

Thomas Samuel Mulock, was born at Killiney, near Dublin, in 1789, the second child and eldest son of Thomas Mulock of Bath, and his wife Maria (nee Horner, a lady of Swiss origin) being the second of twenty-two children said to have been born to the couple. Mulock was of a family to be found in Burke's 'Landed Gentry,' living at Kilnagarna, in County Westmeath. However, of Mulock's earlier days and financial circumstances, little appears to be readily at hand, but as his father's position was that of Comptroller of Stamps he was apparently in acceptable social standing. Different accounts say that young Thomas Mulock was intended for the church or the bar; that he had entered the university at Dublin, but doubt has been thrown on that aspect of his education, as no record of his enrolment has been found at Dublin University.ⁱ Nevertheless it seems that he must have had some independent or public education, and as a young man was said to have been a day-guest of the Duke of Richmond at Dublin Castle, during the time of the Duke's viceroyalty.ⁱⁱ

Whatever ambitions were held for him, it appears that Thomas overrode his parents' intentions and moved to Liverpool in company with his sister, Sophia, having persuaded his father to advance him a capital of some £1,000, reasoning that this would have been money spent on his education at a university.ⁱⁱⁱ Be that as it may, by 1812, young Mulock was involved in business as a merchant at Liverpool, with Harris Blood, his brother-in-law. Mulock's penchant for the written word was early in evidence and in 1812, at Liverpool, he published 'Short Practical Considerations on Scarcity, and the plans for remedying deficient subsistence in Great Britain and Ireland,' a paper that ran to a second edition.^{iv} Mulock and Blood, then of 20 Water Street, advertised a few tons of prime biscuit for sale in March 1815^v while Harris Blood, merchant and Thomas Mulock, merchant, appear in Gore's Directory of Liverpool for 1816, respectively occupying premises at 45 and 47, Great George Street, with Mulock and Blood, merchants, shown at 31, Argyll Street.^{vi} Mulock also advertised for sale in 1816, freight or passage aboard the brig Magnet bound for Barbadoes.^{vii} A conservative in political opinion Mulock made a favourable impression at Liverpool, and could lay claim, as he frequently did at later dates, to have been a friend and secretary to George Canning, who was elected the member for that constituency on several occasions. Mulock, it was said, accompanied Canning about the town canvassing votes, when at times they were pelted with cabbage stalks, rotten eggs, fish bones and whatever else came to the hand of those who held differing political opinions; given a large town like Liverpool perhaps even from some who held the same political views, and desired to express their appreciation in unmistakeable and generous excitement. However, as to the relationship between the two men, thoughts of a close, deep friendship may have been in Mulock's mind more than in Canning's. The latter was appointed ambassador to Lisbon in 1814, a post in which he remained until 1816, and, although he undoubtedly travelled about during that time and was not confined to Lisbon, it may be doubtful that he and Mulock had much personal contact, and thereafter such relationship as had been enjoyed may have waned, although some letters were exchanged between the two men, an activity that continued limitedly, though almost ardently on Mulock's part, until Canning's death in 1827.

While resident in Liverpool Mulock wrote letters to the *Courier* using the sobriquet 'Six Stars,' the contents of which excited those of liberal political tendencies to refer to him as 'bloody Moloch,' a play on his name and that of his business partner.^{viii} In May 1815, Mulock was the principal speaker at a dinner held by the Liverpool Pitt Club, to commemorate a column that had been erected to the memory of that great statesman, William Pitt, and at which tribute was paid to another - albeit a 'whig' - Edmund Burke. Mulock's 'elegant eulogium,' as it was described, lauded Pitt's selfless achievements:

"Pitt, vigorous, penetrating, indefatigable, armed all over and ready for the perpetual combat, an unequalled model of the sagacity, the diligence, the solemn rectitude, that make the glory of the English mind;" while of Burke: "full of the glowing heart, the fond sensibility, the burning imagination, the impassioned, enthusiastic and exuberant eloquence of Ireland."

They were no doubt stirring words for an appreciative audience, uttered in recognition of conditions that existed on the continent and which would lead to the Battle of Waterloo. Mulock excitedly continued:

"Notwithstanding the hazards of prediction, I am willing to risk one respecting the entire success of the approaching contest. I am even disposed to couple a wish with my prediction, and that wish relates to the duration of the war. I do not wish it to be a very short one, because I see no safety for Europe until the military pride and power of France be humbled to the dust." ix

The bravado of politicians!

It was at about this time that Mulock contributed a series of satirical reports and bulletins to the *Sun* newspaper which were - in the view of William Jerdan, the editor - not unworthy of Dean Swift. The articles were based on the assumption that Henry ('Orator') Hunt - at that time involved in political agitation of a demagogic nature and who, with Burdett and Cobbett, was thought by more staunch Tory opinion to have trod near, if not over, the line of treason, an agitation which foreshadowed the Chartist times of two decades later - had been admitted to Bedlam^x having fallen into incurable mental derangement. Mulock stated how much the *Sun* deplored Hunt's activities and protested solemnly:

*".....that we should have preferred hearing that Mr. Hunt had been **hanged**, rather than that he should have been visited with the intellectual affliction which now so horribly humiliates him. In order to secure the sympathy of the public, we shall now proceed to communicate the details which have been supplied us respecting the lamentable progress of Mr. Hunt's disorder. On the morning of Friday, it was observed by some friends who called upon Mr. Hunt, in order to accompany him to the meeting in Spa Fields, that there was a more than usual incoherence in his conduct, language and manners. Contrary to the earnest exhortations of his compatriots, he **dressed** himself for the meeting, and betrayed in his whole deportment an aristocratic foppery, which very considerably tended to weaken the regards of his staunchest adherents. It was remarked, too, that Mr. Hunt's **oaths** were more refined and classical than he had been accustomed to use in his quality of popular blasphemer. As a conclusive indicant of some portentous change, it was noticed that Mr. Hunt assumed a lofty and condescending air towards his **former** companions, which, however well meant, was certainly very ill-taken."*

Further comments of Mulock's included a description of Hunt quitting his elevated position on a hackney coach from where he had been accustomed to address the crowds:

"Choosing instead one of the windows of 'The Loyal Volunteer,' where, screened from the winds without and warmed with brandy providentially placed within, he spent two hours declaiming to the un-drammed and unsheltered crowds until at last he was taken to Bedlam."

Mulock continued in similar vein stating that on a Sunday Sir Francis Burdett had visited 'Citizen' Hunt^{xi} at Bedlam and through a plausible misapprehension of the officers of that hospital had for some time been detained in a cell adjoining that of Hunt!^{xii}

These articles so amused Canning, who had missed two of them while travelling on the Continent, that he had his secretary write to Jerdan to obtain copies that they might be sent on. That Canning should have been so interested is no surprise, given his own association with the satirical literature of the *Anti Jacobin*.

Mulock's business ventures in Liverpool, however, failed; perhaps he spent more time on political matters than his business warranted, immersing himself in the political to and fro of local politics - until bankruptcy proceedings were instituted against him and his co-partner, Harris Blood; both were declared bankrupt being required to surrender themselves to the Commissioners of the Commission of Bankruptcy at the end of December 1818^{xiii}. Before then, however, on the 20th June 1817, Mulock, aged 27, had enrolled at Magdalene Hall, Oxford^{xiv}, perhaps entertaining literary or clerical ambitions; but then having been bankrupted, Mulock left the university without a recognised qualification, to become, in the words of doctor Thom 'the subject of serious impressions.'^{xv}

A further publication of Mulock's, 'A letter to John Gladstone, esquire,' as chairman of the Anniversary Meeting of the Liverpool Auxiliary Bible Society, that had been held on April 8th 1818, may have exercised his talents but perhaps did little else.^{xvi}

In 1819, then in London seeking his living through literature and as a response to the late Thomas Paine's the 'Age of Reason', Mulock wrote: 'The answer given by the Gospel to the Atheism of all Ages,' a work of some 159-octavo pages published by A. A. Paris, of Long Acre, London, the title page of which described Mulock as 'late of Magdalene Hall, Oxford'^{xvii}.

The poet, Byron, had his attention drawn to Mulock by the editor of the *Bologna Telegraph*, and Byron, while aware of Mulock's criticism of him, thought that "this gentleman seems to be my great admirer; so I take what he says in good part, as he evidently intends kindness, to which I can't accuse myself of being insensible."^{xviii} Mulock had also contributed an article to the Kaleidoscope, '*Scriptural Speculations on the movements of Lord Byron's mind and in the intellectual character of his poetry.*'^{xix}

During 1819 Mulock also published “Blasphemy not to be Repressed or Refuted but by the Truth as it is in Jesus.” Perhaps there was an encouraging financial return with these publications but that aspect of his venture is unclear.

In the December of 1820, three letters that Mulock had written, under the title ‘from a distinguished personage’ (Satan), were published in the *Literary Gazette*, a publication edited by William Jerdan following the failure of the *Sun*. In these letters Mulock displayed a fine turn of satire and gained public attention.^{xx} The first commenced in admirable style:

“Though this is the first communication you ever received directly from me, yet I am certain you cannot be unacquainted with my name; and though I have not the pleasure of being personally known to you, you cannot be ignorant of my character, as the interests of others make it necessary for me to represent it. Trusting to your good nature, (may I add friendship?) I shall take leave, through the medium of your paper, to correct some of the absurd and very mistaken notions which are generally entertained regarding my person and conduct. Were these notions entertained by the vulgar and uneducated alone, I know not that I should trouble myself or you on the subject; but the light in which I am viewed by the higher ranks and educated classes of society, seems to require that, even for my own reputation, I should endeavour to set them right. The untutored Indian may be forgiven for dividing his attention between the Good Spirit who supplies his wants, and the Evil Principle whose wrath he is anxious to deprecate, - but what shall be said for those who, in your country and in Europe, embody me with powers which belong only to Omnipotence, and invest me with attributes which are characteristic of Him alone who formed, amidst other and innumerable worlds, the earth which you inhabit, and all its gay creation.” Another extract continued: *“I am sometimes seen if your legends are to be believed, as a tall man in black, but always with the addition of at least one cloven foot; and your judicial records bear witness, as far as human testimony can go, that when I am disposed to be naughty, I solace myself, (no great proof of my taste, you will say) with shrivelled hags, whom age, infirmity, or ill nature, have rendered obnoxious to their village companions.”* Then, following a polite disclaimer that as a spirit he could not possibly have any material form: *“I am nevertheless to be seen, mixing daily in all the transactions of life; and my invisibility as a spirit does not hinder me from embodying myself, so as my presence may be detected, and my features recognised, in the persons of my friends, who lend themselves to me for this purpose, by the most careless observer. Though I have long given up the visible possession of the bodies of my followers, for that more delicate control which I possess over their minds, yet is my presence not less certainly to be discovered; and though it is not the custom now for even my most devoted disciples to barter themselves to me for money, which might vanish from their sight, the evidence of their being wholly mine exists in deeds more binding than a parchment traced in blood - the exhibition of passions unrestrained by reason, and of conduct not regulated by religion.”* Further: *“There is not a kingdom or a court - a city or a village - a family or an individual, in which, or over whom I have not occasionally some influence. I possess more than one seat in the British parliament, though I am not formally elected; sometimes carry a question, though my name does not appear in the majority; not infrequently assist at the privy council, and can boast of having been more than once on the bench of bishops. In the supercilious looks of the churchmen, as well as in the affected humility of the dissenter, the lineaments of my countenance may often be distinctly traced. I am sometimes to be seen beneath the broad brimmed hat of the Quaker, - and all the young men about town must have frequently recognized me in more alluring form - peeping slyly from under a straw bonnet, or enveloped in the folds of a silk petticoat.”* And then continuing: *“No sooner do your children see the light, and are capable of distinguishing one articulate sound from another, than I am presented to them under a thousand shapes, all calculated to inspire terror; and though I am thus very useful in the nursery, and acquire an ascendancy there which all the education, and all the scenes of future life seldom surmount; yet I feel somewhat reluctant at gaining this advantage, at the expense of being looked upon as an object of affright.”*

Then, temptingly:

“I hold not out to my friends the thorny paths of unmeaning duty, or the hard to be acquired habits of self-denial, - but the smooth road, that leads to unrestrained pleasure, and to joys which allow no ill-timed reflections to interrupt their current,”

And finally:

“It is but a poor compliment to a spirit such as I am conceived to be, to fancy that his purpose is only to frighten clowns and children; and I conclude at present with observing, that, for one subject acquired in this manner, I have thousands who devote themselves to my service when I approach them in the fascinating smile of female loveliness, or assail them in the deep interests of the gaming table; and tens of thousands more own my sway, when allured from

what your philosophers call their true interests and lasting repose, they follow, with exclusive pursuit, the tinsel bubbles of Time, which lead them to the ruin of their hopes, and then – leave them forever.”

In the second letter, growing with confidence, he continued:

“In my last letter I pointed out a few of the distinguishing marks by which my followers will be able, in future, to trace in one another’s features and conduct, their mutual relation to me, from their subservience to the purposes I am supposed to have in view. This I did from no motive of vanity (though few princes can boast of subjects so numerous as those who own my sway), as I am aware that the multitude of my disciples is best increased by the influence of silent unostentatious example. But in the present state of society, I have no fear that either reason or ridicule will materially lessen the number of those who act on my principles; and with just confidence in their leader, they may bid defiance to all that reason can urge, ridicule expose, or religion threaten. Besides, the display of preponderating force often supersedes the actual trial of strength; and though I should not decline the contest, yet perhaps the less that is said about the principles of those who oppose me, the better for my cause. Though, from your intercourse with the world, mister editor, you must have been long ago convinced, even though the clergy had been silent on my exploits, of the vast influence I possess over the minds and bodies of your race, yet perhaps it never entered into your mind over what immeasurable spaces, and by what countless millions, I am adored as a Divinity. Among the followers of Mahomet, and even in Europe, how few are there who conscientiously follow the tenets of the Koran, or the infinitely more important doctrines of the Bible! How few in comparison of those who bow their heads at my diversified shrines. Although no temples rise in your country in honour of my name, yet even there, never was my Divinity so extensively worshipped; and the number of my followers in the very city of London, has proved to a certainty that the essentials of my worship maybe continued from age to age, without the formality of legal establishment, or the sanction of a bench of bishops. Wherever human habitations exist, I am venerated and adored in a thousand forms. From India to Iceland, from America to Europe – my votaries appear in numbers which almost darken conception. My rites are so simple, the duties I exact so accommodating to all that man fancies of pleasure, that in my system there is no need for bridles upon conduct or restraints upon character. The European worships me in his exclusive pursuit of selfish and temporary interests; and the Indian “sees me in the whirlwind,” and recognises me in the storm. How many myriads daily approach me in the temples of Vanity, bow down before me at the altar of Ambition, and confess my power in the receptacles for the enjoyment of unhallowed Pleasure! By millions I am figured and revered as the goddess of Fortune; sought eagerly by crowds in the shape of Fame; and in all the courts of law in the world, I am pictured with balances under the form of Justice.”

Then came comments, the sentiments of which, no doubt, have ushered forth from the lips of many past, perhaps even present members of the clergy, in sermons or homilies denouncing forms of affectation - though perhaps nowadays with even less success than ever previously achieved:

*“I may observe, that one of my chief amusements is to preside over the ever-varying fashions of female attire. I taught the fairest part of your creation, when excess had tarnished the roses of their cheeks, to substitute, for the colour of health artificial roses; for be it known, that **rouge** was first invented by me, to serve a few particular friends, who were anxious to retain the semblance of health and modesty, when the substance had departed from their cheeks for ever. I, in concert with a few devoted admirers; leaders of the fashions of Paris and London, shortened the petticoat, till it had almost ceased to afford the shade of a fig leaf; and it was I (with the best intentions in the world you may presume) who first hinted, in an assembly of ladies, all my special acquaintances, that nature never meant their lovely necks and bosoms, or even any part of their bodies, to be concealed by unnecessary envelopes of silk, muslin, or lace; and I succeeded in convincing them, and the thousands who have since followed their example, that they might as well shroud their faces in handkerchiefs, as conceal a part of their form upon which nature had lavished so much beauty. So kindly were my hints taken, that, had it not been for the affected modesty of the other sex, and some ill-directed effusions of popular feeling, the ladies might, in spite of the climate, have carried their dress, or rather their undress, the length of complete nudity.”*

The third and final letter was in similar facetious vein, commenting that the records of history were required to be held as a tribute to his (Satan’s) name, as having directed the counsels of Greece and Rome:

“The dark ages that followed, and all the blood, and treasure, and human happiness, which centuries saw wasted in the decline and fall of the Roman empire, can be attributed to my procurement alone; and in the crusades which powers called Christian, afterwards termed and accounted so holy; for what purpose were they undertaken, or what end did they serve, if not to extend that misery and bloodshed in which I am said to delight? More modern times affect to pity the credulity and ignorance that led to these expeditions; but what can they say of their own battles and their thousands slain; or how can they be explained to the moralist or the Christian, otherwise than as victims of human

depravity immolated on my altars, the altars of ambition, and vain-glory, and pride! If war, in its most civilised forms, ever had, or can be proved to have, any other result than to increase the amount of human misery, and add to the sum of human wretchedness, let my agency be distrusted, and let the annals of Europe for the last hundred years be reckoned as fabulous narrations."

Mulock then continued with an inevitable swipe at the church:

"The reformation of religion demonstrated my ascendancy in the councils of the infallible father of the Christian church; for no one can deny, that the immediate cause of that change of opinions was owing to the indiscreet sale of indulgencies, - a plan of expiating human guilt, and supporting the expenditure of the clergy, of which I dare even my enemies to rob me of the merit. The consequences of that event, the persecutions, the cruelties, the burnings, could only have their source in my suggestions; and all tend to show with what deference I am listened to in assemblies of Christian ministers, armed with the power of torture and death. Europeans affect to look with horror on the savage nations who sacrifice human beings on my shrine; but how many Christian processions, even in Britain, had the same termination?"

The state of society generally was not left unmentioned:

"The French revolution, it will scarcely be disputed, took its rise from a state of manners introduced and supported by me. When the higher orders of society forget their duty to their God and to themselves, it is no wonder that the lower classes should cease to regard them with respect. Laxity of moral principles may begin, as it usually does, at the court, but it soon descends to the cottage; and when there is no fear of a power to which I (tremble to say it) all are accountable, can any brief, and infinitely less authority, make up for the deficiency? So it was in France; and it shall not be my fault, if it is not soon so in Britain."

The letter returned to teasing the ladies once more with sentiments that, at a later date, Mulock was to embody in his sermons to the faithful of his following:

"Finally, let the ladies recollect, that when in their parties scandal is the subject, or cards the amusement, I am present by myself or substitutes; that they never can have a tete-a-tete or an assignation with a dear friend, without my participation and knowledge; and that she who oversteps in the slightest degree the bounds of matron decorum or virgin modesty, has run into a snare, from which all the prudence of female heads, and all the purity of female hearts, rarely effect an honourable escape. I mention this not to deter my fair readers from those innocent amusements which kill time so agreeably; but the fact is, so many of the fairest forms and unsuspecting minds, swayed by fashions which they thinly despise, crowd to enter the lists of error, that, however contrary it may seem to my character, I almost pity the delusion which, for the fleeting and fevered enjoyment of a few moments, leads - finally and invariably leads - to those "regions of sorrow, and doleful shades," (too well known, alas! to me)"

The letter concluded with the most delightful remonstrance at the clergy:

"I trust that the clergy, who are in general so vociferous against me, will, in talking of me in future, speak of me as it becomes one gentleman to speak of another. Vulgar abuse ill suits the dignity of their profession, or the importance of my character. Pray what would be their use if there were not, or if there never had been, a Devil. Not less than twenty thousand of them in this country eat their bread indirectly through my means; and if I were once fairly disposed of, it is demonstrable that there would be no farther occasion for tithes. I know I have a good many friends, even among the clergy; and in the hope of their still increasing in number, I forbear saying harsh; but let them look to it, for we stand or fall together."

While these letters were received mainly as amusement it would seem that to Mulock the sentiments were precisely what he thought.

Mulock also had a sonnet published on John Milton's 'Paradise Lost':

*'Milton, I ever deem'd thy soaring strain
In genuine grandeur unsurpass'd by all
Whose numbers loudly swell or softly fall,
Of British bards the long illustrious train.
But ne'er till now to my perceptions plain*

*Appear'd the secret of that wondrous thrall
 O'er mightiest minds to melt or to appal,
 And the clear fount of Poesy to drain;
 Pouring forth blindest love or passion's rage,
 In varying verse of mingled sweet or strong.
 The highest truths that grace the holiest page
 Form the pure magic of thy Heav'n-taught song;
 And Gospel glories, ripening every age,
 Thy tuneful spell shall sacredly prolong.*^{xxi}

In 1820, the year in which he also published 'Two Letters on the Mystery of the Gospel and on a Servant of Christ',^{xxii} Mulock crossed to the Continent – he was fluent in French - and spent some time at Geneva where, in the September, he gave a series of lectures on English literature to an audience of mixed nationalities. This attracted attention at home Mulock having written to William Jerdan, the editor of the *Literary Gazette* asking him to print a notice about the series of fourteen lectures. Jerdan duly obliged:^{xxiii}

“Among the new circumstances of these times of international peace which come under this denomination, we have to notice the curious fact of a course of lectures on English literature being delivered at Geneva! We observe by the prospectus, syllabus and letters which have reached us from Switzerland, that the lecturer, Thomas Mulock, Esq., (late of Magdalene Hall, and known to the British public by several political and theological works, as well as by his taste in the belles-lettres), commenced his course on the 7th ult and that the Genovese are so earnest in the cultivation of our literature, that his success has been very great. The auditory of the five lectures up to the 17th consisted of Germans, Italians, Genovese, and English; and nine discourses yet remained to be delivered of the proposed series which was divided into four chronological eras, and embraced a comprehensive view of the subject, interspersed with criticisms, from the dawning of letters in Britain, to the close of the last reign. Independent of the novelty of the circumstances of hearing the English language propagating English letters in the midst of so many tongues, we may fairly reckon it a matter of national concern, that so able an apostle as Mr. Mulock has assumed the literary cross.”^{xxiv}

Mulock's journey to the Continent begs the question, why? Had his financial circumstances improved of a sudden and if so why did he not return to the university that he had left so abruptly? Could he have gone to the Continent following Canning? Was he just doing what was fashionable for men of financial standing and was broadening his experience? Whatever the cause from the letter that he sent to Jerdan, dated 17th August 1820, it would seem that it was while he was in Geneva that the lectures were proposed to him, perhaps a subject that he had already formulated in his mind:

“My dear sir,

Is it out of the reasonable range of your journal to ask you to take some notice of the printed papers, which I now send you through Mr. Canning? Perceiving shortly after my arrival here, that the Genovese were earnest cultivators of our Literature I was led to put forward my prospectus, and in consequence of immediate patronage, to commence my undertaking. My success has been great indeed. The lectures have been wholly extempore – so much so that had not two eminent professors here (Pietet and Rossi) done me the honour of taking notes, no record would remain of these efforts, Professor Pietet being the editor of a very extensively circulating journal (the Bibliotheque Universal). I think it likely that I shall, next month, be enabled to send you some proofs of the interest which my lectures have excited. My auditory consists of Genovese, Germans, Italians and English. Do what you can in making the matter, and you will oblige.”

The printed syllabus of the lectures was indeed a concentrated study, Mulock in his now customary manner styling himself, late of Magdalene Hall, Oxford::

Lecture 1: Monday 7th August 1820:

Preliminary considerations – State of criticism in Great Britain – Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews – Continental criticism upon English Literature – Voltaire – Madam de Stael – Schlegel – Difficulties which impede foreigners seeking to acquire a good knowledge of the English Language and Literature – Distinguishing and permanent peculiarities – Early English Writers – Monastic Conservation of classic remains. Chaucer – Intervening writers down

to Sir Philip Sydney and Spenser – England's share of the benefits which accrued from the revival of Learning in Italy, and from the Invention of Printing.

Lecture 2: Wednesday 9th August 1820:

Brief disquisition on Dramatic literature – Shakespeare – Ben Jonson and the Contemporary Dramatists.

Lecture 3: Friday 11th August 1820:

State of Learning during the reign of James 1st. Translation of the Bible – Revival of Scholastic Theology – Inductive Philosophy - Bacon – Temporary Decline of Poetry – Donne.

Lecture 4: Monday 14th August 1820:

Connection between the spread of perverted Literature and the civil commotions in the reign of Charles 1st – Medley of polemical divinity and political controversy – Metaphysical Poetry – Cowley – Waller – Fixation of the true English poetical style by Milton – Prose style of this period – Hobbes – Clarendon.

Lecture 5: Wednesday 16th August 1820:

Ascendancy of the French style in English Literature after the Restoration – Dryden – Butler – Formation of the English School of Philosophical Literature – Locke.

Lecture 6: Friday 18th August 1820:

Further progress of the French style in English Literature – Addison – Pope – Swift and their most distinguished contemporaries.

Lecture 7: Monday 21st August 1820:

Continuation of the preceding subject – English Essayists.

Lecture 8: Wednesday 23rd August 1820:

State of poetry in the reign of George 2nd – Young – Thompson – Fiction employed to aid representations of national manners – Richardson – Fielding – Smollett.

Lecture 9: Friday 25th August 1820:

State of Literature in Europe at the accession of George 3rd. Diffusion of anti-Christian principles, under the guise of a popular and social philosophy, Scottish School, Political Economy wrought into a system – Progress of that presumed science, from Smith to Malthus.

Lecture 10: Monday 28th August 1820:

Historical Literature. Hume, Robertson, Gibbon. English Moral Philosophy in contrast with that of the Scottish School. Dr. Johnson. Paley.

Lecture 11: Wednesday 30th August 1820:

Progress of Poetry. Gray, Goldsmith, Poems ascribed to Ossian, Cowper, Burns.

Lecture 12: Friday 1st September 1820:

Continuation of the foregoing topics. Living poets, analysis of Lord Byron's works, as considered to contain the *representative* poetry of the age. Moral fiction. Miss Edgeworth. Romances ascribed to Walter Scott. Literary prospects of England.

Lecture 13: Monday 4th September 1820:

English Eloquence. National history of the Art, pursued in the persons of the most eminent English orators; and more particularly from Chatham to Canning.

Lecture 14: Wednesday 6th August 1820:

Subject continued. Illustrative remarks on the national character of the English, Scottish and Irish. Peculiarities flowing from their respective political changes and institutions. Burke, Curran, Grattan, Summary of the inferences deduced during the course of the Lectures.^{xxv}

Given extempore, without notes? Remarkable!

During the November Mulock was at Paris, where he again gave his lectures. Thomas Moore, the Irish poet, attended the of these and described it as ‘mere verbiage,’ then, thinking that he was to be the subject of Mulock’s spleen, stayed away, to later discover that Mulock had been full of praise for him. Nevertheless Moore did take huff with Mulock over slighting remarks made about Moore’s *Lalla Rookh*.^{xxvi} It was said that while in Paris, Mulock met with William Wordsworth, the poet, and his sister, both then on holiday enjoying the relaxation of travel following the difficulties of the French wars of aggression, but there is no suggestion here that Mulock was in any way on familiar terms with them.

At this time Mulock had also written to the poet Byron in an endeavour to convert him to Christianity, but Byron made jocular reference to Mulock as ‘Muley Moloch’, the name of a racehorse of the period, and was content that he was already of that faith; writing to Thomas Moore, Byron remarked: “I have some knowledge of your countryman, Muley Moloch, the lecturer; he wrote to me several letters upon Christianity, to convert me: and, if I had not been a Christian already, I should probably have been now, in consequence. I thought there was something of wild talent in him, mixed with a due leaven of absurdity – as there must be in all talent, let loose upon the world without a martingale.”^{xxvii}

Returning to England, and presumably still in need of income, Mulock continued with his lectures on English literature and in April, 1821 advertised the thirteenth in his series, to be held at the Argyll Rooms in London, when he was also to seize the opportunity to offer strictures on Lord Byron’s recent letter to Mr. Matthews.^{xxviii} From London he then sought to obtain further remuneration by making contact with W. Roscoe, a former acquaintance at Liverpool, soliciting his opinion as to the prospect of speaking at the Liverpool Royal Institution. Roscoe expressed himself happy, within the limits of his power, to promote Mulock’s objective, but pointed out that such a course of lectures might clash with the interests of Thomas Campbell, the Institution’s professor of poetry and that it might be more profitable for Mulock to arrange lecturing to the public on his own account, as if the committee of the institution granted the facility of their own room, then a great number of the members of the institution would claim free admission. Nevertheless Roscoe, having declined an invitation to lecture at the Institution himself, did put forward Mulock’s name to the committee through a friend, though having failed to establish whether anything came of the proposal, I presume that nothing did.^{xxix}

At some time during this period Mulock was invited to be the guest of the Reverend Sir Harcourt Lees at his rectory near Newcastle-u-Lyme, in Staffordshire, and while there met Mr. Minton, (he of the famous pottery firm) who was said to have invited Mulock to take up residence in the neighbourhood in order to ‘evangelise’ the workmen. If this meeting did occur it might account for Mulock’s continuation in the Potteries, as during 1821 he founded a small chapel at Stoke – said to have followed the Baptist persuasion, though this seems doubtful and Mulock referred to his congregation simply as dissenters - the services held in the large upper room of a china factory, where his rhetorical aptitude attracted a following. This chapel was, according to a description by William Howitt, “of bare white-washed walls some thirty or so yards long and about twelve yards in width, and of proportionate height. The congregation consisted of about fifty persons, amongst them a number of ladies of known financial substance, the remainder being potters, their wives and children; they all sat upon planks that were supported on piles of bricks. The room was lighted by improvised chandeliers, each consisting of two laths crossed and nailed in the centre, while at the four ends stood lighted candles held in position by three nails that had been driven into the wood. In the centre of the room Mulock, wearing a blue dress-coat with gilt buttons, a buff kerseymere waistcoat and white trousers, stood at a round three-legged table that served both as pulpit and reading desk.” On the occasion of Howitt’s visit Mulock assured the congregation:

"That all of the preachers the so called Christian world over, were preaching what they did not understand, and that all of the missionaries to every region of the globe were running before they were sent, and on a business which they knew nothing about."^{xxx}

The year 1821 also brought another publication, 'Divine Truth the real Rebuker of Inferior Scepticism and the Detector of Spurious Christianity' this essay also suggested to Mulock by the 'The Age of Reason.' It was printed by A. Paris, 53 Long Acre, London, and sold for the author by F. C. and J. Rivington, of Waterloo Place, Pall Mall, London. Liberally sprinkled with biblical quotations, it was an attack on the theological aspect of Thomas Paine's writing 'a man who uttered frightful blasphemies,' but one in which Mulock's egoism prevails. Mulock, was equally scathing of the Church of Rome, describing it as: 'the common sink of all heresies,' and of the 'variable delusions and simulated sanctity of every generation of Puritans.' Of other philosophers of the day: Hume's contributions were regarded as 'the jeering logic of a chill and comfortless metaphysician,' while 'Bacon, Hale, Locke, Newton, Addison, Boyle, Berkeley, Bishops Butler and Warburton, Johnson, Young, Cowper, Hooker and the whole body of religious reasoners, who would ascend from nature to nature's God, constituted an awful class.' Gibbon, Voltaire and Paine, Mulock described as displaying zeal: 'for securing the sovereignty of Satan over this ruined world.' Of Methodists ('and other miserably misled fanatics') Mulock thought they were: 'alienated from all knowledge of the true God' while Methodism to him "retained everything of popery but its gorgeousness and ritual observances, and had 'the same depraved deference to human authority in things spiritual.'"

To members of his congregation at Stoke, assuming that they did not read his religious observations, Mulock may well have appeared in a favourable light, and to some ladies he might have appeared as an attractive marriage prospect. A physical description describes him as standing close to six feet tall with a slim figure.^{xxxi} A miniature portrait of him painted at this time is reproduced in Aleyne Reade's 'The Reades of Blackwood Hill,' (together with a photograph taken a few years before Mulock's death in 1869, I believe by William Marson, of Stafford, as a copy of the photograph is contained in Marson's 'scrap-book' at the William Salt Library). Mulock, lodged with a gardener at Hartshill, in a cottage adjacent to Longfield Cottage, then occupied by a widow, Mrs. Mellard (whose late husband had been a successful tanner at Newcastle-u-Lyme and whose death had left her with sufficient funds to maintain her for life, with bequests to her three daughters, all of whom were at the time unmarried). There Mulock met and became friendly with William James Reade, who also became a member of Mulock's congregation and who, having personal financial means, discreetly gave Thomas Mulock substantial support.

Mulock soon brought himself to public attention in Staffordshire contributing 'Lines to Lord Byron - On noticing numerous passages of scripture wrought into his unrivalled poetry.' This also appeared in the *Morning Post*, with an accompanying letter in which Mulock was unable to resist a hint at Byron's suspected sexual activity and while Mulock did not make reference as to which of Byron's poetry he referred to - perhaps there was no need at the time - could it have been the 'The Vision of Judgement,' Byron's delightful satire on the death of George 3rd? Perhaps not, since Cain does not get mentioned in the 'Vision.' Mulock's effort though, was by no means equal to Byron:

Sir,

*Whenever, to use an official phrase, 'a vacancy shall occur' in your crowded columns, I will thank you to give a place to the lines which I send you. It will be gathered from them, that I, who hold up Christianity somewhat higher than most of my contemporaries, do not join in the clamour now raging against Lord Byron, and the alleged impiety of his **acknowledged** works. I do not perceive a single blasphemy, in Cain, for example, the description of which to the talking transgressor introduced in the so styled Mystery, is not perfectly justified by the authority of Holy Writ. Lord Byron has given expression to the exceeding sinfulness of sin; and where he errs, the error consists in his attributing a softened sentiment of half repentance to the first remorseless murderer:*

*'Bard of the broken heart! Whose sovereign skill
Hath swept the chords that waken inmost woe!
Thou tuneful tracer of the streams that flow
In fitful tides from nature's fount of ill.
Making life's leprous – thence such plagues distil!
Thou who hast known, what all would madly know,
Pleasure's fierce throb, and fame's exulting glow;
The cheating joys which through our being thrill
Till He who sways the tempest, saith, "Be still."
Thou analyst of agonies which find*

*Their h aunt and their historian in the mind
Recording its own wretchedness – which seeks
A respite from the restlessness that wreaks
Such vengeance on the sinner – for within
Thought's desecrated temple, all is sin!
Come, eloquent expounder of the pangs
Which in their wild succession fix their fangs
In thy bared breast and ever burning brain.
Disclose thyself, dark mourner, in a strain
Not all despairing. – Say if light divine
Dawns on thy soul, and brightens to thy view
That holy page where endlessly shall shine
The Godhead's glory? If a ray of true
Intelligence, shall win thee to the mine
Of gospel treasure – all that man e'er knew
Of bliss and wisdom – Byron will be thine!' xxxii*

Of Byron, Mulock expressed belief that the principal characters in his poems, Childe Harold, Manfred, Lava, Corsair and even Don Juan, were merely endless variations of a portrait of Byron himself, varied by change of costume, vicissitude of health and the play of passions.^{xxxiii}

By 1823 the subscriptions from faithful followers, together with substantial contributions from his prospective wife, her sister and other relations, allowed Mulock to embark, under the control of trustees, upon the erection of a small chapel in Thomas Street, Stoke, undoubtedly a progressive step; but the thinnest of lines distinguishes religious and social responsibilities which, indeed, at times merge defying separate identification; soon Thomas Mulock was involved as much with political as religious contentions; not always with the most judicious judgement.

During 1823 Mulock also appears to have been involved with a primitive Methodist Church at Burland, in Cheshire.^{xxxiv}

In the latter part of 1823 and into 1824, Mulock corresponded with George Canning seeking to obtain his influence on behalf of John Henry North, a friend of Mulock, a member of the Irish legal system who, from the correspondence that is available appeared to seek a seat in parliament. Canning “did not have it at command to offer gratuitously what North sought,” but observed that it must necessarily be dealt with obscurely, and could not recall ever having previously written a letter on such a matter. Through his secretary, Backhouse, Canning appeared to have put forward a proposition to North that proved unacceptable with the outcome that North, by then having spent three months in London, deciding that he would be just as happy in Ireland, “amidst books and work” and there the matter ended. In this instance Mulock acted as an agent between ‘his two friends’, hoping that from his own ‘disinterested zeal’ both would benefit from his endeavours. But did he in fact, engineer the situation – quietly believing that it was in their best interests that he did so? The foregoing is a brief summary of the correspondence, but as it involves so significant a statesman and adds also to insight of Mulock’s character, I give it here. The first letter is from Canning, in reply to Mulock:

Gloucester Lodge,
December 25th 1823.

My dear sir,

Your letter and its enclosure require not my forgiveness but my acknowledgement. I am not the less obliged to you, because I had seen, read and admired Mr. North’s speech before; nor are your suggestions the less welcome, because they exactly tally with my own first thoughts on reading that beautiful piece of oratory.

It deserves all that you say of it, and you can hardly wish more than I do that the author of it should find larger audience and a more splendid theatre, for the display of talent such as fit him for the highest

Could I, in any way, facilitate this object? Or do you think that he would desire that I should endeavour to do so? I have it not at command or I would make the offer directly.

Your letter finds me in bed at the end (I hope) of a perfectly severe attack of gout; which (I hope for) will have cleared me of that infirmity for the session.

I could not defer answering it and felt I should be abrupt again lest other more pressing but not even grateful should intervene: and I return the pamphlet by return of post, lest in the multitude of papers I should mislay it.

Believe me
Very sincerely yours,
George Canning.^{xxxv}

To this Mulock responded:

Newcastle-u-Lyme,
January 6th 1824.

My dear sir,

I lose no time in transmitting you a letter which I received this morning from my friend Mr. North. I prefer this step to a stricter compliance with his request which would constrain me to communicate in my poorer phrase what he has so happily expressed in his own peculiar vein of eloquence. Mr. North has spoken out his sentiments with such unembarrassed candour that I feel inclined to acquiesce in the propriety of his proceeding though at variance with my original view and counsel.

I shall feel greatly gratified in being the means of opening an intercourse highly honourable and advantageous to Mr. North and I would fain hope, pleasing to yourself and profitable to the Empire. If my further services in promoting these objects shall be deemed desirable pray command me to the uttermost. But as my sphere of personal usefulness is wholly apart from political life, the wish I am most desirous of giving expression to is that mister North's worth and talents may be speedily directly and attachingly secured to you.

I am happy to learn from the newspapers that your recovery is almost complete.

*I have the honour to be, dear sir, with great respect,
Your faithful and obliged servant,
Thomas Mulock.*

P.S. *At your perfect convenience, I should like to have Mr. North's letter returned to me.*^{xxxvi}

Mulock had also written to Mr. North who replied:

January 3rd 1824.
31, Mission Square, Louth.

My dear Mulock,

Your letter and its enclosure gave me no small degree of surprise together with, as you may easily believe, the highest gratification. But I do assure you among the agreeable reflections they occasioned the first and most delightful was that you still continued to remember me with such an ardent and affectionate interest notwithstanding the changes and chances that have so long separated us from each other. I must ever retain a deep and grateful sense of Mr. Canning's kindness. His letter to you is the warm effusion of a generous nature and breathes all that goodness of heart which I firmly believe to be invariably united with talents of a very high order. Indeed there is something so calculated to inspire confidence in the tone of that communication, that I felt half tempted to take your advice and to thank him myself for the friendly sentiments he was pleased to entertain regarding me and the kind and flattering manner in which he had expressed them. On consideration, however, I have thought it better not to do so. Besides that we are not personally acquainted there is a deference due to his very eminent rank and station which would render such a step on my part an improper freedom. At the same time I cannot but desire that he should be appraised by you, and in the warmest terms you are master of, how much and how sincerely I have been gratified by the profession of his good wishes and favourable opinion which you have conveyed to me. I do not recollect the letter in which you say, that I avowed my predilection for political pursuits – but to you, the sentiment must have often escaped from me. You know the aspirations we men both accustomed to indulge in, some ten years ago – “then painted clouds that beautified our days” – visions that I cannot regret and am unwilling to condemn. That early fervour however is of course abated, and I think I can say with truth the subsidence has been accompanied on my part with no disappointed or misanthropical feeling. But original impressions are never perhaps entirely effaced – “e'en in our ashes live their wonted fires,” – and still, I confess, I should consider a seat in the House of Commons obtained without any dishonourable sacrifice a high

and gratifying object of ambition. There are certain terms on which I dare say you are well aware I might have long since enjoyed it was I unworthy enough to surrender my opinion on the subject of Catholic Emancipation, I could as you well know at any time supplant Plunkett and represent the University. With my views of the true policy of England towards this country Mr. Canning is naturally the statesman to whom I should be most desirous of attaching myself, and could I forget his claims on my respect and gratitude as an Irishman the wisdom, dignity and firmness which under his direction seem likely to govern and animate the foreign policy of Great Britain, would in my judgement fully entitle him to the support of every real well wisher to the glory and prosperity of the Empire.

And now my dear Mulock having said so much of myself I am entitled to reproach you for the silence you observe on the subject of your own prospects. I am induced to hope by this very unexpected exertion on behalf of your friend, that you have not entirely given up the world and its concerns, and that you may yet be disposed to employ your activity and talents to promote your own advancement. Whatever may be your choice, I must always take an anxious interest in all that relates to you. I shall ever cherish the recollection of our early friendship and shall never cease to form the most ardent wishes for your happiness.

I am my dear Mulock,
With sincere affection, ever faithfully yours,
John Henry North.

P.S. I return you Mr. Canning's note.^{xxxvii}

Canning now wrote to Mulock seemingly replying to the letter of the 6th January:

Gloucester Lodge,
January 14th 1824.

My dear sir,

How am I to convey to your friend the intelligence that such a thing as he desires is at his service – on terms which I presume he would prefer to a gratuitous presentation.

You will hardly believe that I never wrote on such a subject before but I really cannot call to mind that I ever did. Can you give me a notion whether I am right in my estimate of his probable preference.

Yours, my dear sir,
Very sincerely,
G.C.

I will return your friend's letter to you but the intelligence which I communicate comes upon me at a moment when I cannot immediately lay my hand upon it.^{xxxviii}

Mulock by now having received another letter from North appears to have found a small obstacle in the path of progress and wrote to Canning forwarding another letter received from North:

Newcastle-u-Lyme,
January 31st 1824.

My dear sir,

The letter which I enclose forbids me to entertain, for the present, certain expectations which I had cherished with reference to Mr. North's parliamentary usefulness.

When the day of development arrives you will find Mr. North all that I sought to describe.

I have the honour to be, dear sir, your faithful and obliged servant,

Thomas Mulock.^{xxxix}

To this came Canning's tactful reply:

London,

February 2nd 1824.

Dear Sir,

The obscurity with which we must necessarily write on such subjects, has I am afraid, led Mr. North into an error. When I told you in my first letter that I had not such a thing at command, I meant to imply that I had it not to offer gratuitously.

It did not so happen that this intimation produced any reply. I thought it quite possible that the gratuitousness might not be a *sine qua non* and having, some time afterwards, the offer of that which I desired Mr. B to explain to you, I thought it just worth while trying whether that might be acceptable. But it is not what I would have proposed had I anything of another sort in my power.

Such other things may occur: and when they do, I have no other engagement so near my wishes as this.

I am afraid the obscurity which I mention pervades this letter also: but in addition to the nature of the subject, I have the further difficulty today of writing amidst the thousand plagues of the day before the opening of the session.

Yours sincerely,

G.C.^{xl}

Still the go-between, Mulock wrote to Canning again, expressing hope that his endeavours would have a satisfactory outcome:

Newcastle-u-Lyme,
Feby 28th 1824.

My dear sir,

Before this communication can reach London, you will I apprehend have received a letter from Mr. North.

I can say with perfect truth that few circumstances, during my somewhat chequered life, have afforded me more satisfaction than I now feel in contemplating the successful issue of my little labour aiming as I did to draw into public and private bonds two friends whom I so highly esteem. I am glad to perceive from the tone of a letter which I have just received from Mr. North, that he see the propriety (which I had strongly pressed) of devoting himself to a strict political career, even though his present pecuniary sacrifices in foregoing a portion of his professional engagements, should be considerable. He sees this exactly in the point of view which you will, if I do not greatly err, deem desirable. Mr. North proposes to pass a day or two with me here on his way to London, when I shall have some pleasing opportunity of dwelling upon this subject.

You will find enclosed a note which I should prefer keeping, but the same motives which influenced me to return a former communication, prompt me to place beyond all mischance, or even the supposition of such, the confidential, explanatory lines with which you favoured me.

*Dear Sir, with the truest respect,
Your faithful and obliged servant,*

Thomas Mulock.^{xli}

To this Canning replied shortly afterwards:

Gloucester Lodge,
March 2nd 1824.

My dear sir,

As you wish to keep the enclosed, and it is in strictness your property, I return it to you.

But it is not worth preserving as a model of calligraphy.

You see I can write a little letter with a new pen and after the House of Commons has been sitting a month; and sitting so quietly.

I look forward with great pleasure to Mr. North's arrival.

Ever my dear sir,
Very sincerely yours, George Canning.^{xlii}

There is then a gap of some weeks before further correspondence on this subject is available although it is clear from the following that other letters would have been exchanged. Mulock now wrote to Canning acknowledging a letter from Canning that had been misdirected and was late in receipt, promising to send a further letter in a day or two, but in doing so indicates that his ambition in uniting North and Canning may not have gone well:

Newcastle-u-Lyme,
July 17th 1824.

My dear sir,

I am but this moment returned from Buxton, and I find on my table your letter which (having been miss sent to Lyme in Dorsetshire) did not reach my address till this morning. Your communication is kinder and wiser than any expressions of mine can do justice to. On the Monday I will endeavour to state to you my poor views on the subject which you have done me the honour to write so largely upon.

You my dear friend, who are yourself one of the most ardent and faithful of friend's will make, I know, liberal allowances for any errors into which my zeal may have hurried me. But I am persuaded all will be well yet.

*I have the honour to be dear sir,
Your ever obliged and grateful humble servant,*

Thomas Mulock.^{xliii}

True to his word Mulock, by then having had time to dwell on the subject, replied:

Newcastle-u-Lyme,
July 19th 1824.

My dear sir,

I have applied myself as closely as possible to the consideration of the several points contained in the admirable letter which you recently honoured me with, and I feel inclined to send you, in lieu of a direct reply, the copy of a letter which I have this day despatched to Mr. North:

"I am at length enabled to give you something more beneficial than my 'counsel and opinion' upon a subject stated in your last letter. By last Saturday's post a letter from Mr. Canning of nine closely written pages revealed to me his wise and generous views with reference to your interests. That letter is so fruitful in proofs of the soundness of his judgement, the warmth and sincerity of his regard for you, the high estimate in which he holds your talents, and the strong expectation which he entertains of your increasing success in parliament, that it would greatly gratify me to be empowered to send you Mr. Canning's communication, instead of my poor praise of it. But the unwanted word 'private' at the top of the first page, forbids me to follow my inclinations until I shall have obtained Mr. Canning's permission to do so, I think, however, I shall be free from blame in transcribing the following passage – prefacing it with this observation, that I was clearly wrong in declaring so positively my persuasion that Mr. Canning contemplated what I somewhat clumsily termed your 'official transference' to this country. You will however do me the justice to attest that I never for a moment led you to believe that Mr. Canning authorised my suppositions. Indeed had I done so, it would have been a gross deviation from truth, and a signal act of unfairness towards the friend who has heaped obligations upon me with an absolute prodigality of kindness. I candidly confess I have cherished views of your advancement in political life, which I renounce with regret. But notwithstanding my peculiar predilections, I am not blind to the wisdom which pervades Mr. Canning's observations upon your case. I now give you Mr. Canning's own words (the passage respecting an application to Lord Wellesley).

As Mr. Canning has done me the honour of asking me to make choice of the course of proceeding most likely to further your objects, I will take the liberty of suggesting an early communication to Lord Wellesley. My long and intimate acquaintance with the trickery in the disposal of Irish patronage, (which all Lord Wellesley's ability and

integrity cannot speedily subdue) makes me anxious that the lord lieutenant should be in possession of Mr. Canning's wishes with respect to the appointment you are desirous of succeeding to."

"Some thoughts crowd in my mind, which I am half tempted to give expression to, but the more I reflect upon the general tenor of your letter, the deep attention which you have devoted to Mr. North's true interests, and the dignified decision which is stamped upon your sentiments, and which, let me add, it would ill befit me to attempt to disturb, the more I am convinced of the propriety of abstaining from further comment."

I have the honour to be dear sir,
With the truest respect and most grateful regard,
Your faithful and obliged servant,
Thomas Mulock.^{xliv}

Letters then appear to have crossed in the post and Mulock next wrote to Canning, who had returned a letter sent on to him by Mulock from North:

Newcastle-u-Lyme,
July 20th 1824.

My dear Sir,

Conformably to your desire I beg to say that I have received safely your communication of yesterday's date and the enclosure adverted to viz Mr. North's letter addressed to me on the 18th May 1824.

*I have the honour to be dear sir,
Your faithful and obedient servant,
Thomas Mulock.^{xlv}*

The interest that Mulock had shown in Mr. North now appears to have run its course and he wrote to Canning copying out a passage from a letter received from Mr. North:

Newcastle-under-Lyme,
July 27th 1824.

My dear Sir,

However contrary the indicants may be, rest assured that I feel a just anxiety to relieve you from the too frequent pressure of my correspondence. My friend Mr. North shares in this scrupulousness, and expresses himself as follows with reference to those communications which I have had recently the honour of holding with yourself.

"It is really no affectation of feeling on my part when I say I am overpowered by the generosity and goodness of Mr. Canning that he should have written nine lines much less nine pages on my subject, at such a time, and with such cares as his, was far more than I should have expected. It would be very ungrateful in me to say that I disapproved of your conduct. Disapprobation seldom waits on such prosperous results. Yet I must be permitted to remark that you gave a greater latitude to the terms 'counsel and opinion,' than I intended them to receive, and I should most assuredly have refused my consent to your troubling Mr. Canning on the subject of my letter if I had supposed you had any such intention. I do my dear Mulock entirely acquit you of having held out to me hopes of that 'official transference' you mention. Nay I question much if at any time that transference would have had for me a strong attraction; and a good deal of the illusion that hangs over London life was dispersed by my three months experience. One's place in society is hardly ever determined by one's self. Fourteen years have settled the point for me, and pronounced their irrevocable doom – and after all there is a propriety in not dissolving the ties that bind one to their country. With books, and reputation and competence, and the fond imagination that I may be useful, why should I not be very happy in Ireland? I am to set out tomorrow morning for the circuit. When it is over, which will be about the 15th of August, I shall go to call on old Lord Oriel's, and there devote myself to labours which I hope will produce their fruits in the next session."

And now my dear Sir, may I indulge the persuasion that you do not deem my zeal in behalf of Mr. North too strained and officious? One quality appertaining to that zeal you have kindly acknowledged, it is certainly 'disinterested.' And for this I claim no praise. Human power and influence have nothing to command or bestow which should drive or draw me from the humble, happy sphere of increasing usefulness in which I am blessedly placed. But a part, and no small part of my happiness consists in contributing to further the happiness of those who moving in modes of enjoyment other than mine, are nevertheless perpetually pursued by my sincere respect, admiration and regard.

*I have the honour to be, Dear Sir,
Your faithful and obliged servant,
Thomas Mulock.^{xlvi}*

The next communication that is available from Mulock to Canning refers to assistance Canning had afforded Mulock in respect of the latter's father:

*Newcastle-u-Lyme,
October 16th 1824.*

My dear Sir,

I have waited till the first toils of interrupted occupation were over to thank you for the result of your kind interference in behalf of my father. During my short stay in London I had two interviews with Mr. Spearman of the Treasury, one of the most intelligent and obliging official persons I ever conversed with. Mr. Spearman stated to me that government had it in contemplation to abolish the office which my father holds, that he thought a year would elapse before the arrangements previewed could be accomplished and that interveningly, my father should be empowered by a Treasury leave of absence to reside in England, where he now is, near Taunton in Somersetshire.

As this is your good work, I am happy to make grateful mention of it.

I have had a letter this day from Mr. North, who names his having been favoured with a letter from you. As Mr. North and his lady intend to pass a few days at my house on their way to London, I shall avail myself (with your permission) of the occasion to terminate my function, not of friend, but of agent between friends, by showing Mr. North your letter of July 12th 1824.

There are one or two expressions in that letter with reference to myself which seem to question the candour which (if I do not greatly err) reigned in all my communications with yourself, whose good opinion I highly value. But I feel so persuaded that you will, in due season, do full justice to my motives and conduct, that I must entreat you not to notice the subject by a single line.

*I have the honour to be dear sir, with true respect and grateful regards,
Your faithful servant,
Thomas Mulock.*

P.S. I am about to make a bold request but I know you will kindly chide me if I am wrong. A very young lad named Bostock of great promise as an artist, and whom I sent up to town that my friends might obtain his admission to the Royal Academy, has painted at my desire, an admirable portrait of mister North. I wish to have any excellent existing portrait of mister Canning reduced in copy by this young person. Is there such a portrait at Gloucester Lodge which Mr. Bostock might have access to?^{xlvii}

Canning's response, virtually by return of post, was that the only portrait of him of which he knew was in the hall at Christ Church, Oxford, but that he was at present 'sitting' for the artist, Lawrence, and understood that the portrait was to be ready for the exhibition of the next year. The young artist whom Mulock sought to introduce to Canning may have been John Bostock (1808/9-1872), perhaps the same artist who painted a water-colour of Mulock that was reproduced in 'The Reades of Blackwood Hill', (see footnote 1). Quite what level of involvement Mulock had with the advance of this young man is far from clear, but a John Bostock is recorded as having later painted the portraits of numerous titled persons.^{xlviii}

Yet another occasion of Mulock's relationship with Canning was an attempt to procure a letter of introduction from Canning to all the king's ministers in Italy, on behalf of a man named Wilson, who was Mulock's friend, but who, having delivered the request failed to leave his address at the Foreign Office; the letter was sent to Mulock for him to forward it on.^{xlix}

Meanwhile, amidst these exchanges, in January 1824, a public meeting was held at the National School, Hanley, to consider whether a regular police force should be established for the Potteries. Public meetings at that time required the sanction of either the Lord Lieutenant or the High Sheriff of the county, and always attracted the attention of respectable citizens. One report of the proceedings of the meeting stated that when the propositions before the meeting had been read out:

“Thomas Mulock rose, and in a most energetic strain of eloquence, declared that he could not concur in the resolutions proposed. *“It does not appear to me that the real case of the Potteries has been gone into, so as to know how to apply a remedy suited to the case. The general evil which you suffer, is the total destitution of resident magistrates, and consequently the miserable and defective state of your police. The particular grievance is the influx of imported crime, the daily disorders and nightly depredations, which are committed with more impunity here than elsewhere, from the absence of all magisterial redress. Some persons seemed more disposed to complain of this state of things, than to inquire into the cause of it.”*

Mulock then gave his comprehensive view of the British magistracy, as composed of first the ancient and proper enforcers of the laws, the justices of the peace, and quorum; secondly the chartered jurisdiction, and thirdly, stipendiary magistrates, and to the latter he expressed his decided aversion:

“If under the pressure of present ills you rashly apply for a stipendiary magistrate, prepare to endure the rule of a monarch, whose acts will be uncontrolled by the check of co-ordinate authorities. He may be such a one as to render my suspicions unjust; but I am too well versed in human nature to rest the continuance of my comfort, and my freedom from oppression, on the imagined merit of any individual. I cannot but encourage the expectation that the materials of a magistracy may yet be found in the Pottery, if moderate property, and such measure of knowledge, as may reasonably be calculated upon, be considered qualification, then I unhesitatingly avow my conviction that such persons are not rare in this thriving and talented community. I cannot look to you, sir, (addressing the chairman) and not feel assured that we are not without the elements of a magistracy within the compass of our own district. The master potter is in my opinion an improper person to fulfil the duties of a magistrate: it is wrong to place a man in a situation in which his public and private regulation might be conflicting, as in the case of masters and servants. I cannot think but that there are five or six of that class of persons in this place who are every way competent to act in this capacity.”

Mulock concluded by adding a list of resolutions, differing so little from those submitted, that the chairman proposed that they should retire and endeavour to amalgamate them, to which many gentlemen agreed, but an objection to this was raised from the floor and after discussion (and Mulock’s insistence that his resolutions did not in any way envisage the appointment of a stipendiary magistrate), the original resolutions put forward were further considered, adopted and carried.”¹

No doubt Mulock’s quiet criticism of the property qualifications then necessary for a person to hold magisterial office, would find favour in modern days, and equally doubtless with a substantial number of less-favoured citizens in distant times, but such matters were for the legislature and beyond the scope of the meeting; but when he mentioned the five or six worthy citizens who under a less financially inhibiting circumstance, might prove suitable, for office, did he include himself?

The editor of the *Pottery Gazette*, a rival newspaper to the *Mercury*, did not view Mulock’s outburst in quite the same way and during the following week there appeared a denial from Mulock that he had expressed any reprehension at all in respect of stipendiary magistrates. There was support for the *Mercury*, however, from a man named Sidney, who wrote to confirm that Mulock “*had most clearly and distinctly uttered his aversion to a paid magistrate, repeating this several times during the course of the meeting.*” With hindsight such arguments that Mulock put forward may easily be dismissed, but at the time, as Sidney made clear, especially in the provinces, many persons would have reservations about a magistrate sitting alone and, when patronage played so important a part in social life, the impartiality of such a person who did not possess a sufficiently high independent income was viewed with doubt.¹¹

Mulock’s temperament and his rigid, religious beliefs had by now led to the severance of his relationship with William James Reade, his erstwhile friendly benefactor. This occurred in consequence of a difference of opinion on a religious matter – the discomforts of Job – and led Mulock, in correspondence with Reade, to declare:

*“The difference to which you advert to as at present subsisting between us is not a difference between man and man, but between light and darkness, liberty and bondage, truth and error. It is impossible for me fully to express the pity I feel for you. I can truly say that the first tears of gospel compassion I ever dropped were shed last night when contemplating the force, subtlety, and success of the satanic craft permittedly practised upon you. Your case is measurably revealed to me. You are the victim of **inordinate affections** which nothing but the riches of grace can subdue. Finding that the privileges of the glorious gospel were and are deemed **idle tales** by one to whom it is not given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven, Satan has ensnared you to rob the Christ of his glory by bringing down the blessedness of the faithful to the level of unbelief. Instead of predicting terrible things as connected with your*

*departure from the truth, I say, speaking the truth in love, I am persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation. For Gods is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love. Your kindness to myself in times past has been wonderful. But as it grew out of the truth, so, when the truth itself is suspended, the acting's of a liberality which (for a small moment) cannot proceed from **inward affection** must be checked rather than cherished.*"^{lii}

Then during a sermon, Mulock denounced his erstwhile friend as '*a blasphemer and the greatest heretic that had arisen since the days of the apostles!*' Now no matter how honest such opinion might be, though vain and dogmatic, it was scarcely conducive to easy relationships within a narrow social setting and Reade, who over the course of the years had given Mulock financial support totalling at least £200, came to the conclusion that their relationship was more burthensome than it was worth. Perhaps too, at that early stage, there was also a disquieting prognosis formulating in the opinions of other members of the family elect, but if so it did not prevail as Mulock, then seemingly in a respectable and encouraging situation, was set to marry his widowed neighbour's youngest daughter, who may well have put aside any reservation concerning her prospective husband, fearing, given that she had advanced in age to a stage when other opportunities might not readily present themselves, that she might destroy her chance to enjoy the pleasures of matrimony. The rebuke that Mulock delivered to Reade was not one accepted and suffered lightly; Reade retaliated with a publication of his own, 'Remarks upon a Sermon preached by the Reverend T. Mulock from Hebrew xi 39, 40.'^{liii}

During 1824 Mulock had an earlier publication, 'Two letters on the Mystery of the Gospel and on a servant of Christ,' re-printed at Oxford. There was also another publication this year, 'Two letters on the origin, progress, decline and fall of the Bible and Missionary Societies.'^{liv}

Mulock's marriage to Dinah Mellard, then aged 31, took place on the 7th April 1825; for the occasion Thomas was dressed in white from head to foot, and so became brother-in-law of his former friend William James Reade, who had previously married another of the Mellard daughters!^{lv} Following the marriage Mulock and his wife remained at Longfield Cottage, but Mrs. Mellard, if we can accept the observation of a local newspaper editor, moved to Bucknall to escape the sulphurous atmosphere, if not of Stoke, of Mulock.^{lvi}

It was also during this period that the reverend David Thom, D.D., expressed the most favourable opinion of Mulock's oratory as 'perhaps the ablest man, as well as most original genius, who has temporarily resided in Liverpool and enriched its religious literature by his writings,' and 'an able and original writer and speaker.' Praise arising from Mulock's preaching at the church in Bold Street, Liverpool, where Thom was established.^{lvii}

To return to local topics: at the Hanley Petty Sessions, held on the 22nd April 1825, Mulock brought charges against William Read and Thomas Simpson, both closely involved with the chapel, accusing them of having 'wilfully, maliciously and contemptuously' disturbed him in the exercise of his duties as a minister. These men and also – perhaps with reckless effrontery, Mrs. Mellard, his mother-in-law - Mulock now: "*consigned over to eternal perdition,*" declaring from the pulpit "*that they would die in the greatest torments, and their houses be void and uninhabited,*" pledging his authority as a servant of God, upon the truth or falseness of his predictions!

The presence of the two men at the chapel on the occasions that Mulock objected to, seems to have been to demonstrate to others of the congregation that despite Mulock's condemnation, they were still very much in the land of the living, but it must be concluded that they well knew their actions would be a source of irritation to Mulock. The charge against Read and Simpson, having been heard by the magistrates, was dismissed, but Mulock was far from satisfied, arguing that only one charge had been heard, that relating to the 17th April, whereas he had made three separate accusations, and prevailed upon the magistrates that there should be another hearing in respect of the two other 'offences.' The second hearing took place at Hanley on the 4th May 1825, before two justices of the peace.^{lviii}

At that hearing several of Mulock's faithful adherents gave evidence, from which it appeared that Mulock, who was extremely short-sighted, only became aware of the presence of the men in the congregation when he heard Simpson singing, and - recognising the voice that had once led the singing in the chapel - promptly stopped the service explaining:

"It is in consequence of the entrance of the son of perdition, the person who formerly led the singing in this place and I will not have the praise of God polluted by his accursed voice: he will shortly be joining the chorus in hell."

The two men, it appears, had done nothing more than smile at each other, had perhaps allowed a facial expression to convey whatever inner emotion was felt, but made no noise. A witness, George Plant, could only say that

he saw the two men come into the chapel on the 3rd April that he did not see them conduct themselves disorderly, but had previously heard that they said they would not be put out of the chapel, and that they came in spite of Mr. Mulock.

Althea Forrester also saw Read and Simpson at the chapel on the Easter Sunday; she thought that they conducted themselves in a very improper manner by laughing and improper gestures, but they made no noise, although during prayers they made signs and gestures; she did not recollect that anyone spoke to them.

William Davis was also at the chapel on the 3rd April, saying Read and Simpson conducted themselves in a different way than they had formerly done; they looked around contemptuously, annoyed the congregation, as they not only smiled but gave contemptuous grins, and caused Mr. Mulock to pause several times. Plant saw consternation amongst the congregation, but there was no palpable noise and Mr. Mulock might have continued the service, as there was no noise.

A Mrs. Jones was at the distance of three seats from the two men; saw them laugh and nod during prayer and could not help but take notice of them, but she did not hear them and could not recollect whether Mr. Mulock paused in his service or not.

Mulock in evidence stated that on Sunday the 3rd April, Read and Simpson came into his chapel with intent to disturb him; of their intention he had been given previous notice by George Plant; in answer to questions Mulock stated that the men made no noise, but with him it was a mental thing; they had been two years and a half under his ministry, and had often represented him as a blasphemer; his personal persuasion was that he was thus disturbed in his own mind and that he suffered a chain of outrages.

The magistrates were unanimously of opinion that the Act of Parliament did not encompass this situation brought before them, had not been violated and dismissed the charges.

The proceedings of the hearing were reported in a local newspaper to the area, *The Pottery Mercury and Staffordshire and Cheshire Advertiser*, the editor of which, judging from the relative absence of Mulock's letters, did not appear to entertain the same evaluation of Mulock's literary talents as others more generously inclined were wont, and prefaced the report with a less than flattering observation about Mulock, made by Byron, continuing to add insult to injury, with a verse from Samuel Butler:

"Most of our readers have heard of the Reverend Thomas Mulock, of Stoke, a gentleman whom Lord Byron describes as "a writer of bad sonnets, and lecturer in worse prose, and as the inventor of some new mode of religion." The celebrity of this personage in the Potteries has been obtained, not only by the exhibition of his amazing capabilities at some of our late public meetings:

"For he at any time would hang
For the opportunity to harangue
And rather on a gibbet dangle
Than lose his dear delight to wrangle;
In which his parts were so accomplisht,
That right or wrong, he ne'er was nonplussht;
But still his tongue ran on, the less
Of weight it bore, with greater ease,
And with its everlasting clack,
Set all men's ears upon the rack."

The editorial comment on Mulock and the case that had been heard continued: "this equitable and just decision of the magistrates, we are sorry to say, was not received by Mr. Mulock with becoming submission and respect; indeed, throughout the whole proceeding we could not but deprecate the imperious behaviour of this extraordinary personage. It is true, he did not, like his great prototype, L. Muggleton, damn the magistrates to their faces, and consign them over to the pangs of eternal death, but he gave vent to the bitterness of his spirit, by telling them that 'imperial justice' would soon be administered in the Potteries. The worthy magistrates *took it from whence it came* as we are told the man did when the ass kicked him, and good-humouredly thanked him for his intelligence. We expected that the affair would have ended here, but were mistaken. The man, whose resentments are not bounded by the limits of time, but lengthens his prospective vengeance against his adversaries, through the countless ages of eternal perdition, cannot suffer an offender, even of the magisterial rank, to escape so cheap; we have, therefore, been presented with a bitter philippic – 'a wicked and atrocious libel, - on the magistrates of this district, in a journal of last week, and we may add, *the only*

journal in the kingdom, which would have given publicity to such a malignant attack upon gentlemen, to whom the country is so deeply indebted. The observations of a correspondent, which will be found in another place, render it unnecessary for us to say anymore on this subject; we shall therefore restrain our feelings, and only observe, that, we hope, if these gentlemen should ever have to sign a certificate, for placing him under the tuition of his old friend Mr. Bakewell,^{lix} they will take his present conduct and behaviour into the account, and give him the full benefit of it.” These last lines prophetically anticipated future events.^{lx}

At the same time another case in which Mulock was concerned, perhaps even instigated, was heard and disposed of. This was one of assault brought by William Davis, Mulock’s servant of all tasks, against Mrs. Mellard, the indomitable mother-in-law, accusing her of wickedly, maliciously, and outrageously breaking the peace of our sovereign lord the king, by breaking his (Davis’s) head with a dust shovel, an action that Mulock considered to be “*a case of aggravated assault and battery*.” Mrs. Mellard, having been drawn into the chapel circle from the earliest time had, as has been noticed, withdrawn to a safer distance, an action that Mulock deemed had exposed her to all the terrors of the world to come, the schism arising, seemingly, through her having questioned the infallibility of the Pope (perhaps only a theoretical topic at the time as it was not until the 21st General Council Meeting, convened at the Vatican in December 1869, continuing into 1870 that the bull *Aeterni Patris* confirmed the theory of papal infallibility in matters of religious matters, that is to say that when the Roman pontiff speaks *ex cathedra* in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians he speaks with infallibility, though no doubt it had been thoroughly discussed for many years before that) though why Mulock of all people, given his attitude to the Roman Catholic hierarchy, should have taken offence at Mrs. Mellard’s opinion is beyond understanding, unless of course the dear lady had questioned Mulock’s personal opinion on papal fallibility. To continue: one day a member of the Mellard household was alarmed on seeing what was described as “the lengthy form of the complainant Davis, at her gate, and knowing by experience, that he was the bearer of no welcome tidings, refused to let him in but sought the decision of the mistress of the house upon the further subject of would she receive a letter from Mr. Mulock?” Mother-in-law’s answer was an emphatic, No! It is perhaps here desirable to revert to the newspaper account: “Davis, probably thinking that there was no occasion to be ceremonious with folk that were under the malediction of his master, attempted to force his way in; but this Mrs. Mellard very properly resolved to prevent; a scuffle ensued and Mrs. Mellard succeeded in keeping possession of her castle; while Davis retired discomfited, complaining that Mrs. Mellard had broken a dust shovel over his head - the shovel was affixed to a length of timber and so had additional power. On examination it turned out that this assaulted and battered piece of mortality, had neither wound, bruise, nor scratch, to show in evidence, and the dust shovel was produced, as free from dent and damage, as the hide of the woeful complainant.” The magistrates, therefore, immediately dismissed the charge, observing that missus Mellard had not used more force than was necessary to keep him out of her premises.^{lxi}

Discontented with these reversals at law, Mulock embarked upon an attack on the integrity of the magistrates in a letter published in the *Pottery Gazette* on the 7th May 1825.^{lxii} This brought what was far more than an indignant response from a local doctor:

Sir,

I beg leave to call your attention to a letter signed ‘Thomas Mulock’ inserted in the *Pottery Gazette* of Saturday last. The following scandalous and arrogant assertions made against gentlemen whose services demand, and have obtained the highest respect and gratitude of the country I shall give myself the trouble of transcribing:

- (a) Redress of wrongs is of most rare and difficult attainment in the Staffordshire Potteries.
- (b) Their (the magistrates) decision was *contrary to law*, in the very truth of evidence, and at variance with the plainest principles of natural equity.
- © The clearest evidence that could be delivered was brow beaten and rejected.
- (d) The grossest perjury (so help me God) was complacently listened to.
- (e) The magistrates are not remarkably conversant with the laws they are called upon to administer.
- (f) There is evidently a respecting of persons.

The letter went on to add that nothing would deter him from “*steadily pursuing his course until*” he adds, “*I behold the principle of the imperial justice recognised and acted upon in the Staffordshire Potteries, until I see rich and poor made to submit to the supremacy of those equal laws, etc.*”

I am persuaded, sir, that there exists not a man of the least respectability in the Staffordshire Potteries, who would not burn with honest indignation at the perusal of assertions so monstrous; imputations so unjust, wicked and scandalous, effusions so arrogant, insulting and maniacal! Indeed, it would have been impossible for the unhappy writer of such disgraceful sentiments to have found a channel of circulation for his arrogance and folly in any print of

respectability: and I am able to assert, that it is only by the audacious use of names too noble ever to be associated with his, and by the artful promise of grand and extravagant things, that this writer has successfully duped your cotemporary to render his print subservient to the vain and ambitious views of the man who was not ashamed to put his signature to such a letter. And who, sir, is this extraordinary personage, who arrogantly offers his protection and patronage to the Staffordshire potteries? His course, sir, is well known at Stoke, from whence he dates this rhapsody of arrogance and effrontery: who he is, few know; and what he pretends to be, still fewer believe; but as he has attempted to make himself a public man, by interfering wherever it appears possible to throw the apple of discord; and has succeeded in making himself a notorious man, by exposing his real merits to the neighbourhood, I shall leave him to speak for himself; and therefore beg leave to present you with the two following letters, which require no comment, and which will further unfold his real character better than I should ever think it worth any while to attempt to do.

John Crawford Whitehead.^{lxiii}

So much from the view of a seemingly impartial, professional man, but it must be said that there was history between the two, and that Whitehead, like a number of other persons, though he may at first have been attracted by Mulock's undoubted eloquence, was then unable to come to terms with the doctrinal interpretations that were delivered. The following is one of the letters to which Whitehead referred:

"To the Sons and Daughters of the Lord Almighty, in and near Stoke:

*Beloved in the Lord, I am moved to inform you who **love the Lord Jesus Christ** in sincerity, that guided and preserved by his holy providence, I arrived here yesterday afternoon, and preached in the evening with all acceptance, on the part of God's elect, from Hebrew xi 39, 40. I was enabled to set forth the grace and glory of our adorable Lord, the privileges of the New Testament dispensation, and the certainty of the **manifestation of the sons of God**; in short those very truths, which by the shining of Christ's spirit, have been made lately so blessed to those of my hearers who are of the eternal family of God. It was by preaching of perfect freedom to God's elect, that Satan's children were discovered; and more of his cursed seed will, by the same preaching, be clearly manifested yes, beloved, it was through preaching **Jesus Christ, and him crucified**, that the mystery of iniquity was at length unveiled, and **the man of sin, the son of perdition**, was revealed in the proper person of mister W. Read. I tell you in the name of the everlasting God, that Mr. W. Read will be eternally damned; yes, he is **condemned already**, John iii 18. As this is his **SECOND** fall, so I proclaim of him, that he is **twice dead, plucked up by the roots; a raging wave of the sea, foaming out his own shame, a wandering star, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever**. If the arch traitor should remain awhile in your neighbourhood before (like his elder brother Cain) he goes to the land of Nod, (i.e. banishment) avoid him as you would a pestilence, receive him not into your house **neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth God speed, is a partaker of his evil deeds**. And now, as I am enjoined of God to warn every man in all **wisdom**, I must proceed, however painful the task, to put you on your guard with respect to another person, whom I proclaim, with all boldness, to be **a deceiver and an antichrist; for as you have heard that antichrist shall come, even are there now many antichrists**. I now speak of **DOCTOR WHITEHEAD**. As Mr. Read's heresy consisted in denying that **Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, to save his people from their sins and sorrow**. 1 John v 20; so Doctor Whitehead's error, taught him by **his father, the devil**, consists in denying the resurrection of Christ, which he does deny to all damnation of himself, when he denies that we are quickened together with Christ. 1 Cor. Xv 12-15. Upon the strength, therefore, of God's holy truth, revealed to me, his sent-servant, Amos iii 7; I enjoin the elect of God, called by his grace, not to comply with **DOCTOR WHITEHEAD** nor with any of my hearers who give ear to his lies seeing that you cannot touch pitch without being defiled. If I were now present with you, I would, in the power of the spirit of truth, adjure **DOCTOR WHITEHEAD**, by Jesus Christ our lord, to depart from among us, as one who hath **no portion in Israel**; as one that I plainly see hath followed our adorable lord, and me his minister, not because he (**DOCTOR WHITEHEAD**) **saw the miracles of Christ**, (in and by his preached word) but **BECAUSE OF ADVANTAGE**, John vi 26, Jude 16. It is my desire, moreover, that if **DOCTOR WHITEHEAD** should **come among you**, Job I 6, 2 Tim vi 7, he shall have his my letter shown to him, that his anger shall rest upon me, the under shepherd, instead of you, the sheep of Christ, John ix 11,12.*

*I am so greatly occupied, that I cannot now write more fully, but I will shortly do so, **if the Lord permit**. **Stand fast, my beloved, my joy and crown of rejoicing**. Look to yourselves that we lose **not these things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward**. I wish one of you may be moved to write to me at Mr. Hunt's, declaring your state, **lest by some means the tempter hath tempted you**, and our labour be in vain. Let me have **good tidings of your faith and charity; and that ye have good remembrance of us always, desiring greatly to see us, as we ourselves to see you**.*

*I exhort you to comfort and communicate with Mr John Read, in his affliction, who is undoubtedly a child of the Most High God. In his is fulfilled the scriptures, that **one shall be taken, and the other left**; even so, Father, for so*

*it seemed good in thy sight. The Lord bless and keep you steadfast in his holy truth. **Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection, on him the second death hath no power.***

*Your servant for Christ's sake,
Thomas Mulock.*

Oxford, 8th September 1824.^{lxiv}

From Thomas Simpson - one of the men vilified by Mulock in his accusations at court - there came public response, delivered in a letter to the editor of the local newspaper that adds a little more colour to Mulock's early days at Stoke:

"Sir,

You are well aware it is no uncommon thing for the defeated to feel sore, and also to strive to shift the odium and filth that clings about them to some other quarter; but surely Mr. Mulock's calumnious strictures on the magistrates must come with very ill-grace, when coupled with the flattering encomiums which he bestowed on those very gentlemen, in the *Gazette* of the 24th January 1824. I would ask Mr. Mulock seriously, how it comes to pass, that the "*zeal, promptitude, and intelligence, which is not only honourable to themselves, but calculated to reflect credit on that admirable magistracy which they adorn*" how is it, I ask, that they have all on a sudden lost their once abundant "*penetration in investigation.*" The very unjust unprovoked and personal attacks of Mr. Mulock, while confined to his pulpit (although a shameless prostitution of it), we were willing to excuse, and attribute them to his feverish state of mind; but the charges he has brought against us, being for subverting the laws of the land, it assumes a very different aspect, and calls for explanation. Mr. Mulock aye, and all those *creatures* he brought forward, were well satisfied that our *conduct* did not disturb them, *but our presence*; not because he had for seven months crammed his sermons with scarce anything else but the pending judgment which he vomited forth. Mr. Mulock publicly warns his adherents not to come nigh to our dwellings, lest the earth should open and swallow them up also; they naturally concluded that the crisis was arrived, and that the "Korahs, the Dathans, the Abirams, &c" would there and then "go down alive into the pit.

Amidst the conflicting statements now abroad, the first natural enquiry is, were not those men once Mr. Mulock's strenuous advocates? Then wherefore the cause of all this? We answer yes, and confess that we were his dupes too; but why? Why when Mr. Mulock first came to settle in this county, he assumed the gentleman, and we looked upon him as such. Crying down penny-a-week societies, and "*Ladies with their trash baskets sallying forth each Monday morning to inflict a burthen upon the inhabitants equal to a fiscal tax.*" Pointing out the errors of others, and free to acknowledge his own; claiming "no dominion over anyone's faith;" and denying ALL PUBLIC AID himself; declaring that so long as he lived the gospel should be preached *free of expense*; we of course looked upon him as a distinguished gentleman; and notwithstanding the many inconsistencies which we could not but notice, we were willing to excuse what we could not control; but no sooner was the spell broken, than we found all his boasting mere noisy breath, and that his hitherto unknown supplies sprang from the pockets of one of his admirers!! It is natural for the dog to lick the hand of its benefactor, but not so with this man; whom for a slight difference in doctrinal views (now in public print) Mr. Mulock three times over publicly, and in the most sarcastic manner, accused his only benefactor of scattering arrows, firebrands, and death in his congregation; but still evaded private explanation, by the flimsy shelter "*I am apostolically enjoined not to controvert,*" but was ever ready to "controvert" when he had the advantage. This gentleman (Mr. W. Read) stated Mr. Mulock's ingratitude to the lady he has since married, but no sooner did it reach Mr. Mulock's ears than his pride was wounded. Immediately he *tears off the mask, dubs himself Pope, jumps into the infallible chair, and issues his first bull from Oxford, dated September 8th 1824, consigning over to damnation his former friend and benefactor, and all who admitted him into their houses!!* I must confess that I laughed at his folly, and being disobedient to the pseudo Pope's mandate, got publicly ranked "among the dead." Thomas Simpson.^{lxv}

Not content with having suffered reverses at law, which defeats he now ascribed to the perverseness of the county magistrates, Mulock launched into another court action. Reade and Simpson had not been the only persons to suffer the acerbity of Mulock's tongue; other members of the congregation too had been publicly reproved. Sarah Garner was a liar and covetous; Samuel Grocott - no doubt like many another young man in that and every other age - also failed to meet the expectations of his minister and on the 17th April 1825, Samuel (whose mother, Martha, had earlier been publicly admonished for paying attention to gossip) was described by Mulock as a drunkard and debauched young man. Grocott, however, made of sterner stuff than many, forced his way into the area of the chapel where only the 'elect' members of the congregation were permitted to sit, assaulting Samuel Buxton, Mulock's assistant and guardian of the pews in the process, and at the end of the service, having during the sermon been denounced amongst others with lewd behaviour and other sins, rose and challenged the minister, counter charging him with beating his wife on their wedding day in order to drive the devil out of her. Grocott was further annoyed that he had come under

communal persuasion to contribute money to pay off a debt of Mulock's, under the consideration that the debt of the minister was 'Christ's debt,' and that the congregation should meet it. Mulock's response to this verbal assault was, as noticed, to launch a further prosecution at law, again for disturbing the service.

Samuel Ginders, at that time one of Mulock's faithful, appeared before Walter Weston Coyney, at Swinnerton, on the 19th April 1825, to give evidence that Grocott had as Mulock alleged, 'wilfully and maliciously disturbed the congregation,' and Grocott was summoned to appear before the same magistrate at the Coyney Arms, in Weston Coyney, on the 22nd of April, when the magistrate, having deemed that Grocott was guilty of the offence laid against him, the respective parties were required to enter into recognizance to appear at the next quarter sessions of the peace; Mulock in the sum of £20 without surety, Grocott with two sureties, William Outram, accountant, and Henry Dufort, surgeon, both of Stoke-u-Trent, in £50, but when the case came to trial, at the Staffordshire Midsummer Sessions of 1825, the charge failed, largely it would seem because the act under which the case was brought, 'An Act for the Better Protection of Methodists and Dissenters' (introduced to safeguard minority religious beliefs from the narrow minded wrath of members of the Established Church) specified that to be an offence such behaviour had to be committed *during* the service, and the evidence indicated that Grocott rose to speak when the service was over!^{lxvi} The matter of wife beating, raised by Grocott, appears to have been sensitive to Mulock on this occasion as, when questioned about it, he was evasive before eventually denying its truth; so whether the accusation against him had been made from rumour current within the circle of the congregation, with or without foundation, or brought from a malicious recollection of Richard Savage's poem, 'Progress of a Divine,' may at this distant stage be an amused conjecture.

The penalty for Grocott's 'offence,' had it been established was £40, and there were those who readily entertained belief that Mulock had brought the charge in the hope, even expectation, that he would receive what would have undoubtedly been for him much welcome funds.

Following the report of the case against Grocott, the editor of the *Pottery Mercury* was requested to publish an extract from a letter that Mulock had addressed to his faithful, sent also to those at Oxford and also at London, (though whereabouts in the capital I have not as yet established) the object of which had been to stimulate contributions towards the repayment of the debt Mulock owed to Reade:

*"As for the items amounting to £25 placed by Mr. Rhead to my credit I wholly disclaim – being discharged from them Mr. Rhead's bill against **Jesus Christ my lord** must be paid without any deductions. The kindness rendered him by me proceeded from God's Spirit, they cannot therefore be valued nor can they be repaid. Rom. Xi 35."*

*The foregoing statement will be read this evening at the prayer meeting of the Church of God in this place, and copies of the same will be forwarded by tomorrow, Saturday night's post to the Lord's people in Oxford and London, so that no time may be lost in relieving the Lord Christ from even the shadow of an obligation to one whose **destruction cometh as a whirlwind**, an apostate from God, and a traitor to man. 2 Tim iii 1-9.*

Thomas Mulock.

Stoke Lane, March 4th 1825.^{lxvii}

It had been Mulock's custom for the past three years, to visit Oxford in the autumn of each year, for the purpose of "*building up in our most holy faith a few persons who receive and realise the great truths I promulgate.*" It was said that Mulock was intimately acquainted with William Wilberforce, the tireless worker for the abolition of slavery, and also knew but did not much care for his sons,^{lxviii} but whatever the social circle of Mulock's acquaintance, it does not appear to have embraced these gentlemen at the time of his visit to Oxford, in the August of 1825. On that occasion Mulock preached in a regularly registered place of worship, but the service was interrupted by what he later described as a group of "well-known ruffians," causing him to abandon the chapel and express his intention not to preach in public at Oxford again! Amongst the objections that some of the crowd entertained to Mulock, was that he had induced a man to separate from his 'reprobate wife,' while another member of the congregation - to whom similar advice had been given but not attended to - had been criticised as "*a false brother who did not and could not obey from the heart that form of doctrine that was delivered to him.*" The meeting broke up in riot, and some of Mulock's closer adherents were targeted, two of them, Hunt and Arnett, pursued through the town, covered with mud, their clothes torn and saved from a 'ducking' only through the intervention of some of the kindlier of Oxford's citizens, while some reports stated that Mulock was actually thrown in the river.^{lxix}

Yet even at this time when Mulock was troubled by and responding to adverse publicity occasioned by the trouble at Oxford, he took opportunity to defend the reputation of his dear friend George Canning.^{lxx}

To the editor of the Morning Chronicle,

Sir,

*I cannot suffer myself to suppose that you will refuse to insert in your journal, the letter, though necessarily long, which I now transmit to you. It is an answer to a communication addressed to me by a Mr. Samuel Watts, Westgate Buildings, Bath – a gentleman of whom I have no other knowledge. The letter will speak for itself. I avail myself, however, of this opportunity to state, that I have just read an article purporting to be copied from **The Taunton Courier**, in which, mixed with the vilest calumnies, the name of Mr. Canning is most wantonly and unwarrantably introduced. While I deprecate the insolence of the writer whoever he may be, I cannot have any reasons for withholding the fact, that for more than ten years I have enjoyed the friendship of Mr. Canning – a friendship, however, not to be confounded with the servile connection of patron and dependent, but generous in its formation and cemented by such an interchange of good offices, as to leave me under no other obligation than that which Mr. Canning's favourable opinion is sure to confer.*

There then followed Mulock's response to Samuel Watts:

*"You are not aware, perhaps, that my stated ministry is at Stoke-u-Trent, Staffordshire, but that in the autumn of the three years last past, I have visited Oxford, for the purpose of **building up in our most Holy Faith** a few persons who receive and realise the great truths I promulgate. On my arrival here at the close of the month of August, I preached in a regularly registered place of worship, until a concerted disturbance (effected by some well-known ruffians) caused me to descend from the pulpit to dismiss the congregation, and to announce my determination of not preaching again in public during my stay in Oxford. I was led to adopt this course in consequence of a lesson I received at the Staffordshire Quarter Sessions, to which I had resorted in order to obtain justice against a miscreant who had shamelessly violated the law of the land in my own chapel. I found (what all real Christians will infallibly find) that unjust administrators of the law cannot avenge injuries inflicted on a faithful minister of the gospel. Never did I witness so clear a fulfilment of the prophecy, **'the law is slacked and judgement cannot go forth, truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter'** as at the Staffordshire quarter sessions. Bench, bar, jury – all were unanimous in deeming me culpable for having fearlessly discharged my ministerial duty as a reprover of sin; while the palpable guilt of the accused party was so leniently construed, as to convert his acquittal into an infamous triumph. With such recollections vividly impressed, you will not marvel that I considered it sager and safer to preach in private, than to expend my time and money in purchasing from a court of law, a formal denial of justice – with the super added soreness of an envenomed, insulting invective, from some foul mouthed advocate, the greedy recipient of his kindred client's enormous lies.'*

Mulock's account of the riot at Oxford stated:

*"A mob of **certain lewd fellows of the baser sort**, instigated I am persuaded, by professors of religion, surrounded the house into which my two friends had entered. Imputations, the most revolting, of crimes that Christianity reveals the cause and the punishment of (see Rom. 1, 18, ad finem), crimes, too, which it hath been made awfully clear, under my own ministry, that counterfeit Christians, pretenders to spirituality, are secretly guilty of, were artfully assumed as pretexts for the violence that ensued. Mr. Taylor and Mr. C. Wootton were pursued with the war-whoop of wickedness through the most populous part of this city, and reached the lodgings I then occupied, happily unhurt, but covered with mud. As for the poor deluded creatures who committed this outrage, I cannot, as a Christian, lay the stress of my censure upon them, as I am clearly convinced, by indisputable facts, that some leading members of religious societies (whose names I am ready to bring forward), were in the background ringleaders of the riot. In the evening I went to Mr. Hunt's, and tidings reached me that the mob had broken into and havocked the house which my friends had quitted, I desired Mr. Hunt and Mr. Arnett, to proceed, though at the risk of their lives, to succour, if possible, the individual whose person and property I apprehended to be in jeopardy. On their arrival at the scene of commotion, they found the city marshal leisurely surveying a procedure in which every person implicated was, if I do not greatly err, liable, according to the law of the land, "to be hanged by the neck till dead." Endeavouring to escape from this place of peril, Mr. Hunt and Mr. Arnett were attacked by several hundreds of misguided persons, who, in dutiful deference to the doctrine so seasonally laid down by Sir Joseph Lock, immediately proposed to plunge their victims into an adjacent depth of water. Providentially rescued from this danger, by the interference of some kindlier individuals mixed with the mob, Mr. Hunt and Mr. Arnett, contrived to measure back their way, and at length reached the town hall, where they cleaned their persons, and having obtained raiment from home (their clothes having been torn from their backs) they, after a lapse of time, regained mister Hunt's house, by a pardonable stratagem."*^{lxxi}

Some other newspapers, needless to say, did not fail to bring the story to the attention of their readers and Leigh Hunt, in the *Examiner* made light of Mulock's plight:

Mr. Mulock:

The preaching of this fanatic has given occasion for a riot at Oxford, where a High Church rabble are easily set to work by the well-paid and orthodox. His doctrines are sufficiently revolting, no doubt; but had he not bitterly assaulted the Churchmen, we suspect that personal violence would not have been resorted to. Absurd as this man's opinions are about election, grace, &c., they are nevertheless all to be found in the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England. He may have raved away, however, about God's Elect (some dozen or two) and the synagogue of Satan (the rest of mankind) had he not poured out his wrath upon "learned and spiritual Divines" and averred that, "so far as their spiritual state is indicated by their writings, Paley and Watson were as thorough unbelievers as Thomas Paine. Both appear to have been void of even the faintest knowledge of the elementary truths of the Gospel, viz. Man's entire and unqualified apostacy from his Creator, and the clear consequent necessity of regeneration, in order to capacitate the creature for spiritual life." And again: "Amidst all the gorgeousness of our Church Establishment, and the less ostentatious but not less sordid zeal of variously denominated Dissenters, the population of Great Britain is sunk into Heathenism, as absolute as that of China or Hindustan." This was not to be endured in the very headquarters of Episcopacy, so the enemy was to be subdued, not by humility, long suffering, turning the left cheek, &c., but by the more active virtues of mud and other convincing missiles, aided by the sedative qualities of Thames water. In Mr. Mulock's estimation, the Methodists are quite as corrupt as the Orthodox. He says, "The religion of the Methodists have wholly succeeded in placing sensation in the room of spirituality. They have contrived what may be termed convulsive Christianity – a system of sighs, groans and sensual impulses, to supersede the glorious Gospel faith. Looking through the annals of Methodism, the Christian cannot fail to notice the subtlety of Satan in thus seasonably providing a substitute for Popery in the hour of its decline. Methodism retains everything of Popery but its gorgeousness and its ritual observances. The same depraved deference to human authority, in things spiritual, stamps it the religion of a corrupt nature. Then Wesley, Whitefield, Coke, Fletcher, etc., etc., each and all of them unacquainted with the rudiments of divine truth, serve them instead of Popes and Councils. Evangelical Religion is Church Methodism, and must therefore be deprecated by every faithful follower of Jesus – It is Methodism insinuated into vicarages and curacies, *"taking the oversight thereof for filthy lucre."* This is not ill said; and if this new teacher possesses talent and courage, and it seems he is not deficient in either, he will soon, aided as he is by persecution, become a leader of no small note. The followers of the God Molock used to pass through fire in this world, to obtain everlasting bliss in the next; the hearers of the preacher Mulock are assured, that never-ending tortures await all but a few select vassals of grace! Barbarous as it were the institutions of the "horrid God," as Milton calls him, the doctrines of the Oxford Teacher appear to us to be still more revolting to reason and humanity. What with the Ranters, the Bryanites, the Southcotians, the Methodists, the Mulockites, and Antimonians, and the Athanasians – the people of England may well talk of themselves as "most enlightened and thinking!" It is not a little singular, too, that all these religionists profess to be only true disciples of Jesus, whose chief precepts were "to do as you would be done by," and above all things, "to love one another." Verily, it is a pleasant mode of calling forth the benevolent feelings, to assure men that God will everlasting gly burn all those who cannot believe in the efficacy of ranting and shaking – in the incarnation of the modern Shiloh – the saving grace of beard wearing and mutilation – the consoling doctrine of election – or the rational creed of the Trinitarian Saint! The *Taunton Courier* says, "Mr. Mulock, who has so unhappily been distinguished at Oxford, is a gentleman of very considerable attainments, and has been, through life, patronised by Mr. Canning, (to which Mulock took offence, see above) purely from the respect and admiration due to his abilities. Mr. Mulock's father lately resided in this town, and we know that it was a source of much uneasiness to him, that his son's fine talents and well founded expectations of success in life should be annulled by the fanatical perverseness of understanding to which he has resigned himself. Mr. Mulock was a member of Magdalene Hall, Oxford. He has published several religious works."^{lxxii}

Later *The Examiner* published a fuller account, taken from an Oxford paper:

Riot, Oxford:

A Mr. Mulock commenced preaching in Oxford about twelve months since, in a public auction room. He had a previous acquaintance with Mr. Hunt, a chemist, who invited him to Oxford, and soon gained him

another disciple, in the person of a young gentleman of considerable academic acquirements. The young man heard Mr. Mulock and Mr. Hunt, became a convert to their dark doctrines, struck his name from the college books, and fixed himself as a dependent on his father – for such he must remain, unless he becomes an itinerant preacher. Soon after, another young man, terrified by the horrid threats held out in the discourses of the *soi disant* sole teacher of the Gospel, became his follower. He is the son of Mr. Arnott, one of the Clarendon readers. The three persons abovementioned are the leading members of Mr. Mulock's communion, since his return to Oxford, where he has gained few converts, except amongst the most ignorant classes, but his preaching has produced much evil. An honest and industrious workman, in possession of some little property, who had lived happily with his wife and family for fifteen years, has been induced to desert them, from a conviction that he should not hold a communication with the flesh, - with the reprobate, with those doomed to eternal perdition – (his wife would not become a follower of Mr. Mulock). The separating of wives from husbands and children from parents, which evidently proceeded from the preaching of the leader, and from the terrific persuasions of his followers, at length aroused public indignation. Thursday evening last, a scene of extraordinary riot and confusion took place in St. Thomas's parish; a report having been circulated that Mr. Mulock had induced several men to leave their wives because they would not conform to the new creed which their husbands had adopted. A vast concourse of men, women and children collected in front of a house in which the new sect was assembled, and commenced hostilities by making a bonfire of wet straw, in order to *smoke them out*; they then assailed the house with the most discordant sounds of tin kettles, horns, etc., etc., and after some time succeeded in dislodging them; when in their retreat, they were attacked with every species of missile, and several times rolled in the dirt. Two of the party took shelter in the Town Hall yard, in a most deplorable condition, their coats being nearly torn off their backs, and their persons completely covered with mud and filth of every description. On their leaving the Town Hall yard, they were again hooted and pelted with mud until they effected their escape. We think it necessary, by way of conclusion to this paragraph, to give, for the perusal of our readers, a clause from Blackstone's Commentaries, book iv chap 4 – "Of offences against God and religion: A seventh species of offenders in this class are all *religious imposters*: such as falsely pretend an extraordinary commission from Heaven, or terrify and abuse the people with false denunciations of judgements. These, as tending to subvert all religion by bringing it into ridicule and contempt, are punishable by the temporal courts with fine, imprisonment and infamous corporal punishment."^{lxxiii}

Following the incident at Oxford, reported as it was in many newspapers throughout the land, one editor took the bother, if such it was, to read and deliver a summary of the views Mulock held, published in the work 'The Divine Truth.' This, the editorial opinion averred, presumably contained the doctrine that Mulock pursued: but here let me quote from the paper itself, with its piquant style and intimations perhaps as equally relevant today:

"In this work, which is most forcibly written and which, we presume, contains the doctrine which he had been preaching at Oxford, we see nothing to justify the animosity which has been manifested against him. We should suspect that he is no great admirer of the system which allots so very disproportionate a share of the good things of this world, to those whose business it is to assist us in preparing for the next, - that he has some scruples as to the propriety of quickening the passage through this earthly vale of two or three hundred thousand miserable Irish peasants, to enable a Bishop to kill himself in a few years with good cheer, and yet leave half-a-million behind him – that he does not in the truly orthodox manner, take a hint from the lawyers, and view all these Scriptural doctrines, the observance of which might be attended with some inconvenience, especially to men in the enjoyment of rich livings, as so many fictions. But we do not exactly see why he should be crucified on this account. He may be wrong in his theology – he may be too sincere – he may disapprove of making religion a stalking horse for knavery, but that is no good reason for setting the mob on him. We are willing to admit that a man who preaches on the subject of "distressing vicissitudes and invidious inequalities of property," and of the "responsibility attached to riches" will never make a good churchman, or a good politician (for the practice of the churchman and the theory of the politician are quite in accordance), and we can very well understand how a churchman with £5,000 a-year should dislike being told that he holds his wealth in trust for the necessitous; but surely, this is no good reason for *smoking out* the holder of the heresy."^{lxxiv}

Mulock's involvement in the local affairs of the Potteries also embraced the touchy subject of master and servant. Ginders and company was an earthenware factory at Lane Delph, Staffordshire, and in December 1825, a part of the work force went absent from their employment, due to a 'union decision'- one that had been accepted by a number of other manufacturers - that only specific sizes of items should be manufactured. Ginders, who had his own opinion on the matter and reserved the right to manufacture as he thought fit, was unwilling to be 'bullied' into

submission, and appeared before magistrates at Betley, at a meeting that was held to determine claims for relief made by various workmen adversely affected by the strike. It so happened that the work force employed by Ginders had individually entered into a voluntary contract that was held by the magistrates to be equally binding on all parties, and that no *judicial* cognizance could be taken of the situation that had arisen, but following that ruling there followed an impartial inquiry into the circumstances of the matter, during which Mr. Ginders to avoid giving the appearance of urging his side of the argument, requested Thomas Mulock, who had attended the hearing with Ginders, to detail the principal points that he wished to put forward. Mulock did so, with his customary eloquence, explaining that the present instance was *“an attempt to embarrass or intimidate Ginders into a compliance with certain regulations respecting the size and count of earthenware which other manufacturers thought proper **nominally** to adopt, but which Mr. Ginder in the exercise of his judgment as an independent trader, refused to become a party to. Whether those regulations might, or might not, be good in themselves, was a question which Mr. Ginder left to those who approved of them: he contented himself with simply declining to associate with any set of men for the furtherance of what he considered to be an undue interference with his freedom of trade.”* On this refusal to accede to what were termed the ‘union sizes,’ his throwers – hired to make the old and accustomed sizes – absconded from their service. Mulock then averred it *“to be a matter of notoriety, that the throwers were instigated to break their contracts by certain manufacturers, who, in their blind zeal to establish their own projects, condescended to become the suborners of revolt and treachery among the hired servants of brother traders.”* The meeting was said to have concluded with satisfaction being expressed at a proposal of Mulock’s: *“If, as is rumoured, a bill is to be prepared for regulating the manufacture of earthenware, Mr. Ginder must necessarily submit to its provisions if passed into law; but why should his business be molested, and his property seriously injured, because he refuses to submit interveningly to the blundering legislation of a Pottery parliament, presuming to shackle interests which the wisdom of the imperial senate has hitherto left at perfect liberty.”*

Whether everybody concerned was satisfied is another matter, nevertheless Ginders and Company obtained warrants against those workmen who had failed to honour their contract, and William Bagnall, one of the Throwers concerned, appeared before magistrates at Betley on Friday, 23rd December 1825, and was sentenced to three months hard labour in the house of correction.^{lxxv}

During 1825 Mulock had also extended his rhetorical range, in distance if not in volume, by association with a congregation of Methodists at Oakengates, the relationship embracing a period of some six months, and also at Chester, where his connection with the group lasted for a period of eighteen months.^{lxxvi}

-
- ⁱ 'The Reades of Blackwood Hill, in the parish of Horton, Staffordshire,' Aleyn Ryall Reade.
- ⁱⁱ 'Thomas Mulock: an historical sketch,' Elihu Rich.
- ⁱⁱⁱ 'Thomas Mulock: an historical sketch,' Elihu Rich.
- ^{iv} Morning Chronicle, 8th May, 1812.
- ^v Liverpool Mercury, 24th March 1815.
- ^{vi} Gore's 'Directory of Liverpool, 1816.' I am indebted to Randle Knight for the reference.
- ^{vii} Liverpool Mercury 13th December 1816.
- ^{viii} 'Memorials of Liverpool, volume 2, page 17,' Picton.
- ^{ix} Gentleman's Magazine, May 1815.
- ^x Bedlam was a lunatic asylum in London.
- ^{xi} 'Citizen' the French Revolution was fresh in virtually everybody's memory at the time.
- ^{xii} See 'The Autobiography of William Jerdan, volume 2, pages 130-153.'
- ^{xiii} London Gazette 28th November 1818.
- ^{xiv} Now Hertford College.
- ^{xv} Notes and Queries June 22nd 1901.
- ^{xvi} Liverpool Mercury, 17th April 1818.
- ^{xvii} Liverpool Mercury, 27th August 1819, The Scott Magazine, 2nd November 1819.
- ^{xviii} 'Old Newcastle,' T. Pape. See also a letter to John Murray, 'Between Two Worlds, Byron's Letters and Journals,' Leslie Marchand, volume 7.
- ^{xix} Liverpool Mercury, 10th March, 1820.
- ^{xx} See Rich; Literary Gazette, December 1820, pages 765/766,781,796/797. If my memory does not play tricks I believe that one of these letters also appeared in a publication 'The Poetry of the Anti Jacobin,' a copy of which was in my possession but disposed of to a charity shop when my wife insisted that I had a 'clear out' of books. I had completely forgotten the article until memory was jogged by recently re-reading the letter.
- ^{xxi} The Literary Gazette, 6th February 1819.
- ^{xxii} Bibliotheca Staffordshire, Simms.
- ^{xxiii} See World Wide Web Bryn Mawr College Seymour Adelman Special Letters Collection.
- ^{xxiv} The Literary Gazette, Saturday, September 9th 1820.
- ^{xxv} Bryn Mawr College Seymour Adelman Special Letters Collection.
- ^{xxvi} Lalla Rookh, a collection of Oriental sentimental tales in verse – see Saintsbury, 'A History of English Literature.'
- ^{xxvii} Byron's Letters to Thomas Moore, 9th December 1820.
- ^{xxviii} The Morning Chronicle, 5th April, 1821. Mr. Matthews was Byron's publisher.
- ^{xxix} Liverpool Record Office 920/ROS/2786, 920/ROS/2785, 920/ROS/2633.
- ^{xxx} 'Thomas Mulock: an historical sketch,' Elihu Rich.
- ^{xxxi} 'Thomas Mulock: an historical sketch,' Elihu Rich.
- ^{xxxii} Staffordshire Advertiser 16th February 1822.
- ^{xxxiii} Staffordshire Advertiser 1822.
- ^{xxxiv} 'Directory of Primitive Methodist Ministers and their Circuits,' W. Leary.
- ^{xxxv} Leeds Records Office: WYL887/46/1.
- ^{xxxvi} Leeds Records Office: WYL887/46/2.
- ^{xxxvii} Leeds Records Office: WYL887/46/2.
- ^{xxxviii} Leeds Records Office: WYL887/46/3.
- ^{xxxix} Leeds Records Office WYL887/46/4.
- ^{xl} *Backhouse was Canning's private secretary. Leeds Records Office WYL887/46/5.
- ^{xli} Leeds Records Office WYL887/46/6.
- ^{xlii} Leeds Records Office WYL887/46/7.
- ^{xliii} Leeds Records Office WYL887/46/9.
- ^{xliv} Leeds Records Office WYL887/46/10.
- ^{xlv} Leeds Records Office WYL887/46/11.
- ^{xlvi} Leeds Records Office WYL887/46/12.
- ^{xlvii} Leeds Records Office WYL887/46/13.
- ^{xlviii} Leeds records Office WYL/46/13; 'Catalogue of Engraved British Artists in the British Museum,' Henry Hake, volume 6, page 461.
- ^{xlix} Leeds Archives WYL887/46/1-13.
- ^l Pottery Mercury and Staffordshire and Cheshire Advertiser 14th January 1824.
- ^{li} Pottery Gazette 17th January 1824, Pottery Mercury and Staffordshire and Cheshire Advertiser 21st January 1824.
- ^{lii} Reade, 'Quotes and Queries, June 29th 1901.
- ^{liii} Pottery Mercury and Staffordshire and Cheshire Advertiser 3rd November 1824.

-
- ^{liv} Bibliotheca Staffordshire, Simms. The Cambridgeshire Chronicle and Huntingdonshire Gazette, 28th January, 1825.
- ^{lv} See Mitchell.
- ^{lvi} 'Old Newcastle' T. Pape.
- ^{lvii} See Rich and Reade. The reverend David Thom, was a Baptist minister at Liverpool but was removed from office circa 1826, his supporters then obtained a new chapel for him at Bold Street that opened in 1828. Thom later described himself as a Universalist.
- ^{lviii} Pottery Mercury & Staffordshire and Cheshire Advertiser 11th May 1825.
- ^{lix} Bakewell was the proprietor of a lunatic asylum at Spring Vale.
- ^{lx} Pottery Mercury and Staffordshire and Cheshire Advertiser, 11th May 1825.
- ^{lxi} See above.
- ^{lxii} Regrettably I do not have a copy of the letter.
- ^{lxiii} See above.
- ^{lxiv} Pottery Mercury and Staffordshire and Cheshire Advertiser, 18th May 1825.
- ^{lxv} See above.
- ^{lxvi} Staffordshire Advertiser 16th 23rd July 1825;
- ^{lxvii} Pottery Mercury and Staffordshire and Cheshire Advertiser 20th July 1825.
- ^{lxviii} See Rich.
- ^{lix} Staffordshire Advertiser 29th October, 3rd December 1825. See also the Oxford Herald 1825, Northampton Mercury 15th October 1825.
- ^{lxx} Staffordshire Advertiser 29th October, 3rd December 1825..
- ^{lxxi} See above.
- ^{lxxii} *The Examiner* October, 1825, page 662.
- ^{lxxiii} *The Examiner* October, 1825, page 667
- ^{lxxiv} The Morning Chronicle, Wednesday 12th October, 1825.
- ^{lxxv} Public Records Office HO 44/15 f69; Staffordshire Advertiser 17th 24th December 1825. For an account of the Ginders family and concern see 'Fragility and Resilience in a Middle Class Family, Jeremiah Ginders and his kin,' Alannah Tomkins, Staffordshire Studies vol. 13, 2001.
- ^{lxxvi} 'Directory of Primitive Methodist Ministers and their Circuits,' W. Leary.