and The Sorrows of Werther. But despite his vows, he soon finds himself involved in not one but two love affairs: one with his lovely and vivacious cousin Marionetta and another with the mysterious and exotic Stella, whom Scythrop discovered one night in his apartment and who hinted darkly about being pursued by evil men. But Scythrop is exposed, and both girls denounce him. "Stella" ironically turns out to be Celinda Toobad, the girl to whom Scythrop, unknown to both parties, had been betrothed by his father. During all this action, the usual quota of cranks gathers at Nightmare Abbey to expound their respective manias over old Mr. Glowry's good wine. To the inexperienced Peacockian Nightmare Abbey will probably be the most enjoyable novel because it has a considerable plot. The discussions, however, to which plot is always closely related, overweigh the plot in importance as is usual in Peacock's novels. In matters of structure and of prose style, Nightmare Abbey is probably the first production of the mature Peacock at his best.

The next two novels, as has been pointed out, depart considerably from Peacock's usual pattern. Maid Marian is pure lyrical romance. The story is the well known tale of Robin

Hood, his life in the greenwood, and his eventual pardon by King Richard. But the interest lies not in the tale, which is light and superficial, nor in historical background as in Scott. Instead Peacock carries us back to the greenwood, even as Shakespeare does to the forest of Arden. There people laugh and tell tales and sing songs. Maid Marian contains satirical jibes, mostly by means of an unfavorable comparison of the present with the past, but these are light-hearted and gay, and this novel, both in ideas and in tone, is of a piece with Nightmare Abbey, Crotchet Castle, and all the others.

The dominant characteristic of Maid Marian is its lyricism. On the slightest provocation the characters break into song. The actor Charles Kemble noticed this lyric quality and suggested it to James Robinson Planché as a source for a libretto. Planché was enthusiastic and so was Peacock, who was consulted on the proposal. Sir Henry Bishop wrote the music, and the opera opened at Covent Garden, December 3, 1822. It made a hit, ran for twenty-seven nights, and was later produced in New York.[35]

The Misfortunes of Elphin, like Maid Marian, is a lyrical romance set in the olden days, but it deals with legendary Welsh history. Peacock pieces together three

---

35 Brett-Smith, pp. cxvii-cxxi; Van Doren, pp. 166-69; Young, pp. 95-99. A reproduction of a playbill announcing the Covent Garden performance is given as the frontispiece to Maid Marian in the Halliford Edition, Vol. III. For the best discussion of Peacock's sources, see Young, pp. 84-92; and Sir Henry Newbolt, The Greenwood.

legends. The first deals with the inundation of Gwaelod. Because of the drunkenness and neglect of duty of Seithenyn, the great embankment crumbles in a storm and the lowland nation of Gwaelod is flooded. Young Prince Elphin takes some of the survivors to the highlands. The second legend is of the birth and education of the famous bard Taliesin, whom Peacock has Elphin discover as a baby and bring up along with his own daughter Melanghel. Taliesin falls in love with Melanghel and, in order to win her hand, in the third legend rescues Queen Gwenyvar from King Melvas and thus acquires the aid of King Arthur in rescuing Elphin, who was a prisoner of one of the minor kings.

As in Maid Marian, Peacock is interested not in his story nor in historical background, but in the setting. Here in the early semi-historical period, he has free play for the most delightful whimsy and mockery. Seithenyn in particular is a character who, like Falstaff, carries any scene with him and could bear the entire novel on his shoulders even if it had nothing else to recommend it.[36]

In Crotchet Castle Peacock returns to his houseparty scheme. The genial host is Squire Crotchet, who surrounds himself with such fanatics as Mr. Skionar, the transcendental

---

36 For an excellent sketch of Seithenyn, see J. B. Priestly, English Comic Characters, p. 178.

poet; Mr. Firedamp, the meteorologist; Mr. MacQuedy, the political economist (Mac Q. E. D., son of a demonstration); and Mr. Chainmail, who has built himself a medieval castle and will not admit that anything is better today than in the middle ages. Miss Susannah Touchandgo, whose banker father, slightly embarrassed by a superfluity of paper and a shortage of gold, had skipped the country, has retired to North Wales. She had been betrothed to young Ebenezer Crotchet, who had broken off the engagement after learning of her father's disgrace. Ebenezer then plans to marry the Lady Clarinda, who is on the point of jilting her true lover Captain Fitzchrome and becoming Mrs. Crotchet when she realizes that money isn't everything and returns to Fitzchrome. Mr. Chainmail, meanwhile, on a walking trip through Wales, has discovered the deserted Miss Touchandgo, falls in love with her, and as usual, the novel ends with a mass pilgrimage to the altar. The presiding genius through it all is the Reverend Dr. Folliott, a remarkable character and, unlike Peacock's earlier clergymen, one whose wit matches his appetite and his common sense his thirst. Partly because of him, Crotchet Castle is generally considered to be Peacock's finest novel.

Gryll Grange appeared almost thirty years after Crotchet Castle. Even more genial and whimsical, it obviously embodies the fond reminiscences of an old man (Peacock was in his seventies when he wrote it). The same ideas are expressed

but with no sting or bite to the satire. Peacock is completely his own good-natured self. The plot is inconsequential: Mr. Falconer is a young bachelor with idealistic notions of beauty. He lives a solitary life attended only by seven beautiful maidens who are well accomplished in all the arts. Toward these seven vestal virgins, as he calls them, his intentions are most honorable. Falconer falls in love with Miss Gryll, whose uncle is proprietor of nearby Gryll Grange. Although she returns his love, Falconer cannot bear to give up his solitary philosophic life among his books and attendant maidens. Finally the Reverend Dr. Opimian, a friend of the family, brings things to a head by encouraging seven young farm lads of the neighborhood to propose simultaneously to the seven maidens. This abrupt dissolution of his little household jars Falconer to his senses, and he quickly woos and wins the fair Miss Gryll.

As in the other novels, however, the chief interest is not in the plot but in the talk, the mockingly brilliant talk of the eccentrics congregated at Gryll Grange, the golden flow of talk over the golden wine on the Squire's table. Dr. Opimian is almost equal to Dr. Folliott, and the women in the novel, particularly Miss Gryll and Miss Niphet, ripen into full blown beauties which Peacock's son-in-law, Meredith, would have been proud to have created. Priestly has admirably caught the spirit of Gryll Grange:

> The garden, the forest, the table bright with candles; and somewhere a daft roaring world filled with reformers and canters and ranters; some books, a little music, young people falling in and out of love, the bottle happily circulating while the shining ball of talk is flung across the table: such is Gryll Grange.[37]

Many attempts have been made to capture the secret of the Peacock novel but none have succeeded. The secret lies somewhere in the delicate structure of the novels, which were so carefully constructed but have such a carefree natural appearance. Imitators of Peacock have invariably failed because, believing him formless, they were deliberately formless. Peacock's work can be called formless only if form is entirely restricted to plot, a restriction which is certainly inadmissable. Many approaches can be made to the discovery of his appeal. The greatest single consideration is the self-satisfied, goodnatured amateur status of Peacock as a writer. Priestly, as has been pointed out, noticed this quality but later lost sight of it. Saintsbury saw it but did not discuss it to any length. Most of the other critics missed it completely. Another important consideration is the projection of Peacock's personality into the novels. He is everywhere and yet he is nowhere. No character is Peacock, yet scattered everywhere we find his tastes, his opinions, and his habits, even in so trifling an item as sailing paper boats on a lake.[38]

---

37 J. B. Priestly, Thomas Love Peacock, pp. 92-93.

38 See Melincourt, Vol. II, p. 156.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Fedden has called attention to the concept of a Peacock world. "He has his own world as much as Dickens, a fantastic place, strangely unreal and yet strangely serious."[39] The romantic settings cannot be overlooked. Priestly has pointed out that if Peacock's object were satire, he would have done much better to place his novels in London, the location most fertile in satiric possibilities, instead of in the wildly romantic sections of the country.[40] Peacock's natural love of pageantry as expressed in the "chess dance" in Melincourt, the exotic table centerpiece in Headlong Hall, and the Aristophanic comedy performed in Gryll Grange, gives a quality all its own to the novels, a quality which is usually overlooked. Some critics try to probe the nature of Peacock's novels with witty and piercing epigrams. Burdett, for example, says of the novels, "To me they suggest a Platonic dialogue as Aristophanes might have caricatured it."[41] The secret is certainly not in Peacock's sources or in any influences which have yet been traced. These influences have been pretty generally conceded to be French, yet Headlong Hall is certainly not a Candide. But whatever the secret, one thing remains certain: any man who has created three characters so great and so varied as a

---

39 H. R. Fedden, in The English Novelists, p. 145.

40 Priestly, p. 140.

41 Osbert Burdett, Critical Essays, p. 83.

---

39 R. B. Peden, in The English Novelists, p. 165.

40 Priestly, p. 160.

41 Osbert Burdett, Critical Essays, p. 83.

Sir Oran Haut-ton, a Prince Seithenyn, and a Dr. Folliott will be read wherever and whenever novels are read.

Peacock's prose style is marked by crispness, by rapid, vigorous, poetically melodic rhythm, and by a classic French clarity. In his clarity, his concision, and his liberal use of antithesis he closely resembles Hazlitt, yet his prose is distinctively his own. Peacock obtains his dry humorous effects often through rhetorical devices: incongruous listings, absurd parallelism, atrocious *non sequiturs*, and occasional *stychomythia*, in which each crotcheteer seems bursting with impatience to get in a word for his particular system.

Peacock as a creative artist, then, produced an extremely varied output. All of his work, however, is marked by the same qualities: it is all the work of an amateur and a dilettante in letters; it was all written for the pleasure of the writer and the enjoyment of the reader. Unlike the work of Peacock's contemporaries in both prose and verse, anything he ever wrote can be read in one sitting. Indeed, it is thus he should be read: there is far more in Peacock to enjoy than there is to study.

Sir Oran Haut-ton, a Prince Saltburn, and a Dr. Folliott will be read wherever and whenever novels are read.

Peacock's prose style is marked by epigrams, by rapid, vigorous, poetically melodic rhythm, and by a classic French clarity. In his clarity, his concision, and his liberal use of antitheses he closely resembles Hazlitt, yet his prose is distinctively his own. Peacock obtains his dry humorous effects often through rhetorical devices: incongruous listings, absurd parallelism, ~~ironical~~ bon mots, and occasional ~~oxymorons~~, in which each protagonist seems bursting with impatience to get in a word for his particular system.

Peacock as a creative artist, then, produced an extremely varied output. All of his work, however, is marked by the same qualities: it is all the work of an amateur and a dilettante in letters; it was all written for the pleasure of the writer and the enjoyment of the reader. Unlike the work of Peacock's contemporaries in both prose and verse, anything he ever wrote can be read in one sitting. Indeed, it is thus he should be read: there is far more in Peacock to enjoy than there is to study.

CHAPTER IV

PEACOCK AS A LITERARY CRITIC

"The Four Ages of Poetry" was first published in 1820. The last of the articles comprising the "Memoirs of Shelley" did not appear until 1862. During the intervening forty-two years, Peacock was a frequent contributor to several periodicals and, as such, wrote a considerable body of critical prose. Some of his contributions, such as "The Last Day of Windsor Forest" and "Recollections of Childhood," were non-critical essays, but the large body of work consisted of articles and reviews of the literature and drama of his day. It is this prose criticism that will be examined here.

Peacock's criticism has long been neglected. The one critic who has even noticed its importance was Saintsbury, who complained that "It is rather unfortunate that no complete republication, nor even any complete list of these articles has been made. . . . His criticism, though not great in amount, is good."[1] Most of the articles have since been reprinted in the Halliford Edition, but nothing approaching a thorough study has been attempted.

---

1 George Saintsbury, Essays in English Literature, pp. 238, 259.

CHAPTER IV

PEACOCK AS A LITERARY CRITIC

"The Four Ages of Poetry" was first published in 1820. The last of the articles comprising the "Memoirs of Shelley" did not appear until 1858. During the intervening forty-two years, Peacock was a frequent contributor to several periodicals and, as such, wrote a considerable body of critical prose. Some of his contributions, such as "The Last Day of Windsor Forest" and "Recollections of Childhood," were non-critical essays, but the latter body of work consisted of articles and reviews of the literature and drama of his day. It is this prose criticism that will be examined here.

Peacock's criticism has long been neglected. Even one critic who has even noticed its importance, Raimbury, who complained that "It is rather unfortunate that no complete republication, nor even any complete list of these articles has been made. . . . His criticism, though not great in amount, is good."[1] Most of the articles have since been reprinted in the Halliford Edition, but nothing approaching a thorough study has been attempted.

---

1 George Raimbury, Essays in English Literature, pp. 238, 239.

At some future date I intend to give a complete analysis to what must here be treated only in a brief survey.

Peacock's best-known essay is his first, "The Four Ages of Poetry," which appeared in Ollier's Literary Miscellany in 1820.[2] Unfortunately it is known only as the essay which prompted Shelley to write his "Defense of Poetry." Few people have ever read the "Four Ages," and even fewer have taken the trouble to learn the true facts regarding the affair. Half-truths and misquotations from Shelley's letters have perpetuated a completely wrong conception.

First let us examine the essay itself. Peacock begins by advancing a mock thesis:

> Poetry, like the world, may be said to have four ages, but in a different order: the first age of poetry being the age of iron; the second, of gold; the third, of silver; and the fourth, of brass.[3]

The iron age is the bardic, in which the heroic deeds of contemporaries are celebrated. The golden age idealizes the past and celebrates the heroes of the iron age. The silver age only polishes and re-casts the poems of the golden age. The age of brass, however, by "rejecting the polish and

---

2 Reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. VIII, pp. 3-25.

3 P. 3.

the learning of the age of silver, and taking a retrograde stride to the barbarisms and crude traditions of the age of iron, professes to return to nature and revive the age of gold."[4] The four ages are exemplified in classical poetry by the ancient bards, Homer, Virgil, and Nonnus, respectively. In English poetry they are typified by the Arthurian legends, Shakespeare, Pope, and Thomson and Cowper. So far, there is nothing alarming in the essay. It is all good romantic doctrine. Every tenet of romantic criticism is implied in the statement,

> The silver age was the reign of authority; but authority now began to be shaken . . . Thomson and Cowper looked at the trees and hills which so many ingenious gentlemen had rhymed about so long without looking at them at all, and the effect of the operation on poetry was like the discovery of a new world.[5]

But now Peacock turns his attention to the "few unfortunate persons" whose heads have been turned by the new enthusiasms. And now the real purpose of the essay becomes apparent: an opportunity to lambaste his contemporaries. A fustian attack on "the descriptive poetry of the present day" culminates in this tirade:

---

4 P. 13.

5 Pp. 16-17.

learning of the age of silver, and taking a retrograde stride to the barbarisms and crude traditions of the age of iron, professes to return to nature and revive the age of gold."[4] The four ages are exemplified in classical poetry by the ancient bards, Homer, Virgil, and Ossian, respectively. In English poetry they are typified by the Arthurian legends, Shakespeare, Pope, and Thomson and Cowper. So far, there is nothing alarming in the essay. It is all good romantic doctrine. Every tenet of romantic criticism is implied in the statement,

> The silver age was the reign of authority; but authority now began to be shaken . . . Thomson and Cowper looked at the trees and hills which so many ingenious gentlemen had rhymed about so long without looking at them at all, and the effect of the operation on poetry was like the discovery of a new world.[5]

But now Peacock turns his attention to the "few unfortunate persons" whose heads have been turned by the new enthusiasms. And now the real purpose of the essay becomes apparent: an opportunity to lambaste his contemporaries. A Tuscan attack on "the descriptive poetry of the present day" culminates in this tirade:

---

[4] p. 13.

[5] pp. 16-17.

> Mr. Scott digs up the poachers and cattle-stealers of the ancient border. Lord Byron cruizes for thieves and pirates on the shores of the Morea and among the Greek islands. Mr. Southey wades through ponderous volumes of travels and old chronicles, from which he carefully selects all that is false, useless, and absurd, as being essentially poetical; and when he has a commonplace book full of monstrosities, strings them into an epic. Mr. Wordsworth picks up village legends from old women and sextons; and Mr. Coleridge, to the valuable information acquired from similar sources, superadds the dreams of crazy theologians and the mysticism of German metaphysics, and favours the world with visions in verse, in which the quadruple elements of sexton, old woman, Jeremy Taylor, and Emanuel Kant, are harmonized into a delicious poetical compound. Mr. Moore presents us with a Persian and Mr. Campbell with a Pennsylvanian tale, both formed on the same principle of Mr. Southey's epics, by extracting from a perfunctory and desultory perusal of a collection of voyages and travels, all that useful investigation would not seek for and that common sense would reject.[6]

All this is great fun. But so far there has been no attack on poetry as such, even on the age of brass as such, but only on those contemporaries who have degraded that age. Now, however, he concludes the essay with four or five pages of sheer farce: Since poets of our time have so degraded themselves, why not chuck poetry entirely? After all, there are already more poems written than a man can read in one lifetime; why add more? And finally, poetry is useless. "It can never make a philosopher, nor a statesman, nor in any class of life an useful or rational man."[7]

---

6 Pp. 19-20.

7 P. 21.

Mr. Scott digs up the peasants and castle-attackers of the ancient border. Lord Byron crusades for thieves and pirates on the shores of the Piraea and among the Greek islands. Mr. Southey wades through ponderous volumes of travels and old chronicles, from which he carefully selects all that is false, useless, and absurd, as being essentially poetical; and when he has a commonplace book full of monasticism, springs them into an epic. Mr. Wordsworth picks up village legends from old women and sextons; and Mr. Coleridge, to the valuable information acquired from similar sources, superadds the dreams of crazy theologians and the mysticism of German metaphysics, and favours the world with visions in verse, in which the quadruple elements of sexton, old woman, Jeremy Taylor, and Immanuel Kant, are harmonized into a delicious poetical compound. Mr. Moore presents us with a Persian and Mr. Campbell with a Pennsylvanian tale, both formed on the same principle of Mr. Southey's epics, by extracting from a performatory and desultory perusal of a collection of voyages and travels, all that quoad invastigation would not suit for much that common sense would reject.[6]

All this is great fun. But so far there has been no attack on poetry as such, even on the age of prose as such, but only on those contemporaries who have degraded that age. Now, however, he considers the camp with four or five pages of sheer farce: Since poets of our time have so degraded themselves, why not shoot poetry entirely? After all, there are already more poems written than a man can read in one lifetime; why add more? And finally, poetry is useless. "It can never make a philosopher, nor a statesman, nor in any close of life an useful or rational man."[7]

---

6 Pp. 15-20.

7 P. 21.

> But in whatever degree poetry is cultivated, it must necessarily be to the neglect of useful study: and it is a lamentable spectacle to see minds, capable of better things, running to seed in the specious indolence of these empty aimless mockeries of intellectual exertion.[8]

This essay has been treated in great detail because it best exemplifies Peacock's most frequent critical stand--that of devil's advocate. He is deliberately baiting Shelley and the world. It seems inconceivable that anyone who has read Crotchet Castle or even so much as heard of his ridicule of the Steam Intellect Society and The March of Minds could take seriously the arguments, quoted above, against the practical utility of poetry. The idea of the ages of poetry is a clever idea; the attack on the modern poets is with tongue in cheek; the denunciation of poetry in general is pure farce--nothing more. Yet Young, whom I quote only as one flagrant example of too prevalent an opinion, actually says:

> A want of imagery on Peacock's part, together with the inability of understanding others in possession of it is disclosed in his "Four Ages of Poetry," . . . The opinions here expressed are alone sufficient to show that its author was what Shelley said of him, namely, "a nursling of the exact and superficial school of poetry."[9]

A far saner interpretation is that of Van Doren: "A reasoned criticism of The Four Ages of Poetry and any show of

---

8 P. 22.

9 Young, p. 13.

irritation at its opinions would be equally ludicrous."[10] This essay is very typical of Peacock's criticism--mocking, taunting, yet with matchless good humor. Of course Peacock was well aware of the importance of the problem with which the essay deals--the decreasing significance of poetry in the practical modern world--but, as was his usual practice when faced with knotty problems, he treated the whole question most flippantly.

We cannot leave the "Four Ages," however, without a brief mention of its effect on Shelley. As is well known, it inspired Shelley to write his "Defense of Poetry," but far too much is made of the "sacred rage" in which Shelley wrote his reply. As the phrase is usually quoted out of context, I will give here a larger portion of the letter from which it is taken:

> At the same time, your anathemas against poetry itself excited me to a sacred rage, or calœthes scribendi of vindicating the insulted Muses. I had the greatest possible desire to break a lance with you, within the lists of a magazine, in honour of my mistress Urania; but God willed that I should be too lazy, and wrested the victory from your hope: since first having unhorsed poetry, and the universal sense of the wisest in all ages, an easy conquest would have remained to you in me, the knight of the shield of shadow and the lance of gossamere. Besides, I was at that moment reading Plato's Ion, which I recommend you to reconsider.[11]

There are few examples extant of Shelley's sense of humor, but this is certainly one of them. The "Four Ages" was a

---

10 Van Doren, p. 154.

11 Shelley, letter to Peacock, February 15, 1821, in Shelley's Literary and Philosophical Criticism, pp. 212-13.

good joke, and Shelley was replying in kind. The "Defense" itself, of course, was no joke: first because Shelley, when he actually began to write the work, found himself engaged in something far greater than a mock quarrel, and second because the little jesting personal digs at Peacock were removed by editor John Hunt. The "Defense of Poetry" is a monumental work of criticism. But we should modify our conception of Shelley's writing it in blood, with "his eye in a fine frenzy rolling," and with every word a muttered curse against the bones of T. L. Peacock. Such a conception is an insult to Shelley's intelligence. Too many condescending critics now see Peacock's essay as a joke, "but poor, erratic, sensitive, imaginative (although dim-witted) Shelley took it seriously. What a laugh!" Peacock was no Phillistine, and Shelley was no Ariel.

If "The Four Ages of Poetry" exemplifies Peacock's mocking, ragging type of criticism, a flippant treatment even of really significant problems, then its opposite, his sincere, appreciative writing, is well demonstrated by another well-known work: the so-called "Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley."[12] This name is loosely used to refer to a series of five articles which appeared in Fraser's Magazine, although only two of the articles actually bear that title.

---

12 Reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. VIII, pp. 37-141.

34-161.

The first article was published in Fraser's for June, 1858, and was entitled simply "Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley." Actually it was a review of three works: Charles S. Middleton's Shelley and his Writings, E. J. Trelawny's Recollections of the Last Days of Shelley and Byron, and the first two volumes of Thomas Jefferson Hogg's The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley. In this article Peacock gives us his philosophy of biography. No man is under obligation to write the life of another. Above all, there is no excuse for dragging out embarrassing episodes in a man's life which the man would prefer to have remained concealed. This discussion leads him to a condemnation of the current "gossip" about Shelley, which he calls "the old village scandal on a larger scale."[13]

> Now, I could have wished that, like Wordsworth's Cuckoo, he had been allowed to remain a voice and a mystery: . . . But since it is not to be so, since so much has been, and so much more will probably be, written about him, the motives which deterred me from originating a substantive work on the subject, do not restrict me from commenting on what has been published by others, and from correcting errors, if such should appear to me to occur in the narratives which I may pass under review.[14]

Peacock then proceeds to relate the life of Shelley up to the separation from Harriet, making frequent reference to the three biographies being reviewed. His account is

---

13 Pp. 39-43.

14 P. 42.

The first article was published in Knight's for June, 1858, and was entitled simply "Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley." Actually it was a review of three works: Charles S. Middleton's Shelley and His Friends, E. J. Trelawny's Recollections of the Last Days of Shelley and Byron, and the first two volumes of Thomas Jefferson Hogg's The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley. In this article Peacock gives us his philosophy of biography. No man is under obligation to write the life of another. Above all, there is no excuse for dragging out embarrassing episodes in a man's life which the man would prefer to have remained concealed. This discussion leads him to a condemnation of the current "gossip" about Shelley, which he calls "the old village scandal on a larger scale."[13]

> Now, I could have wished that, like Wordsworth's Quakeress, he had been allowed to remain a veiled and a mystery; . . . But since it is not to be so, since so much has been, and no much more will probably be, written about him, the motives which deterred me from originating a substantive work on the subject, do not restrict me from commenting on what has been published by others, and from correcting errors, if such should appear to me to occur in the narratives which I may pass under review.[14]

Peacock then proceeds to relate the life of Shelley up to the separation from Harriet, making frequent reference to the three biographies being reviewed. His account is

---

[13] Pp. 39-42.

[14] P. 42.

personal and sympathetic, making frequent digressions in praise of Shelley's generosity, his love for his children, and so on. When the narrative reaches his own meeting with Shelley, Peacock abandons the biographies entirely and relies on his own memory of the association. About Trelawny's biography he has little to say, for it deals exclusively with Shelley's later years. Middleton he criticizes for overemphasizing Shelley's "boyish passion" for Harriet Grove. He agrees with Hogg that Shelley frequently suffered from hallucinations but certainly does not concur with Hogg's estimate of Shelley's character as irresponsible.

"Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley / Part II" appeared in Fraser's for January, 1860, and was a review of the Shelley Memorials. The Shelley family, disgusted by the first two volumes of Hogg's work, had withdrawn the materials placed at his disposal and published, in 1859, the Memorials, which were intended to refute the opinions of Hogg. In his first article Peacock had been rather guarded in his criticism of Hogg, but now, seeing himself seconded by the Shelleys, he concurred in their attack, an action which for some time lost him the friendship of Hogg. At the same time he must acknowledge that he is not in complete accord with the author of the Memorials.

> I am very sorry, in the outset of this notice, to be under the necessity of dissenting from Lady Shelley

> respecting the facts of the separation of Shelley and Harriet.[15]

With this introduction, Peacock resumes his account of Shelley's life where he had dropped it in the previous article and carries the narrative up through Shelley's death. For Shelley's last years in Italy, Peacock draws heavily upon Trelawny, whom he praises highly as "a true and indefatigable friend" of Shelley.[16] The most interesting part of this article is the account of the separation and elopement. Peacock claims there was no estrangement from Harriet before Shelley met Mary Godwin. He does not condemn Shelley, and his references to Mary are so scrupulously fair that I know of no bitterness on her part in reaction to the "Memoirs." But neither would he condemn Harriet in order to exonerate Shelley.

> I feel it due to the memory of Harriet to state my most decided conviction that her conduct as a wife was as pure, as true, as absolutely faultless, as that of any who for such conduct are held most in honour.[17]

Peacock resolves the entire question with this statement: "That Shelley's second wife was intellectually better suited to him than his first, no one who knew them both will deny."[18]

---

15 P. 85.

16 P. 122.

17 P. 93.

18 P. 95.

respecting the facts of the separation of Shelley and Harriet.[15]

with this introduction, Peacock resumes his account of Shelley's life where he had dropped it in the previous article and carries the narrative up through Shelley's death. For Shelley's last years in Italy, Peacock draws heavily upon Trelawny, whom he praises highly as "a true and indefatigable friend" of Shelley.[16] The most interesting part of this article is the account of the separation and elopement. Peacock claims there was no estrangement from Harriet before Shelley met Mary Godwin. He does not condemn Shelley, and his reference to Mary are so surprisingly fair that I know of no bitterness on her part in reaction to the "Memoirs." But neither would be condemn Harriet in order to exonerate Shelley.

> I feel it due to the memory of Harriet to state my most decided conviction that her conduct as a wife was as pure, as true, as absolutely faultless, as that of any who for such conduct are held most in honour.[17]

Peacock resolves the entire question with this statement: "That Shelley's second wife was intellectually better suited to him than his first, no one who knew them both will deny."[18]

---

15 P. 85.

16 P. 122.

17 P. 93.

18 P. 95.

In Fraser's for March, 1862, appeared an article entitled "Percy Bysshe Shelley / Supplementary Notice." This was an answer to two attacks made on his earlier Shelley articles: one by Richard Garnett in Macmillan's Magazine, the other anonymously in the Quarterly Review. Garnett had questioned Peacock's assertion that no estrangement had taken place between Shelley and Harriet before the separation. Peacock merely restated his previous arguments and presented a little additional documentary evidence in proof. The anonymous writer in the Quarterly had charged that the hallucinations referred to by Peacock had indicated insanity on Shelley's part. Peacock refuted this vigorously, asserting that even in times of great emotional excitement Shelley was "calm and self-possessed."[19]

The other two articles in the "Memoirs" were "Unpublished Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley" and "Postscript to the Shelley Letters," which appeared in Fraser's for March and May, 1860, respectively. These articles do not concern us here, as they are a job of editing, with virtually no comment.

Various estimates have been made of the value of the "Memoirs." Grabo[20] seems to doubt their value in the light of

---

19 P. 140.

20 Grabo, pp. 100-101.

In Fraser's for March, 1832, appeared an article entitled "Percy Bysshe Shelley \ Supplementary Notice." This was an answer to two attacks made on his earlier Shelley articles: one by Richard Garnett in Macmillan's Magazine, the other anonymously in the Quarterly Review. Garnett had questioned Peacock's assertion that no estrangement had taken place between Shelley and Harriet before the separation. Peacock merely restated his previous arguments and presented a little additional documentary evidence in proof. The anonymous writer in the Quarterly had charged that the Reminiscences referred to by Peacock had indicated insanity on Shelley's part. Peacock refuted this vigorously, asserting that even in times of great emotional excitement Shelley was "calm and self-possessed."[19]

The other two articles in the "Memoirs" were "Unpublished Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley" and "Postscript to the Shelley Letters," which appeared in Fraser's for March and May, 1860, respectively. These articles do not concern us here, as they are a job of editing, with virtually no comment.

Various estimates have been made of the value of the "Memoirs." Grebo[20] seems to doubt their value in the light of

---

19 P. 140.

20 Grebo, pp. 100-101.

modern scholarship. Priestly,[21] on the other hand, claims that "Great efforts have been made to prove that he [Peacock] was wrong . . . but, except in certain small details, such efforts have failed." Professor Grabo is right in saying that some of Peacock's interpretations have been disproved. Although Shelley was quite intimate with Peacock, there were some things which he did not tell even to a friend. Any contemporary biographer is under this same disadvantage. If we judge the "Memoirs" on the basis of their general stand, however, we find that except for the undue emphasis placed on Shelley's hallucinations, their interpretation is excellent and approaches the modern evaluation of Shelley. They are certainly vastly superior to Hogg's biography. There are some, such as Professor Saintsbury, who do not hesitate to call Peacock Shelley's "best and most trustworthy contemporary biographer by far."[22]

Peacock's criticism, then, either ranted, as in the "Four Ages," or was extremely personal and sympathetic, as in the "Memoirs." Seldom was the rant in earnest, and in his later years never. It was definitely in earnest, and in one pair of articles for the Westminster Review bitter enough to have shaded Gifford himself. These were reviews of two

---

21 Priestly, p. 88.

22 George Saintsbury, Prefaces and Essays, p. 217.

---

82 Georgs Saintsbury, Prefaces and Essays, p. 317.

works by Thomas Moore: a review of The Epicurean in the October, 1827, number of the Westminster, and of the Letters and Journals of Lord Byron in the April, 1830, number. There was to have been a third article, a review of the second volume of Moore's Byron, but Moore was so indignant at the ill treatment he had received that the editor John Bowring deemed it wiser not to have the second volume reviewed at all.[23]

In the review of The Epicurean[24] Peacock's method is to tell the whole narrative, quoting generously and pausing occasionally for a sarcastic comment. After describing the adventures of Moore's hero in a lush and magnificent subterranean garden, Peacock remarks, "We recommend Mr. Moore to try the experiment of growing a pot of grass in his cellar before he again amuses the public with similar fancies."[25] And so Peacock goes on, relentlessly pursuing Moore's own story to the bitter end of absurdity. No defect passes notice, from Moore's making Cleopatra an Egyptian to an item so small as an omitted iota subscript. Again and again he slashes out at Moore: "He has drawn a portrait of everything that an eminent

---

23 Brett-Smith, p. cxliv.

24 Reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. IX, pp. 1-67.

25 Pp. 27-28.

works by Thomas Moore: a review of The Epicurean in the October, 1827, number of the Westminster, and of the Letters and Journals of Lord Byron in the April, 1830, number. There was to have been a third article, a review of the second volume of Moore's Byron, but Moore was so indignant at the ill treatment he had received that the editor John Bowring deemed it wiser not to have the second volume reviewed at all.[23]

In the review of The Epicurean[24] Peacock's method is to tell the whole narrative, quoting generously and pausing occasionally for a sarcastic comment. After describing the adventures of Moore's hero in a lush and magnificent subterranean garden, Peacock remarks, "We recommend Mr. Moore to try the experiment of growing a pot of grass in his cellar before he again amuses the public with similar fancies."[25] And so Peacock goes on, relentlessly parading Moore's own story to the bitter end of absurdity. No detail passes notice, from Moore's making Cleopatra an Egyptian to an item so small as an omitted lotus subscript. Again and again he slashes out at Moore: "He has drawn a portrait of everything that an eminent

---

23 Brett-Smith, p. xxiv.

24 Reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. IX, pp. 1-87.

25 Pp. 83-28.

Epicurean was not, and presents it to us as a fair specimen of what he was. Hamlet's uncle might as fairly have sat for the portrait of Hamlet's father."[26] When the story is completed, Peacock lists several items in Moore's scholarship which he had originally intended to attack, but--and here is the masterstroke of the review--he contemptuously refrains from doing so, with the words: "but it would be a waste of time to discuss these matters with an author who elects a pregnant woman a priestess of Isis."[27] The effect is devastating. Peacock's method is to let Moore tell his own story and cut his own throat. Peacock merely stands by to hand him the knife.

The review of Moore's Byron[28] is far less effective, for here Peacock loses his temper and his good humor entirely. Whereas in the review of The Epicurean Peacock allows Moore to make himself ridiculous, in this article he makes a direct attack. Again he follows Moore's narrative, but instead of gaily destructive jibes we have bitter comments such as, "And here Mr. Moore misses the matter most completely, as, in all cases in which a grain of philosophy is requisite, he makes a point of doing."[29] Personal elements enter the attack. When Moore misnames the prison in which Leigh Hunt was kept,

---

26 P. 51.

27 P. 56.

28 Reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. IX, pp. 69-139.

29 P. 100.

Peacock remarks, "Mr. Moore is too genteel to know one gaol from another."[30] Moore's name is repeated in almost every sentence in a sort of screeching sarcasm: Mr. Moore this, Mr. Moore that. Finally Peacock summarizes the book as

> . . . a series of shallow sophisms and false assumptions, wrapped up in bundles of metaphors, put forth with a specious semblance of reason and liberality, and directed to the single end of upholding all abuses and delusions by which the aristocracy profit.[31]

As in the previous article on Moore, Peacock succeeds in utterly demolishing the book under review, but this time, in doing so, he leaves quite a bad taste in our mouths.

Fortunately, however, these two articles stand alone. At no other time is Peacock's ranting wholly serious. It is certainly not so in the review of Chronicles of London Bridge,[32] which appeared in the Westminster for October, 1830. Here Peacock's method is reductio ad absurdum. One excerpt will suffice:

> The old London Bridge was begun in 1176, and finished in 1209. It was built on such unscientific principles, that it ought to have been carried away before it was finished, when it was finished, and at any given time subsequently; but partly by the awkward contrivances of barbarous men, partly by its own obstinacy, it has stood six centuries and a quarter, amidst the perpetual prophecies of disinterested engineers that it could not stand any longer: while one bridge after another, on different parts of the same river, in which no son of science had espied a flaw, has wilfully tumbled to pieces, by

---

30 P. 132.

31 P. 139.

32 Reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. IX, pp. 189-219.

---

30 P. 139.

31 P. 139.

32 Reprinted in Hallford Edition, Vol. IX, pp. 135-215.

> the sinking of the piers, or the yielding of the abutments, in despite of the most mathematical demonstrations of the absurdity and impropriety of such a proceeding.[33]

In such a manner does Peacock dismiss those who would replace the old London Bridge with a new one.

Peacock's "Essay on Fashionable Literature,"[34] unfortunately left unfinished, reads like a chapter from one of his novels. It romps through contemporary literature in the same manner as does the table-talk at Crotchet Castle, taking a dig at the reviews here, expressing sincere compliments to Wordsworth there and a dubious one to Scott elsewhere. Its one unifying idea is that contemporary readers are a bunch of silly asses, seconded only by the writers who pander to their tastes.

Of the other extreme in Peacock's criticism, the sincere and sympathetic, very little, except for the "Memoirs of Shelley," deals with contemporaries. By far the largest body of this work deals directly or indirectly with music. He is known to have written at least eighty-eight[35] opera notices for The Globe and The Examiner, and we may safely conjecture that he wrote many more which have not yet been identified. Two other essays on music are extant: a review

---

33 P. 193.

34 Reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. VIII, pp. 261-91.

35 This many are itemized, although not reprinted, in Halliford Edition, Vol. IX, pp. 414-20.

---

33 P. 193.

34 Reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. VIII, pp. 861-81.

35 This many are itemized, although not reprinted, in Halliford Edition, Vol. IX, pp. 414-20.

of Lord Mount Edgecumbe's Musical Reminiscences[36] and an essay entitled Bellini.[37] Peacock's musical tastes are personal and bear the same mark of the dilettante which characterize his literary criticism. Mozart is his favorite composer, closely rivalled, strangely enough, by Beethoven and Rossini. He is a strict purist and violently denounces the current practice of editing operas to suit the resources of particular companies.

Five articles deal with classical literature. Two of these were reviews: Demetrius Galanus' Greek Translations from Sanscrit[38] and Müller and Donaldson's History of Greek Literature.[39] For the first he has nothing but praise, and nothing but admiration for its author. Few men have ever become so enthusiastic over translations of sacred Hindu writings into ancient Greek. The History of Greek Literature is also trated favorably: the review is largely a chapter-by-chapter account of the book with occasional digressions on some of Peacock's favorite authors. He disagrees with the authors only on certain minor details: Greek music, the

---

36 In The London Review, April, 1835; reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. IX, pp. 221-52.

37 In The London Review, January, 1836; reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. IX, pp. 313-38.

38 Fraser's Magazine, November, 1858; reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. X, pp. 119-61.

39 Fraser's Magazine, March, 1859; reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. X, pp. 163-229.

career and execution of Socrates, and a few others. In general he evaluates the work as "a great service to letters."[40] The other three articles on classical literature form the first three numbers of a series in Fraser's entitled "Horae Dramaticae," which was thus admirably begun but then discontinued. The three numbers were entitled "Querolus," "The Phaethon of Euripides," and "The 'Flask' of Cratinus."[41] The first and third of these are excellent appreciative sketches, but the second is marred by an excess of pedantry, dealing as the article does largely with purely textual problems which are of interest only to a specialized student of Euripides. The third number is particularly charming, mainly because of a lengthy digression into the "Bacchic birth" of poetry, "The necessary dependence of good poetry on good liquor."[42] This is a delightful mixture of scholarship and whimsy, as fine a piece as Peacock ever wrote. Large portions of it later found their way into Gryll Grange.

Three articles deal with French literature: a review of Oeuvres de Chapelle et de Bachaumont,[43] which

---

40 P. 165.

41 These appeared in Fraser's Magazine for March, 1852, April, 1852, and October, 1857, respectively. They are reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. X, pp. 1-38, 39-68, 69-88.

42 P. 77.

43 Fraser's Magazine, April, 1858; reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. X, pp. 89-118.

was another appreciative sketch but has little general comment, and two articles entitled "French Comic Romances" and "The Épicier."[44] The first of these is especially important, because here Peacock admits his admiration for the French comic writers who so strongly influenced his novels, and because here he most clearly states his own theory of comedy, which he insists always is that which

> limits itself, in the exposure of abuses, to turning up into full daylight their intrinsic absurdities--not that which makes ridiculous things not really so, by throwing over them a fool's coat which does not belong to them, or setting upon them, as honest Bottom has it, an ass's head of its own. . . . In the first case, the ridicule is never sought; it always appears, as in the comic tales of Voltaire, to force itself up obviously; in the second case, the most prominent feature of the exhibition is the predetermination to be caustic and comical.[45]

The other article deals with the bourgeois épicier, or shopkeeper, as he is portrayed in the work of de Kock and others. From this point of departure Peacock generalizes in two directions: he investigates the commercial, political, and the emblematic extensions of the épicier, and thus shows himself to be still of extremely liberal views; and he expounds the curious and half-joking doctrine that

---

44 These appeared in The London Review for October, 1835, and January, 1836, respectively, as introductory essays to a more extensive study of the popular French novelist Paul de Kock. This study, unfortunately, was never written. The two essays are reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. IX, pp. 253-88, 289-312.

45 Pp. 261-62.

literary production follows public taste in the same manner as demand regulates the supply of commodities in the shop of the épicier. "Milton would be forthcoming if he were wanted; but in our time Milton was not wanted, and Walter Scott was."[46]

One other review is of interest to us here--that of the Memoirs, Correspondence, and Private Papers of Thomas Jefferson[47]--in that it gives us Peacock's political views during his Benthamite days. As literary criticism it is negligible. Peacock tosses a hurried compliment to the editor and then rushes on to give his own views of Jefferson, whom he idolizes. Peacock's concluding sentence is

> He was undoubtedly the greatest public benefactor that has yet appeared in the nineteenth century; whatever may be his station in the eighteenth, in which it is difficult to say he was second, even to Washington.[48]

This article does not reveal Peacock as a very thorough student of political theory and especially of economics (he can see Hamilton as nothing but an aristocratic scoundrel), but it places him definitely in the camp of the "radicals" at this time. Every expression of admiration for the American government

---

46 P. 294.

47 Westminster Review, October, 1830; reprinted in Halliford Edition, Vol. IX, pp. 141-187.

48 P. 187.

is accompanied by a denunciation of the corrupt British aristocracy.

Peacock's criticism, then, falls into two general groups: the warmly appreciative essays and the ranting, ragging criticism. The latter is seldom serious: for one brief period, however, it was so serious that Peacock acquired the reputation of the most acid of reviewers. Mill wrote to his co-editor John Robertson in 1837 regarding a proposed review of Moore's work: "Moore, if favourable, is not worth doing; if unfavourable, Peacock should do it."[49] However, such bitterness was unnatural to Peacock. Most of his ragging criticism is rather sound if not taken too literally. His more serious work is infused with a personal element which makes it delightful to read. At no time, however, did he attempt anything approaching a complete aesthetic. His essays, at their best, were founded on his personal tastes and prejudices, and, like Hazlitt, he made little attempt to reduce these to logical order.

---

49 Quoted by Van Doren, p. 204.

---

[49] Quoted by Van Doren, p. 204.

CHAPTER V

THE EXTENT OF THE LITERARY CRITICISM IN THE NOVELS

The general purport of the preceding chapters would seem to invalidate the subject from the start: Peacock was not a social critic; he was impartial in the novels; he wrote only for his own pleasure and his readers' enjoyment. Nevertheless, a study of the ideas in the novels is important.

One of the values of Peacock's novels is that they, unconsciously perhaps, portray a comprehensive panorama of his age. What other writer has given us so concise a background of a social, political, and literary era, anatomized each facet of his age so unmercifully, and then presented it in such an enjoyable packet? Granted, a few writers have: Chaucer, More, Swift, and others, but these have all been the "great" writers. Does not the same reasoning which permits extensive investigation of Chaucer's picture of medieval England also permit some study of the ideas of a "near great," Peacock?

Peacock's work can be enjoyed without the aid of academic interpretation. Indeed it is to his merit that he can delight us even if we do not know, for example, that Mr. Cypress is Byron or that Mr. Flosky is Coleridge. The present study, however, will, it is hoped, both enhance the enjoyment of the amateur devotee and orient those who

CHAPTER V

read Peacock for an understanding of his age. Indeed, it is a strange world that they will find in Peacock unless they read him with certain essential qualifications. Our study should then appeal to two different kinds of readers. For their sakes much attention has been given to the revaluation of Peacock's creative work and to the realignment of his personality. If we are successful, the reader's enjoyment, as well as his understanding, of Peacock will be increased.

Since Peacock wrote for pleasure and was usually impartial in his mockery, the novels offer no complete system of critical ideas. Certainly no complete aesthetic will be essayed in this study. In fact, the concluding chapter will be disappointing to any non-Peacockian who expects neatly-systematized critical dogmas, purporting to be those of Peacock. Previous studies have made such an attempt and have therefore been unreliable. Previous students, faced with the problem of Peacock's good-humored impartiality, have tried to validate their theses. In this attempt most of them have violently misinterpreted our author: Mr. Draper and Miss Hammond called him a critical satirist out of sympathy with his age; Mr. Frankel saw him struggling with the problem of evil. Invariably such studies have failed in their purpose: they have advised the beginner neither how seriously Peacock can be

taken, nor how much of him can be swallowed whole, nor how often we must simply laugh along with him.

There are several levels of criticism in Peacock's novels. By comparing these and by correlating them with statements in his critical prose, we can at least infer the general direction of Peacock's jibes in the novels. The levels of criticism which will be discussed in this chapter are: (1) Peacock's own practice as a creative artist, which helps clarify his notion of what a good novel or a good poem should be; (2) his literary tastes as revealed by the writers whom he quotes in the novels or whom he seems to have read; (3) his direct statements of literary opinion in the novels--these may be either sincere assertions or obviously satiric statements of opinions with which he disagrees; (4) statements made by characters--these also are sometimes sincere, sometimes satiric; and (5) caricatures in the novels--these can be caricatures of events, of ideas, of types, or of living individuals.

To deduce critical opinions from Peacock's own practices is extremely hazardous: Peacock, like many another writer, often "recks not his own rede." However, a few salient features of the novels strongly indicate certain critical essentials which Peacock consistantly demanded of all literary work: clarity, forthrightness,

conciseness, moral integrity, originality, vigorous spirit, and, above all, careful craftsmanship. The fact that these qualities, rather than social utility, comprehensive symbolism, or depth of feeling, characterize Peacock's own work is highly significant.

To judge a man's critical opinions by his personal tastes is also extremely fallible. Taste, like practice, often does not follow precept. Numerous factors influence a man's tastes: conventional evaluations of the "old masters," particular and personal associations with certain books, and special interests in certain types of literature. Peacock's critical statements are so broad and his reading so varied that no startling conclusions are possible. However, I will include here a list of the authors whom Peacock quotes in the novels or whom he discusses at enough length to give some evidence that he read their work. This list has been drawn only from the seven novels. It would be considerably longer if the authors cited in Peacock's critical prose and other work were included. The numbers following the names indicate the number of times each author is cited in the novels. Neither this list nor the number of citations can be considered definitive. Some quotations are so woven into Peacock's own prose that I have undoubtedly

missed many of them. Also there is a problem as to how considerable a reference must be to constitute a citation. For example, an entire series of citations of one man for one purpose I have counted as only one citation; the caricatures of contemporaries I have not counted at all. In all cases, however, I have been consistent in my judgment, and the general proportions indicated will still be valid.

Homer	46	Wordsworth	14
Virgil	14	Southey	6
Horace	17	Byron	2
Petronius Arbiter	12	Coleridge	7
Nonnus	10	Smollett	2
Bible	12	Dr. Johnson	6
Pindar	9	Swift	2
Aristophanes	8	Butler	13
Sophocles	8	Cottle	2
Aeschylus	9	Scott	2
Euripides	9	Percy's Reliques	4
Menander	3	Burns	4
Aristotle	4	Gray	1
Plato	10	Allan Ramsay	1
Simonides	2	Bentham	1
Longinus	1	Moore	2
Cicero	8	Collins	1
Hippocrates	1	M. G. Lewis	1
Zoroaster	1	Brockden Brown	1
Confucius	1	Schiller	1
Lucretius	2	Rousseau	12
Juvenal	7	Shakespeare	53
Junius	1	Milton	14
Lycophron	1	Chaucer	3
Tacitus	2	Boccaccio	1
Plutarch	6	Dante	9
Seneca	1	Ariosto	7
Ovid	3	Bojardo	13
Anacreon	4	Tasso	5
Herodotus	1	Redi	1

Homer	46	Wordsworth
Virgil	14	Southey
Horace	17	Byron
Petronius Arbiter	12	Coleridge
Nonnus	10	Shelley
Bible	12	Dr. Johnson
Pindar	9	Swift
Aristophanes	8	Butler
Sophocles	8	Cowley
Aeschylus	9	Scott
Euripides	9	Percy's Reliques
Menander	8	Burns
Aristotle	4	Gray
Plato	10	Allan Ramsay
Simonides	2	Ossian
Longinus	1	Moore
Cicero	8	Collins
Hippocrates	1	H. G. Lewis
Caesar	1	Brockden Brown
Quintilian	1	Schiller
Lucretius	2	Goethe
Juvenal	7	Shakespeare
Junius	1	Milton
Lycophron	1	Chaucer
Tacitus	2	Boccaccio
Plutarch	6	Dante
Seneca	1	Ariosto
Ovid	3	Berjardo
Apuleius	4	Tasso
Herodotus	1	Madi

Arrian	1	Goldoni	2
Philostratus	1	Petrarch	3
Pausanius	2	Forteguerri	1
Solinus Polyhistor	1	Defoe	1
Xenophon	2	Tillotson	1
Bacchylides	1	Atterbury	1
Plautus	3	O. E. Chronicles	1
Terence	1	Pope	5
Athenaeus	3	Addison	2
Alcaeus	3	Dryden	3
Persius	5	Ralph Roister Doister	1
Apuleius	3	Spenser	2
Lipsius	1	Sidney	1
Diphilus	1	Chapman	1
Pliny	2	Fletcher	2
Suidas	1	Beaumont & Fletcher	4
Philetaerus	1	Middleton	3
Theodectes	1	Drayton	1
Paterculus	1	Greene	4
Livy	2	Ben Jonson	2
Rhianus	1	Congreve	1
Vitruvius	1	Gay	1
Alexis	1	Jeremy Taylor	6
Dio	1	Erasmus	1
Julius Capitolinus	1	Thomas-a-Kempis	1
Servius	1	Rabelais	17
Sallust	1	Voltaire	7
Tibullus	1	Montaigne	1
Lucan	1	Racine	1
Phlegon	1	La Rochefoucald	1
Anaxandrides	1	Niebuhr	3
St. Chrysostom	2	Boileau	1
St. Jerome	1	Chateaubriand	1
St. Athanasius	1	Scribe	1
Gronovius	1	Goethe	4
Hemsterhusius	1	Cervantes	2
Gregory Nazianzenus	1	Lope de Vega	1
Malthus	2	Calderon	2
Emmerton	1	Ponsard	1
Payne Knight	2	Leyden	1
Lord Monboddo	11	Zimmermann	1
Newton	4	La Place	1
Locke	2	Horne Tooke	2
Lavoisier	1	Donaldson	1
Sir William Drummond	3	Gardiner	1
Tom Paine	1	Berni	1

Artian	1	Goldonj
Philoatrata	1	Peterreh
Tasanaina	2	Portagaertl
Solinus Polyhistor	1	Delos
Xenophon	2	Tallstaon
Saecobylides	1	Atterbury
Plautus	3	O. P. Chrematlan
Terence	1	Tape
Athanasius	3	Addison
Lucanus	3	Dryden
Peraius	5	Ralph Roister Doister
Apuleius	3	Spencer
Lipsius	1	Sidney
Diphilus	1	Chapman
Pliny	2	Fletcher
Suidas	1	Beaumont & Fletcher
Philetaerus	1	Middleton
Theodectes	1	Drayton
Futerculus	1	Greene
Livy	2	Ben Jonson
Rhianus	1	Congreve
Viturvius	1	Gay
Alexis	1	Jeremy Taylor
Dio	1	Erasmus
Julius Capitolinus	1	Thomas-a-Kempis
Servius	1	Rabelais
Sallust	1	Voltaire
Tibullus	1	Montaigne
Lucan	1	Rabelais
Philippus	1	La Rochefoucald
Anaximenides	1	Nietzsche
St. Chrysostom	2	Bollaus
St. Jerome	1	Chateaubriand
St. Athanasius	1	Berlbe
Cromwell	1	Goethe
Hemsterhusius	1	Carvantes
Gregory Nazianzenus	1	Lope de Vega
Malthus	2	Calderon
Emerson	1	Pensard
Payne Knight	2	Leyden
Lord Monboddo	11	Zimmermann
Newton	4	La Place
Locke	2	Horne Tooke
Lavoisier	1	Donaldson
Sir William Drummond	3	Gardiner
Tom Paine	1	Bertl

Doctor Paley	1	Encyclopoedia Britannica	1
Gautier	1	Donald Stewart	1
Machiavelli	4	Heyne	1
Colley Cibber	2	Miss Bannerman	1
D'Alembert	1	Bontius	1
Buffon	2	Condorcet	1
Linnaeus	1	de Guyot	1
Louvet	1	Burke	2
St. Augustine	1	Weld	1
Dennis	1	Gibbon	2
Forsyth	2	Montfort	1
Gilpin	1	Berkeley	1
Kant	4	Spartacus Weishaupt	1
Villars	1	Giraldus	1
Diderot	1	Llwyarch Hên	1
Hermann	1	G. Peigniot	1
Porson	1	G. A. Steevens	1
Huddleston	1	Trelawny	1
Ritson	1		

The major conclusions to be drawn from this list are that Peacock's reading was widely varied, that the dramatic writers predominate, and that the list reveals marked romantic tendencies. Although the Greek and Latin writers form the largest single group, the list in general displays the marked exuberance and humanism of the romantic mind. The obvious interest in the Elizabethans is noteworthy in this respect. The favoritism shown to the dramatists is to be expected both from Peacock's own novels, which are strikingly dramatic in method, and from his general attitudes elsewhere expressed..

The third level of criticism in the novels is that of direct statements by the author. These are rare with

Peacock, whose method, as we have noted, is essentially dramatic. Such direct statements can be either positive or negative, sincere or satirical. For example, he expounds a Welsh triad, the "Triads of Poetry":

> The three primary requisites of poetical genius: an eye, that can see nature; a heart, that can feel nature; and a resolution, that dares follow nature.[1]

This we need not hesitate to accept as Peacock's own opinion. But in the same novel, in speaking of the Welsh Bards, he remarks:

> If many of them, instead of acting up to this splendid profession, chose to advance their personal fortunes by appealing to the selfishness, the passions, and the prejudices, of kings, factions, and the rabble, our free press gentry may afford them a little charity out of the excess of their own virtue.[2]

This is obviously satiric, an attack on the integrity of contemporary letters. Yet even the negative statement of satire does not fully equate with Peacock's own ideas. Taken without reservations, the satiric import of this passage is a denunciation of all contemporary writers. Peacock meant only a sly dig at his contemporaries. The good humor of the context aptly demonstrates this fact. In general we may say that when Peacock's personal comments

---

1 Misfortunes of Elphin, Vol. IV, p. 50.

2 Vol. IV, p. 52.

in the novels are not satiric they can be accepted as sincere expressions of opinion; when they are satiric they must be examined with great care: the negative statement implied in the satire cannot be accepted indiscriminately, for often Peacock is only joking.

On the fourth level of criticism, that of the general statements of characters, the problem is more complex, for we must consider how seriously Peacock is treating the character making the statement. When Peacock is being sympathetic in his portrayal of a certain character, we may apply to the statements of that character the same criteria which we applied to the statements of Peacock himself. When Miss Ilex says, "Truth to nature is essential to poetry,"[3] we may accept the statement as that of Peacock. Likewise when Robin Hood says,

> I am come to play anywhere where I can get a cup of sack; for which I will sing the praise of the donor in lofty verse, and emblazon him with any virtue which he may wish to have the credit of possessing, without the trouble of practicing,[4]

we must hesitate in accepting the full value either of the statement or of its implied opposite. True a dig at Southey and the court sycophants was intended, but not the wholesale denunciation which would follow from a literal interpretation.

---

3 Gryll Grange, Vol. V, p. 239.

4 Maid Marian, Vol. III, p. 124.

in the novels are not, as this may seem to be accepted as sincere expressions of opinion; when they are realistic they must be examined with great care: the negative statement implied in the satire cannot be accepted immediately, for often Peacock is only joking.

On the fourth level of criticism, that of the general statements of characters, the problem is more complex. For we must consider how seriously Peacock is treating the character making the statement. When Peacock is being sympathetic in his portrayal of a certain character, we may apply to the statements of that character the same criteria which we applied to the statements of Peacock himself. When Miss Ilex says, "Truth to nature is essential to poetry,"[3] we may accept the statement as that of Peacock. Likewise when Robin Hood says,

> I am come to play anywhere where I can get a rap of such; for which I will sing the praise of the donor in lofty verse, and embalmon him with any virtue which he may w h to have the credit of possessing, without the trouble of practising.[4]

we must hesitate in accepting the full value either of the statement or of its implied opposite. True a dig at Dentley and the court sycophants was intended, but not the wholesale denunciation which would follow from a literal interpretation.

---

3 Crotchet Castle, Vol. V, p. 239.

4 Maid Marian, Vol. III, p. 124.

The situation is complicated when the character itself is being made fun of. For example, when Mr. Feathernest advances his definition of poetry,

> A fine poem is a luminous development of the complicated machinery of action and passion, exalted by pathos, irradiated with scenes of magnificence, figures of loveliness and characters of energy, and harmonized with infinite variety of melodious combination,[5]

he is quite sincere in his statement; yet we cannot ascribe the opinion to Peacock, first because it would be a strange utterance indeed to come from him, but second because the entire character of Mr. Feathernest is treated without respect. When sincere statements, then, are made by characters which themselves are being treated satirically, we discount the statement as it stands, but we must hesitate to accept the opposite as Peacock's own opinion, for, especially if the context is good humored, he is most likely merely laughing at the idea, not attacking it. Peacock's attitude in the passage quoted is not "This is false and consequently the opposite is true," but merely "What an absurd definition!"

These sound like very simple criteria for determining Peacock's ideas, and indeed they would be if Peacock were consistent in the degree of sympathy with which he treats his characters. If a list could be drawn up naming which characters can be taken seriously and which are only caricatures, it would be an easy process to follow the simple method

---

5 Melincourt, Vol. II, p. 91.

outlined above. But no such list is possible except of a very few characters. Mr. Feathernest, for example, never receives the sympathy of his creator, and Mr. Foster never lacks it. Usually, however, the treatment is more complex. Mr. Marmaduke Milestone, who is thoroughly ridiculed for his ambition to make formal gardens out of mountain scenery, has his day when he clashes with Mr. Gall in an argument over taste and makes a piercing comment which leaves Gall biting his lips in silence.[6] Likewise the Reverend Dr. Folliott is generally treated sympathetically and often expresses opinions which are Peacock's own. But he cannot be identified with Peacock, for he does not always remain in favor. He enters into an argument with Mr. Crotchet regarding the moral decency of possessing nude statues even if they are priceless examples of Greek art.[7] Now Peacock, with his free nature and love for Greek sculpture, certainly is not siding with Folliott in this argument. From a seat on the right hand of the author himself, Folliott has here tumbled to a humbler station as a vehicle for satire. Peacock shows us that none are so favored as to be entirely immune from his thunderbolts.

Folliott, in this case, is obviously expressing opinions which are contrary to Peacock's. But the situation is again

---

6 Headlong Hall, Vol. I, pp. 31-32.

7 Crotchet Castle, Vol. IV, pp. 86-101.

different when he makes the statement,

> But, sir, I further propose that the Athenian theatre being resuscitated, the admission shall be free to all who can expound the Greek choruses, constructively, mythologically, and metrically, and to none others. So shall all the world learn Greek: Greek, the Alpha and Omega of all knowledge. At him who sits not in the theatre shall be pointed the finger of scorn: he shall be called in the highway of the city, "a fellow without Greek."[8]

Here Folliott is not expressing opinions contrary to those of Peacock, but is himself making fun of Peacock's own love of Greek. Through the mouth of the same character, then, Peacock expresses his own ideas, satirizes ideas which he dislikes, and makes fun of the excesses in his own opinions.

Likewise when Mr. Fax expounds Malthusian doctrine he is laughed at, but otherwise he is treated sympathetically. We are wrong if we infer either that Peacock was a Malthusian or that everything Mr. Fax says is nonsense. Obviously Peacock needed a companion and confidant for Forester in Melincourt, someone agreeable enough to be Forester's close friend yet cynical enough to serve as a foil and to stimulate discussion between the two men. Fax's cynicism, as it evolved, inevitably suggested Malthus, and Peacock could not resist the temptation to emphasize the similarities and treat the subject satirically.

In this, as in other cases, our guide is common sense plus a constant awareness of the novels as creative works. We must consider to what extent a character's ideas are necessary

---

8 Vol. IV, p. 83.

to the structure of the novel. And we must reason from the context and from our other knowledge of Peacock. Dr. Folliott often expresses Peacock's ideas, but is it conceivable that Peacock would advance an argument so absurd and so contrary to his nature as that Greek sculpture is immoral?

This inconsistency in the degree of sympathy given to his characters should not be construed as a defect in Peacock. Instead, it is an example of his skill in structure. The genial warmth of the dialogues is maintained by keeping the characters from becoming so exemplary as to be prudish on the one hand or so unswerving in their folly as to be disagreeable on the other. Peacock's characters, at best, wear neither halos nor horns. It is partly in this respect that Melincourt falls down. With the exception of Fax, and possibly of Sir Telegraph, the characters are too absolute. Forester and Anthelia are disgusting in their self-righteous virtue, and Feathernest, Paperstamp, and their colleagues are only shallow personifications of moral degradation.

The final level of criticism to be discussed here is that of the caricatures. These can be caricatures of ideas only or of actual personalities. Mr. Foster in Headlong Hall, for example, is a caricature of an idea. As a perfectibilian he resembles Shelley to some small extent, but he is by no means a personal portrait of Shelley. Mr. Cypress in Nightmare Abbey, on the other hand, is an

unmistakable caricature of Byron, representing not only the general Byronic temper but a few personal aspects of that poet.

It is unfortunate that a great deal of Peacock criticism consists only of playing a game of identifying the originals of Peacock's characters. This practice is useful and harmless in moderation, but the mania for identification has grown into a frantic scramble to pin down the most insignificant persons in the novels. In demonstration I offer here a compilation of the identifications made by six reputable Peacockians. In the following list, arranged in order of publication, Young (1904) will be represented by the letter Y, Van Doren (1911) by VD, Freeman (1911) by F, Priestly (1927) by P, Brett-Smith (1934) by BS, and Redman (1947) by R.

Headlong Hall

Escot: Peacock (Y, VD, R), J. F. Newton (F).
Foster: Shelley (Y, VD, F, P, R).
Jenkinson: Hogg (Y, F, P, R).
Milestone: Humphrey Repton (Y, VD, F, P, BS, R).
Gall: Jeffrey (Y, F, P, R).
MacLaurel: Campbell (F, P, R).
Nightshade: Southey (VD, P, R).
Philomela Poppyseed: Amelia Opie (F, P, BS, R).
Cranium: Dr. Gryffydh (F).
Cephalis: Jane Gryffydh (F).
Sir Patrick O'Prism: Sir Uvedale Price (F, P, R).
Panscope: Coleridge (P, R), Lord Brougham (Y).

Melincourt

Captain Hawltaught: Thomas Love (Y, F, P, BS).
Paperstamp: Wordsworth (Y, VD, F, P, BS).
Mystic: Coleridge (Y, VD, P, BS).
Feathernest: Southey (Y, VD, F, P, BS, R).
Anyside Antijack: Canning (Y, VD, F, P, BS).

unmistakable caricature of Byron, representing misanthropy as the general Byronic temper but a few personal touches as that poet.

It is unfortunate that a great deal of research criticism consists only of playing a game of identifying the originals of Peacock's characters. This practice is useful and even justified in moderation, but the mania for identification has given rise into a frantic scramble to pin down the most insignificant persons in the novels. In demonstration of after here a compilation of the identifications made by six reputable Peacockians. In the following list, arranged in order of publication, Young (1904) will be represented by the letter Y, Van Doren (1911) by VD, Freeman (1911) by F, Crewdt (1913) by C, Brett-Smith (1934) by BS, and Hodson (1937) by H.

Headlong Hall

Essot: Peacock (Y, VD, H), J. P. Collier (F).
Foster: Shelley (Y, VD, F, H).
Jenkinson: Hogg (Y, F, H).
Milestone: Humphrey Repton (Y, VD, F, H, BS).
Gall: Jeffrey (Y, F, H).
Mealancel: Campbell (F, H).
Nightshade: Beddoes (VD, H).
Philomela Poppyseed: Amelia Opie (Y, F, VD, H).
Cranium: Dr. Gryllyah (F).
Cephalis: Jane Gryllyah (F).
Sir Patrick O'Prism: Sir Uvedale Price (Y, H).
Panscope: Coleridge (F, H), Lord Brougham (H).

Melincourt

Captain Hawltaught: Thomas Love (Y, F, H).
Paperstamp: Ackermann (Y, VD, F, H).
Mystic: Coleridge (Y, VD, F, H).
Featherstone: Southey (Y, VD, F, H).
Anyside Antijack: Canning (Y, VD, F, H).

Forester: Shelley (Y, F, P, R), Peacock (Y, F).
Fax: Malthus (Y, VD, F, P, BS, R), Peacock (Y).
Killthedead: Croker (VD, F, P, BS), Barrow (Y).
Vamp: Gifford (Y, VD, F, R, BS).
Derrydown: Scott (VD, BS), Wordsworth (VD), M. G. Lewis (F).
The Learned Mythologist: Thomas Taylor (Y, VD).
Uncle Hippy: Sir Henry Scott (BS).
Anthelia: Sir Henry's niece (BS), Jane Gryffydh (Y).
Sir Gregory Greenmould: Sir William Curtis (F).
Sarcastic: Peacock (F).
Sir Telegraph Paxarett: Hogg (F).

Nightmare Abbey

Scythrop: Shelley (Y, VD, F, P, BS, R).
Marionetta: Harriet (Y, F, P, BS, R).
Stella (Celinda): Mary (Y, VD, F, P, BS, R), Miss Hitchener (VD), Clara Clairmont (Collins, in Byron in His Letters).
Emily Girouette: Harriet Grove (Y, F, BS).
Flosky: Coleridge (Y, VD, F, P, BS, R).
Toobad: Newton (VD, F, P, BS, R).
Cypress: Byron (Y, VD, F, P, BS, R).
Hilary: Peacock (VD, F, P).
Glowry: Sir Timothy Shelley (Y), Peacock (Ellis in George Meredith).
Sackbut: Southey (Y, VD, F).
Listless: Sir Lumley Skeffington (VD, P).
The novel Devilman: Godwin's Mandeville (VD).
Asterias: Sir John Sinclair (Y).

Maid Marian

Harpiton: Southey (Y, F).

The Misfortunes of Elphin

Seithenyn: Canning (Y).
Gwythno: George IV (Y).

Crotchet Castle

Susannah Touchandgo: Jane Gryffydh (BS).
Touchandgo: Rowland Stephenson (BS).
Learned Friend: Brougham (Y, VD, F, P, BS).
Steam Intellect Society: Society for the Diffusion of Popular Knowledge (P, BS).
MacQuedy: J. R. MacCulloch (Y, VD, F, P, BS, R).
Skionar: Coleridge (Y, VD, F, P, BS, R).

Wilful Wontsee: Wordsworth (Y, VD, F, P, BS, R).
Rumblesack Shantsee: Southey (Y, VD, F, P, BS, R).
Ramsbottom: Newton (VD, BS).
Toogood: Robert Owen (Y, VD, P, BS, R).
Philpot: MacGregor Laird (Y, BS, R).
Evesdrop: Hazlitt (Y, BS, R).
Trillo: Peacock (Y, VD).
Folliott: Peacock (Y).
Chainmail: Scott (Y).

Gryll Grange

Facing-both-ways: Brougham (Y, F, P, BS, R).
Pantopragmatic Society: Social Science Association (BS).
Michin Malicho: Lord John Russell (Y, F, BS).
Falconer: Shelley (F, R).

The agreement or even unanimity of several commentators with reference to certain of these identifications is, of course, significant. It does not, however, mean that the character so identified is a portrait of the person named, but merely that in part the character is a representation of some of the ideas of the person named. Moreover, such unanimity is the exception rather than the rule. The fact that Peacock himself made a few of these identifications so obvious as to be unmistakable supports the view that the more far fetched identifications are the result only of the imaginative conjectures of the commentators, not of the author's intention. Probably no more than a third of the identifications in this imposing list merit serious consideration. Each critic has his own peculiar crotchet, and the result is an absurd display that would have truly delighted Peacock. Peacock himself is identified with no less than eight of his characters: Folliott, Trillo, Hilary, Glowry, Sarcastic, Fax, Forester, and Escot. Two of

these--Hilary and Glowry--are exact opposites and serve as foils to each other in Nightmare Abbey. What a strange figure Peacock must have been! Panscope is identified with both Coleridge and Brougham, a coupling of which neither gentleman would have approved. Derrydown is supposed to represent Scott, Wordsworth, and "Monk" Lewis, three personalities which, as all the world knows, have a great deal in common. Some of the identifications are advanced on no grounds stronger than family relationships between characters. For example, Young identifies Glowry with Sir Timothy Shelley merely because he is Scythrop's father. The same reasoning would identify Stella's father with Mary's father and make a Mr. Toobad out of Godwin!

A few critics have footnoted their identifications with cautions not to take them too seriously, but they nevertheless went ahead with their game of identification. Priestly gives about the most adequate summary of Peacock's method of caricature:

> For the most part, these characters must be regarded as a rough personification of the views of actual individuals, and not, as is frequently supposed, caricatures of the persons themselves. . . . we must not imagine that Peacock thought he was portraying these gentlemen . . . he . . . was creating fantastic personnages out of their opinions.[9]

It is unfortunate that previous studies of Peacock's ideas have been based almost entirely on these caricatures. Actually the caricatures are not really informing. First, they do not furnish a reliable guide to Peacock's impressions of the originals as personalities: if we read Nightmare Abbey to learn Peacock's opinion of Shelley's marriage, we will be led

---

9 Priestly, pp. 36-37.

far astray. Second, the characters throw very little light on Peacock's literary evaluations of his contemporaries. Actually Peacock was always very fond of Wordsworth's poetry, but if we determine his opinions from the characters of Paperstamp and Wontsee (as all previous studies have done) we will conclude that he had no use for Wordsworth. Peacock shows a great deal of admiration for Coleridge's "Kubla Khan,"[10] but from Mr. Flosky's account of the composition of that poem[11] we could conclude only that Peacock thought it nonsense.

The caricatures grow out of three sources: first, and most important, Peacock needed crotchety disputants to serve his structural needs in the novels. He never hesitated to sacrifice the satiric identification to the artistic requirements of his work. Second, he enjoyed and knew that his readers would delight (as we know from all accounts that they did) in his bringing in a few well-known figures for a share of the fun. He did this whenever, without damaging the structure of his novel, he could introduce minor quirks in his characters which would suggest to his readers public figures who were afflicted with similar aberrations. Finally, he found the caricatures an opportunity for taking a few digs at what he considered literary abuses. Mr. Cypress and Mr. Flosky tell us that Peacock did not like mysticism or morbidity in poetry. They do not tell us that

---

10 For example, he quotes from it as a motto for Chapter V of The Misfortunes of Elphin, Vol. IV, p. 44.

11 Nightmare Abbey, Vol. III, p. 76.

Peacock thought that Byron sang dismal songs at dinner parties nor that Coleridge shook salt on his candle to make it burn blue. And they most certainly do not tell us that Peacock did not like the poetry of Byron and Coleridge.

To understand Peacock's critical ideas, however, we must understand the caricatures. In two ways they are important to a study of his ideas. First, since the caricatures are not personal portraits but personifications of certain ideas or "humours" of the originals, we can determine these ideas and ascertain Peacock's attitude toward them. From Mr. Flosky, as has been mentioned, we learn that Peacock liked poetry clear and forthright, not confused and mystified. Second, only by determining the nature of the treatment of the character (remembering always that this treatment is seldom constant throughout) can we know how seriously the character is to be taken and how much value, either positive or negative, can be placed on his statements.

The student should constantly bear in mind everything that he knows about Peacock as a complex whole--Peacock as a poet, as a critic, as a lover of nature in the Wordsworthian sense, as a lover of fair young ladies in a very real and worldly sense. When reading Prince Seithenyn's defense of the embankment one should remember that Peacock himself once wrote a very similar defense of the old London Bridge[12] and should withhold judgment accordingly. One should balance

---

12 Quoted in Chapter IV of this thesis.

---

12 Quoted in Chapter IV of this thesis.

Mr. Forester against the Reverend Dr. Folliott, just as Peacock himself balanced Mr. Foster, the perfectibilian, against Mr. Escot, the deteriorationist. But neither should one conclude that Peacock is always the mean between the two extremes. He is certainly not a Mr. Jenkinson, perpetually *in statu quo*. Our knowledge of Peacock's ideas cannot come from identifying Peacock with some of his characters and accepting their statements, labeling other characters as caricatures and invariably accepting the converse of their opinions.

The conclusions drawn by this chapter have unfortunately been mostly negative--a warning against how not to read Peacock. Such strictures have been made necessary by the repeated studies which have found Peacock opposed to education, scornful of marriage, and contemptuous of the literary productions of each and all of his contemporaries. On the positive side not so much can be said. It is impossible to produce a *Handbook for Enlightened Peacockians*, although mere lists of character identifications have often passed for just that. As a summary, however, a few helps and hints can be advanced, in the earnest hope that they will be of aid to readers.

First, determine the essence of each caricature as it is read. Each has some essential quality which distinguishes it. Then note the degree of sympathy awarded the caricature. If Peacock seems to admire the character, the quality which it personifies may safely be added to Peacock's own ideas.

But the converse is not always true. If Peacock is ridiculing the caricature, we may suspect that his own opinion is the opposite of the ideas personified, but then again Peacock may be just clowning, and we must withhold judgment until we find a more positive statement as corroboration.

Second, watch for general statements made by Peacock as author. If these are stated directly (that is, not satirically) we may accept them as his own. If they are satirical we may suspect the opposite to be his actual stand, but again we must draw such conclusions with many reservations.

Third, note the degree of sympathy with which the more important characters are treated. Remember that this may vary within the same novel. If a certain character makes a positive statement at the time Peacock seems to favor that character, we may ascribe to Peacock the opinion expressed. If the statement of the favored character is satiric, then the opposite may be taken only with the reservations already mentioned. On the other hand, if the character, at the time of making a statement, is being ridiculed by Peacock, the opposite of the opinion expressed may perhaps be Peacock's but must be accepted with the customary precautions. This method of dealing with the major characters, who are complex and ever-changing individuals, should not be confused with the method of dealing with the caricatures, who, generally speaking, are simple and consistent personifications of a single dominant idea.

Finally, the opinions thus derived should be further checked against Peacock's tastes, his practices, and the statements which he made elsewhere as a review critic.

The single emphasis in all these warnings is obviously that Peacock was nearly always sincere in positive statements but often not so in satire. The former can be accepted without question; the latter cannot. The explanation, as this thesis has attempted to point out, is that Peacock was not so much a satirist as a humorist. He more often laughs <u>with</u> an idea than <u>at</u> it. The reader who is blessed with a good sense of humor will find in the context of all statements a pretty good clue as to whether Peacock is attacking an idea or just playing with it.

CHAPTER VI

PEACOCK AND THE ROMANTIC MOVEMENT

Peacock's critical ideas about literature in general are best understood in relation to the ideas of his own age. That age was, primarily, the romantic period. This chapter, then, will discuss Peacock's place in that great movement of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

No attempt will be made here to define romanticism. Existing definitions are as restricted as that of H. A. Beers--"pertaining to the style of the Christian and popular literature of the Middle Ages"[1]--or as broad as that of Lascelles Abercrombie, who jokingly remarks,

> One poet is romantic because he falls in love; another, romantic because he sees a ghost; another, romantic because he hears a cuckoo; another, romantic because he is reconciled to the Church.[2]

Definitions are as derogatory as that of Goethe--"Romanticism is disease; Classicism is health"[3]--and as sweepingly laudatory as that of Stendhal:

> Le romantisme est l'art de présenter aux peuples les oeuvres littéraires qui, dans l'état actuel de leurs habitudes et de leurs croyances, sont susceptibles de leur donner le plus de plaisir possible.
>
> Le classicisme, au contraire, leur présente la literature qui donnait le plus grand plaisir possible à leurs arrière-grands-peres.[4]

---

1 Henry A. Beers, A History of English Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century, p. vi.

2 Lascelles Abercrombie, Romanticism, p. 11.

3 Goethe, quoted by Frank Lucas, The Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal, p. 9.

4 Marie Henri Beyle (de Stendhal), Racine et Shakespeare, p. 21.

p. 81.

In the face of just four such divergent definitions we are inclined to complain along with Professor Lovejoy that "The word 'romantic' has come to mean so many things that, by itself, it means nothing."[5]

Clearly in a work of this scope no definitive limitation can be made of the concept. I shall then treat the term romanticism rather loosely, signifying by it the general liberal and vigorous spirit of enthusiasm which appears in much of the best work of the early nineteenth century as opposed to the more reactionary and more reserved formalism of neo-classicism. Within these broad limitations are many component elements, ideas with some of which Peacock agreed and to some of which he was opposed.

The first conclusion to be drawn is paradoxical: Peacock never consciously identified himself consistently with any party, either literary or political, and therefore to some extent he can be identified with the general neo-classic position. Aloofness and impartial objectivity are certainly not characteristics of romanticism. On the contrary, rabid partisanship is its very essence. Shelley, one of the most intellectual of the romantics, was afflicted with a partisan zeal quite foreign to the neo-classical temperament. Such divergent personalities as Shelley and Byron always had one common tie,

---

5 A. O. Lovejoy, "On the Discrimination of Romanticisms," Publications of the Modern Language Association, XXXIX (June, 1924), 229.

In the face of just four such divergent definitions we are inclined to complain along with Professor Lovejoy that "The word 'romantic' has come to mean so many things that, by itself, it means nothing."[5]

Clearly in a work of this scope no definitive limitation can be made of the concept. I shall then treat the term romanticism rather loosely, signifying by it the general liberal and vigorous spirit of enthusiasm which appears in much of the best work of the early nineteenth century as opposed to the more reactionary and more reserved formalism of neo-classicism. Within these broad limitations are many component elements, ideas with some of which Peacock agreed and to none of which he was opposed.

The first conclusion to be drawn is paradoxical: Peacock never consciously identified himself wholeheartedly with any party, either literary or political, and therefore to some extent he can be identified with the general neo-classic position. Aloofness and impartial objectivity are certainly not characteristics of romanticism. On the contrary, rabid partisanship is its very essence. Shelley, one of the most intellectual of the romantics, was affiliated with a partisan zeal quite foreign to the neo-classical temperament. Such divergent personalities as Shelley and Byron always had one common tie,

---

5 A. O. Lovejoy, "On the Discrimination of Romanticisms," Publications of the Modern Language Association, XXXIX (June, 1924), 229.

even when they differed in everything else: they were both rebels. Yet Peacock never saw a reason to rebel. He was himself quite contented with things as they were. Yet he could see abuses even when they did not personally affect him, and he could not excuse the abuses. He held a semi-governmental position and depended on the so-called reactionary administration for his livelihood, yet his associates in the India House itself included some of the most prominent of the Benthamite radicals. Hobhouse called him "a strong conservative in politics,"[6] yet Peacock could write reviews in the radical Westminster violently attacking the administration. Peacock's personal friends ranged from such conservatives as Houbhouse to such radicals as Shelley and Leigh Hunt. Peacock's politics pretty well balance off into fence-sitting.

In literary matters likewise he never committed himself to either party. His personal tastes were confined to neither school of thought, and his critical estimates of his contemporaries follow no party line. His judgments were often bigoted or prejudiced, but it may be said in his favor that his prejudices generally applied to the individual and not to his party. He could sincerely admire such differing individuals as Pope, Scott, Wordsworth, and Coleridge.

Since Peacock never declared his partisanship, critics

---

6 Sir John Cam Hobhouse, Recollections of a Long Life, Vol. V, p. 184.

---

6 Sir John Cam Hobhouse, Recollections of a Long Life, Vol. V, p. 184.

ever since his death have attempted to claim him for the classicists or the romantics. Much criticism has been wasted in futile attempts to pigeon-hole Peacock in this manner. As for any overt declaration, Peacock consistently avoided the embarrassment of complete identification with either party on the one hand, and consciously strove to maintain his individuality on the other. The satire in the novels could prove him of either party or of neither, for he constantly made fun of both but seldom spoke in favor of either. But Peacock, as I have pointed out, was quite capable of making fun of ideas to which he himself adhered. The neo-classicist seem to have won one victory in Peacock's very detachedness, for such objectivity and flexibility are certainly not romantic characteristics.

On the question of the social obligations of the artist, Peacock leans toward the romantics. Complete liberty of thought and unblemished moral integrity were certainly not demanded in the days of Pope, when the patronage system presupposed that the politics of an author would be biased by his pocketbook. But the romantic period gave to poets, as "unacknowledged legislators of the world," a new moral responsibility. Peacock admired the poetry of Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey, but he could not understand their shift to conservatism as anything but dishonesty and defection. Consequently his criticism of these men as personalities is

consistently severe. Mr. Feathernest, representing Southey in some ways, the entire group of poets to which he belonged in others, says,

> I took my station, became my own crier, and vociferated Truth and Liberty, till the noise that I made brought people about me, to bid for me: and to the highest bidder I knocked myself down, at less than I am worth certainly; but when an article is not likely to keep, it is by no means prudent to postpone the sale.[7]

Similar statements appear in all seven of the novels. We must not interpret these primarily as attacks on the poetry of the lake poets, toward whom he bore little other resentment, but only as an expression of a general opinion, the importance of freedom and integrity in the artist.

The reading public must also be respectable according to Peacock. Consistently he condemns fickle, gossip-loving readers and the writers who pander to their taste. The women novelists, whose superficial elegance had great appeal among the circulating libraries, particularly received his reproach. Lady Clarinda sums up Peacock's opinion of such writing when she announces that she herself is writing a novel:

> Yes, a novel. And I shall get a little finery by it: trinkets and fal-lals, which I cannot get from Papa. You must know I have been reading several fashionable novels, the fashionable this, and the fashionable that; and

---

7 Melincourt, Vol. II, p. 182.

> I thought to myself, why I can do better than any of these myself.[8]

Peacock often exhibits a lack of respect for the novel as a form of art. To some extent such statements must be discounted as only making fun of Peacock's own ideas and activities. Yet the feeling of corruption in fashionable novels is definitely Peacock's own. In Crotchet Castle Peacock declines to describe minutely the Ap-Llymry farm, saying,

> We shall leave this tempting field of interesting expatiation to those whose brains are high-pressure steam engines for spinning prose by the furlong, to be trumpeted in paid-for paragraphs in the quack's corner of newspapers: modern literature having attained the honourable distinction of sharing with blacking and macassar oil, the space which used to be monopolized by razor-straps and the lottery, whereby that very enlightened community, the reading public, is tricked into the perusal of much exemplary nonsense.[9]

As a positive statement of the same opinion, we have Mr. Forester's description of his ideal sweetheart:

> I would have a woman that can love and feel poetry, not only in its harmony and decorations, which limit the admiration of ordinary mortals, but in the deep sources of love, and liberty, and truth, which are its only legitimate springs and without which well turned periods and glittering images are nothing more nor less than the vilest and most mischievous tinsel.[10]

Such a statement is almost Shelleian, and indeed Peacock's critical ideas differ from Shelley's merely in the emphasis

---

8 Crotchet Castle, Vol. IV, p. 68.

9 Vol. IV, p. 166.

10 Melincourt, Vol. II, p. 116.

I thought to myself, why I can do better than any of these myself.[8]

Peacock often exhibits a lack of respect for the novel as a form of art. To some extent such statements must be discounted as only making fun of Peacock's own ideas and activities. Yet the feeling of exemption in fashionable novels is definitely Peacock's own. In Crotchet Castle Peacock declines to describe minutely the Ap-Rhyarry farm, saying,

> We shall leave this tempting field of interesting explanation to those whose brains are high-pressure steam engines for spinning prose by the furlong, to be transported in packages for perusal in the quack's corner of newspapers; modern literature having attained the honourable distinction of sharing with blacking and macassar oil, the space which used to be monopolized by razor-strops and the lottery, namely that very enlightened community, the reading public, is tricked into the perusal of much exemplary nonsense.[9]

As a positive statement of the same opinion, we have Mr. Forester's description of his ideal sweetheart:

> I would have a woman that can love and feel poetry, not only in its memory and associations, which limit the admiration of ordinary mortals, but in the deep recesses of love, and liberty, and truth, which are its only legitimate springs and without which soil turned periods and glittering images are nothing more than the vilest and most miserable tinsel.[10]

Such a statement is almost Shelleian, and indeed Peacock's critical ideas differ from Shelley's merely in the emphasis

---

8 Crotchet Castle, Vol. IV, p. 69.

9 Vol. IV, p. 166.

10 Melincourt, Vol. II, p. 116.

and consistency with which they are advanced. Shelley and Peacock certainly concurred in the concept of the moral integrity of the artist and his readers, but whereas the moral degradation deeply moved Shelley, it only annoyed and lightly amused Peacock.

On the question of the social utility of literature, another romantic concept, Peacock was not so explicit. When under the influence of Shelley--that is, in Melincourt--he occasionally assumes the attitude of a satiric reformer:

> The vices that call for the scourge of satire are those which pervade the whole frame of society, and which, under some specious pretence of private duty, or the sanction of custom and precedent, are almost permitted to assume the semblance of virtue, or at least to pass unstigmatized in the crowd of congenial transgressions.[11]

This statement is curious. Although satire itself is primarily neo-classic, Peacock's declaration of its use to scourge the complacent and well-established is clearly romantic. Peacock, in the eyes of those who knew him, was a man armed with a deadly weapon but without a cause. Shelley, realizing Peacock's potential ability as a social satirist, attempted to enlist him in the liberal cause. But Shelley was unsuccessful in this endeavor, and concluded by being quite disappointed in his friend. For Peacock, after producing his one piece of liberal propaganda, Melincourt, declined ever again to be so partisan. A far more typically Peacockian

---

11 Mr. Forester in Melincourt, Vol. II, pp. 178-79.

discussion of the social utility of literature occurs in Crotchet Castle. Dr. Folliott, commenting on the romances of Scott, complains,

> As to any sentence worth remembering, any moral or political truth, anything having a tendency, however remote, to make men wiser or better, to make them think, to make them even think of thinking; they are both precisely alike: nuspiam, nequaquam, nullibi, nullimodis.[12]

This sounds like a reaffirmation of the statement in Melincourt, and we could so construe it if Folliott did not, a few pages later, restate his same argument in words which reduce it to absurdity:

> My quarrel with him [Scott] is, that his works contain nothing worth quoting; and a book that furnishes no quotations, is, me judice, no book--it is a plaything.[13]

This, of course, only makes fun of Peacock's own excessive habit of quoting from authors he had read. The overall idea of the discussion seems to be as follows: Scott's work may not have much moral utility, but, after all, such utility often amounts to nothing more than quotable sophisms; the fact remains that Scott is extremely entertaining to read. As a dilettante amateur, Peacock thought highly of the ethics of his calling and could not understand how those who wrote for a living could bear to sully their art with money, yet, being neither a professional nor a reformer, he could not get very enthusiastic

---

12 Crotchet Castle, Vol. IV, p. 117.

13 Vol. IV, pp. 121-22.

over any purpose to literature except the giving of wholesome delight.

One of Peacock's strongest opinions is that art must be true to nature. This, of course, is one of the keystones of romantic criticism. Miss Ilex says,

> Truth to nature is essential to poetry. Few may perceive an inaccuracy; but to those who do, it causes a great diminution, if not a total destruction, of pleasure in perusal. Shakespeare never makes a flower blossom out of season. Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey are true to nature, in this and in all other respects: even in their wildest imaginings.[14]

And Peacock as author states:

> The three primary requisites of poetical genius: an eye, that can see nature; a heart, that can feel nature; and a resolution, that dares follow nature.[15]

Peacock sees this mimetic principle as essential to effective art, but dangerously harmful if exploited by writers lacking sufficient moral integrity.

Peacock never gave a complete definition of the true sources of poetry. As we have seen, he held that poetry must be true to nature and that love, liberty, and truth are its only legitimate springs, but beyond that he never would go. As to the nature of artistic creation and inspiration, we can only conjecture from what we know him to have disliked. On the one hand, he could not tolerate the pat mechanistic

---

14 Gryll Grange, Vol. V, p. 239.

15 The Misfortunes of Elphin, Vol. IV, p. 50. See also the quotations from "The Four Ages of Poetry" in Chapter IV of this thesis.

explanations of the neo-classicists. Mr. Feathernest is obviously being absurd when he maintains,

> A fine poem is a luminous development of the complicated machinery of action and passion, exalted by sublimity, softened by pathos, irradiated with scenes of magnificence, figures of loveliness, and characters of energy, and harmonized with infinite variety of melodious combination.[16]

But on the other hand, Peacock had very little sympathy with the mystic inspiration, the divine madness of the romantic poets. Consistently he ridicules mysticism in poetry, never, perhaps, more vigorously than in The Misfortunes of Elphin. Teithrin comes to warn King Gwythno of the dangerous condition of the embankment but finds the king busily composing a poem. "Teithrin knew better than to interrupt him in his awen.*" The note which Peacock laconically appends is "*The rapturous and abstracted state of poetical inspiration."[17] Later, in the very midst of the great storm, as the embankment is actually collapsing, the old bard can no longer resist the emotional excitement. As the flood burst into the castle, "the awen came upon him" and he had to stop and compose a song on the spot.[18] Likewise, although Peacock greatly admired the poem "Kubla Khan," he thought Coleridge's account of its composition rather absurd.

Peacock's own creative work reveals him to be

---

16 Melincourt, Vol. II, p. 91.

17 The Misfortunes of Elphin, Vol. IV, p. 6.

18 Vol. IV, p. 25.

somewhat closer to the position of Mr. Feathernest than to that of Gwythno. He was always a craftsman, not an inspired prophet. Just where his own position did lie it is impossible to say with certainty, but he was obviously somewhere between the two extremes, biased somewhat toward the intellectual and away from the emotional.

This observation calls to attention the strange dichotomy in Peacock's novels as creative works. The seven novels are most notable for clarity, brevity, and careful craftsmanship, all neo-classic characteristics. Romantic literature tends to be introspective, involved, and somewhat obscure, yet the very essence of Peacock is his precision and clarity, strongly derivative of the eighteenth century neo-classical French--"Ce qui n'est pas clair n'est pas Français." The romantic novel was long, often running to several volumes, yet Melincourt is the only work of Peacock that even approaches the conventional length. All seven of the novels have been printed in a single volume. Romantic work had a notorious disregard for careful form, yet structurally Peacock's novels are superb.

But if the construction of Peacock's novels is neo-classical, the material treated is romantic. First there is love of nature. Every novel is set in some romantic part of England, the Welsh mountains, the Cumberland lakes, and so on. No man can be called antiromantic who has written such a paragraph as this:

> Passing over the steep and wood-fringed hills of rock that formed the boundary of the valley of Melincourt, she descended through a grove of pines, into a romantic chasm, where a foaming stream was crossed by a rude and ancient bridge, consisting of two distinct parts, each of which rested against a columnar rock, that formed an island in the roaring waters. An ash had fixed its roots in the fissures of the rock, and the knotted base of its aged trunk offered to the passenger a natural seat, over-canopied with its beautiful branches, and leaves, now tinged with their autumnal yellow. Anthelia rested awhile in this delightful solitude. There was no breath of wind, no song of birds, no humming of insects, only the dashing of the waters beneath. She felt the presence of the genius of the scene. She sate absorbed in a train of contemplations, dimly defined, but infinitely delightful: emotions rather than thoughts, which attention would have utterly dissipated, if it had paused to seize their images.19

All the novels contain descriptive passages such as this.

Peacock's love of the native past also proclaims romantic tendencies. He quoted Greek and Latin authors but the age he loved was that of merrie old England.

> I myself think much of Christmas and all its associations. I always dine at home on Christmas-day, and measure the steps of my children's heads on the wall, and see how much higher each of them has risen, since the same time last year, in the scale of physical life. . . . I like the idea of the Yule log, the enormous block of wood, carefully selected long before, and preserved where it would be thoroughly dry, which burned on the old-fashioned hearth. . . . I like the festoons of holly on the walls and windows; the dance under the mistletoe; the gigantic sausage; the baron of beef; the vast globe of plum-pudding, the true image of the earth, flattened at the poles; the tapping of the old October; the inexhaustible bowl of punch; the life and joy of the old hall, when the squire and his household and his neighborhood were as one.20

---

19 Melincourt, Vol. II, pp. 101-102.

20 Gryll Grange, Vol. V, pp. 229-30.

Another romantic element is the belief in the inherent goodness of man. As has been pointed out, Peacock had read Rousseau and obviously believed in the ultimate perfectiblity of man in a healthy natural state.

Finally we must note Peacock's treatment of his young lovers. Although he satirized commercial match-making and marriages of convenience, he never doubted the power of true love. The love affairs in the novels he never treated with anything but kindness and sympathy. This does not mean that he was above having a little fun with his young couples. When Falconer has a long and personal talk with Miss Gryll, for example, Peacock notes, "To observe romantic method, we shall give what passed between them with the Christian names of the speakers."[21] And so the rather pithy speeches which follow are headed "Algernon" and "Morgana," making them sound a little silly, but in a warmly whimsical, not a bitterly satirical manner. Peacock often smiled in this manner at the very same romantic tendencies to which he himself was most addicted:

> The sentimental tourist, (who, perching himself on an old wall, works himself up into a soliloquy of philosophical pathos, on the vicissitudes of empire and the mutability of all sublunary things, interrupted only by an occasional peep at his watch, to ensure his not overstaying the minute at which his fowl, comfortably roasting at the nearest inn, has been promised to be ready,) has, no doubt, many fine thoughts well worth recording in a dapper volume.[22]

---

21 Vol. V, p. 202.

22 The Misfortunes of Elphin, Vol. IV, pp. 101-102.

This is a direct reference to Peacock's own poem Palmyra, but he had by no means discontinued the habit of reflecting on fallen grandeur. Almost all of the novels contain old ruins of some sort.

In summary, Peacock's general critical statements in the novels, although highly individual, are biased in general toward the romantic. In demanding the personal integrity of the artist and truth to nature in poetry, he supported the Platonic doctrines which dominated romantic criticism. In denominating such concepts as love, truth, and liberty as the sources of poetry, he was also subscribing to romantic doctrine. However, in all matters touching actual literary composition, he was non-committal in his statements or tended toward the neo-classic. His notion of the creative process lay somewhere between romantic enthusiasm and neo-classical craftsmanship, probably closer to the latter. He always demanded careful construction in any literary work. And, although Peacock stood for moral integrity on the part of the artist, he was hardly convinced of the moral utility of literature. Peacock's own creative methods reveal this same dichotomy. The love of nature, interest in the native past, and sympathetic treatment of young lovers indicate dominant romantic elements in his subject matter, yet in form the novels are marked by clarity, brevity, and careful workmanship.

The explanation lies in Peacock's nature as a dilettante writer. In ideas he was always young and enthusiastic--young even at the age of eighty--strongly influenced by his varied reading and by his radical friends from the Benthamite and the Godwinian circles. In ideas Peacock differed from the true radicals in that he remained too critically objective to lose himself in any movement and, more important, he was personally quite well off and had no particular desire to reform the world. But his sympathies, if only in theory, usually lay with the radicals. Peacock, however, was a fashionable young man of letters. He was remarkably well read and was slightly contemptuous of anyone who had not consumed equal quantities of Greek and Latin. He was extremely skilled at versifying and at prose composition, and he could not excuse anyone who lacked that skill. He demanded craftsmanship in others because he himself was the clever young craftsman. Hence we have the phenomenon of a Wordsworthian description of mountain cataracts expressed in the concise and lucid construction of an eighteenth century Frenchman.

Peacock himself never openly acknowledged either his romantic sympathies or his neo-classical methods. His attitude toward the wars of the critics as they were then being fought was one only of amusement. Peacock's detached laughter at the entire squabble is epitomized in Crotchet

Castle. Mr. Crotchet says, slightly wistfully,

> The sentimental against the rational, the intuitive against the inductive, the ornamental against the useful, the intense against the tranquil, the romantic against the classical; these are great and interesting controversies, which I should like, before I die, to see satisfactorily settled.23

But Mr. Firedamp immediately replies to give the touch which we can call nothing but Peacockian:

> There is another great question, greater than all these, seeing that it is necessary to be alive in order to settle any question; and this is the question of water against human woe. Wherever there is water, there is malaria, and wherever there is malaria, there are the elements of death. The great object of a wiseman should be to live on a gravelly hill, without so much as a duck-pond within ten miles of him, eschewing cisterns and water-butts, and taking care that there be no gravel-pits for lodging the rain. The sun sucks up infection from water, wherever it exists on the face of the earth.24

---

23 Crotchet Castle, Vol. IV, p. 22.

24 Vol. IV, pp. 22-23.

CHAPTER VII

PEACOCK AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

> And this old man had spoken with Shelley, not once, but a thousand times; and had known well both Harriet Westbrook and Mary Godwin; and had cracked jokes with Hobhouse, and chaffed Procter's latinity; and had seen, and actually criticized, Malibran; and had bought "the vasty version of a new system to perplex the sages" [Wordsworth's *Excursion*], when it first came out, in a bright, new, uncut quarto; and had dined with Jeremy Bentham; and had smiled at Disraeli, when, resplendently attired, he stood chatting in Hookham's with the Countess of Blessington; and had been face to face with that bland Rhadamanthus, Chief-Justice Eldon; and was, in short, such a living chronicle of things past and men dead as filled one's soul with delight and ever-varying wonder.[1]

Peacock began reading and writing before the *Lyrical Ballads* were even conceived; he was still reading and still writing when Carlyle, Tennyson, and Browning dominated the literary scene. He was born in the eighties, between the two great waves of romantics, and he outlived both of them. His life span extended into three of the standard literary "periods." Few men have had such a long period of creative activity; even fewer have associated with so many and such varied celebrities over such a wide span of time. I have already compared Peacock in some respects with Hazlitt and Pepys. Of Peacock as an old man, a third comparison may be advanced--Henry Crabb Robinson. Both men were truly "living chronicles

---

1 Robert Buchanan, "Thomas Love Peacock: A Personal Reminiscence," *Littell's Living Age*, CXXVI (July 17, 1875), 158.

of things past and men dead."

Peacock's literary associations are of several kinds. First there are the men whom Peacock criticizes in the novels, either by direct statement or by caricature. These relationships are the most pertinent to this study and will be the primary object of discussion in this chapter. But we must also consider the men with whom Peacock had personal associations yet whom he never mentions in the novels: Keats, Hobhouse, Strachey, the Mills, Leigh Hunt, Charles Lamb, and many others. Most of these men appear in Peacock's letters or in his periodical articles. A comprehensive study of them is material for future investigation, yet we cannot pass them without notice here. Neither can we entirely ignore those men whom Peacock never met and never mentioned, but who have personally cited Peacock's work or whom critics have declared to have been influenced by Peacock. Such instances of influence shade off into mere comparison, for purpose of illustration, of Peacock's work with that of another writer[2] and are far outside the scope of this discussion. However, we are primarily studying a man's ideas; anyone who can be shown to have known the man or to have read his work must have come under the influence of his ideas to some extent. From the study of Peacock's contemporaries we must learn not only what

---

2 For example, Wagenknecht, Cavalcade of the English Novel, p. 496, calls Lawerence's Women in Love a "bad-smelling variant of the Peacock country house novel."

Peacock thought of them but to what extent these opinions were influential.

A glance at the bibliographies appended to this thesis will attest how widely Peacock has been read. In his lifetime Peacock saw most of his novels and many of his poems go through several editions. Fifty-seven reviews and notices of his work appeared in the major periodicals before his death. Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey have never been out of print, and I suspect that at least three of the remaining five novels share the same distinction. These editions were not large; there will probably never be a "Peacock Society"; Halliford will never become a literary shrine; yet there always have been and perhaps always will be Peacockians. His readers have been few but steady. He has ever been most popular with men of intellect and fine wit, men who have themselves been important forces in literature.

In his own day Peacock's habit of introducing celebrated personalities into his novels was well known. Miss Mitford, a contemporary, wrote in a letter,

> I have been laughing at Nightmare Abbey, the pleasantest of all Mr. Peacock's works, whether in verse or in prose, Rhododaphne and Melincourt included. I have not met with a more cheerful or amiable piece of raillerie. The chief objects of his attack are misanthropical poetry and transcendental metaphysics (deuce take Mr. Peacock for putting me such hard words) in the persons of Lord Byron and my poor dear friend Mr. Coleridge--the last in particular fares most lamentably. Mr. Peacock serves

> him just as Sancho's Baratarian subjects treated their luckless governor--throws him down and then dances over his body.[3]

Here Miss Mitford aptly catches the spirit of Peacock's work: primarily creative work for enjoyment but spiced with amiable raillerie (these two words are very happily chosen) against individuals, and a more sincere protest against the general qualities of morbidity and obscurity in poetry.

An exhaustive collection of Peacockiana would be extremely large, far too large for the scope of this thesis.[4] The number of influential literary figures who have thus indicated that they read Peacock, proves that the ideas in Peacock's novels, although subtle and by no means the primary purpose of the novels, were widely disseminated.

Peacock's personal associations with his contemporaries were briefly discussed in Chapter II. These personal relationships are important to his criticism, for Peacock lived at a time when it was considered quite normal for a man's criticism to be based on his personal likes or dislikes of the author. Among the major figures with whom Peacock is known to have associated are Thackeray, Leigh Hunt, Macaulay,

---

3 Quoted by Brett-Smith, pp. lxxxiv-lxxxv.

4 I have traced a considerable number of items. Two widely varied examples will suffice: Edgar Allan Poe, in "Marginalia," p. 48, praises Rhododaphne as "brim-full of music." In Kipling's Stalky & Co., pp. 249-50, Beetle finds in the headmaster's library some "little tales of a heady and bewildering nature, interspersed with unusual songs--Peacock was that writer's name."

Meredith, Tennyson, Trelawny, Keats, Disraeli, and Charles Lamb. These men, and many others, associated with Peacock but are not treated by him in the novels. A longer list and one more pertinent to this study can be made of the contemporaries who appear in the two charts included in Chapter V. The contemporary writers with whom Peacock is said to have dealt in the novels include Wordsworth, Southey, Coleridge, Byron, Amelia Opie, Scott, Burns, Moore, Shelley, Jeffrey, Gifford, Campbell, Malthus, Croker, Thomas Taylor, Godwin, and Hazlit. The treatment, if any, of these men will now be discussed.

The most important single relationship was that with Shelley. Appraisals of the degree of direct influence exchanged between Shelley and Peacock vary from the statement of Garnett--"As authors, the two men remained almost entirely unaffected by each other's writings. Not a trace of direct influence can be found in the style of either."[5]--to that of Peck, who sees parallel passages in a great number of poems.[6] I most nearly agree with Herford, who says,

> Both owed much to their friendship. Peacock's lively feeling for landscape was a point of access for Shelley's more glowing sense of beauty; and Shelley, a Platonist by birth and a scholar by education, responded instantly to the stimulus of Peacock's Attic culture.[7]

---

5 Richard Garnett, Introduction to Headlong Hall, 1908, p. 17.

6 W. E. Peck, "Note on Shelley and Peacock," Modern Language Notes, XXXVI (June, 1921), 371-73.

7 C. H. Herford, The Age of Wordsworth, p. 130.

both owed much to their friendship. Peacock's lively jesting
for Landscape was a point of access for Shelley's more
glowing sense of beauty; and Shelley, a Platonist by
birth and a scholar by education, responded instantly to
the stimulus of Peacock's Attic culture.

---

5 Richard Garnett, Introduction to Headlong Hall, 1906, p. 17.

6 K. I. Poet, "Note on Shelley and Peacock," Modern Language Notes, XXXVI (June, 1921), 371-73.

7 C. H. Herford, The Age of Wordsworth, p. 130.

Besides encouraging Shelley in Greek, Peacock is known to have inspired most of whatever appreciation of music Shelley had and to have directly influenced Shelley's reading.[8] But the influence from both men was mostly one of ideas personally exchanged, and neither man borrowed extensively from the writing of the other. Shelley was probably the more strongly influenced of the two, for he had a temperament which could absorb all ideas and make them his own. Peacock remained somewhat aloof and incorporated fewer of his friend's ideas. Only in Melincourt, with its expression of the ideal lover, the ideal poet, and so on, does the influence of Shelley predominate. On the other hand, Peacock seemed to appreciate the intercourse more than did Shelley. In the "Memoirs of Shelley" Peacock had nothing but superlative praise for his friend, but Shelley's letters often show a skeptical distrust of Peacock.

The "Memoirs of Shelley" have been discussed in Chapter IV. Peacock, echoing to some extent Hogg's biography, held that Shelley had delusions. This is now generally conceded to be a misinterpretation on Peacock's part. It arose largely from Peacock's friendship with Hogg; the tone of the "Memoirs" changes sharply in the second article, after Hogg had been denounced by the Shelley family. Professor Grabo

---

8 Van Doren, p. 56, notes several books, all Peacock's favorites, which Shelley began reading in 1812-13.

offers an additional explanation:

> Without charging Peacock with deliberate misinterpretation such as can be proved in the case of Hogg, it can be plausibly urged that in a few cases Shelley was pulling Peacock's leg. I do not myself greatly admire Shelley's humor from the few instances of it extant, but I think him capable of deriving pleasure from testing his friend's credulity.[9]

Peacock always showed high respect for his friend, respect which was not always reciprocated. As has been pointed out, he was quick to defend Shelley from charges of mental unbalance and of moral laxity.

In this respect I slightly disagree with Professor Grabo, who states, "Peacock, though admiring Shelley's powers, seems to have regarded him as an irresponsible genius and so depicts him in Nightmare Abbey."[10] Nightmare Abbey contains the character of Scythrop, who has often been identified with Shelley. In some characteristics Scythrop does resemble Shelley: he carries on a dual love affair with girls who vaguely suggest Harriet and Mary; he writes philosophical pamphlets with which he intends to reform the world; and there are other resemblances. But the differences are fully as great: Scythrop finishes by losing both girls, and, having passed his intellectual adolescence, he finally settles down to the business of cultivating his garden, in a manner practical and worldly enough to have satisfied Peacock

---

9 Grabo, pp. 100-101.

10 P. 101.

himself. Peacock tells us that Shelley "took to himself the character of Scythrop,"[11] meaning that Shelley himself recognized some of the similarities. But the contemporary reviews do not seem to have made the identification, and Peacock and Shelley themselves certainly did not interpret Scythrop as a literal portrait. Otherwise Shelley and Mary would certainly have resented the intrusion on their privacy rather than expressing delight over the book. Nightmare Abbey reveals Peacock's amused and sympathetic disapproval of the Scythrop type of mind, but it by no means expresses his whole opinion of Shelley or of Shelley's marital difficulties. Scythrop falls in and out of love because it makes a good story for him to do so, not because Shelley had behaved in a slightly similar manner. Peacock, as usual, was far more interested in the structure of his novel than in ridiculing his friend.

If we give any consideration at all to the resemblances between Scythrop and Shelley, and we cannot completely ignore them, then we must with equal care consider the treatment of Shelleian ideas in the other novels. Nightmare Abbey was Peacock's third novel. In the two which preceded it, Shelley has been identified with Mr. Foster and with Mr. Forester. I cannot agree with these identifications, which are even more strained than that with Scythrop. But still in Foster

---

11 Halliford Edition, Vol. VIII, p. 497.

and Forester, Peacock was dealing with ideas which were notably Shelleian, and he dealt with them seriously and sympathetically. In both Headlong Hall and Melincourt, Peacock analyzes the doctrines of human perfectibility and the moral responsibility of the artist. Of course other men than Shelley had advanced such opinions. We can only conjecture to what extent these ideas came from Shelley and to what extent they were only part of the spirit of the age. But Peacock's most frequent contact with such ideas was undoubtedly in his conversations with his friend. Wherever else Peacock heard them, he certainly heard them from and identified them with Shelley. Most important, he discussed these ideas with sympathy and respect, and by no means did he always conclude by laughing at them. In some respects, as has been pointed out, Peacock ended up as much a Platonist as Shelley. The two men differed mainly in that Shelley's Platonism was of an extremely practical sort. To Shelley this meant embodying his ideas in his own life and work and rationalizing any inconsistencies in his own doctrine. The far less serious-minded Peacock hesitated at devoting his life to the support of his ideas and consistently dodged the weightier philosophical problems by treating them flippantly. However, Peacock sympathized with many of Shelley's ideas, investigated them extensively, and then, only after such a thorough examination, introduced a few personal characteristics of his friend in Scythrop.

One strange fact in the treatment of Shelley in the novels must be noted. As can be seen from the list in Chapter V, Peacock cited most of his important contemporaries, yet never once did he mention Shelley. The name of Shelley or of any of Shelley's poems never appears, and I have identified no quotation from Shelley's works. This is strange because of Peacock's habit of frequently citing the books he had just been reading; and it is significant to our critical evaluation because of his equally marked habit of himself positively identifying any caricatures with whom he intended any identification to be made. Rumblesack Shantsee and Willful Wontsee both have their initials to connect them to Southey and Wordsworth. Mr. Cypress quotes from Childe Harold, and Mr. Flosky tells of the composition of "Kubla Khan." But Scythrop does not quote Shelley. This fact supports the contention that Scythrop was conceived as a good character for the needs of the novel--perhaps suggested by Shelley, just as Meredith often drew his characters from real life--but with no deliberate reference to Shelley intended.

Toward the three Lake Poets Peacock's feelings were mixed. We know that he approved of their poetry, but that he had little respect for them as personalities. The references in the novels are almost exclusively to their sudden switch to conservatism, which Peacock could construe only as rank apostasy. Southey, who as poet laureate received the greatest share of Peacock's ridicule, is lampooned in all but one of

the novels. Some of this attack must be discounted as only Peacock's notion of good fun, for in all ages the laureate and his associates have been fair game for ridicule. However we can safely conclude that Peacock distrusted the politics of these men. He also seems to have had little respect for the poetic theories of Wordsworth and Coleridge. He laughs at Wordsworth's naturalism as "passing the whole day in the innocent and amiable occupation of going up and down hill, receiving poetical impressions, and communicating them in immortal verse to admiring generations."[12] And through Mr. Flosky he burlesques Coleridge's account of the composition of "Kubla Khan."[13]

Peacock's purely literary appraisal of the Lake Poets was far different. He sincerely admired the poems of these men, particularly Wordsworth. Most of these complimentary statements are found in work other than the novels.[14] But even in the novels Peacock shows his admiration for some of their poems by quoting from them frequently. No man who quotes Wordsworth fourteen times, all in a complimentary manner, can be said to dislike the poems of Wordsworth.

---

12 "The Four Ages of Poetry," Vol. VIII, p. 18.

13 Nightmare Abbey, Vol. III, p. 76.

14 Two examples will suffice: "Memoirs," Vol. VIII, p. 96;"Essay on Fashionable Literature," Vol. VIII, pp. 275-91.

the novels. Some of this attack must be discounted as only Peacock's notion of good fun, for it will have the listeners and his associates have been fair targets. However we can safely conclude that Peacock disapproved the politics of these men. He also seems to have had little respect for the poetic theories of Wordsworth and Coleridge. The lambs of Wordsworth's naturalism as "peering the whole day to the innocent and amiable occupation of gazing my own face", receiving poetical impressions, and "consecrating them to immortal verse to soothing generations." And through Mr. Flosky he burlesques Coleridge's account of the composition of "Kubla Khan."[13]

Peacock's purely literary opposition or the lack of it was far different. He sincerely admires the poems of these men, particularly Wordsworth. Most of these complimentary statements are found in work other than the novels.[14] Even in the novels Peacock shows his admiration for more by their poems by quoting from them frequently. To see who quotes Wordsworth fourteen times, all in a complimentary manner, can be said to dislike the poems or Wordsworth.

---

13 "The Four Ages of Poetry," Vol. VIII, p. 86.

14 Nightmare Abbey, Vol. III, p. 75.

15 Two examples will suffice: "Essay on Fashionable Literature," Vol. VIII, p. 98; "Essay on Fashionable

Coleridge's transcendental metaphysics made that poet a ready butt for Peacock's humor, but not one of the jibes in the novels even implies that Coleridge's poems are not excellent. Indeed, frequent quotation from "Cristabel" and "Kubla Khan" prove that Peacock did think these poems excellent. Peacock had a slight personal feud with Southey, which grew out of the bad relations between Southey and Shelley. According to Peacock,[15] Southey also had admired Mary Godwin and resented Shelley's leaving Harriet to marry her. Peacock's admiration for Southey's poems was dampened but not drowned by this personal consideration. Particularly in Gryll Grange he expresses, both by quotation and by direct statement, great respect for Southey's work. Peacock, then, seems to have disapproved of the Lake Poets as individuals: he had little use for the poetic theories of Wordsworth and Coleridge; he had a personal grudge against Southey; and he distrusted the politics of all three of them. Yet he sincerely admired their poetry. His true attitude is apparent in this statement by Miss Ilex:

> Truth to nature is essential to poetry. Few may perceive an inaccuracy: but to those who do, it causes a great diminution, if not a total destruction, of pleasure in perusal. Shakespeare never makes a flower blossom out of season. Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey are true to nature, in this and in all other respects: even in their wildest imaginings.[16]

---

15 "Memoirs of Shelley," Vol. VIII, pp. 93-94.

16 Gryll Grange, Vol. V, p. 239. Quoted also in Chapter VI of this thesis.

The discussion of truth in poetry, which Miss Ilex thus begins with a compliment to the Lake Poets, goes on to contrast sharply two other interesting contemporaries, Burns and Moore. Peacock's two reviews of Moore have been discussed in Chapter IV. Here in Gryll Grange Peacock again attacks Moore's Epicurean. His principal objection is still that Moore commits the unpardonable sin of making Cleopatra a negress, a "hideous grinning Aethiop."[17] Even in his old age Peacock could not forgive Moore this offense. Moore stands as the only writer whom Peacock consistently attacked and whose literary works, not ideas, were the object of the attacks. Unfortunately it is no credit to Peacock that his objections to Moore were invariably picayune.

It is worth noting that the poet who is placed in direct opposition to Moore is Burns. For every fault in Moore, Peacock finds the corresponding virtue in Burns. Dr. Opimian says, and Peacock certainly speaks with him,

> I do not look for profound knowledge. But I do expect that poets should understand what they talk of. Burns was not a scholar, but he was always master of his subject. All the scholarship of the world would not have produced Tam O'Shanter: but in the whole of that poem there is not a false image nor a misused word.[18]

On May 30, 1818, Peacock wrote to Shelley,

---

17 Vol. V, p. 242.

18 Vol. V, p. 242

> I have almost finished Nightmare Abbey. I think it necessary to "make a stand" against the "encroachments" of black bile. The fourth canto of Childe Harold is really too bad. I cannot consent to be auditor tantum of this systematical "poisoning" of the "mind" of the "reading public."19

This is the only really direct statement Peacock ever made of the direction of his satire. Nightmare Abbey was written primarily to give enjoyment, but so far as was possible within the structural limits of his work, he also planned to ridicule the Byronic type of mind. This does not mean that Mr. Cypress is a complete portrait of Byron or even that Peacock disliked all of Byron's work. Through Mr. Cypress Peacock tells us only that he disliked the quality of morbidity in any poetry, including Byron's. Peacock's method on those occasions when he does deal with individuals is to make a type out of the individual and then to ridicule the type. Personal elements, therefore, disappear entirely or become so warped that they are unreliable as evidence of Peacock's opinions. In the process, of course, Peacock reveals that he does thoroughly understand the personality of the original individual even if he does not choose to portray it.

Peacock certainly did not believe that Byron personally behaved like Mr. Cypress. He knew from his own relationships with Byron that the poet was personally genial and good

---

19 Vol. VIII, p. 193.

natured. Soon after the publication of Rhododaphne, when there was still some doubt in some minds as to who had written the poem, Byron sent word to Peacock that he would "be willing to father the 'Grecian Enchantress' himself."[20] When Peacock, in a smart aleck manner sarcastically ridiculed Byron in Sir Proteus, Byron affably replied in the words of Samuel Johnson: "Are we alive after all this censure?"[21] Byron's reaction to the treatment in Nightmare Abbey itself was characteristic: he gave Shelley a rosebud "to be taken to Peacock with his love."[22]

It is inconceivable that Peacock thought Byron personally was a Mr. Cypress. That character is only a fantastic personification of certain ideas of which Peacock disapproved, ideas which were most prominently expressed by Byron. In drawing his character, however, Peacock reveals that he was well acquainted with the Byronic pose and was not at all impressed by it. When Mr. Cypress says,

> Sir, I have quarreled with my wife; and a man who has quarreled with his wife is absolved from all duty to his country. I have written an ode to tell the people as much, and they may take it as they list,[23]

Peacock is not so much attacking Byron as he is expressing his amusement at a pose which to him could appear only

---

20 Van Doren, p. 106.

21 Byron, Letters and Journals, Vol. III, pp. 89-90.

22 Van Doren, p. 122.

23 Nightmare Abbey, Vol. III, p. 103.

ridiculous. Mr. Cypress dominates an entire chapter,[24] in which he makes such delightfully illogical pronouncements as the one above, quotes passages from Childe Harold in a sophistical and pithy prose which makes them appear ridiculous, and concludes with a song which is a magnificent burlesque of the whole Byronic manner:

> There is a fever of the spirit,
> The brand of Cain's unresting doom,
> Which in the lone dark souls that bear it
> Glows like the lamp in Tullia's tomb:
> Unlike that lamp, its subtle fire
> Burns, blasts, consumes its cell, the heart,
> Till, one by one, hope, joy, desire,
> Like dreams of shadowy smoke depart.
>
> When hope, love, life itself, are only
> Dust--spectral memories--dead and cold--
> The unfed fire burns bright and lonely,
> Like that undying lamp of old:
> And by that drear illumination,
> Till time its clay-built home has rent,
> Thought broods on feeling's desolation--
> The soul is its own monument.[25]

Peacock in Nightmare Abbey gave the Byronic attitude a sound drubbing. It is his most successful single piece of ridicule. However, we must not construe it as an evaluation of the literary merit of Byron's poems. Actually Peacock admired Byron's poetry. He wrote to Shelley on February 28, 1822, "Cain is very fine; Sardanapalus I think is finer; Don Juan is best of all. I have read nothing else in recent

---

24 Chapter XI, pp. 93-113.

25 Vol. III, p. 111.

literature that I think good for anything."[26] In his excellent caricature Peacock had no intention of denying Byron's merits as a poet. His attack is exclusively on a set of ideas, a philosophy which pervades some of the poems of Byron. Perhaps Shelley, like many other readers, misinterpreted the novel, for on September 15, 1818, Peacock wrote to Shelley correcting him:

> I thought I had fully explained to you the object of Nightmare Abbey, which was to bring into a sort of philosophical focus a few of the morbidities of modern literature, and to let in a little daylight on its atrabilarious complexion.[27]

Hazlitt is treated very superficially if at all in the novels. Three critics--Brett-Smith, Young, and Redman--have identified him with Mr. Evesdrop of Crotchet Castle. Such an identification can be accepted only with great reservations. There is only one point of resemblance, Hazlitt's alarming practice of portraying his acquaintances in print, as in The Spirit of the Age. But such a practice was not limited to Hazlitt. Peacock himself indulged in it to some extent. It is far more likely that Peacock was merely making fun of a rather common practice and was expressing his disapproval of such intrusions on individual privacy. Hazlitt is never once cited in the novels, and, although Peacock himself resembles Hazlitt in some ways, there is no

---

26 Vol. VIII, p. 228.

27 Vol. VIII, p. 204.

evidence that he ever read Hazlitt or paid him much attention. I have found only one positive link between the two men. In the Atlas for July 19, 1829, Hazlitt published an article entitled "The Utilitarian Controversy." Peacock at this time was writing reviews for the utilitarian Westminster and at the same time was writing opera notices for the Globe and Traveller and for the Examiner. Hazlitt, in attacking the Phillistine attitudes of the utilitarians on art and music, was struck by the strange dichotomy of Peacock's two activities. Humorously he sympathizes with Peacock, whom, he predicts, the utilitarians will eventually forbid his love of music: "P____, poor fellow! dare no more show his face there [the opera] than his own Sir Ourang-Outang!"[28] However, there is no evidence that Peacock ever read this article. Lacking any more positive link, we should minimize the treatment of Hazlitt in the novels.

Likewise Keats is not treated in the novels. He is never cited, and no discussion seems particularly applicable to him. Peacock became acquainted with both Keats and his poems through the Shelleys. Mary Shelley's Journal for February 11, 1818, notes of an evening at the Hunts', "Peacock, Hogg, and Keats were present."[29] Brett-Smith[30] describes another

---

28 Hazlitt, New Writings, p. 175.

29 Mary Shelley's Journal, p. 92.

30 Brett-Smith, p. lxxxi.

evidence that he ever read Hazlitt or paid him much attention. I have found only one positive link between the two men. In the Athas for July 19, 1829, Hazlitt published an article entitled "The Utilitarian Controversy." Peacock at this time was writing reviews for the utilitarian Westminster and at the same time was writing opera notices for the Globe and Traveller and for the Examiner. Hazlitt, in attacking the Philistine attitudes of the utilitarians on art and music, was struck by the strange diabolony of Peacock's two activities. Humorously he sympathizes with Peacock, whom, he predicts, the utilitarians will eventually forbid his love of music: "[illegible], poor fellow! dare no more show his face there [the opera] than his own Sir Oureng-Quaing!"[29] However, there is no evidence that Peacock ever read this article. Seeking any more positive link, we should minimize the treatment of Hazlitt in the novels.

Likewise Keats is not treated in the novels. He is never cited, and no discussion seems particularly applicable to him. Peacock became acquainted with both Keats and his poems through the Shelleys. Mary Shelley's Journal for February 13, 1818, notes of an evening at the Hunts', "Peacock, Hogg, and Keats were present."[30] Brett-Smith[30] describes another

---

[29] Hazlitt, New Writings, p. 178.

[30] Mary Shelley's Journal, p. 92.

[30] Brett-Smith, p. lxxxi.

subsequent meeting. Peacock and Keats on these occasions did not get along well together, and comments from both parties were unfavorable. On December 4, 1820, Peacock wrote to Shelley, "If I should live to the age of Methusalem, and have uninterrupted literary leisure, I should not find time to read Keats's Hyperion."[31] Keats, on the other hand, wrote to Benjamin Robert Hayden, March 14, 1818, that "Peacock has damned satire."[32] There was obviously little love between the two men.[33] Had Peacock treated Keats in his novels, it would almost certainly have been unfavorably. He refrained from doing so probably because, first, it was not his policy to use his novels for serious attacks, and second, such an attack would also have been a personal affront to his friend Shelley.

Scott is treated both directly and indirectly in the novels. Mr. Chainmail in Crotchet Castle embodies a number of Scott's ideas, although he is anything but a personal portrait of Scott. Mr. Chainmail's crotchet is the medieval: he keeps a feudal castle and longs for the golden age of the twelfth century. But although Peacock is amused by these

---

31 Vol. VIII, p. 219.

32 The Letters of John Keats, p. 119.

33 Yet both Sidney Colvin, John Keats, p. 405, and Douglas Bush, Mythology and the Romantic Tradition in English Poetry, pp. 110-11, see Rhododaphne as a strong influence on Lamia.

---

31 Vol. VIII, p. xxv.

32 The Letters of John Keats, p. 214.

33 Yet both Sidney Colvin, John Keats, p. 285, and Douglas Bush, Mythology and the Romantic Tradition in English Poetry, pp. 110-11, see Endymion as a strong influence on Lamia.

ideas, he does not ridicule them. The episode of Christmas dinner at Chainmail Hall[34] shows Peacock somewhat more than sympathetic with the holly and mistletoe, the "stupendous fire" on which "blocks of pine were flaming and crackling," the "boar's head, garnished with rosemary, with a citron in its mouth," and particularly the wassail-bowl, that "immense bowl of spiced wine, with roasted apples hissing on its surface." Peacock was no medievalist himself, but he certainly could appreciate the romanticized elements of the middle ages. Mr. Chainmail as a character is treated very sympathetically and finally marries Miss Touchandgo, who in many ways is a reflection of Peacock's own wife.

Also in Crotchet Castle there is a direct discussion of the romances of Scott.[35] Mr. Chainmail himself takes part in the discussion, of course on the side of the "enchanter of the North." Peacock's conclusion seems to be that Scott is not the greatest writer nor the most morally useful, but he is thoroughly entertaining. One interesting reflection of Peacock's tastes is that he connects this great "enchanter of the North" with "another enchanter"--Rossini. Peacock we know was reading and enthusiastically quoting Scott as early as 1808.[36] On the whole, Peacock's treatment of Scott

---

34 Chapter XVIII, Crotchet Castle, Vol. IV, pp. 193-211.

35 Vol. IV, pp. 115-22.

36 See letter to Edward Hookham, November 28, 1808, Vol. VIII, pp. 161-62.

Vol. VIII, pp. 161-62.

is favorable. The character of Mr. Derrydown in Melincourt, sometimes identified with Scott, is not a caricature of that poet but a personification of the general current craze for ballads which was sending aimless young men with nothing else to do out in search for folk-lore.

A few minor writers appear for short glimpses in the novels. The similarity in names probably indicates that Peacock singled out Amelia Opie for his attack on the women novelists in the person of Philomela Poppyseed in Crotchet Castle. But the comments made regarding Miss Poppyseed are so general that they apply to an entire class of writers rather than to an individual. Only the similarity in names indicates any identification. The Learned Mythologist in Melincourt, who wants to rebuild the temple of Jupiter, may be interpreted as Thomas Taylor the Platonist, but the identification is only an amused reference to Peacock's old friend and has no particular critical value. In Nightmare Abbey[37] Mr. Listless receives, among the latest fashionable books from London, a novel entitled Devilman. This may be interpreted as an approximate anagram of Godwin's Mandeville, in which case the comment on the novel is amusing: "Hm. Hatred--revenge--misanthropy--and quotations from the Bible. Hm. This is the morbid anatomy of black bile."[38] Malthus is made fun of in the person of Mr. Fax, although, as has been pointed out,

---

37 Nightmare Abbey, Vol. III, pp. 38-9.

38 Vol. III, p. 39.

Fax is a major character and should not be interpreted as a mere caricature. Malthusian doctrines are also echoed elsewhere in the novels, primarily by the deteriorationist Mr. Escot in Headlong Hall, but these opinions are always received unfavorably. It seems absurd that Young calls Peacock a Malthusian, with no grounds stronger than the fact that Peacock and Malthus had both once opposed Godwin.[39]

Perhaps the contemporaries who received Peacock's most pointed attacks are the reviewers. Mr. Vamp of the Legitimate Review in Melincourt clearly resembles Gifford of the Quarterly. The other disreputable journalists in Peacock's novels represent types more than individuals and can be identified with Jeffrey, Campbell, Southey, and so on, only with great reservations. Mr. Killthedead in Melincourt is given away as Croker by a couplet which is repeated from Sir Proteus, in which the name is supplied.[40] But none of these characters is a complete sketch of the original, and Peacock's concern is not with the individuals but with the general ethics of the profession of reviewing. He knew the practice well from his own experience and at one time himself wrote some of the bitterest criticism ever to appear in the reviews. Peacock's objections to the reviews are twofold: first, he

---

39 Young, pp. 56-58.

40 Melincourt, Vol. II, p. 301, and Sir Proteus, Vol. VI, p. 311.

Fox is a major character and should not be interpreted as a mere caricature. Maltravers doctrines are also echoed elsewhere in the novels, primarily by the deteriorated Mr. Escot in Headlong Hall, but these opinions are always received unfavorably. It seems absurd that Young Cells Peacock a Maltravers, with no grounds stronger than the fact that Peacock and Maltravers had both once opposed Godwin.[39]

Perhaps the contemporaries who received Peacock's most pointed attacks are the reviewers. Mr. Vamp of the Fashionable Review in Melincourt clearly resembles Gifford of the Quarterly. The other disreputable journalists in Peacock's novels represent types more than individuals and can be identified with Jeffrey, Campbell, Southey, and so on, only with great reservations. Mr. Mainwaring in Melincourt is given away as Croker by a couplet which is repeated from Tit Bitters, in which the name is supplied.[40] But none of these characters is a complete sketch of the original, and Peacock's concern is not with the individuals but with the general schools of the profession of reviewing. He knew the practice well from his own experience and at one time himself wrote some of the bitterest criticism ever to appear in the reviews.

Peacock's objections to the reviews are twofold: first, he

---

[39] Young, pp. 56-58.

[40] Melincourt, Vol. II, p. 303, and Tit Bitters, Vol. VI, p. 311.

opposes any personal connection between author and reviewer. He accuses Southey of reviewing his own poems,[41] and he contends that the reviews will praise or condemn anything, for a price:

> I look on periodical criticism in general to be a species of shop, where panegyric and defamation are sold, wholesale, retail, and for exportation.[42]

Second, Peacock could not tolerate the affiliation of the reviews with fixed political principles. The Quarterly was staunchly Tory, the Edinburgh Whig. All judgments, literary, ethical, or political, were made in strict observance of party line. Peacock often laughed at his own period of reviewing, but his serious objections to the reviews are summed up by Mr. Escot:

> I conceive that periodical criticism disseminates superficial knowledge, and its perpetual adjunct, vanity; that it checks in the youthful mind the habit of thinking for itself; that it delivers partial opinions and thereby misleads the judgment; that it is never conducted with a view to the general interests of literature, but to serve the interested ends of individuals, and the miserable purposes of party.[43]

There is far less criticism of contemporaries in Peacock's novels than has hitherto been supposed. Extensive studies, such as that by Miss Hammond, have been made of Peacock's

---

41 Nightmare Abbey, Vol. III, p. 39.

42 Mr. Escot in Headlong Hall, Vol. I, p. 43.

43 Vol. I, p. 44.

oppose any personal connection between author and reviewer.
He accuses Gosse of reviewing his own poems,[41] and he contends that the reviews will praise or condemn anything, for a price:

> I look on periodical criticism in general to be a species of shop, where panegyric and defamation are sold, wholesale, retail, and for exportation.[42]

Second, Peacock could not tolerate the affiliation of the reviews with fixed political principles. The Quarterly was staunchly Tory, the Edinburgh Whig. All judgments, literary, ethical, or political, were made in strict observance of party line. Peacock often laughed at his own period of reviewing, but his serious objections to the reviews are summed up by Mr. Escot:

> I conceive that periodical criticism eliminates superficial knowledge, and its perpetual sojourn, vanity; that it checks in the youthful mind the inchoate thinking for itself; that it delivers partial opinions and literary misleads the judgment; that it is never conducted with a view to the general interests of literature, but to serve the interested ends of individuals, and the miserable purposes of party.[43]

There is far less criticism of contemporaries in Peacock's novels than has hitherto been supposed. Extensive studies, such as that by Alan Hammond, have been made of Peacock's

---

41 Nightmare Abbey, Vol. III, p. 38.

42 Mr. Escot in Headlong Hall, Vol. I, p. 43.

43 Vol. I, p. 44.

caricatures as a guide to his opinions of his contemporaries. But as has been pointed out, such caricatures seldom give any information whatever regarding Peacock's literary evaluation of their work. Shelley, for example, is never really treated in the novels. The character Scythrop has a few personal similarities, and Shelleian ideas are discussed throughout most of the novels, but Shelley himself is never mentioned or even indicated, and nothing Shelley wrote is ever discussed. The criticism of the Lake Poets in the novels is very misleading, for it deals primarily with the political activities of these men and with the poetic theories of Wordsworth and Coleridge. Consequently this criticism is derogatory, whereas Peacock greatly admired the poetry of these three men, largely for its quality of truth to nature. Peacock criticizes the reviews as he does the political activity of the Lake Poets, for their lack of moral integrity. A few other writers are briefly discussed, generally favorably, for with the exception of Moore's Epicurean, Peacock hardly ever treated in his novels literary works which he disliked. Derogatory satire is not very frequent in Peacock, and it attacks almost exclusively the politics or the peculiar ideas of the writers, not their actual literary productions. Peacock may ridicule the transcendentalism of Coleridge or the misanthropy of Byron but his opinions of their poems, expressed mostly outside of the novels, are generally those of

admiration. Only a very few writers, such as Scott and Burns, are discussed directly. Actually the amount of critical comment is small. Only can only conclude that Peacock was far more interested in constructing his own novels as delightful works of fiction than in using them to criticize the works of others.

admiration. Only a very few writers, such as Scott and Burns, are discussed directly. Actually the amount of critical comment is small. Only can only conclude that Jackson was far more interested in constructing his own novels as delightful works of fiction than in using them to criticize the works of others.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Peacock has suffered from many false and foolish interpretations. For example:

> But Peacock's is not an indictment of society merely, but of humanity, not merely of this or that class, but of the individuals that make up every class: for him human nature is gone wrong.[1]

But Draper's is unfortunately not the only gross misinterpretation of Peacock. On the one hand it is charged that Peacock grappled with the problems of the world and ended in hopeless cynicism; but on the other the charge is made that a shallow epicureanism blinded Peacock to the real problems of the world.

> Peacock's philosophy was an excellent one for fine afternoons in the garden and untroubled evenings in the library, enabling him to endure the occasional trials of a corked wine and a mislaid folio; but it would be as useful to a man really grappling with this life as a toy whip would be to a lion tamer.[2]

But whichever approach is taken, critics have usually made out Peacock as a pathetic and frustrated individual, ill at ease in his times.

> He has knowledge, wit, humour, technical skill, cleverness in abundance, some genius, he is a keen observer, a caustic critic. What he lacks is humanity, just that which is the essence of the greatness of the great humourists--Cervantes, Rabelais, Shakespeare.[3]

---

1 Draper, p. 463.

2 Priestly, pp. 109-10.

3 Hugh Walker, The Literature of the Victorian Era, p. 618.

p. 616.

> He was distrustful of the present, regretful of the past, and despondent for the future.[4]

Such interpretations all assume as axiomatic that Peacock's purpose was primarily satiric criticism. There is no justification for such an assumption. Indeed Peacock laughed at the idiosyncrasies of his age, just as he also laughed at the quirks in his own temperament. But it does not follow, as many critics have assumed, that he was out of tune with that age. When a man has soured on anything, as the critics claim Peacock had soured on the world, he can no longer laugh at it.

Such interpretations have ignored biography and have considered only a small portion of Peacock's creative work. They have attempted, by a literal interpretation of certain aspects of some of the novels, to reconstruct the personality of a man. The same methods would prove that Rabelais, Erasmus, or Cervantes had soured on the world. Biographical information reveals that Peacock had a comfortable position, was well satisfied with his world, and saw no reason to reform it. He had his library, his garden, his good dinner, and his old wine. His friends were not great in number but were wide in variety. He was quite content with his lot. Nor was he retired from the world in an ivory tower. For thirty years he occupied a semi-official position of great importance, in which his decisions controlled the activities of a great

---

4 Young, p. 35.

number of men and had a direct influence in shaping the Empire. Peacock's friends represented all political camps; he personally knew most of the important writers, philosophers, and statesmen of his day. His observations show the keenest awareness of the world about him. No such man can be said to have dwelt apart. Biographical information also reveals that Peacock had fully his share of affairs of the heart and that he had a genuine Wordsworthian love of nature. Everything indicates that he had exceptional abilities but otherwise was quite normal, neither cynical nor complacent.

As a man of letters Peacock was a dilettante. His knowledge was sometimes superficial, for he never attended a university and read only for his own enjoyment. His reading was extremely extensive and varied, however, and the lack of formal training generally freed him from conventional interpretations. His judgments are marked by prejudices, but the prejudices were his own and not merely the established dogmas of the age. In music, art, and literature his tastes were individual, and he seldom attempted to justify his opinions. Beginning in his early school days and continuing throughout his life, Peacock wrote poems, light and facile verses which at their best are clever, delightful, even touching, but which contain no particular depth of thought. To these poems Peacock added personal essays, plays, translations, and the seven little novels which are undoubtedly his best work. He covered the opera and ballet and wrote book

reviews for the literary magazines. In all this varied activity he remained the amateur, for he never received any considerable remuneration for his literary work, and the dilettante, for he dabbled in every activity which happened to appeal to him, and he entertained no notions that his work would achieve world-shaking results. His work was careful, however, and every production was polished and shaped until it became all that genius and craftsmanship could make of it. If Peacock seldom came to grips with knotty problems in his work, it is not because he did not understand humanity or did not love it, for his very humor is marked by the warmest of humanism. Instead it is because he wrote for his own amusement and for the enjoyment of others and could not see his novels as vehicles for social reform or for misanthropical analysis. Like most active men of predominantly humanistic temperament, Peacock was far more concerned with fully and richly living life than with pondering over it. He side-stepped problems not because a cynical despondency or an aesthetic disdain of the world gave him pause, but because he was sidetracked by a more immediate concern with the good things of the world. Priestly calls Peacock's philosophy as useless as a toy whip in the hands of a lion tamer. On the contrary, Peacock preferred to watch the lions from outside the cage, and we can hardly blame him for his decision.

Such is the realignment which must be made of the interpretation of Peacock's personality. When we view Peacock's attitude as nothing but healthy and normal, we will make fewer great discoveries of ideas in his novels. We will find far less criticism than has previously been supposed. We will realize that simply to extract and compile references from the novels or to identify characters with actual personalities does not reveal Peacock's own opinions. Direct statements are few in the novels and, especially when expressed satirically, cannot be accepted without great reservations. Indeed certain characters do personify ideas and occasionally suggest contemporary figures, but Peacock never attempted portrait painting and the didactic elements are always subordinated to the artistic structure of the novels. The caricatures do not even give us Peacock's opinion of the personalities represented, much less a literary evaluation of their works. We must be extremely cautious in accepting or rejecting even the general ideas which such caricatures sometimes personify. Peacock was quite capable of laughing at the very ideas which he loved most. Peacock cannot be identified consistently with any of his characters, nor can most of the characters be identified consistently with any fixed set of ideas, for Peacock's degree of sympathy toward his characters changes whenever the artistic structure of the novels compels it to change. The structure always predominates and Peacock never hesitates to

change his treatment of any character or to sacrifice the likeness of any caricature in order to acquire just the right balance of tone for his dialogues. If we fail to recognize the true nature of the novels, ignore their complexity, and proceed without proper caution, we too will conclude that Peacock disliked the poems of Wordsworth or that he thought Scott a silly fool, or, like Draper, we too will find in Peacock an indictment of all humanity.

The conclusions of this thesis have been mostly negative. Far more criticism has been repudiated than has been discovered. The body of critical ideas thought to be present in the novels has been substantially reduced. For the reputation of Peacock such a weeding-out process has been beneficial, for most of the opinions rejected as not Peacockian have been harsh and unreasonable indictments, for which Peacock has always been criticized. Peacock's critical opinions are not infallible, nor have I attempted to tailor them in order to make them more sound. His judgments were founded almost entirely on his own tastes. Generally those tastes were very good, but occasionally his individual judgments were mistaken, as in his denunciation of Keats, and no amount of rational persuasion could correct his prejudices once they were formed. However, those critical opinions in the novels which are well enough substantiated to be called Peacock's own reveal Peacock as rather sound in evaluating the work of his contemporaries. Of

course our own judgments, made with the perspective of a hundred years, offer no fair comparison. But we can compare Peacock's opinions with those of his contemporaries and we find that his judgments are, generally speaking, among the soundest of his time. He clearly perceived the conflict of the classic and the romantic, yet he rose above this conflict to evaluate writers as individuals irrespective of schools. Indeed he misjudged Keats, and he seems to have been totally unacquainted with Jane Austin, but he could admire poems by such divergent writers as Pope, Scott, Wordsworth, and Byron, even when he did not always respect these writers for their ideas or for their political activities.

Some of these judgments were very perceptive. Peacock saw fallacies in the theories of Wordsworth and Coleridge, yet he early recognized the beauty of some of the poems of these men. He perceived the superficiality of Scott's novels, yet he defended them as enjoyable reading. He loved Burns for closeness to nature and Dickens for comic spirit. Moore's Epicurean is the only book which Peacock deliberately attacks in his novels. With this exception he usually preferred to deal only with works which he liked and ignore entirely those which he disliked. He satirized Byron, Southey, Coleridge, and Wordsworth, but always for the political activities and the aberrations in the ideas of these men, not for their literary merit. Actually he admired the poems of these men but,

having no intention of embodying deliberate and consistent criticism in his caricatures, seldom bothered to praise them in the novels. We must compare the statements in the novels with those in Peacock's letters and critical prose in order to ascertain his true opinion of these men. Contrary to common opinion, Shelley never appears directly in the novels. Certain characters echo a few qualities of his personality, and Shelleian ideas are discussed in most of the novels, but those ideas had also become Peacock's, and the resemblances between Shelley and Scythrop, for example, are no greater than are found in the work of most writers who find in their friends the raw materials for their own literary productions. Shelley is never once cited in the novels. In the absence of any such positive identification, it would be absurd to interpret Scythrop as a deliberate caricature of Shelley. Peacock was a creative artist writing novels, not a literary satirist writing criticism. The literary criticism in the novels is generally high in quality but very small in body. The student will find in Peacock's novels a great deal of background of the nineteenth century, but he will find nothing approaching a literary history.

In his general ideas of art, particularly poetry, Peacock was strongly Platonic in theory and usually sympathized with, although he frequently laughed at, the ideas of Shelley and the other romantic writers. His two main

tenets were truth to nature and the integrity of the artist and his audience. He held that the nature of literature, like painting, is imitative. The writer must know at first hand what he is talking about. He must deal with particulars and these must be accurate in detail. Art must be produced and enjoyed only by those whose moral character is strong enough that they will not be harmed by this mimetic principle. Because the reading public does not have this moral integrity and probably will not soon acquire it, the moral responsibility lies doubly on the shoulders of the artist. If the public is corrupted by a book, the author may be blamed for writing it. Fashionable and superficial novelists who pander to the public's taste for trash receive only scorn from Peacock.

In his own writing, however, Peacock found it very difficult to remain consistent with his Platonic doctrines. First, his dilettante nature made him loth to put his ideas into active practice, to use literature as a vehicle for social reform as Shelley had done. He had accepted the premise of the moral integrity of the artist, but he was troubled by the corollary of the moral utility of art itself. And so he continued to write for his own pleasure and for the enjoyment of his readers, regardless of the inconsistency.

Second, Peacock could not accept the romantic critical precept which placed content above form. His own novels are

noted for clarity, brevity, and careful structure, not for depth of feeling or earnestness of purpose. He himself was always careful and precise--in rhetoric, in scholarship, and in every literary quality--and he could not excuse the lack of the same care and precision in others. Peacock, then, became a Platonist in theory and an Aristotelian in practice.

Such inconsistencies do not invalidate either Peacock or his ideas. His literary evaluations were primarily based on his personal tastes, and he made little attempt to rationalize them. Indeed, such divided sympathies and hesitant detachedness enabled Peacock to make many perceptive observations which would have been difficult for a more partisan devotee of either critical system. It is absurd to think less of Peacock's novels because they are structural and artistic, rather than emotional or didactic in nature. His work is unique and must be judged on the basis of faults that it itself contains, not of the Shelleian merits which it lacks. Peacock does not rival Shelley; he merely differs from him. There is more than one kind of art, and there will always be room for a Mozart as well as for a Beethoven.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

In selective bibliographies the principles of selection employed vary widely with each bibliographer, and the result often becomes merely an expression of personal taste: "My Favorite Books about Peacock." Such has been the condition of Peacock bibliographies, and for that reason a rather complete bibliography is attempted here.

No thorough list of books and articles about Peacock has ever been compiled. The section on Peacock in the Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, although compiled by Mr. C. E. Jones, co-editor of the Halliford Edition, lists a considerable number of books and articles about Peacock, many of which are not of general enough interest to warrant including, and omits a number of items which are really important. The primary bibliography consists of little more than a list of Peacock's major books, with dates of first publication of each.

The most extensive primary bibliography of Peacock is that in the Halliford Edition of his works. Here Mr. Brett-Smith, assisted by Jones, gives excellent and complete descriptions of all first editions and is quite thorough in determining the canon of Peacock's works. This work is so excellent that it is doubtful whether another descriptive bibliography of Peacock will ever be required. It has but two shortcomings, which, although minor, perhaps justify my adding my own bibliographical contribution. First, Mr. Brett-

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

In selective bibliographies the principles of selection employed vary widely with each bibliographer, and the result often becomes merely an expression of personal taste: "My Favorite Books about Peacock." Such has been the condition of Peacock bibliographies, and for that reason a rather complete bibliography is attempted here.

No thorough list of books and articles about Peacock has ever been compiled. The section on Peacock in the Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, although compiled by Mr. C. E. Jones, co-editor of the Halliford Edition, lists a considerable number of books and articles about Peacock, many of which are not of general enough interest to warrant including, and omits a number of items which are really important. The primary bibliography consists of little more than a list of Peacock's major books, with dates of first publication of each.

The most extensive primary bibliography of Peacock is that in the Halliford Edition of his works. Here Mr. Hewitt-Smith, assisted by Jones, gives excellent and complete descriptions of all first editions and is quite thorough in determining the canon of Peacock's works. This work is so excellent that it is doubtful whether another descriptive bibliography of Peacock will ever be required. It has but two shortcomings, which, although minor, perhaps justify my adding my own bibliographical contribution. First, Mr. Hewit-

Smith, who is primarily interested in establishing the texts for his edition, does not deal with subsequent editions and reprints unless they are textually valuable. Second, his bibliographies, which appear in the volumes with the works described, are difficult for anyone but the most thorough investigator to use, even with the aid of the index which he kindly provides. For thorough, scholarly description and careful research into textual problems, his work is unmatched, but it does not provide a ready picture of the scope of Peacock's work, the changes in the popularity of Peacock during the past century, or the present availability of recent editions. Also Mr. Brett-Smith does not attempt any thorough listing of books and articles about Peacock. The bibliographies which follow are not intended to compete with those in the Halliford Edition, but only to supplement them.

The only other considerable Peacock bibliography is that in Van Doren's biography. This includes no secondary materials and is incomplete in its listing of primary sources. However, its form--the listing of all items of publication chronologically rather than by title--makes it readily usable. In my Bibliography A I have to a large extent employed the same method of organization.

In Bibliography A I have listed all items of Peacock publication between 1800 and 1948 of which I have found reliable evidence. Certain bibliographical problems in the

Peacock canon have made many bibliographies unreliable. Because Peacock's novels are short, they have often been printed two or three to the volume. Occasional American editions of his work have also confused the bibliographers. Many so-called lost editions have turned out to be only a confusion resulting when two or more novels appeared in the same volume or when an American edition had been wrongly inserted into the sequence of British editions. A number of Peacock's works, as was then the custom, were published late in the year and post-dated for the following year. Because some bibliographers have given the actual date of appearance and others the date which appears on the title page, subsequent students have occasionally assumed that two separate editions existed. It is hoped that the form of this bibliography will obviate many of these difficulties in interpretation. All items have been listed by date instead of by title, thus avoiding the necessity of two references to the same edition in those cases in which two novels appeared in one volume. I have provided an index which gives the years under which each item can be found. No attempt has been made to describe editions, but whenever possible I have referred the reader to the descriptions in the Halliford Edition.

Bibliographies B through E provide an extensive coverage of books, articles, etc., about Peacock, including some of the more important original sources of Peacock biography.

Some of the items in these lists I have not seen. These are marked with an asterisk. As many of the items are only of limited interest to any but specialized students, I have annotated the entries whenever possible. Bibliography F has been taken intact from the Halliford Edition, Volume I, pages 182-184. As far as I know, no additions have been made to this list, compiled by Messrs. Brett-Smith and Jones, of reviews and notices of Peacock's work published during his lifetime.

These six bibliographies, of which all but the last are original contributions, should be of considerable value to future students of Peacock. They are the most complete, except in description, which have been compiled. Of course this work does not pretend to be definitive. I have no doubt missed many items; my information regarding the publication of some which I have not yet seen is incomplete. Certain items are so inconsequential that they have not been included. No attempt, for example, has been made to include all anthologies and literary histories which deal with Peacock, although Bibliography D attempts a representative sampling of such treatment.

INDEX TO BIBLIOGRAPHY A

NOTE: All references in the following index are to year of publication. Because most of the indexed items also appear in at least one of the three editions of Peacock's collected works, these editions have not been referred to in the indexing of each individual item. The three editions themselves are indexed as "Works."

"The Abbey House": cf. "Recollections of Childhood"

Aelia Laelia Crispis cf. Gl'Ingannati

"Ahrimanes" 1909

"Bellini" 1836

"A Bill for the Better Promotion of Oppression on the Sabbath Day" 1926

Biographical Notes 1873

"Byp and Nop" 1837

Calidore and Miscellanea 1892

Chapelle and Bachaumont, Works of (review of) 1858

"A Chorus of Bubble Buyers" 1837, 1838

"A Chorus of Scotch Economists" cf. Paper Money Lyrics

Chronicles of London Bridge (review of) 1830

Collected Prose Works cf. Works

Crotchet Castle 1831, 1837, 1849, 1856, 1887, 1895, 1903, 1905, 1924, 1927, 1940, 1947, 1948

Demetrius Galanus; Greek Translations from Sanscrit (review of) 1858

INDEX TO BIBLIOGRAPHY A

NOTE: All references in the following index are to year of publication. Because most of the indexed items also appear in at least one of the three editions of Peacock's collected works, these editions have not been referred to in the indexing of each individual item. The three editions themselves are indexed as "Works."

"The Abbey Nurse": cf. "Recollections of Childhood"

Aelia Laelia Crispis cf. *Gl'Ingannati*

"Almanzaree" 1909

"Bellini" 1896

"A Bill for the Better Promotion of Oppression on the Bankbank Day" 1926

Biographical Notes 1873

"Byp and Nop" 1897

Calidore and Miscellanea 1892

Chapelle and Beauchamp, Works of (review of) 1838

"A Chorus of Bubble Buyers" 1837, 1838

"A Chorus of Scotch Economists" cf. *Paper Money Lyrics*

Chronicles of London Bridge (review of) 1830

Collected Prose Works cf. Works

Crotchet Castle 1831, 1837, 1849, 1856, 1887, 1895, 1903, 1905, 1924, 1927, 1940, 1947, 1948

Demetrius Galanus; Greek Translations from Bannorit (review of) 1838

"The Épicier" 1836

The Epicurean (review of) cf. Moore's Epicurean

"Essay on Fashionable Literature" 1910

The Faro Table cf. "Prologue"

"The Fate of a Broom" 1831, 1837

"The Flask of Cratinus" cf. "Horae Dramaticae"

"The Four Ages of Poetry" 1820, 1880, 1890, 1921, 1923, 1929, 1937, 1945

"French Comic Romances" 1835

"Gastronomy and Civilization" 1851

The Genius of the Thames 1810, 1812, 1817

Gl'Ingannati and Aelia Laelia Crispis 1862, 1901

Greek Translations from Sanscrit cf. Demetrius Galanus

Gryll Grange 1860, 1861, 1896, 1903, 1905, 1927

Halliford Edition 1924-34

Headlong Hall 1815, 1816, 1822, 1837, 1845, 1849, 1856, 1887, 1895, 1896, 1903, 1905, 1908, 1927, 1929, 1940

History of Greek Literature (review of) 1859

"Horae Dramaticae" 1852, 1857

"Is History or Biography the more improving Study?" (prize essay in answer to this question) 1800, 1901

Jefferson, Thomas cf. Memoirs, etc.

"The Last Day of Windsor Forest" 1887

"The Legend of Manor Hall" 1837

Letters 1814, 1910

Letters and Journals of Lord Byron cf. Moore's Byron

"The Epistler" 1896

The Epicurean (review of) cf. Moore's Epicurean

"Essay on Fashionable Literature" 1910

The Faro Table cf. "Prologue"

"The Fate of a Groom" 1831, 1837

"The Flask of Gratinus" cf. "Horae Dramaticae"

"The Four Ages of Poetry" 1820, 1880, 1890, 1921, 1923, 1929, 1937, 1945

"French Comic Romances" 1835

"Gastronomy and Civilisation" 1851

The Genius of the Thames 1810, 1812, 1817

Gil Blas and Aelia Laelia Crispis 1862, 1901

Greek Translations from Sandorit cf. Demetrius Galanus

Gryll Grange 1860, 1861, 1896, 1903, 1905, 1927

Halliford Edition 1924-34

Headlong Hall 1815, 1816, 1822, 1837, 1845, 1849, 1856, 1887, 1895, 1896, 1903, 1905, 1908, 1927, 1929, 1946

History of Greek Literature (review of) 1859

"Horae Dramaticae" 1852, 1857

"Is History or Biography the more improving Study?" (prize essay in answer to this question) 1800, 1901

Jefferson, Thomas cf. Memoirs, etc.

"The Last Day of Windsor Forest" 1887

"The Legend of Manor Hall" 1837

Letters 1814, 1910

Letters and Journals of Lord Byron cf. Moore's Byron

Lord Mount Edgecumbe's Musical Reminiscences (review of) 1835

"Love and the Flimsies" 1837, 1838, also cf. Paper Money Lyrics

Maid Marian 1822, 1823, 1826, 1837, 1849, 1855, 1856, 1892, 1895, 1899, 1903, 1905, 1912, 1925, 1927, 1935

"Margaret Love Peacock" 1880-94

Melincourt 1817, 1856, 1896, 1903, 1905, 1927

Memoirs, Correspondence, and Private Papers of Thomas Jefferson (review of) 1830

"Memoirs of Shelley" 1858, 1860, 1862, 1875, 1909, 1928, 1932, 1933

The Misfortunes of Elphin 1829, 1897, 1903, 1905, 1924, 1927, 1928

The Monks of St. Mark 1804

"A Mood of My Own Mind" cf. Paper Money Lyrics

Moore's Byron (review of) 1830

Moore's Epicurean (review of) 1827

Musical criticism in The Globe and The Examiner 1829-34

Musical Reminiscences cf. Lord Mount Edgecumbe

"Newark Abbey" 1860

"The New Year" 1838

Nightmare Abbey 1819, 1837, 1845, 1849, 1856, 1887, 1895, 1896, 1903, 1905, 1908, 1923, 1927, 1929, 1940, 1947, 1948.

Palmyra 1805, 1812, 1817

"Pan in Town" cf. Paper Money Lyrics

Paper Money Lyrics 1837

"The Phaëthon of Euripides" cf. "Horae Dramaticae"

Lord Mount Edgcumbe's Musical Reminiscences (review of) 1835

"Love and the Fitmates" 1837, 1838, also cf. Paper Money Lyrics

Maid Marian 1822, 1823, 1826, 1837, 1849, 1853, 1856, 1892, 1895, 1899, 1903, 1905, 1913, 1925, 1927, 1935

"Margaret Love Peacock" 1880-94

Malinconi 1817, 1836, 1896, 1903, 1905, 1927

Memoirs, Correspondence, and Private Papers of Thomas Jefferson (review of) 1830

"Memoirs of Shelley" 1858, 1860, 1862, 1875, 1909, 1928, 1932, 1933

The Misfortunes of Elphin 1829, 1897, 1903, 1905, 1924, 1927, 1928

The Monks of St. Mark 1804

"A Mood of My Own Mind" cf. Paper Money Lyrics

Moore's Byron (review of) 1830

Moore's Epicurean (review of) 1827

Musical criticism in The Globe and The Examiner 1829-34

Musical Reminiscences cf. Lord Mount Edgcumbe

"Newark Abbey" 1860

"The New Year" 1838

Nightmare Abbey 1819, 1837, 1845, 1849, 1856, 1857, 1895, 1898, 1903, 1905, 1908, 1923, 1927, 1929, 1940, 1947, 1948.

Palmyra 1805, 1812, 1817

"Pan in Town" cf. Paper Money Lyrics

Paper Money Lyrics 1837

"The Phasëlion of Euripides" cf. "Horae Dramaticae"

The Philosophy of Melancholy 1812

The Plays of Thomas Love Peacock 1910

The Pleasures of Peacock 1947

Poems 1906

"Postscript to the Shelley Letters" cf. "Memoirs of Shelley"

"Proemium of an Epic" cf. *Paper Money Lyrics*

"Prologue" to *The Faro Table* 1816

"Promotion by Purchase and No Purchase" cf. "Byp and Nop"

"*Querolus, or the Buried Treasure*" cf. "Horae Dramaticae"

"Recollections of Childhood: The Abbey House" 1837, 1859

Rhododaphne 1818, 1843, 1897, 1927

"Rich and Poor; or Saint and Sinner" 1821, 1825, 1837

The Round Table; or King Arthur's Feast 1817

Selections from Peacock 1911, 1928, 1947

"Shelley Memoirs" cf. "Memoirs of Shelley"

Sir Hornbook 1813, 1815, 1816, 1838, 1843, 1845, 1855

Sir Proteus 1814

Songs from the Novels 1902, 1905

Steam Navigation to India 1834, 1835

"The Three Little Men" cf. *Paper Money Lyrics*

"Touchandgo" 1829

"Unpublished Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley" cf. "Memoirs of Shelley"

"Unpublished Songs by T. L. Peacock" 1908, 1909

The "Vida" articles 1822-23

The Philosophy of Melancholy 1812

The Plays of Thomas Love Peacock 1910

The Pleasures of Peacock 1947

Poems 1906

"Postscript to the Shelley Letters" cf. "Memoirs of Shelley"

"Prosodium of an Epic" cf. *Paper Money Lyrics*

"Prologue" to *The Paro Table* 1816

"Promotion by Purchase and No Purchase" cf. "Ryp and Nop"

"Querelus or the Buried Treasure" cf. "Horse Dramatice"

"Recollections of Childhood: The Abbey Horse" 1837, 1859

Rhodesiaphone 1818, 1843, 1897, 1927

"Rich and Poor; or Saint and Sinner" 1821, 1825, 1837

The Round Table; or King Arthur's Feast 1817

Selections from Peacock 1911, 1928, 1947

"Shelley Memoirs" cf. "Memoirs of Shelley"

Sir Hornbook 1813, 1815, 1816, 1838, 1843, 1845, 1855

Sir Proteus 1814

Songs From the Novels 1902, 1905

Steam Navigation to India 1836, 1837

"The Three Little Men" cf. *Paper Money Lyrics*

"Toucandgo" 1829

"Unpublished Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley" cf.
"Memoirs of Shelley"

"Unpublished Songs by T. L. Peacock" 1908, 1909

The "Vida" articles 1822-23

A Whitebait Dinner 1851

"The Wise Men of Gotham" cf. Paper Money Lyrics

The Works of Thomas Love Peacock 1875, 1888, 1891-92, 1924-34

A Midsummer Dinner 1851

"The Wise Men of Gotham" cf. Paper Money Lyrics

The Works of Thomas Love Peacock 1875, 1888, 1891-92, 1924-34

BIBLIOGRAPHY A

PUBLICATIONS OF PEACOCK'S WORKS, 1800-1948

NOTE: I have not seen most of the items in this list. Volume and page references are given to the bibliographical descriptions in the Halliford Edition.

1800: "Is History or Biography the more improving Study?" The Monthly Preceptor /The Juvenile Library when in bound form/, I (February, 1800), 54-6. Peacock's prizewinning essay in heroic couplets. Described in Vol. VII, pp. 464-65.

1804: The Monks of St. Mark. London: T. Bensley, printer. Privately printed. Described in Vol. VII, pp. 474-75.

1805: Palmyra, and Other Poems. London: Printed by T. Bensley for W. J. and J. Richardson. Published late in 1805 and post-dated 1806. Mrs. Edith Nicolls Clarke in her Biographical Notes wrongly stated that this was published by Hookham; the error was corrected by Young in 1904. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 335-36

1810: The Genius of the Thames: a Lyrical Poem in Two Parts. London: Hookham. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 336-40.

1812: The Philosophy of Melancholy, a Poem in Four Parts, with a Mythological Ode. London: Hookham. Not reprinted until the Halliford Edition. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 342-43.

1812: The Genius of the Thames, Palmyra and Other Poems. London: Hookham. Reprinted from 1805 and 1810, adding two new poems. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 340-42.

1813: Sir Hornbook; or Childe Lancelot's Expedition: a Grammatico-Allegorical Ballad. Published anonymously. London: Sharpe and Hailes. Published late in 1813 and post-dated 1814. Mrs. Clarke wrongly dated it 1818; the error was corrected by Young in 1904. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 344-47.

BIBLIOGRAPHY A

PUBLICATIONS OF PEACOCK'S WORKS, 1800-1948

NOTE: I have not seen most of the items in this list. Volume and page references are given to the bibliographical descriptions in the Halliford Edition.

1800: "Is History or Biography the more Improving Study?" _The Monthly Preceptor_ ⟨_The Juvenile Library_ when in bound form⟩, I (February, 1800), 54-6. Peacock's prizewinning essay in heroic couplets. Described in Vol. VII, pp. 464-65.

1804: _The Monks of St. Mark_. London: T. Bensley, printer. Privately printed. Described in Vol. VII, pp. 474-75.

1805: _Palmyra, and Other Poems_. London: Printed by T. Bensley for W. J. and J. Richardson. Published late in 1805 and post-dated 1806. Mrs. Edith Nicolls Clarke in her _Biographical Notes_ wrongly stated that this was published by Hookham; the error was corrected by Young in 1904. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 335-36

1810: _The Genius of the Thames: a Lyrical Poem in Two Parts_. London: Hookham. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 338-46.

1812: _The Philosophy of Melancholy, a Poem in Four Parts, with a Mythological Ode_. London: Hookham. Not reprinted until the Halliford Edition. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 342-43.

1812: _The Genius of the Thames, Palmyra and Other Poems_. London: Hookham. Reprinted from 1805 and 1810, adding two new poems. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 340-42.

1819: _Sir Hornbook; or Childe Lancelot's Expedition: a Grammatico-Allegorical Ballad_. Published anonymously. London: Sharpe and Hailes. Published late in 1819 and post-dated 1820. Mrs. Clarke wrongly dated it 1818; the error was corrected by Young in 1904. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 344-47.

1814: Sir Proteus: A Satirical Ballad. Published under the pseudonym of P. M. O'Donovan, Esq. London: Hookham. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 347-49.

1814: A letter to the editors of The Morning Chronicle, April 8, 1814. Signed only as "P."

1815: Headlong Hall. London: Hookham. First edition. Published late in 1815 and post-dated 1816. Described in Vol. I, pp. 155-58.

1815: Sir Hornbook. London: John Sharpe. Second edition.

1815: Sir Hornbook. London: John Sharpe. Third edition. Published late in 1815 and postdated 1816.

1816: Headlong Hall. London: Hookham. Second edition.

1816: Headlong Hall. Philadelphia: M. Carey. First American edition.

1816: "Prologue" to The Faro Table; or The Guardians, by John Tobin. London.

1816 [or 1817 ?]: Sir Hornbook. Fourth edition. No copy has been traced.

1817: Melincourt. By the author of Headlong Hall. In three volumes. London: Hookham. First edition. Described in Vol. II, p. 456.

1817: Melincourt. Philadelphia: Moses Thomas, Jr. First American edition.

1817: The Genius of the Thames, Palmyra and Other Poems. London: Hookham. The label on spine says "Second Edition," but actually only a reissue of 1812 with new title page and table of contents. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 341-42.

1817: The Round Table; or King Arthur's Feast. London: John Arliss' "Juvenile Library." Undated and anonymous, but reviewed in Edinburgh Review, November, 1817. Only one copy extant. Van Doren wrongly dated it 1819. Described in Vol. VI, pp. 349-51.

1818: Rhododaphne: or, The Thessalian Spell. A Poem. London: Hookham. Described in Vol. VII, pp. 437-41. This is the only British edition of this year; Allibone is undoubtedly in error, not describing a separate edition, when he calls this first edition a 12mo instead of 8vo.

1818: Rhododaphne. Philadelphia: M. Carey. First American edition. Published anonymously. According to Van Doren, p. 109, gossip ascribed this poem in America to the Virginia poet Richard Dabney, and this edition was not added to the Peacock canon until comparatively recently.

1818: Rhododaphne. Van Doren's note: "A French version of Rhododaphne is said to have appeared in this year, but a careful search made for me in the principal libraries of Paris by Mr. B. Woodbridge has failed to find a copy of the book."

1818: Nightmare Abbey. By the author of Headlong Hall. London: Hookham. First edition. Described in Vol. III, p. 146.

1818: Sir Hornbook. Fifth edition of 1813. London: N. Hailes.

1819: Nightmare Abbey. New York. No copy of this edition has been discovered and its existence may be doubted.

1819 [or 1820 ?]: Nightmare Abbey. Translated into French as L'Abbaye de Cochemar. Publication was for unknown reasons deferred and the manuscript was in 1891 in the hands of Dr. Garnett (see Van Doren, p. 124).

1820: "The Four Ages of Poetry," Olliers Literary Miscellany, No. 1 [only issue], pp. 183-200. London. Published anonymously.

1821: "Rich and Poor; or Saint and Sinner," The Traveller, No. 6927 (July 9, 1821). Reprinted in 1837 as part of Paper Money Lyrics.

1821: "Rich and Poor; or Saint and Sinner," The Examiner, No. 707 (July 22-23, 1821). Reprinted from The Traveller.

1822: Maid Marian. By the author of Headlong Hall. London: Hookham. First edition. Described in Vol. III, p. 179.

1822: Headlong Hall. London: Hookham. Third British edition.

October, 1822, to November, 1823: A series of nine articles signed only as "Vida," London Magazine. These were long included in the Peacock canon, but Van Doren disputed the authorship. Butterworth convincingly proved that the articles were really written by Sir Charles Abraham Elton.

1818: Rhodedaphne. Philadelphia: M. Carey. First American edition. Published anonymously. According to Van Doren, p. 109, possibly ascribed this poem in America to the Virginia poet Richard Dabney, and this edition was not added to the Peacock canon until comparatively recently.

1818: Rhodedaphne. Van Doren's note: "A French version of Rhodedaphne is said to have appeared in this year, but a careful search made for me in the principal libraries of Paris by Mr. B. Woodbridge has failed to find a copy of the book."

1818: Nightmare Abbey. By the author of Headlong Hall. London: Hookham. First edition. Described in Vol. III, p. 146.

1818: Blr Notbook. Fifth edition of 1813. London: H. Hailes.

1819: Nightmare Abbey. New York. No copy of this edition has been discovered and its existence may be doubted.

1819 (or 1820 ?): Nightmare Abbey. Translated into French as L'Abbaye de Cauchemar. Publication was for unknown reasons deferred and the manuscript was in 1891 in the hands of Dr. Garnett (see Van Doren, p. 124).

1820: "The Four Ages of Poetry," Oilliers Literary Miscellany, No. 1 (only issue), pp. 183-200. London. Published anonymously.

1821: "Rich and Poor; or Saint and Sinner," The Traveller, No. 6?? (July 9, 1821). Reprinted in 1837 as part of Paper Money Lyrics.

1821: "Rich and Poor; or Saint and Sinner," The Examiner, No. 707 (July 22-23, 1821). Reprinted from The Traveller.

1822: Maid Marian. By the author of Headlong Hall. London: Hookham. First edition. Described in Vol. III, p. 129.

1822: Headlong Hall. London: Hookham. Third British edition.

October, 1822, to November, 1823: A series of nine articles signed only as "Vida," London Magazine. These were long included in the Peacock canon, but Van Doren disputed the authorship. Butterworth convincingly proved that the articles were really written by Sir Charles Abraham Elton.

1823: Maid Marian. Translated into German as Der Forstgraf, oder Robin Hood und Mariane. Jena.

1825: "Rich and Poor; or Saint and Sinner," The Globe and Traveller, No. 7097 (August 27, 1825). Reprinted from 1821.

1826: Maid Marian. Translated by Mme. Daring into French as Robin Hood, ou La Forêt de Sherwood. Paris.

1827: Review of Moore's Epicurean, Westminster Review, VIII (October, 1827), 351-84.

1829: "Touchandgo," The Globe and Traveller, No. 8194 (January 24, 1829).

1829: The Misfortunes of Elphin. By the Author of Headlong Hall. London: Hookham. First edition. Described in Vol. IV, pp. 153-55.

1829-1834 /circa/: Musical and dramatic reviews and notices in The Globe and Traveller and in The Examiner. These articles are too numerous to be listed individually here. Many of them have not yet been identified. Vol. IX, pp. 414-20, lists eighty-eight articles, but there are undoubtedly more.

1830: Review of Moore's Letters and Journals of Lord Byron, Westminster Review, XII (April, 1830), 269-304.

1830: Review of Memoirs, Correspondence, and Private Papers of Thomas Jefferson, ed. Thomas Jefferson Randolph, 1829, Westminster Review, XIII (October, 1830), 312-35.

1830: Review of Chronicles of London Bridge, by an Antiquary, 1827, Westminster Review, XIII (October, 1830), 401-15.

1831: Crotchet Castle. By the Author of Headlong Hall. London: Hookham. First edition. Described in Vol. IV, p. 213. This is the only edition of this year, yet Allibone described the first edition as a 12mo, and the Catalogue of the British Museum describes it as a 16mo; both are probably in error, as the Halliford Edition calls it an 8vo.

1831: "The Fate of a Broom," The Examiner, No. 1228 (August 14, 1831). Reprinted in 1837 as part of Paper Money Lyrics. Also was reprinted as a footnote to Chapter XVIII of Crotchet Castle in the 1837 edition.

1834: "Memorandum respecting the Application of Steam Navigation to the internal and external Communications of India; Steam Navigation in India and between Europe and India; estimate of the probable Expense of placing Two Iron Steam Vessels on the River Euphrates at Bussora, and navigating the same from Bussora to Bir and back." In the Report from the Select Committee on Steam Navigation to India, pp. 1-12. Never reprinted, even in Halliford edition.

1835: Review of Report of the Select Committee on Steam Navigation to India, Edinburgh Review, LX (January, 1835), 445-82. Never reprinted, even in Halliford Edition. Van Doren doubted authorship, but Brett-Smith proved it with external evidence.

1835: Review of Lord Mount Edgecumbe's Musical Reminiscences, London Review, I (April, 1835), 173-87.

1835: "French Comic Romances," London Review, II (October, 1835), 69-84.

1836: "The Épicier," London Review, II (January, 1836), 355-65.

1836: "Bellini," London Review, II (January, 1836), 467-80.

1837: "The Legend of Manor Hall," Bentley's Miscellany, I (January, 1837), 29-32.

1837: "Recollections of Childhood. The Abbey House," Bentley's Miscellany, I (February, 1837), 187-90.

1837: Headlong Hall; Nightmare Abbey; Maid Marian; Crotchet Castle. With corrections and a preface, dated March 4, 1837, by the author. London: Bentley. No. 57 of Bentley's Standard Novels. Described in Vol. I, pp. 167-69.

1837: "Paper Money Lyrics: The Three Little Men," The Guide, April 22, 1837.

1837: "Byp and Nop," The Guide, April 29, 1837.

1837: "Rich and Poor; or, Saint and Sinner," The Guide, May 6, 1837.

1837: "Paper Money Lyrics II: Proemium of an Epic," The Guide, May 21, 1837.

1837: "Paper Money Lyrics III: Pan in Town," The Guide, May 28, 1837.

1837: "Paper Money Lyrics IV: A Mood of My Own Mind," The Guide, June 4, 1837.

1837: "Paper Money Lyrics V: Chorus of Scotch Economists," The Guide, June 11, 1837.

1837: "Paper Money Lyrics VI: The Wise Men of Gotham," The Guide, June 18, 1837.

1837: "Paper Money Lyrics VII: "Love and the Flimsies," The Guide, June 18, 1837.

1837: Paper Money Lyrics, and Other Poems. Privately printed in an edition of 100 copies. Includes the seven poems published in The Guide as "Paper Money Lyrics," plus "Byp and Nop," "Rich and Poor," "The Fate of a Broom," and six other poems.

1838: "The New Year; Lines on George Cruikshank's Illustration of January, in the Comic Almanack for 1838," Bentley's Miscellany, III (January, 1838), 104.

1838: "Love and the Flimsies," Bentley's Miscellany, IV (August, 1838), 140. Reprinted from 1837.

1838: "Chorus of Bubble Buyers," Bentley's Miscellany, IV (September, 1838), 239. Reprinted from 1837.

1838: Sir Hornbook. In "The Home Treasury" Series. Mrs. Clarke in her Biographical Notice testifies to this edition, but Brett-Smith notes that no copy of, nor any other allusion to, an edition of 1838 has been discovered.

1843: Sir Hornbook. In "The Home Treasury" Series, ed. Sir Henry Cole. London: Joseph Cundall. Perhaps reprinted from 1838 (see above).

1843: Rhododaphne. In The Southern Literary Messenger, June and July, 1843. Reprinted from the Philadelphia edition of 1818.

1845: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. New York: Wiley and Putnam's Library of Choice Reading.

1845: Sir Hornbook. London: Cundall. "The Home Treasury" Series. Reprinted from 1843 [or 1838?]. Van Doren dates this edition as 1846. Perhaps this too was a post-dated edition.

1849: Headlong Hall; Nightmare Abbey; Maid Marian; Crotchet Castle. London: Bentley's Standard Novels, No. 57. Reprinted from 1837.

1837: "Paper money [illegible] of Queen Adelaide," The Guilde, June 17, 1837.

1837: "Paper money [illegible] of London Bankers," The Guilde, June 24, 1837.

1837: "Paper money [illegible] Key of Commerce," The Guilde, June 28, 1837.

1837: "Paper over [illegible] Three and Six Pence," The Guilde, June 10, 1837.

1837: Paper Money Lyrical, and [illegible]. Privately printed in an edition of 100 copies. Inscribed "To Mrs. Griffin from the Author" and dated "Bath, 1837."

1838: "The Bee Hive, Issue of January 1838," [illegible]

1838: "Love and the Arabs," [illegible] (August, 1838).

1838: "Chorus of Ducks," [illegible] (September, 1838).

1839: Six Portraits. In this year Brewster's [illegible] Drawing in Two Sheets [illegible] Brewster-Wells Types. This is only one of [illegible] to, an edition of 1839 [illegible].

1845: Life Assurance. In this year [illegible] Henry Colt, Comm. [illegible] from 1839 [illegible].

1845: Woodcarving. In the edition [illegible] and July, 1845. [illegible] of 1815.

1845: Wealthy Men and [illegible] [illegible]

1845: Six Portraits. [illegible] Journal. [illegible] this edition on 1845. [illegible] edition.

1845: Beautiful Well [illegible] Castle. [illegible] Reprinted from 1837.

1851: A Whitebait Dinner. A Greek poem with Latin translation, privately printed as a leaflet. In the 1875 edition of Peacock's Works is included an English translation by Lord Broughton. Described in Vol. VII, pp. 506-8.

1851: "Gastronomy and Civilization," Fraser's Magazine, XLIV (December, 1851), 591-609. Authorship in question. Published over the initials of Peacock's daughter, Mrs. George Meredith, but shows strong Peacockian characteristics. Brett-Smith and Van Doren both call it joint work.

1852: "Horae Dramaticae I: Querolus, or the Buried Treasure," Fraser's Magazine, XLV (March, 1852), 291-302.

1852: "Horae Dramaticea II: The Phaëthon of Euripides," Fraser's Magazine, XLV (April, 1852), 448-58.

1855: Maid Marian. Translated into French by Louis Barre. Brussels. No copy of this edition has been found.

1855: Sir Hornbook. London: Chapman and Hall.

1856: Melincourt. With special preface by Peacock, dated March, 1856. London: Chapman and Hall. In one volume.

1856: Maid Marian and Crotchet Castle. London: Ward and Lock. No copy of this edition has been discovered. It is supposed to have been issued in 12mo but may be only a confusion with the 8vo edition of the same year (see below) which is found in the British Museum. Its existence may be doubted.

1856: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. London: Ward and Lock. A great deal of confusion surrounds the facts of publication of this edition and of the one above. The Catalogue of the British Museum and the Allibone Index disagree as to its format.

1857: "Horae Dramaticae III: The Flask of Cratinus," Fraser's Magazine, LVI (October, 1857), 482-88. Signed as "The Author of Headlong Hall"; other articles in the series are all signed only as "M.S.O."

1858: Review of the Works of Chapelle and Bachaumont, Fraser's Magazine, LVII (April, 1858), 502-11.

1858: "Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley," First paper, Fraser's Magazine, LVII (June, 1858), 643-59. Consists of a review of Charles Middleton's Shelley and his Writings, E. J. Trelawney's Recollections of the Last Days of Shelley and Byron, and Thomas Jefferson Hogg's The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley, Vols. I and II.

1851: A Whitehall Dinner. A Greek poem with Latin translation, privately printed as a leaflet. In the 1875 edition of Peacock's Works is included an English translation by Lord Houghton. Described in Vol. VII, pp. 506-8.

1851: "Gastronomy and Civilization," Fraser's Magazine, XLIV (December, 1851), 591-609. Authorship in question. Published over the initials of Peacock's daughter, Mrs. George Meredith, but shows strong Peacockian characterization. Brett-Smith and Van Doren both call it joint work.

1852: "Horae Dramaticae I: Quarolina, or the Buried Treasure," Fraser's Magazine, XLV (March, 1852), 291-302.

1852: "Horae Dramaticae II: The Phaëthon of Euripides," Fraser's Magazine, XLV (April, 1852), 448-58.

1855: Maid Marian. Translated into French by Louis Barre. Brussels. No copy of this edition has been found.

1855: Sir Hornbook. London: Chapman and Hall.

1856: Melincourt. With special preface by Peacock, dated March, 1856. London: Chapman and Hall. In one volume.

1856: Maid Marian and Crotchet Castle. London: Ward and Lock. No copy of this edition has been discovered. It is supposed to have been issued in 12mo but may be only a continuation with the 8vo edition of the same year (see below) which is found in the British Museum. Its existence may be doubted.

1856: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. London: Ward and Lock. A great deal of confusion surrounds the facts of publication of this edition and of the one above. The Catalogue of the British Museum and the Allibone Index disagree as to its format.

1857: "Horae Dramaticae III: The Flask of Gretina," Fraser's Magazine, LVI (October, 1857), 482-88. Signed as "The Author of Headlong Hall"; other articles in the series are all signed only as "M.S.O."

1858: Review of the Works of Chapelle and Bachaumont, Fraser's Magazine, LVII (April, 1858), 502-11.

1858: "Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley," First paper, Fraser's Magazine, LVII (June, 1858), 643-59. Donnelta of a review of Charles Middleton's Shelley and His Writings, I. 1. Trelawney's Recollections of the Last Days of Shelley and Byron, and Thomas Jefferson Hogg's The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley, Vols. I and II.

1858: Review of Demetrius Galanus; Greek Translations from Sanscrit, Fraser's Magazine, LVIII (November, 1858), 596-608.

1859: Review of Müller and Donaldson's History of Greek Literature, Fraser's Magazine, LIX (March, 1859), 357-77. Signed "T. L. Peacock."

1859: "Recollections of Childhood: The Abbey House," in Tales from Bentley, Vol. I, pp. 89-96. Reprinted from 1837.

1860: "Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley," Second paper, Fraser's Magazine, LXI (January, 1860), 92-109. Consists of a review of the Shelley Memorials, published by Lady Shelley in 1859.

1860: "Unpublished Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley," Fraser's Magazine, LXI (March, 1860), 301-19. Consists of sixteen letters of Shelley and six introductory paragraphs by Peacock. Although not so titled, this article is usually considered a part of the "Memoirs of Shelley."

1860: "Postscript to the Shelley Letters," Fraser's Magazine, LXI (May, 1860), 738. Usually considered part of the "Memoirs of Shelley."

1860: "Newark Abbey," Fraser's Magazine, LXII (November, 1860), 598.

1860: Gryll Grange. Printed serially in Fraser's Magazine, Vols. LXI-LXII: Chaps. i-v, April; vi-xi, May; xii-xiv, June; xv-xviii, July; xix-xxi, August; xxii-xxvi, September; xxvii-xxix, October; xxx-xxxii, November; xxxiii-xxxv, December.

1861: Gryll Grange. By the Author of Headlong Hall. London: Parker. Described in Vol. V, pp. 378-80.

1862: Gl'Ingannati. The Deceived: A Comedy Performed at Siena in 1531; and Aelia Laelia Crispis. London: Chapman and Hall.

1862: "Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley: Supplementary Notice," Fraser's Magazine, LXV (March, 1862), 343-46.

1858: Review of Demetrius Galanus; Greek Translations from Sanscrit, Fraser's Magazine, LVIII (November, 1858), 596-606.

1859: Review of Muller and Donaldson's History of Greek Literature, Fraser's Magazine, LIX (March, 1859), 327-77. Signed "T. L. Peacock."

1859: "Recollections of Childhood: The Abbey House," in Tales from Bentley, Vol. I, pp. 89-96. Reprinted from 1837.

1860: "Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley," Second paper, Fraser's Magazine, LXII (January, 1860), 92-109. Complete of a review of the Shelley Memorials, published by Lady Shelley in 1859.

1860: "Unpublished Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley," Fraser's Magazine, LXI (March, 1860), 301-19. Contains of sixteen letters of Shelley and six Introductory paragraphs by Peacock. Although not so titled, this article is usually considered a part of the "Memoirs of Shelley."

1860: "Postscript to the Shelley Letters," Fraser's Magazine, LXI (May, 1860), 775. Usually considered part of the "Memoirs of Shelley."

1860: "Newark Abbey," Fraser's Magazine, LXII (November, 1860), 598.

1860: Gryll Grange. Printed serially in Fraser's Magazine, Vols. LXI-LXII: Chaps. i-v, April; vi-xi, May; xii-xix, June; xx-xviii, July; xix-xxi, August; xxii-xxvi, September; xxvii-xxix, October; xxx-xxxii, November; xxxii-xxxv, December.

1861: Gryll Grange. By the Author of Headlong Hall. London: Parker. Described in Vol. V, pp. 375-80.

1862: Gl'Ingannati. The Deceived: A Comedy performed at Siena in 1531: and Aella Lucile Orlando. London: Chapman and Hall.

1862: "Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley: Supplementary Notice," Fraser's Magazine, LXV (March, 1862), 343-46.

1873: Thomas Love Peacock. Biographical Notes. From 1785 to 1866. London. Only ten copies printed, of which only two are extant. A collection of notes prepared by Sir Henry Cole for the use of Edith Nicolls (Clarke) in writing her Biographical Notice for the 1875 edition. Contains some verses and letters by Peacock. Brett-Smith calls it "the sole authority for Letters 2, 67, 68, 69, and parts of 72 and 73. Described in Vol. I, p. 170.

1875: Memoirs of Shelley, with Shelley's Letters to Peacock. London: Bentley.

1875: The Works of Thomas Love Peacock, Including his Novels, Poems, Fugitive Pieces, Criticisms, etc. Ed. Sir Henry Cole. Preface by Lord Houghton. Biographical Notice by Peacock's granddaughter Edith Nicolls (Clarke). In three volumes. London: Bentley. Included all seven novels, Gl'Ingannati, Aelia Laelia Crispis, some but by no means all of the poems, "The Four Ages of Poetry," "Horae Dramaticae," and four of the Shelley articles from Fraser's. The edition is described in Vol. I, pp. 170-73. The Bibliography in the Cambridge History of English Literature, Vol. XI, p. 507, wrongly dates this edition as 1873.

1880: "The Four Ages of Poetry," Printed as Appendix to third volume of Forman's edition of Shelley's Prose Works.

1880-1894: "Margaret Love Peacock," in Charles Stafford Dickens' Dictionary of the Thames from Oxford to the Nore. Dickens' quotes, p. 191, the poem from Margaret's tombstone at Shepperton. According to Brett-Smith, the poem appeared "in subsequent annual editions of the Dictionary from 1881-1894.

1887: Crotchet Castle. With an introduction by Henry Morley. Cassell's National Library, Vol. 57.

1887: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. No. 11 of Knickerbocker Nuggets.

1887: "The Last Day of Windsor Forest," ed. Richard Garnett, The National Review, X (September, 1887), 106-11.

1888: The Works of Thomas Love Peacock. London: Bentley. Reprinted from 1875.

1890: "The Four Ages of Poetry," Printed as Appendix to A Defense of Poetry, ed. Albert S. Cook. Boston: Ginn. No mention of Peacock in Cook's introduction and notes.

1891: Collected Prose Works. Ed. Richard Garnett. London: Dent. All the seven novels are here reprinted as the first nine volumes of a proposed ten-volume set. Only 100 copies printed of first edition.

1892: Calidore and Miscellanea. Ed. Richard Garnett. London: Dent. Published as the tenth volume to the 1891 edition. The 1891 date on title page is due to use of an unchanged ornamental plate. Contains article by Edward Strachey, entitled, "Recollections of Thomas Love Peacock." Described in Vol. I, pp. 173-4.

1892: Maid Marian. Second edition of the volume from the 1891 ten-volume set. London: Dent.

1895: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. New York: Putnam's Stories of the Ages.

1895: Maid Marian and Crotchet Castle. Illustrated by F. H. Townsend. Introduction by George Saintsbury. New York and London: Macmillan. Standard Illustrated Novels Series.

1896: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. Illustrated by H. R. Miller. Introduction by George Saintsbury. New York and London: Macmillan. Standard Illustrated Novels Series.

1896: Melincourt; or Sir Oran Haut-ton. Illustrated by F. H. Townsend. Introduction by George Saintsbury. New York and London: Macmillan. Standard Illustrated Novels Series.

1896: Gryll Grange. Illustrated by F. H. Townsend. Introduction by George Saintsbury. New York and London: Macmillan. Standard Illustrated Novels Series.

1897: The Misfortunes of Elphin and Rhododaphne. Illustrated by F. H. Townsend. Introduction by George Saintsbury. New York and London: Macmillan. Standard Illustrated Novels.

1899: Maid Marian. Third edition of the volume from the 1891 ten-volume set. London: Dent.

1901: Gl'Ingannati. In Furness' New Variorum Twelfth Night, Philadelphia. pp. 341-59.

1901: "Is History or Biography the more improving Study?" In The Library, ed. W. E. A. Axon, New Series, II (January, 1901), 69-71.

1902: Songs from the Novels of Thomas Love Peacock. London: R. B. Johnson's York Library.

1891: Collected Prose Works. Ed. Richard Garnett. London: Dent. All the seven novels are here reprinted in the first nine volumes of a proposed ten-volume set. Only 100 copies printed of first edition.

1892: Guidore and Miscellanea. Ed. Richard Garnett. London: Dent. Published as the tenth volume to the 1891 edition. The 1891 date on title page is due to use of an unchanged ornamental plate. Contains article by Edmund Stedman, entitled, "Recollections of Thomas Love Peacock." Reprinted in Vol. I, pp. 173-4.

1892: Maid Marian. Second edition of the volume from the 1891 ten-volume set. London: Dent.

1895: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. New York: Putnam's Stories of the Area.

1895: Maid Marian and Crotchet Castle. Illustrated by F. R. Townsend. Introduction by George Saintsbury. New York and London: Macmillan. Standard Illustrated Novels Series.

1896: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. Illustrated by F. R. Miller. Introduction by George Saintsbury. New York and London: Macmillan. Standard Illustrated Novels Series.

1896: Melincourt; or Sir Oran Haut-ton. Illustrated by F. R. Townsend. Introduction by George Saintsbury. New York and London: Macmillan. Standard Illustrated Novels Series.

1896: Nightmare Abbey. Illustrated by F. R. Townsend. Introduction by George Saintsbury. New York and London: Macmillan. Standard Illustrated Novels Series.

1897: The Misfortunes of Elphin and Rhododaphne. Illustrated by F. R. Townsend. Introduction by George Saintsbury. New York and London: Macmillan. Standard Illustrated Novels.

1899: Maid Marian. Third edition of the volume from the 1891 ten-volume set. London: Dent.

1901: Gryll Grange. In Furness' New Variorum Twelfth Night. Philadelphia. pp. 341-59.

1901: "Is History or Biography the more Improving Study?" In The Library, ed. W. E. A. Axon, New Series, II (January, 1901), 69-71.

1902: Scenes from the Novels of Thomas Love Peacock. London: R. B. Johnson's York Library.

1903: The Novels of Thomas Love Peacock. London and New York: Newnes' thin paper Caxton Series, one volume.

1903: Novels. New York: Dutton. In two volumes. Perhaps only a misdating of the 1905 edition of the Works.

1903: Novels. New York: Scribner.

1905: Songs from the Novels of Thomas Love Peacock. London: R. B. Johnson's York Library. Reprinted from 1902.

1905: The Works of Thomas Love Peacock. London: Routledge; New York: Dutton. In two volumes. Consists of the novels only. New Universal Library.

1906: Poems. Ed. R. B. Johnson, with biographical preface. London: Routledge; New York: Dutton. Muses' Library; New Universal Library.

1908: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. Ed. Ernest Rhys. Introduction by Richard Garnett. London and Toronto: Dent; New York: Dutton. Everyman's Library, No. 327.

1908: "Unpublished Songs by T. L. Peacock," ed. A. B. Young, Notes and Queries, Series X, XI (January 16, 1909), 43-4. Publishes some songs from The Three Doctors.

1909: Memoirs of Shelley, with Shelley's Letters to Peacock. Ed. H. F. B. Brett-Smith. Oxford: Oxford Miscellany of Prose and Poetry.

1909: Ahrimanes. Ed. A. B. Young. Modern Language Review, IV (January, 1909). Corrections and an omitted stanza were supplied to this highly inaccurate text by Mr. Brett-Smith in the same journal for July [Van Doren's note].

1910: The Plays of Thomas Love Peacock, Published for the First Time. Ed. A. B. Young. London: Nutt. Described in Vol. VII, pp. 525-26. Brett-Smith dates this edition as 1903, yet the title page states 1910. His statement is probably a misprint,

1910: "Thomas Love Peacock's Essay on Fashionable Literature," ed. A. B. Young, Notes and Queries, Series XI, II (July 2 and 23). 5-6 and 62-63.

1902: The Novels of Thomas Love Peacock. London and New York: Newnes' thin paper Carton Series, one volume.

1903: Novels. New York: Dutton. In two volumes. Perhaps only a misdating of the 1905 edition of the Works.

1903: Novels. New York: Scribner.

1905: Songs from the Novels of Thomas Love Peacock. London: H. B. Johnson's York Library. Reprinted from 1902.

1905: The Works of Thomas Love Peacock. London: Routledge; New York: Dutton. In two volumes. Contents of the novels only. New Universal Library.

1906: Poems. Ed. R. B. Johnson, with biographical preface. London: Routledge; New York: Dutton. Muses' Library; New Universal Library.

1908: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. Ed. Ernest Rhys. Introduction by Richard Garnett. London and Toronto: Dent; New York: Dutton. Everyman's Library, No. 327.

1908: "Unpublished Songs by T. L. Peacock," ed. A. B. Young, Notes and Queries, Series X, XI (January 15, 1909), 43-44. Publishes some songs from The Three Doctors.

1909: Memoirs of Shelley, with Shelley's Letters to Peacock. Ed. R. Y. H. Brett-Smith. Oxford: Oxford Miscellany of Prose and Poetry.

1909: Abrimanes. Ed. A. B. Young. Modern Language Review, IV (January, 1909). Corrections and an omitted stanza were supplied to this highly inaccurate text by Mr. Brett-Smith in the same journal for July [Van Doren's note].

1910: The Plays of Thomas Love Peacock. Published for the First Time. Ed. A. B. Young. London: Nutt. Described in Vol. VII, pp. 525-26. Brett-Smith dates this edition as 1909, yet the title page states 1910. His statement is probably a misprint.

1910: "Thomas Love Peacock's Essay on Fashionable Literature," ed. A. B. Young, Notes and Queries, Series XI, II (July 2 and 23), 5-6 and 52-53.

1910: Thomas Love Peacock: Letters to Edward Hookham and Percy B. Shelley, with Fragments of Unpublished Mss. Boston: privately printed for members of the Bibliophile Society. Limited to 483 copies. The job of editing was begun by Richard Garnett, but was finished by other hands after his death in 1906. Consisted of fourteen letters to Hookham, the shorter prose outline of Ahrimanes, and four unfinished tales. Described in Vol. I, p. 174.

1911: Thomas Love Peacock. Selections from the novels, ed. W. H. Helm. London: Regent Library.

1912: Maid Marian. London: Macmillan. Introduction by F. A. Cavenagh.

1921: Peacock's Four Ages of Poetry; Shelley's Defense of Poetry; Browning's Essay on Shelley. Oxford: Blackwell. Ed. with introduction and bibliographical notes by H. F. B. Brett-Smith. The Percy Reprints, No. 3

1923: Peacock's Four Ages of Poetry, etc. Second edition of 1921.

1923: Nightmare Abbey. Reprinted from the edition of 1818, ed. C. E. Jones, with reproductions of original title pages, etc. London: H. Milford.

1924: The Misfortunes of Elphin and Crotchet Castle. New York and London: H. Milford. Introduction by R. W. Chapman. The World's Classics, No. 244.

1924: Nightmare Abbey. Oxford: Oxford Miscellany of Prose and Poetry.

1924-34: Works of Thomas Love Peacock. Ed. H. F. B. Brett-Smith and C. E. Jones. London: Constable; New York: Wells. The Halliford Edition. Limited to 675 sets. In ten volumes: Vol. I, Biographical Introduction and Headlong Hall; Vol. II, Melincourt; Vol. III, Nightmare Abbey and Maid Marian; Vol. IV, The Misfortunes of Elphin and Crotchet Castle; Vol. V, Gryll Grange; Vol. VI, Poems; Vol. VII, Poems and Plays; Vols. VIII-X, Essays and Miscellanea. This is the standard edition of Peacock today. Although it does not reprint everything Peacock wrote, it is the most nearly definitive ever published. Includes full-color illustrations, reproductions of title pages, descriptive bibliographies, etc.

1910: Thomas Love Peacock: Letters to Edward Hookham and Percy B. Shelley, with Fragments of Unpublished Work. Boston: privately printed for members of the Bibliophile Society. Limited to 669 copies. The job of editing was begun by Richard Garnett, but was finished by other hands after his death in 1906. Contains 14 of fourteen letters to Hookham, the remainder being written to Shelley, and four unfinished tales. Described in Vol. 4, p. 174.

1911: Thomas Love Peacock. Selections from the novels, ed. R. R. Helm. London: Regent Library.

1912: Maid Marian. London: Macmillan. Introduction by P. A. Cavenagh.

1921: Peacock's Four Ages of Poetry; Shelley's Defence of Poetry; Browning's Essay on Shelley. Oxford: Blackwell. 88. With introduction and bibliographical notes by H. B. Brett-Smith. The Percy Reprints, No. 3.

1923: Peacock's Four Ages of Poetry, etc. Second edition of 1921.

1923: Nightmare Abbey. Reprinted from the edition of 1818, ed. C. E. Jones, with reproductions of original title pages, etc. London: H. Milford.

1924: The Misfortunes of Elphin and Crotchet Castle. New York and London: H. Milford. Introduction by R. B. Chapman. The World's Classics, No. 249.

1924: Nightmare Abbey. Oxford: Oxford Miscellany of Prose and Poetry.

1924–34: Works of Thomas Love Peacock. Ed. H. F. B. Brett-Smith and C. E. Jones. London: Constable; New York: Wolle. The Halliford Edition. Limited to 675 sets. In ten volumes: Vol. I, Biographical Introduction and Headlong Hall; Vol. II, Melincourt; Vol. III, Nightmare Abbey and Maid Marian; Vol. IV, The Misfortunes of Elphin and Crotchet Castle; Vol. V, Gryll Grange; Vol. VI, Poems; Vol. VII, Poems and Plays; Vols. VIII–X, Essays and Miscellanies. This is the standard edition of Peacock today. Although it does not reproduce every title Peacock wrote, it is the most nearly definitive ever published. Includes full-color illustrations, reproductions of title pages, descriptive bibliographies,

1925: Maid Marian. Reprinted complete in the Greenwood, compiled by Henry Newbolt. London and Edinburgh: Nelson.

1926: "A Bill for the better promotion of Oppression on the Sabbath Day," privately printed.

1927: Novels and Rhododaphne. New York and London: Macmillan. Reprinted from the Illustrated Pocket Classics edition of 1895-97, in five volumes.

1928: "Memoirs of Shelley," complete in Great Short Biographies of Modern Times, ed. Barrett H. Clark, pp. 1251-99. Robert M. McBride & Co.

1928: Selections from Thomas Love Peacock. Methuen. Ed. H. F. B. Brett-Smith. July, 1928.

1928: The Misfortunes of Elphin. Gregynog. Limited to 250 copies.

1929: Peacock's Four Ages of Poetry, etc. Reprinted from 1923.

1929: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. New York and London: H. Milford. The World's Classics.

1929: Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. Everyman's Library. Reprinted from 1908.

1932: "Memoirs of Shelley," complete in Great Short Biographies of Modern Times. Second edition of 1928. Bonibooks series.

1933: "Memoirs of Shelley," complete in Great Short Biographies of Modern Times. Reprinted from 1932. Bonibooks series.

1933: "Memoirs of Shelley," in Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley. Ed. H. Wolfe. London: Dent; New York: Dutton.

1935: Maid Marian Toronto: Macmillan. St. Martin's Classics.

1937: Peacock's Four Ages of Poetry, etc. Reprinted from 1923.

1940: Headlong Hall, Nightmare Abbey, Crotchet Castle. Introduction by John Mair. London and New York: Nelson. The Nelson Classics.

1945: Peacock's Four Ages of Poetry, etc. Reprinted from 1923.

1947: The Pleasures of Peacock; Comprising in Whole or in Part the Seven Novels of Thomas Love Peacock. Ed. with introduction by Ben Ray Redman. New York: Farrar, Strauss. Nightmare Abbey and Crotchet Castle are printed complete; the other five are abridged.

1948: Nightmare Abbey and Crotchet Castle. Hamilton. The Novel Library.

BIBLIOGRAPHY B

FULL LENGTH STUDIES OF PEACOCK

* Able, Augustus Henry, George Meredith and Thomas Love Peacock: a Study in Literary Influence. Philadelphia: 1933. Thesis (Ph. D.) at University of Pennsylvania, 1930.

Brett-Smith, H. F. B., Biographical Introduction. London: Constable; New York: Wells, 1934. Vol. I of Halliford Ed. This is the standard biography of Peacock. It is unsurpassed both for sound research and good interpretation. The most essential single work ever written on Peacock.

* Cellini, Benvenuto, Thomas Love Peacock. Rome: Cremonese, 1937. Written in Italian.

* Cole, Sir Henry, Thomas Love Peacock; Biographical Notes. Privately printed, 1873. This is a collection of notes for the use of Mrs. Edith Nicolls (Clarke) in her "Biographical Notice" of her grandfather for the 1875 edition of Works. Only ten copies were printed, of which two are extant.

Frankel, James, A Reevaluation of Thomas Love Peacock. Unpublished thesis (M.A.) at New York University, 1940.

* Fredland, Roger, The Backgrounds of Thomas Love Peacock. Proposed thesis (Ph.D.) at Princeton, listed as in progress in 1942 but never completed.

Freeman, A. M., Thomas Love Peacock, A Critical Study. London: Secker, 1911; New York: Kennerly, 1913. An exhaustive study of the biographical backgrounds of Peacock's novels. Interested primarily in tracing the sources of characters, incidents, settings, etc. Also contains one of the best treatments of Peacock's poems.

Hammond, Kathleen, Thomas Love Peacock's Satire of His Literary Contemporaries. Unpublished thesis (M.A.) at Montana State University, August, 1948. Insufficient reading of Peacock and poor interpretation invalidate this work. Misinterprets Peacock as a critical satirist out of sympathy with his whole age.

* Mayoux, Jean Jacques, Un Épicurien anglais: Thomas Love Peacock. Paris: Nizet et Bastard, 1933. Thesis (Ph.D.) at Université de Paris. Written in French.

BIBLIOGRAPHY B

FULL LENGTH STUDIES OF PEACOCK

* Ahle, Angwetta Henry, George Meredith and Thomas Love Peacock: A Study in Literary Influence. Philadelphia: 1933. Thesis (Ph. D.) at University of Pennsylvania, 1930.

Brett-Smith, H. F. B., Biographical Introduction. London: Constable; New York: Wells, 1934. Vol. 1 of Halliford ed. This is the standard biography of Peacock. It is unsurpassed both for sound research and good interpretation. The most essential single work ever written on Peacock.

* Cellini, Benvenuto, Thomas Love Peacock. Rome: Cremonese, 1937. Written in Italian.

* Cole, Sir Henry, Thomas Love Peacock: Biographical Notes. Privately printed, 1875. This is a collection of notes for the use of Mrs. Edith Nicolls (Clarke) in her "Biographical Notice" of her grandfather for the 1875 edition of Works. Only ten copies were printed, of which two are extant.

Frankel, James, A Reevaluation of Thomas Love Peacock. Unpublished thesis (M.A.) at New York University, 1940.

* Freeland, Roger, The Background of Thomas Love Peacock. Proposed thesis (Ph.D.) at Princeton, listed as in progress in 1942 but never completed.

Freeman, A. M., Thomas Love Peacock, A Critical Study. London: Secker, 1911; New York: Kennerly, 1912. An exhaustive study of the biographical background of Peacock's novels. Interested primarily in tracing the sources of characters, incidents, settings, etc. Also contains one of the best treatments of Peacock's poems.

Hammond, Kathleen, Thomas Love Peacock's Satire of His Literary Contemporaries. Unpublished thesis (M.A.) at Montana State University, August, 1936. Insufficient reading of Peacock and poor interpretation invalidate this work. Misinterprets Peacock as a critical satirist out of sympathy with his whole age.

* Mayoux, Jean Jacques, Un Romancier anglais: Thomas Love Peacock. Paris: Nizet et Bastard, 1933. Thesis (Ph.D.) at Universite de Paris. Written in French.

Priestly, J. B., Thomas Love Peacock. New York: Macmillan, 1927. English Men of Letters Series.
This is more of a critical study than a biography. Takes most of its biographical material from Van Doren. Priestly recognizes the complexity of Peacock's character but still misinterprets occasionally. On the whole, an excellent study, best when discussing the characters in the novels.

Van Doren, Carl, The Life of Thomas Love Peacock. London: Dent; New York: Dutton, 1911.
This was the first full-length biography and remained unrivalled until the publication of Brett-Smith's work. Although superseded in places by more recent discoveries, it is by no means invalidated and remains an absolutely essential work.

Young, Arthur Button, The Life and Novels of Thomas Love Peacock. Norwich: privately printed, 1904. Inaugural Dissertation: Freiberg in Breisgau.
This work embodies some useful research, particularly regarding the sources of Maid Marian and The Misfortunes of Elphin, but the biographical section is factually unreliable and the interpretation of the novels is too literal and unsympathetic, generally unsound.

Priestly, J. B., Thomas Love Peacock. New York: Macmillan, 1927. English Men of Letters Series.
This is more of a critical study than a biography.
Takes most of its biographical material from Van Doren.
Priestly recognizes the complexity of Peacock's character but still misinterprets occasionally. On the whole, an excellent study, best when discussing the characters in the novels.

Van Doren, Carl, The Life of Thomas Love Peacock. London: Dent; New York: Dutton, 1911.
This was the first full-length biography and remained unrivalled until the publication of Brett-Smith's work. Although superseded in places by more recent discoveries, it is by no means invalidated and remains an absolutely essential work.

Young, Arthur Button, The Life and Novels of Thomas Love Peacock. Norwich: privately printed, 1894. Unaltered Dissertation: Freiberg in Breisgau.
This work embodies some useful research, particularly regarding the sources of Maid Marian and The Misfortunes of Elphin, but the biographical section is factually unreliable and the interpretation of the novels is too literal and unsympathetic, generally unsound.

BIBLIOGRAPHY C

TREATMENT OF PEACOCK IN PERIODICALS, BOOKS, ETC.

NOTE: Items in this section range from extensive essays on Peacock to very incidental treatment in books which are primarily concerned with other subjects. A number of these items are mainly important for the background which they give of Peacock's period, his contemporaries, etc. Because they do treat Peacock directly, however, they have been included in this section instead of in Bibliography E. I have also included a number of biographical sources, such as Roebuck and Mary Shelley, and a limited quantity of Peacockiana, such as Macaulay and Kipling. I have attempted by the use of annotations to indicate which are the more important and more general treatments. Items which I have not seen but include on the basis of references in other works, I have marked with an asterisk.

Aspinall, Arthur, Lord Brougham and the Whig Party. Manchester: University Press, 1927.
The background of Peacock's attacks on Lord Brougham. Briefly discusses, p. 234, the treatment of Brougham in Gryll Grange and Crotchet Castle.

* The Athenaeum (February 10, 1866), p. 208.
Van Doren calls this article one of the most judicious of early comments.

* The Athenaeum (December 26, 1874), p. 875.
This is a notice of the 1875 edition of Peacock's Works.

* The Athenaeum (January 9, 1875), p. 49.
A review of the 1875 edition of Peacock's Works.

Babbitt, Irving, Rousseau and Romanticism. Boston and New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1919
Chiefly valuable as background on the romantic movement, but also discusses Peacock's attitudes on romantic poetry.

* Barham, Richard Harris, Life and Letters of the Rev. R. H. Barham. London, 1870.
Tells of the Globe and Traveller and of Peacock's associations with that periodical under Coulson's editorship.

Beddoes, Thomas Lovell, The Works of Thomas Lovell Beddoes. H. W. Donner, editor. London: Milford, 1935.
Contains some personal comments on Peacock.

* Bell, Clive, "Peacock," The Athenaeum (February 4 and October 14, 1911). A pair of essays on Peacock, later reprinted in Clive Bell, Pot Boilers. London: Chatto and Windus, 1918.

* Birrell, A., "Thomas Love Peacock; or, The Growth of the Pavonian Legend," The Nation (London), XLV (September 14, 1929), 760.
The same article is also in Et cetera, p. 233.

* Bliss, W. H. W., "Thomas Love Peacock," The Month, CLV (March, 1930), 204.

* Bowring, Sir John, Autobiographical Recollections of Sir John Bowring. London: H. S. King, 1877.
Tells of Peacock's connections with the Westminster and of his fights with Moore.

Boynton, H. W., "Thomas Love Peacock," Atlantic Monthly, XCVIII (December, 1906), 765.
Argues for Peacock's timelessness: the crotchets of his day have their counterparts in ours, etc. Excellent general treatment, but overemphasizes Peacock's conservative tendencies.

* Brett-Smith, H. F. B., "The L'Estrange-Peacock Correspondence," Essays and Studies (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press), XVIII (1933), 122.

Brinton, Crane, The Political Ideas of the English Romanticists. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1926.
Primarily background of the period, but also discusses Peacock's attitudes toward the political affiliations of the reviews.

Buchanan, Robert, "Thomas Love Peacock: A Personal Reminiscence," Littel's Living Age, CXXVI (July 17, 1875), 157. Reprinted from New Quarterly Magazine, IV (April, 1875). Also reprinted in A Look Round Literature, London: Ward and Downey, 1887, p. 162, and in The Poet's Sketch Book. London: Chatto and Windus, 1883, p. 93.
Effusive and sentimental, but the finest sketch ever written of Peacock as an old man.

Burdett, Osbert, "Peacock the Epicurean," Critical Essays. London: Faber and Gwyer, 1925. P. 78.
Amusing and provocative even if not always adequate. Treats Peacock as a Tory foil to the Romantic poets.

* _____, "Thomas Love Peacock, 1785-1866," London Mercury, VIII (May, 1923), 21.

Bush, Douglas, Mythology and the Romantic Tradition in English Poetry. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1937.
Contains the best, although very brief, treatment of Rhododaphne.

Butterworth, S., "News for Bibliophiles," Nation, XCVII (December 18, 1913), 586.
Identifies the author of the "Vida" articles, once ascribed to Peacock, as Sir Charles Abraham Elton.

Byron, George Gordon, Lord, Letters and Journals. R. E. Prothero, editor, London: John Murray, 1899.
Vol. III, pp. 89-90, contain Byron's reply to Peacock's Sir Proteus.

* Chapman, R. W., Saturday Review of Literature, I (1925), 685.

* Chesney, General Francis Rawdon, Narrative of the Euphrates Expedition. London: Longmans, Green, 1868.
The "father of the Suez Canal" here tells of Peacock's part in the origin of the all-water route to India.

Chew, Samuel C., Byron in England, His Fame and After-Fame. London: John Murray, 1924.
Mainly valuable as background material, but also discusses Sir Proteus, Nightmare Abbey, and the review of Moore's Byron.

* Clodd, Edward, "George Meredith, Some Recollections," Fortnightly Review, XCII (July, 1909), 19.
Records some conversations between Meredith and Peacock.

* Cole, Sir Henry, Fifty Years of Public Work. London: G. Bell, 1884.
Numerous personal glimpses of Peacock.

* Collins, Mortimer, Review of the 1875 edition of Works, The St. James Magazine, August, 1875.

Colvin, Sidney, John Keats. New York: Scribner's, 1925.
Sees Lamia as stimulated by Rhododaphne.

* "The Complete Satirist," Littell's Living Age, CCLXXXIII (November 14, 1914), 440.

Cruse, Amy, The Englishman and his Books in the Early Nineteenth Century. New York: Thomas Crowell, n.d.
Not extensive treatment but considers Peacock's novels as important in shaping of ideas and tastes of his time.

* Dannenberg, F., "Peacock in seinem Verhaltnis zu Shelley," Germanish-romanische Monatsschrift, XX (1932).

* Davies, J., "Thomas Love Peacock," Contemporary Review, XXV (April, 1875), 736.

* Dickens, Charles Stafford, Dictionary of the Thames, 1880.
Describes the tomb of Margaret at Shepperton and quotes the poem Peacock wrote as an epitaph.

* Digeon, A., "T. L. Peacock, Ami de Shelley," Revue anglo-américaine, February, 1928.

Draper, J. W., "The Social Satires of Thomas Love Peacock," Modern Language Notes, XXXIII (December, 1918), 456; and XXXIV (January, 1919), 23.
Attempts to extract Peacock's ideas from the novels by literal interpretation. Nihilistically concludes that Peacock had soured on all humanity. Entirely misses the fundamental ideas of Peacock. Picks only on individual passages of satire, out of context. A complete mis-interpretation.

* Drew, E. R., "Peacock's Pie, 1918," New Statesman, XII (November 16, 1918), 133.

Duff, Sir Mountstuart E. Grant, Notes From a Diary.
London: J. Morrzy, 1911.
Contains a number of personal impressions of Peacock.

* Clodd, Edward, "George Meredith, Some Recollections," Fortnightly Review, XCII (July, 1909), 19.
Records some conversations between Meredith and Peacock.

* Cole, Sir Henry, Fifty Years of Public Work. London: G. Bell, 1884.
Numerous personal glimpses of Peacock.

* Collins, Mortimer, Review of the 1875 edition of Works, The St. James Magazine, August, 1875.

Colvin, Sidney, John Keats. New York: Scribner's, 1925.
Does Lamia an attempted by Woodberry.

* "The Complete Satirist," Littell's Living Age, CCLXXXIII (November 14, 1914), 840.

Crusa, Amy, The Englishmen and His Books in the Early Nineteenth Century. New York: Thomas Crowell, n.d.
Not extensive treatment but considers Peacock's novels as important in shaping of ideas and tastes of his time.

* Dannenberg, P., "Peacock in seinem Verhältnis zu Shelley," Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift, XX (1932).

* Davies, J., "Thomas Love Peacock," Contemporary Review, XXV (April, 1875), 736.

* Dickens, Charles Stafford, Dictionary of the Thames, 1880.
Describes the tomb of Margaret at Shepperton and quotes the poem Peacock wrote as an epitaph.

* Digeon, A., "T. L. Peacock, Ami de Shelley," Revue anglo-américaine, February, 1928.

Draper, J. W., "The Social Satires of Thomas Love Peacock," Modern Language Notes, XXXIII (December, 1918), 456; and XXXIV (January, 1919), 23.
Attempts to extract Peacock's ideas from the novels by literal interpretation. Mistakenly considers that Peacock had scorned all humanity. Entirely misses the fundamental ideas of Peacock. Picks only on individual passages of satire, out of context. A complete misinterpretation.

* Drew, E. R., "Peacock's Pie, 1918," New Statesman, XII (November 16, 1918), 135.

Duff, Sir Mountstuart E. Grant, Notes from a Diary. London: J. Murray, 1911.
Contains a number of personal impressions of Peacock.

Ellis, S. M., George Meredith: His Life and Friends in Relation to his Work. London: Richards, 1920.
Unsympathetic toward Peacock. Dismisses him as a crotchety old man who had little or no influence on Meredith.

Fedden, H. R., "Thomas Love Peacock," The English Novelists. Derek Verschoyle, editor, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1936.
Peacock is given a chapter to himself. A fine appreciation.

* Garnett, Richard, Essays of an Ex-Librarian. London: Heinemann, 1901.
Reprints the introduction to Headlong Hall, edition of 1891.

* _____, Relics of Shelley. 1862.
Includes an article on Shelley, Harriet, and Peacock.

Gibson, Strickland, "Bibliographica," Year's Work in English Studies, XXIII (1942), 231.
Describes a gift of Peacock MSS. to the Bodleian.

Glasheen, Francis J., "Shelley and Peacock," (London) Times Literary Supplement, (October 18, 1941), 524.
Tries to show that Shelley's poems contain influences from Palmyra and The Genius of the Thames.

* Gosse, Sir Edmund W., "Thomas Love Peacock," London Society, XXVII (June, 1875).

Grabo, Carl, The Magic Plant. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1936.
The best study of "The Growth of Shelley's Thought." Treats Peacock a little harshly, but this is the only authoritative work on Shelley's ideas.

Graham, Walter, English Literary Periodicals. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1930.
A comprehensive study of the periodical reviewing of Peacock's time. Valuable as background, but also discusses Peacock and the Westminster.

* Hannay, James, "Recent Humourists: Aytoun, Peacock, Prout," North British Review, XLV (September, 1866), 92.
The biographical facts for this article were partly furnished by George Meredith.

* Hartley, L.C., "Thomas Love Peacock," Manchester Quarterly, XXXIV (June, 1915), 256.

Hazlitt, William, New Writings by William Hazlitt. Collected by P.P. Howe, New York: Lincoln MacVeagh, 1925.
Reprints, pp. 171-78, the article "The Utilitarian Controversy," which refers to Peacock as a musical critic. From Atlas, July 19, 1829.

* Hearn, Lafcadio, Some Strange English Literary Figures of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. R. Tanabé, editor, Tokyo: Hokuseida Press, 1927.

Herford, C. H., The Age of Wordsworth. London: Handbooks of English Literature, 1909.
Devotes fourteen pages to Peacock, as sound a treatment as any ever written. Excellent interpretation.

H. M. S., "Thomas Love Peacock's Maid Marian," Notes and Queries, CLXXXVI (1944), 270.
A query and reply concerning the opera made from the novel.

Hobhouse, Sir John Cam, Lord Broughton, Recollections of a Long Life. Lady Dorchester, editor, New York: Scribner's, 1911. In six volumes.
In his diary, Hobhouse records a few fine sketches of his old friend Peacock.

"House Party Alternatives," Time Magazine, L (September 15, 1947), 112.
A review of The Pleasures of Peacock, written with the well-known critical acuity of Time.

Hunt, Leigh, The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt. Roger Ingpen, editor, Westminster: Constable, 1903.
Scanty mention of the Peacock-Shelley-Hunt relations.

_____, Correspondence of Leigh Hunt. London: Smith, Elder 1862.
Frequent anecdotes of Peacock, particularly in relation to Shelley and Hunt.

* Hutson, C. W., The Southern Magazine (Baltimore), February, 1873. An essay on Peacock.

* Johnson, R. B., "Thomas Love Peacock, Satirist," Novel Review, August, 1892.

* Hartley, L.G., "Thomas Love Peacock," Manchester Quarterly, XXXIV (June, 1915), 255.

Hazlitt, William, New Pictures by William Hazlitt. Collected by P.P. Howe, New York: Lincoln MacVeagh, 1925.
Reprints, pp. 171-76, the article "The Utilitarian Controversy," which refers to Peacock as a musical critic. From Atlas, July 19, 1829.

* Hearn, Lafcadio, Some Strange English Literary Figures of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. K. Tanabe, editor, Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1927.

Herford, C. H., The Age of Wordsworth. London: Handbooks of English Literature, 1909.
Devotes fourteen pages to Peacock, as among a treatment as any ever written. Excellent interpretation.

H. M. S., "Thomas Love Peacock's Maid Marian," Notes and Queries, CLXXXVI (1944), 270.
A query and reply concerning the opera made from the novel.

Hobhouse, Sir John Cam, Lord Broughton, Recollections of a Long Life. Lady Dorchester, editor, New York: Scribner's, 1911. In six volumes.
In his diary, Hobhouse records a few fine sketches of his old friend Peacock.

"House Party Alternatives," Time Magazine, L (September 15, 1947), 112.
A review of The Pleasures of Peacock, written with the well-known critical acuity of Time.

Hunt, Leigh, The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt. Roger Ingpen, editor, Westminster: Constable, 1903.
Scanty mention of the Peacock-Shelley-Hunt relations.

_____, Correspondence of Leigh Hunt. London: Smith, Elder 1862.
Frequent anecdotes of Peacock, particularly in relation to Shelley and Hunt.

* Hutson, C. W., The Southern Magazine (Baltimore), February, 1873. An essay on Peacock.

* Johnson, R. B., "Thomas Love Peacock, Satirist," Novel Review, August, 1892.

Keats, John, Letters of John Keats. Maurice Buxton Forman, editor, London: Oxford University Press, 1947.
Contains, p. 119, a disapproving reference to Peacock.

Kipling, Rudyard, Stalky & Co. New York: Doubleday, Page, 1911. Beetle reads the novels of Peacock, pp. 249-50.

* Lane-Poole, The Life of F. R. Chesney, 1893.
Tells of Peacock's work as Examiner in instituting steam navigation to India.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington, Life and Letters. Trevelyan, editor, London: Oxford University Press, 1932.
In his Journal, December 31, 1851, Vol. II, Chapter XII, Macaulay tells of his impressions on meeting Peacock.

* Mason, Ronald, "Notes for an Estimate of Peacock," Horizon (London), IX (1944), 238-50.

McLaughlin, Richard, "Vintage Wit," Saturday Review of Literature, (October 25, 1947), 28.
A review of The Pleasures of Peacock.

* Medwin, Thomas, Conversations of Lord Byron. London: H. Colburn, 1824. Personal impressions of Peacock. Byron takes credit for the origin of the idea of Melincourt.

Mitford, M. R., Letters of M. R. Mitford. R. Brimley Johnson, editor, London: John Lane, 1925.
Anecdotes and personal impressions of Peacock. I am told that H. Charley's edition of 1872 is more complete.

Nesbitt, G. L., Benthamite Reviewing. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.
Considers Peacock prominent among the Benthamite reviewers. This is the best study of Peacock's relations with the Westminster.

Newbolt, Sir Henry, compiler, The Greenwood. London: Nelson, 1925.
"A Collection of Literary Readings Relating to Robin Hood." Contents include the whole of Maid Marian and an essay by Newbolt entitled "Maid Marian and Ivanhoe," page 122, a comparison and study of literary connections.

* _____, "Peacock, Scott and Robin Hood," Essays by Divers Hands. London: Royal Society of Literature, IV (1924), 87. Reprinted in Studies, Green and Gray. London and New York: Nelson, 1926.

Keats, John, Letters of John Keats. Maurice Buxton Forman, editor, London: Oxford University Press, 1947.
Contains, p. 119, a disapproving reference to Peacock.

Kipling, Rudyard, Stalky & Co. New York: Doubleday, Page, 1911. Beetle reads the novels of Peacock, pp. 249-53.

* Lane-Poole, The Life of R. R. Dasgupta, 1893.
Talks of Peacock's work as examiner in laboriously efforts navigation to India.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington, Life and Letters. Trevelyan, editor, London: Oxford University Press, 1932.
In his Journal, December 31, 1851, Vol. II, Chapter XII, Macaulay tells of his impressions on meeting Peacock.

* Mason, Ronald, "Notes for an Estimate of Peacock," Horizon (London), IX (1944), 238-50.

Melaupolin, Richard, "Vintage Wit," Saturday Review of Literature, (October 25, 1947), 26.
A review of The Pleasures of Peacock.

* Medwin, Thomas, Conversations of Lord Byron. London: H. Colburn, 1824. Personal impressions of Peacock. Byron takes credit for the origin of the idea of Melincourt.

Mitford, M. R., Letters of M. R. Mitford. R. Brimley Johnson, editor, London: John Lane, 1925.
Anecdotes and personal impressions of Peacock. I am told that R. Chorley's edition of 1872 is more complete.

Nesbitt, E. L., Pentamerite Revisited. New York: Oxford University Press, 1934.
Considers Peacock prominent among the Pentamerite reviewers. This is the best study of Peacock's relations with the Westminster.

Newbolt, Sir Henry, compiler, The Treasured. London: Nelson, 1925.
"A Collection of Literary Readings Relating to Robin Hood." Contents include the whole of Maid Marian and an essay by Newbolt entitled "Maid Marian and Ivanhoe," pages 122, a comparison and study of literary connections.

* _____, "Peacock, Scott and Robin Hood," Essays by Divers Hands. London: Royal Society of Literature, IV (1924), 87. Reprinted in Studies, Green and Grey. London and New York: Nelson, 1926.

* Notes and Queries, Series III, Volume XII, pp. 79, 115, 171, 277, 316.
A series of articles dealing with Paper Money Lyrics.

* _____, Series IV, Volume XII, p. 207.
An article on the problems of dating "The Round Table."

* Novel Review, I (May, 1892), 184.
Compares Maid Marian with The Foresters and shows the influence of Peacock on Tennyson.

Omond, T. S., The Romantic Triumph. No. XI. George Saintsbury, editor, Periods of European Literature Series. New York: Scribner's, 1909.
A fine background work, but treats Peacock as a mere isolated crank.

Paul, Herbert, "The Novels of Peacock," The Living Age, CCXXXVIII (1903), 158.
Reprinted from Nineteenth Century, LIII (1903); also reprinted in Stray Leaves. London and New York: Lane, 1906. An interesting study, but misled by stuffy preconceptions. Accuses Peacock of bad taste in the novels.

* "Peacock," Temple Bar, May 1, 1887.

Peck, W. E., "Note on Shelley and Peacock," Modern Language Notes, XXXVI: (June, 1921), 371.
Points out textual influences of Peacock on Shelley and vice-versa.

* Planché, James Robinson, Recollections and Reflections. London: S. Low, Marston, 1901.
Tells of writing the opera from Maid Marian. Claims credit for the success of the book.

Poe, Edgar Allan, Complete Works. James A. Harrison, editor. New York: Crowell, 1902.
In "Marginalia," Vol. XVI, p. 48, speaks of Rhododaphne as "brim-full of music."

* Primary Education-Popular Education, XLV (October, 1927), 153.

* "Portrait," Bookman (London), LXV (March, 1924), 309.

* Notes and Queries, Series XII, Volume XII, pp. 79, 113, 171, 277, 318.
A series of articles dealing with Fenner Money Lurkins.

* _____, Series IV, Volume XII, p. 207.
An article on the problems of dating "The Round Table."

* Royal Review, I (May, 1892), 134.
Compares Maid Marian with The Peacocks and shows the influence of Peacock on Tennyson.

Omond, T. S., The Romantic Triumph. No. XI. George Saintsbury, editor, Periods of European Literature Series. New York: Scribner's, 1909.
A fine background work, but treats Peacock as a mere isolated crank.

Paul, Herbert, "The Novels of Peacock," The Living Age, CCXXXVIII (1903), 136.
Reprinted from Nineteenth Century, LIII (1903); also reprinted in Essay Leaves. London and New York: Lane, 1906. An interesting study, but misled by stuffy preconceptions. Accuses Peacock of bad taste in the novels.

* "Peacock," Temple Bar, May 1, 1897.

Peck, W. E., "Note on Shelley and Peacock," Modern Language Notes, XXXVI: (June, 1921), 373.
Points out textual influences of Peacock on Shelley and vice-versa.

* Planché, James Robinson, Recollections and Reflections. London: S. Low, Marston, 1901.
Tells of writing the opera from Maid Marian. Claims credit for the success of the book.

Poe, Edgar Allan, Complete Works. James A. Harrison, editor. New York: Crowell, 1902.
In "Marginalia," Vol. XVI, p. 46, speaks of Headlong Hall as "brim-full of mirth."

* Primary Education-Popular Education, XLV (October, 1927), 153.

* "Portrait," Bookman (London), LXV (March, 1924), 309.

Priestly, J. B., English Comic Characters. London: Lane, 1928.
An excellent sketch of Prince Seitheyn, pp. 178-197, which is largely incorporated into Priestly's biography of Peacock.

_____, George Meredith. New York: Macmillan, 1926. English Men of Letters Series.
A very sympathetic account of the Peacock-Meredith relations, told in somewhat more detail than in Priestly's biography of Peacock.

* Pritchett, V. S., "Mr. Peacock," New Statesman and Nation, XX (July 13, 1940), 42.

* Proctor, Bryan W., Autobiographical Fragment. London: G. Bell, 1877.
Tells of the Leigh Hunt-Barry Cornwall-Peacock relations.

* Raleigh, Sir W. A., On Writing and Writers. G. Gordon, editor, London: E. Arnold, 1926.
Lecture notes on Peacock, pp. 151-54.

Repplier, Agnes, Varia. Boston and New York: Houghton-Miffiln, 1897.
Deals with Peacock's drinking songs, p. 146.

* Roebuck, John Arthur, Autobiography and Letters of the Right Hon. J. A. Roebuck. London: 1897.
Personal impressions and anecdotes of Peacock, arising out of a long friendship starting as early as 1813.

* Rothenstein, William, Men and Memories, A History of the Arts from 1872-1922. New York: Tudor, n.d., Volume II.

Saintsbury, George, Essays in English Literature, 1780-1860. London: Percival; New York: Scribner, 1890.
Essay on "Peacock" reprinted from Macmillan's Magazine, April, 1886. Sympathetic treatment. One of the earliest yet one of the most important treatments of Peacock. Also reprinted in Collected Essays and Papers. London: Dent; New York: Dutton, 1923-4. Vol. II, p. 82.

_____, Prefaces and Essays. London: Macmillan, 1933.
Reprints the five prefaces to the 1895-97 edition of the novels and Rhododaphne. Sympathetic and sound interpretation.

Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, The Letters of Mary W. Shelley. Frederick L. Jones, editor, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1944.
Brilliantly edited. Important biographical source material.

_____, Mary Shelley's Journal. Frederick L. Jones, editor, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1947.
Important biographical source material on Peacock.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe, "A Defense of Poetry," in Peacock's Four Ages of Poetry, Shelley's Defense of Poetry, Browning's Essay on Shelley. H. F. B. Brett-Smith, editor, Oxford: Blackwell, 1945. Percy Reprints, No. 3.
Editor Brett-Smith's introduction is the best treatment of "The Four Ages" and the "Defense" that I have found anywhere.

* _____, Letters. R. Ingpen, editor, London: Pitman, 1909, 1912; New York: Scribner, 1909; Macmillan, 1915.

_____, Literary and Philosophical Criticism. J. Shawcross, editor, London: Frowde, 1909.
A good collection of Shelley's critical prose works, including eleven letters from Shelley to Peacock.

* Shepperton, London Mercury, VIII (July, 1923), 304.

Sickels, Eleanor, The Gloomy Egoist. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Thesis (Ph.D.) at Columbia.
A fine study of the development of the philosophic-melancholy in English poetry. Shows a startling familiarity with Peacock's poems, even such minor pieces as the Ossianic imitations. Contains, pp. 85-90, the best discussion of The Philosophy of Melancholy ever written.

* Smith, G. B., "Thomas Love Peacock," Fortnightly Review, XIV (August, 1873).
Reprinted in Revue Britannique, January, 1874, and in Poets and Novelists. London: Smith, 1876. P. 144

* "Song of the Four Winds," World Review, VI (February 27, 1928), 61.

* Spedding, J., "The Works of Thomas Love Peacock," Edinburgh Review, CXLII (July, 1875).
A review of the 1875 edition of Works.

Squire, John C. (Solomon Eagle), Books in General. London: M. Secker, 1920.
An ultra-brief appreciation.

Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft. The Letters of Mary W. Shelley. Frederick L. Jones, editor, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1944.
Brilliantly edited. Important biographical source material.

_____. Mary Shelley's Journal. Frederick L. Jones, editor, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1947.
Important biographical source material on Peacock.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe, "A Defence of Poetry," in Peacock's Four Ages of Poetry, Shelley's Defence of Poetry, Browning's Essay on Shelley. H. F. B. Brett-Smith, editor, Oxford: Blackwell, 1921. Percy Reprints, No. 3.
Editor Brett-Smith's introduction is the best treatment of "The Four Ages" and the "Defence" that I have found anywhere.

* _____. Letters. R. Ingpen, editor, London: Pitman, 1909, 1912; New York: Scribner, 1909; Macmillan, 1913.

_____. Literary and Philosophical Criticism. J. Shawcross, editor, London: Frowde, 1909.
A good collection of Shelley's critical prose works, including eleven letters from Shelley to Peacock.

* Shepperson, London Mercury, VIII (July, 1923), 294.

Stokoe, Eleanor, The Gloomy Egoist. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Thesis (Ph.D.) at Columbia.
A fine study of the development of the philosophic-melancholy in English poetry. Shows a startling familiarity with Peacock's poems, even such minor pieces as the Gastanio imitations. Contains, pp. 85-90, the best discussion of The Philosophy of Melancholy ever written.

* Smith, G. S., "Thomas Love Peacock," Fortnightly Review, XIV (August, 1873).
Reprinted in Revue Britannique, January, 1874, and in Poets and Novelists. London: Smith, 1878. p. 144

* "Song of the Four Winds," World Review, VI (February 27, 1928), 61.

* Spedding, J., "The Works of Thomas Love Peacock," Edinburgh Review, CXLIX (July, 1879).
A review of the 1875 edition of Works.

Squire, John C. (Solomon Eagle), Books in General. London: M. Secker, 1920.
An ultra-brief appreciation.

* Steuert, H., "Thomas Love Peacock," Dublin Review, CCXVI (January, 1945), 67.

* Stoddard, Richard Henry, Under the Evening Lamp. New York: Scribner; London: Gay, 1893.
Contains an article condemning Peacock's poems but praising his prose.

* Swinburne, Algernon C., "Social Verse," Studies in Prose and Poetry. London: Chatto and Windus, 1907.
Has high praise for Peacock's poetry.

* "Symposiarch," Spectator (London), CVIII (January 27, 1912), 153.

Thackeray, William Makepeace, The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray. Gordon N. Ray, editor, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.
In a letter to Mrs. Brookfield, December 26, 1850, Vol. II, Thackeray tells of his impressions on meeting Peacock.

_____, The History of Samuel Titmarsh and the Great Hogarty Diamond. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, 1889.
Standard Library Edition, Vol. VII.
References to the opera Maid Marian, p. 9.

* "Thomas Love Peacock," Temple Bar, May, 1875.

* Thomson, James, (B.V.), Cope's Tobacco Plant, 1879.
A review of Meredith in which Thomson notes the influence of Peacock on Meredith.

Trelawney, Edward John, Letters of Edward John Trelawney. H. Buxton Forman, editor, London: Oxford University Press, 1910.
References to Peacock, particularly in relation to Shelley.

_____, Records of Shelley, Byron and the Author. London: Basil Montague Pickering, 1878.
A few accounts of Peacock-Shelley relations.

Troubridge, St. Vincent, "Thomas Love Peacock's Maid Marian," Notes and Queries, CLXXXVII (1944), 17.
Reply to a query by H. M. S. (see above) concerning the opera made from the novel.

Walker, Hugh, English Satire and Satirists. London: Dent, 1925. Claims the satire in Peacock outweighs all else. His misinterpretations are repeated almost verbatim in Hammond's thesis on Peacock (See Bibliography B). Even the organization of her work echoes Walker.

White, Newman Ivey, Shelley. New York: Knopf, 1940. The standard biography of Shelley. Devotes considerable attention to the Peacock-Shelley relations.

* Williams, C., "Thomas Love Peacock," Library, October, 1906.

Wilson, Edmund, "The Musical Glasses of Peacock," New Yorker, XXIII (August 23, 1947), 72. A review of The Pleasures of Peacock. Wilson sees form and ctructure in Peacock, but dismisses him as not very significant.

* Wright, Herbert, "The Associations of Thomas Love Peacock with Wales," Essays and Studies, XII (1926), 24.

* Young, A. B., "Shelley and Peacock," Modern Language Review, April, 1907.

* _____, "Thomas Love Peacock's Plays," Notes and Queries, July 10, 1909.

* _____, "T. L. Peacock and the Overland Route," Notes and Queries, August 17, 1907.

* _____, "T. L. Peacock: Contributions to Periodicals," Notes and Queries, Series X, VIII (July 6, 1907), 2.

* _____, "T. L. Peacock's Literary Remains," Notes and Queries, March 20, 1909.

* _____, "T. L. Peacock's Maid Marian and Tennyson's Foresters," Notes and Queries, November 2, 1907.

Walker, Hugh, English Satire and Satirists. London: Dent, 1925. Claims the satire in Peacock outweighs all else. His misinterpretations are repeated almost verbatim in Hammond's thesis on Peacock (See Bibliography E). Wyan the organization of her work echoes Walker.

White, Newman Ivey, Shelley. New York: Knopf, 1940. The standard biography of Shelley. Devotes considerable attention to the Peacock-Shelley relations.

* Williams, O., "Thomas Love Peacock," Library, October, 1924.

Wilson, Edmund, "The Musical Glasses of Peacock," New Yorker, XXIII (August 29, 1947), 72.
A review of The Pleasures of Peacock. Wilson sees form and structure in Peacock, but dismisses him as not very significant.

* Wright, Herbert, "The Associations of Thomas Love Peacock with Wales," Essays and Studies, XII (1926), 24.

* Young, A. B., "Shelley and Peacock," Modern Language Review, April, 1907.

* _____, "Thomas Love Peacock's Plays," Notes and Queries, July 10, 1909.

* _____, "T. L. Peacock and the Overland Route," Notes and Queries, August 17, 1907.

* _____, "T. L. Peacock: Contributions to Periodicals," Notes and Queries, Series X, VIII (July 6, 1907), 5.

* _____, "T. L. Peacock's Literary Remains," Notes and Queries, March 20, 1909.

* _____, "T. L. Peacock's Maid Marian and Tennyson's Forresters," Notes and Queries, November 2, 1907.

BIBLIOGRAPHY D

TREATMENT OF PEACOCK IN LITERARY HISTORIES

NOTE: This section does not pretend to be complete. I have attempted only a sampling of some of the standard literary histories and reference works. I have included no works which omit Peacock entirely, although perhaps such items would provide a better perspective on the weight of critical attitudes toward Peacock. To see the situation properly one should balance the effusive encomiums of Rankin (see below) against at least a dozen standard histories which ignore Peacock entirely or refer to him only as the friend of Shelley or the father-in-law of Meredith.

Baker, Ernest, and James Parkman, A Guide to the Best Fiction. NewYork: Macmillan, 1932.
Lists all seven of Peacock's novels, with remarkably sound thumbnail sketches of each.

Baker, Ernest, History of the English Novel. London: Witherby, 1936. Volume VII.
Twenty pages of sound general treatment. Appreciative and sympathetic. Understands Peacock's method. Uses him as a touchstone to evaluate his contemporaries, Disraeli, etc.

Chew, Samuel C., "The Nineteenth Century and After," A Literary History of England. A. C. Baugh, general editor, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1948.
Brief but sound treatment. Sees Peacock as an "epicurean humanist impatient of pretense." Emphasizes the ideas in the novels more than the artistic structure, but otherwise sound interpretation.

Chesterton, G. K., The Victorian Age in Literature. New York: H. Holt, 1913.
Dismisses Peacock as one of the "eccentrics"--Godwin, Coleridge, etc. Calls him a Bohemian.

Garnett, Richard, "Thomas Love Peacock," Dictionary of National Biography. New York: Macmillan, 1909. Volume XV. Humanistic biographical sketch, mostly reprinted from Garnett's introduction to his edition of Peacock's works. Emphasizes Peacock's genial nature.

Gerould, Gordon Hall, The Patterns of English and American Fiction. Boston: Little, Brown, 1942. Treats Peacock exclusively as a novelist of "propaganda and discussion."

Gosse, Edmund, English Literature; An Illustrated Record. London, New York: Macmillan, 1904. Volume IV. Contains a photograph of Peacock, a reproduction of a page of manuscript, an excerpt from Maid Marian, and a critical commentary on Peacock's methods, placing him in the tradition of the 18th century French contes.

Groome, F. H., "Thomas Love Peacock," Chamber's Cyclopoedia of English Literature. David Patrick, editor, London and Edinburgh: Chambers, 1923. Volume III. Contains a biographical sketch, portrait, and extracts from five of the novels and his letters, but no critical comment.

Houston, Percy H., Main Currents of English Literature. New York: Crofts, 1927. Brief treatment of Peacock as an "eddy in the strong romantic current."

Lovett, Robert Morss, and Helen S. Hughes, The History of the Novel in England. Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin, 1932. Brief but original and controversial treatment. Claims that Peacock most closely resembles W. S. Gilbert.

Moulton, C. W., editor, Library of Literary Criticism. Buffalo: Moulton, 1904. Volume VI. Brief extracts from comments by Thackeray, Macaulay, Grant Duff, Robert Buchanan, Sir Edward Strachey, Richard Garnett, Shelley, Edmund Gosse, George Barnett Smith, Swinburne, Richard Henry Stoddard, Agnes Repplier, Thomas L. Beddoes, James Hannay, James Davies, Margaret Oliphant, Henry Morley, and George Saintsbury. Also quotes Peacock's comments on Roger Bacon, Cowper, Shelley, and Wordsworth.

Oliphant, Mrs. Margaret, The Literary History of England. London: Macmillan, 1894. Hardboiled and unfair. Condemns Peacock for his prejudices. Damns with faint praise.

Rankin, Thomas E., and Wilford M. Aiken, English Literature, New York: Macmillan, 1917.
Treats Peacock with exaggerated importance, too great to be called a minor writer. Lumps Bulwer-Lytton, Porter, Edgeworth, and Marryat together in one paragraph, but gives Peacock a section to himself, along with Dickens, Thackeray, etc. Treats Peacock as a romanticist who was true to history and to nature.

Saintsbury, George, "The Growth of the Later Novel," Cambridge History of English Literature. New York: Putnam, 1914. Volume XI.
Genial appreciative sketch. Concerned mostly with Peacock's current popularity.

_____, A History of English Criticism. Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood, 1925.
Only scattered references, but shows great respect for Peacock's critical opinions, often quoting his judgments of his contemporaries and of literature in general.

_____, A History of English Prose Rhythm. London: Macmillan, 1912.
Calls Peacock "medium-rhythmed." Holds that Macaulay read Peacock and was influenced by his prose style.

Wagenknecht, E. C., Cavalcade of the English Novel. New York: H. Holt, 1943.
Historical treatment. Concerned mainly with the influences on and influences of Peacock. Considers him an important force in the development of the novel.

Walker, Hugh, The Literature of the Victorian Era. Cambridge: University Press, 1921.
Quite extensive treatment but generally unsympathetic. Sees Peacock as a caustic critic who lacked humanity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY E

BOOKS AND ARTICLES ABOUT THE PERIOD, ETC.

NOTE: In this section are included works which have been read in preparing this thesis but which mention Peacock only superficially if at all. They are included here in order to complete the references made in footnotes and also because they provide the student with a great deal of information essential to understanding Peacock. As has been indicated in the annotations, some of the items in Bibliography C which deal directly with Peacock are also significant as background.

Abercrombie, Lascelles, Romanticism. New York: Viking Press, 1927.
One of the most amusing and provocative attempts to define romanticism. Sees it as an "element" in literature.

Beach, Joseph Warren, A Romantic View of Poetry. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1944.
Six lectures given at Johns Hopkins University, 1941. A humanistic approach to the problem. Poetry is the realization of self.

Beers, Henry A., A History of English Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century. New York: H. Holt, 1918.
Restricts definition to the literature of the middle ages. Centers the English movement on Scott. Best when discussing relations between English, French, and German romantic movements.

Bernbaum, Ernest, Guide Through the Romantic Movement. New York: Nelson, 1930.
Little original critical thought, but as a literary history it is clear and readable, one of the finest factual accounts of the period.

Beyle, Marie Henri (de Stendhal), Racine et Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907. An essential but neglected document of French romanticism. Prefers Shakespeare to Racine because of his romantic elements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY B

BOOKS AND ARTICLES ABOUT THE PERIOD, ETC.

NOTE: In this section are included works which have been read in preparing this thesis but which mention Peacock only superficially if at all. They are included here in order to complete the references made in footnotes and also because they provide the student with a great deal of information essential to understanding Peacock. As has been indicated in the annotations, some of the items in Bibliography C which deal directly with Peacock are also significant as background.

Abercrombie, Lascelles, Romanticism. New York: Viking Press, 1927.
One of the most amusing and provocative attempts to define romanticism. Sees it as an "element" in literature.

Beach, Joseph Warren, A Romantic View of Poetry. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1944.
Six lectures given at Johns Hopkins University, 1941. A humanistic approach to the problem. Poetry is the realization of self.

Beers, Henry A., A History of English Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century. New York: H. Holt, 1919.
Restricts definition to the literature of the middle ages. Centers the English movement on Scott. Best when discussing relations between English, French, and German romantic movements.

Bernbaum, Ernest, Guide Through the Romantic Movement. New York: Nelson, 1930.
Little original critical thought, but as a literary history it is clear and readable, one of the finest factual accounts of the period.

Beyle, Marie Henri (de Stendhal), Racine et Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907. An essential but neglected document of French romanticism. Prefers Shakespeare to Racine because of his romantic elements.

Brailsford, H. N., Shelley, Godwin and their Circle. London: Milford, 1945. Home University Library Series.
Background of the revolutionary movement in England: Paine, Price, Godwin, Shelley, and Mary Wollstonecraft.

Broadus, Edmund Kemper, The Laureateship, a Study of the Office of Poet Laureate in England with Some Account of the Poets. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921.
Background of the ridicule of the laureate. Traces history of the laureateship and discusses the critical attitudes toward the laureate poets.

Cruse, Amy, The Shaping of English Literature. New York: Crowell, n.d.
Discusses reading tastes as a force in shaping literature. The chapter on "The Circulating Library" is especially pertinent to this study.

Edinburgh Review, XXV (June, 1815), 227.
A review of Anatomie et Physiologie du Systeme Nerveux en général, et du Cerveau en particulier; avec des Observations sur la Possibilité de reconnoître plusiers Dispositions intellectuelles et morales de l'homme et des Animaux par la Configuration de leurs Tetes, by F. J. Gall and G. Spurzheim. This review is the source of Mr. Cranium in Headlong Hall. Much of what that character speaks is direct quotation or close paraphrase from this article.

Haney, John Lewis, editor, Early Reviews of English Poets. Philadelphia: Egerton Press, 1904.
Contains a short history of English literary periodicals and a collection of 29 reviews of poets from Gray to Browning.

Hazlitt, William, Lectures on the English Poets. London: Milford, 1924. The World's Classics.
An introductory lecture, "On Poetry in General," and seven lectures on the English poets. The final lecture, "On the Living Poets," is the most interesting.

_____, The Spirit of the Age. London: Milford, 1911. The World's Classics.
Nineteen sketches of contemporaries. Keenly perceptive and provocative.

Hogg, Thomas Jefferson, The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley. London: Routledge; New York: Dutton, 1906.
An amazing work, although extremely unreliable concerning Shelley. Reveals not Shelley, but Hogg himself.

Jeffrey, Francis, Jeffrey's Literary Criticism. D. Nichel Smith, editor, London: Frowde, 1910.
A selection of essays from the Edinburgh. Editor Smith tries too hard to whitewash Jeffrey.

Kaufman, Paul, "Defining Romanticism," Modern Language Notes, XL (April, 1925), 193.
Describes the confusion over the term and presents his problem well, although has no particular solution beyond that proposed by Lovejoy.

Lovejoy, A. O., "On the Discrimination of Romanticisms," Publication of the Modern Language Association, XXXIX (June, 1924), 229.
Remarkably sound. There are several different romanticisms. The term is confusing because it is used indiscriminately for all of them.

_____, "Optimism and Romanticism," Publication of the Modern Language Association, XLII (1927), 921.
Shows that 18th century optimism, instead of being antithetical to romanticism, was a step toward it.

Lucas, Frank, The Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal. New York: Macmillan, 1936.
Somewhat Freudian in approach. Romanticism suspends the censorship over our sense of what is fact (realism) and what is fitting (classicism).

Mordell, Albert, Notorious Literary Attacks. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926.
Not so extensive a collection as Haney's (see above) but more interesting, as these are all violent attacks.

Porterfield, Allen Wilson, An Outline of German Romanticism. Boston: Ginn, 1914.
Background of the German romantic movement, the excesses and obscurities of which Peacock disliked.

Quarterly Review, XVI (No. XXXI), 225-278.
An article on Parliamentary reform which is the source of the Main Chance Villa episode in Melincourt. Peacock's characters merely quote or closely paraphrase portions of this article out of context.

Railo, Eino, The Haunted Castle. London: Routledge, 1927.
A study of the supernatural and Gothic elements in English romanticism, particularly in the novel.

Robinson, Henry Crabb, Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence. Thomas Sadler, editor, London: Macmillan, 1869. Glimpses of most of Peacock's contemporaries by a man who was strangely similar to Peacock, yet who never mentions him.

Thrall, Miriam, Rebellious Fraser's. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.
Concerned more with the earlier, wilder days of the magazine than with the days of Peacock's contributions.

Towers, C. Marion, "John Stuart Mill and the London and Westminster Review," Atlantic Monthly, LXIX (January, 1892), 58.
Background of the political and philosophic affiliations of this review to which Peacock contributed.

Trelawny, Edward John, Recollections of the Last Days of Shelley and Byron. London: Milford, 1923.
A fascinating, if not reliable, account. Like Hogg's biography, it reveals more about its author than about its subject.

Robinson, Henry Crabb. Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence. Thomas Sadler, editor. London: Macmillan, 1869. Glimpses of most of Peacock's contemporaries by a man who was strangely unfair to Peacock, yet who never mentions him.

Thrall, Miriam. Rebellious Fraser's. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.
Concerned more with the earlier, wilder days of the magazine than with the days of Peacock's contributions.

Towers, C. Merlon, "John Stuart Mill and the London and Westminster Review," Atlantic Monthly, LXIX (January, 1892), 58.
Background of the political and philosophic affiliations of this review to which Peacock contributed.

Trelawny, Edward John. Recollections of the Last Days of Shelley and Byron. London: Milford, 1923.
A fascinating, if not reliable, account. Like Hogg's biography, it reveals more about its author than about its subject.

BIBLIOGRAPHY F

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF WORKS AND EDITIONS PUBLISHED DURING THE AUTHOR'S LIFE

NOTE: The material in this section is not original with me but has been taken intact from the Halliford Edition, Volume I, pages 182-85. I know of no items which have been discovered since the publication of this list in 1934, and for the present it may be considered definitive.

Palmyra and Other Poems, 1806.

The British Critic, February 1806, pp. 186-7, and January 1808, p. 82.
The Critical Review, February 1806, pp. 210-11.
The Monthly Review, March 1806, pp. 323-5.
The Poetical Register, 1805-7 (published 1811), p. 504.

The Genius of the Thames, 1810.

The Satirist, August 1, 1810, pp. 180-6.
The British Critic, August 1810, pp. 177-80.
The Antijacobin Review, September 1810, pp. 82-4.
The Monthly Review, June 1811, pp. 210-11.
The Poetical Register, 1810-11 (published 1814), p. 504.

The Philosophy of Melancholy, 1812.

The Antijacobin Review, April 1812, pp. 337-43.

The Genius of the Thames, *Palmyra and other Poems*, 1812, 1817.

[No review has been traced.]

Sir Hornbook; or, Childe Launcelot's Expedition, 1814.

The British Critic, May 1814, pp. 543-5.

Sir Proteus, 1814.

[No review has been traced.]

Headlong Hall, 1816.

The Critical Review, January 1816, pp. 69-72.
La Belle Assemblée, February 1816, pp. 91-2.
The Eclectic Review, April 1816, pp. 372-80.
The Analectic Review, July 1816, p. 55 [Not seen; mentioned by Dr. Van Doren (Life of Peacock, p. 91) as a Philadelphian reprint of the above-mentioned notice from The Eclectic Review.]
The Monthly Review, March 1817, p. 330.

Melincourt, 1817.

The Literary Gazette, March 22, 1817, p. 132.
The Monthly Magazine, June 1, 1817, p. 453.
The Monthly Review, July 1817, pp. 322-3.
The North American Review, September 1817, p. 437.
The British Critic, October 1817, pp. 430-42.
The Portfolio (Philadelphia, April 1818, p. 321.)
The Athenaeum, April 19, 1856, p. 486 [Notice of 'yellow back' edition of 1856.]

The Round Table; or, Arthur's Feast of the Kings, 1817.

[No review has been traced.]

Rhododaphne, 1818.

The Literary Gazette. February 21, 1818, pp. 114-5.
The Monthly Review, February 1819, pp. 178-182.

Nightmare Abbey, 1818.

The Literary Gazette, December 12, 1818, pp. 787-8.
The Monthly Review, November 1819, pp. 327-9.

Maid Marian, 1822.

The Monthly Magazine, May 1822, pp. 342-3.
The Literary Gazette, November 23, 1822, pp. 736-8.
The Literary Chronicle, December 7, 1822, pp. 775-7.
[Notices of the opera Maid Marian, with, generally, brief complimentary reference to the novel are found in The Times, The Morning Post, and The Globe of December 4, 1822; The Literary Gazette, December 7, 1822, pp. 779-80; The Examiner, December 8, 1822, pp. 776-7; The Gentleman's Magazine, December 1822, p. 558; The

Monthly Magazine, January 1, 1823, p. 550; The London Magazine, January 1823, pp. 101-2; Ackerman's Repository. March 1, 1823, pp. 171-3. 7

The Misfortunes of Elphin, 1829.

The Literary Gazette, March 7, 1829, pp. 153-5.
The Westminster Review, April 1829, pp. 428-35.
The Cambrian Quarterly Magazine, April 1829, pp. 231-40.
The Athenaeum, May 6, 1829, pp. 276-8.
The Monthly Review, June 1829, pp. 304-7.

Crotchet Castle, 1831.

The Literary Gazette, February 19, 1831, pp. 115-7.
The Athenaeum, March 5, 1831, pp. 145-6.
The Examiner, April 3, 1831, pp. 211-2.
The Monthly Review, May 1831, p. 134.
The Literary Beacon, June 18, 1831, pp. 22-6.
The Westminster Review, July, 1831, pp. 208-18.
Fraser's Magazine, August 1831, pp. 17-20.

Headlong Hall, Nightmare Abbey, Maid Marian, Crotchet Castle: Standard Novels, No. LVII, 1837.

The Guide, April 22, 1837, p. 5.
The Examiner, May 28, 1837, p. 341.
The Edinburgh Review, January 1839, pp. 432-59.

Gryll Grange, 1861.

The Spectator, March 2, 1861, pp. 222-3.
The Saturday Review, March 16, 1861, pp. 274-5.

Gl'Ingannati; and Aelia Laelia Crispis, 1862.

The Athenaeum, September 6, 1862, p. 305.

Monthly Magazine, January 1, 1829, p. 590; The
London Magazine, January 1829, pp. 103-8;
Ackermann's Repository, March 1, 1829, pp. 171-3.

The Misfortunes of Elphin, 1829.

The Literary Gazette, March 7, 1829, pp. 149-51.
The Westminster Review, April 1829, pp. 428-35.
The Cambrian Quarterly Magazine, April 1829, pp. 291-4.
The Athenaeum, May 6, 1829, pp. 276-8.
The Monthly Review, June 1829, pp. 304-7.

Crotchet Castle, 1831.

The Literary Gazette, February 19, 1831, pp. 113-7.
The Athenaeum, March 5, 1831, pp. 149-50.
The Examiner, April 3, 1831, pp. 211-2.
The Monthly Review, May 1831, p. 134.
The Literary Beacon, June 18, 1831, pp. 42-4.
The Westminster Review, July, 1831, pp. 206-10.
Fraser's Magazine, August 1831, pp. 17-20.

Headlong Hall, Nightmare Abbey, Maid Marian, Crotchet Castle:
Standard Novels, No. LVII, 1837.

The Guide, April 22, 1837, p. 3.
The Examiner, May 28, 1837, p. 341.
The Edinburgh Review, January 1839, pp. 432-59.

Gryll Grange, 1861.

The Spectator, March 2, 1861, pp. 222-3.
The Saturday Review, March 16, 1861, pp. 274-5.

El'Ingannati; and Aelia Laelia Crispis, 1862.

The Athenaeum, September 6, 1862, p. 305.

Date Due			
NOV 30 1953			
DEMCO MAR 17 70			

IMPORTANT!

Special care should be taken to prevent loss or damage of this volume. If lost or damaged, it must be paid for at the current rate of typing.

DIETER
BINDS
BETTER
DENVER, COLO.