3. 1840-1844:

In a letter dated 2nd January, 1840, written from Newcastle-under-Lyme, Thomas Mulock dutifully wrote to his mother informing her of his release from the Asylum, that having been discharged he had left Stafford at about 4.30 p.m. arriving at Newcastle a little before 7 p.m. there to be met by *"dear Dinah and the two boys,"* and that he was not allowing one day to pass before fulfilling his promise to write to his mother. To her were due the *"first fruits"* of his freedom.[i] With what suppressed trepidation might Thomas's wife have then faced the future?

At large again Thomas Mulock was soon putting pen to paper writing to the Poor Law Commissioners on the subject of the work force employed by pottery manufacturers, and this correspondence, or most of it, was then sent to the editor of the *Staffordshire Advertiser*. On the 17th March 1840, Mulock had written to the Poor Law Commissioners to pose the question whether *"labourers whose hiring is by virtue of annual contracts are, during the continuance of such contracts, entitled to claim parochial relief?"* There was a reasonably prompt reply from the Commissioners, on the 28th March, stating that before any opinion could be expressed it would be necessary for them to see a copy of the typical contract referred to. Mulock duly obliged, sending, on the 2nd of April, a copy of a contract under cover of another letter. By the 24th April the Commissioners responded to Mulock's question:

"Sir, The Poor Law Commissioners acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd instant, transmitting a form of agreement such as is usually entered into between master potters and their servants, and with reference to the enquiry contained in your former letter, whether a servant who had entered into an agreement of this nature, can, during its continuance, claim parochial relief, the Commissioners desire to state, that they consider the effect of the contract to be, that the master is at liberty to stop the employment and pay of the servant at any time, and to any extent; consequently the existence of the contract does not impose on the master any obligation to support the servant, and the servant must be relieved by the Guardians, if he becomes destitute during the existence of the contract.

George Coode, assistant secretary."

This reply gave Mulock opportunity to disagree, not perhaps so much with the opinion of the Commissioners as with the law of the country, a fact that he duly expressed with his customary courtesy:

"Gentlemen,

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th instant informing me that, with reference to a former communication of mine, inviting your consideration to the important point, whether the hired servants of potters, during the existence of their customary annual contracts, are legally entitled to claim parochial relief, your Board is of opinion that "the effect of the contract is, that the master is at liberty to stop the employment and pay of the servant at any time, and to any extent; consequently the existence of the contract does not impose on the master any obligation to support the servant, and the servant must be relieved by the Guardians, if he becomes destitute, during the existence of the contract."

I hope your Board will give me credit for the assurance, that, with great regret, though with all confidence, I entirely dissent from this construction of the law, which, in my view, would prove wholly subversive of the lawful relation of master and servant, and entail a burden on the payer's of poor rates which the Poor Law Amendment Act was designed to remove.

If the contracts referred to, plainly pledging the master to find (with reasonable and specified exceptions) employment and pay for their hired servants, be of non-effect, then it follows that such part of the contract as stipulates for the regular attention to the servant to his assigned work must also be void; but the latter is most certainly not the case in practice, for nothing is more common than the committal of potters' servants to prison for refusing or neglecting to work, and such convictions are founded upon the enforcement of the very contracts which your Board now distinctly declares to be inoperative.

As it appears to me that this anomaly should be cleared up, and as I have no reason to conclude that your honourable Board's opinion can have the force of a legal adjudication, I will, at my earliest convenience, submit the subject to more enlarged discussion; and to afford me full scope for my proposed publication, I wish to be informed whether any objection exists on the part of your Board to my giving publicity to the communications which I have held with the Poor Law Commissioners.

My rule is to afford the proper authorities every opportunity of arriving at a just conclusion upon any given subject connected with the due administration of the law; and in the failure of that result, to give the widest diffusion to the whole question previously and respectfully mooted.

I am, gentlemen, yours faithfully and respectfully,
Thomas Mulock

Sir, The Poor Law Commissioners, in reference to your letter of the 27th instant, desire me to observe, that you are right in supposing that the opinion of the Commissioners on the case you submitted to them, whether the hired servants of potters, during the existence of their customary annual contracts, are legally entitled to claim parochial relief, has no judicial authority whatsoever. The Commissioners have to add that you will use your own discretion in publishing the correspondence which has taken place between yourself and the Commissioners on the subject in question.

George Coode, assistant secretary.

On the 28th May 1840, Mulock delivered a lecture on the poetry of Lord Byron to the Newcastle-under-Lyme Literary and Scientific Society at its rooms in Merrial Street, Newcastle. Mulock's long absence, and the reason for it, must have been known to a great number of people in the area of the Potteries and the *Staffordshire Advertiser* appears to have sent a reporter to cover the event, when the room was so full that many people could not get in as there was not even room to stand; surely indicating that a great deal of curiosity existed about the lecturer:

"Mr. Mulock, on presenting himself, was received with a very marked manifestation of respect, which it would be in vain to attempt to describe. A still more difficult task would it be to pretend to report his lecture; his rapidity of utterance, his peculiarly characteristic eloquence, the great beauty of his readings, it were utterly impossible, adequately to portray.

The scope of Mr. Mulock's lecture was to open the intellectual character of Lord Byron, and to show forth what might be termed the *personality* of his *poetry* – how powerfully, yet painfully, he had succeeded in transforming his own individuality into his matchless strains. Mr. Mulock instituted a critical comparison between *ancient* and *modern* poetry, and sought to establish the pre-eminent superiority of modern bards in one order of excellence, that of contemplative power. This peculiar power of modern poetry Mr. Mulock ascribed to the indirect influences of Christianity, which the ancients were, of course, unblessed with. *"Over that intellectual world"* said Mr. Mulock, *"Which to them was without form and void, the spirit of Revelation dove-like sits brooding."* With reference to the allegations of infidelity, so hotly urged against Lord Byron, Mr. Mulock took a tone widely different from that adopted by theological censors. Mr. Mulock considered that a great portion of Lord Byron's poetry served to substantiate the truth of divine revelation. Lord Byron's disclosure of the inward suffering – the torturing thoughts – the restless wretchedness of his magnificent mind – drew us irresistibly to the conclusion, that Christianity affords the only balm for the sorrow stricken soul, and that without the Gospel, the most exalted intellectual gifts are fatal bestowments. Mr. Mulock, however, throughout his lecture, wholly disclaimed the desire of converting literary criticism into a vehicle for doctrinal disquisition, or polemical theology. Lord Byron's transcendent talents and extraordinary attainments must be viewed as they present themselves to our delighted perceptions. His exquisite classical taste – his evocations of the illustrious dead –his touching tenderness – his un-sating variety of illustration – these great literary perfections must not be overlooked or disparaged in order to gratify prejudices which can hardly be said to be associated with true religion.

Mr. Mulock was listened to throughout with the most intense interest and manifest delight, evinced by frequent applause.[ii]

Mulock's second lecture on Byron took place the following week, at the same venue, when it was reported:

"Mr. Mulock was listened to throughout with intense interest and *delight.* His extempore delivery – his singularly chaste and eloquent language, and rapidity of utterance, render it extremely difficult for us to convey, correctly, any portion of his lecture; we have endeavoured, however, to follow the order in which he treated his subject, and must apologise for this very imperfect notice:

"The lecturer commenced by a recapitulation of what he had advanced in his previous lecture, on the philosophical character of Byron's writings. He had considered Byron as being, in a very peculiar manner, the representative of a highly intellectual age. Byron came forth in one of the most extraordinary and stirring periods of the world's history; when men's minds were fevered with a preternatural excitement – seeking by means of their own devising, after unscriptural happiness and prosperity. The whole of the civilised world had been convulsed to her very centre. The ebb of European revolution had left men excited, but not exhausted. Wearied with unprofitable change, and

yet unfit for repose, could it be supposed, therefore, that a mind constituted like that of Lord Byron, possessing the most exuberant imagination and fancy, with an equal depth of thought and feeling, could be indifferent to the passing scene? No! Accordingly, he has registered in his matchless works, all that was most within and about him; he has portrayed in his poetry what he felt in his heart; he has exhibited with extraordinary truthfulness, all the various passions, and changes of passion, peculiar to the human heart. Apparently delighting in the delineation of a certain morbid exaltation of character and of feeling, he has embodied in his strains his own almost unutterable woes and inward sufferings; his mental anguish, and heartfelt torments. Truly his own mind is there laid bare; disclosed to us with all its vast richness, as well as its perverted greatness: but, let it be observed, exerting its power upon the corruptions and abuses of mankind. Byron never sympathises with guilt; he never advocates vice in any shape whatever; but rather, throughout the whole of his inimitable verse, he expresses his abhorrence of evil, and his love of good. In no part of his writings will there be found a direct attack upon religion, virtue or morality. Love, honour, and patriotisms are not mentioned merely to be scoffed at; and although he has given us inimitable yet truthful pictures of the worse as well as the better elements of which human life is composed – the purest of virtues, and the most odious of vices contrasted – a reference to his writings will satisfy any but the prejudiced mind, that Byron's muse has a far higher and noble aim than that of doing injury to virtue or to religion. It is said that Byron did not advocate Christianity. Nor does Christianity require his advocacy; or that of any other man. It is far above the reach of mortals; and if Byron had ever attempted to do injury to it, his arrow could never have reached it. Byron has, however, afforded us an assurance of his faith in Christ. In a note to the 15th canto of Don Juan, he says, "As it is necessary in these times to avoid ambiguity, I say that I mean by 'Divine Still,' Christ. If ever God was man, or man God – he was him." Then, again, it may be said, that he did not live the life of a Christian. Let the answer be, *Who does?* Take the man from his works, and ask after all, what are the bad things we know of him? He was not the profligate which Scandal, with her thousand tongues, whispers abroad and malignity joyfully believes and repeats. No. Truth and justice ordain us to declare that Byron was not the demon-like character which Cant and Hypocrisy represent him. In all his works you will find strains of pure feeling – touches of tenderness – sympathy with the sorrowful and the oppressed, and at least the indirect (which is the utmost the poet is allowed) inculcation of truth and virtue."[iii]

Mulock's wife, Dinah, upon the death of her mother, Mrs. Mellard, had come into possession of additional financial assets and with Thomas freed from confinement, the family moved to London in the autumn of 1840, perhaps with the thought that a fresh start could be made and that there Thomas might find a suitable outlet for his undoubted talents. Mulock now had influence, though not control, over his wife's inheritance (before Thomas was discharged from the asylum her share of the residue of her father's estate had wisely been vested in two trustees as a safeguard for her interests, presumably by the influence of her relations or advisors in apprehension lest should Thomas should demolishing them; an action about which Thomas, at a later date, expressed annoyance).[iv] The family settled at 4 Earl's Court Terrace - it was their fourth place of residence in a very short time - and Mulock was able to settle on a life style nearer to his fancy, establishing, amongst other contacts, a friendship with Charles James Matthews, a noted actor of the day, then manager of the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, and his wife, the former Madam Vestris; an association that afforded, now and then, the opportunity for Mulock and his family to enjoy the delights of the theatre.[v] Daughter Dinah also had the opportunity to walk through the crowded streets of London with her father, and take in the hubbub of life; she studied French, Italian, Latin and also practised singing with the daughter of the dramatist Sheridan Knowles, with whom Mulock was friendly. Thadeus Connellan, another of Mulock's friends, gave her instruction in Irish. Dinah also attended the Government School of Design at Somerset House, where she was taught drawing by a Mrs. MacIan. The eldest son, Thomas, was put to studying painting, and appears to have been considered a very good prospect; while the younger son, Benjamin, embarked upon the ambition to be a civil engineer.[vi]

It would seem that either during his confinement in the asylum at Stafford, or perhaps shortly after his discharge,[vii] Mulock wrote the following verse, a copy of which he sent to William Salt at Stafford - perhaps the same gentleman after whom the celebrated Stafford Library is named, whose London address was near to where Mulock lived and who may have been visiting Stafford at the time. The circumstance that had brought about Mulock's ire (and humour) was a bazaar held at St. Mary's Church, Stafford, for the purpose of raising funds towards the founding of Christ Church (initially a chapel of ease to St. Mary's),[viii] on a site opposite to the south-west corner of the prison. In a note accompanying the verse Mulock wrote:

*"I send you a **jieu d'espirit** on the bazaar – if the Reverend Rector[ix] should think it hits too hard, he will, I know benignantly ascribe it to 'aberrations of mind!"*

The church of our fathers they say is in danger
Since papist O'Connell presumed to arrange her,
She's losing her bishops, her tithes, and her rates,
And Spring-Rice talks of letting her sacred estates.

As for doctrines, ‘tis owned by the friends of the church
That the priesthood have long since left them in the lurch;
Even wedlock now wants not a parson to splice,
For the registrar pops off the job in a trice,
Without mention of God, which set folks on their tenters
And highly displeased conscientious dissenters.
In baptism and burial we ‘go the whole hog,’
And good Christians will soon be interred like a dog.
In this gloomy condition much scheme has been started,
To solace the church for her glory departed;
But of champions the chief to restore and protect her
None have stood in the gap like the old Stafford’s grave rector.
According to Chalmers,[x] free trade in Christianity
Is a manifest token of hopeless insanity.
But doctors will differ – so Coldwell[xi] combines
Evangelical truth, which religion refines,
With the shop-keeping mania proceeding so far
That the church of our fathers is now a bazaar.
Those who bought and who sold in the Temple, ‘tis known,
Once were chased from its precincts, their stalls overthrown.
But Coldwell much wiser, lures traders within
And whips them not out, but is chief whipper-in.
To build up *his* temple all ranks he must rally
Till the church he converts into Cranbourne Alley
First catch a young duchess[xii] renowned for humility
Behind a shop counter, who hides her nobility;
Then implore all the peeresses spread through the county
To aid in a plan of the least costly bounty.
Their half-faded finery – royalty’s rags –
Any trifle will do to fill clerical bags,
And if ladies will properly puff at the counter
Tho’ the church be sore fallen will quickly re-mount her,
So send all your samplers, worst tuckers, and bibs,
They’re sure to go off with the countess’s fibs;
Vamp up your old slippers – fetch retired reticules.
Bring out the past covers of hearthstones and stools.
Fashion’s cast off, knickernackeries furbished anew,
Will draw pence from the pocket of Gentile and Jew!
What next? That the Gospel may give satisfaction
Let us choose the law courts for the scene of our action,
And to decorate fitly the grim looking halls
No man like our gaoler for *hanging the walls.*[xiii]
The church of our fathers, believe me was founded
By men in the truth of the scriptures well grounded,
Their temples when wanted were builded and paid for
No titled shop women’s assistance was prayed for
When money was wanted, ‘twas money they gave,
Without dirty devices their money to save
They called and religion replied to the call
Without paltry perversion of counter and stall.
The church of our fathers for worship was meant,
The church of their children to Mammon seems lent,
Thus the liberal make and the covetous mar,
Till the temple of Jesus becomes a bazaar!

By now settled in London, in early November 1840, Mulock wrote to Lord Hatherton (the former Sir Edward Littleton), of Teddesley Hall, Staffordshire, advising him of a pamphlet that he (Mulock) had written and seeking Hatherton’s aid in respect of any anecdotes that he might possess in respect of the late George Canning:

My Lord,

There will be published tomorrow (Saturday) by all London booksellers, a pamphlet written by me which I wish your lordship to see. It is intitled 'England's threatened war with the World.'

I would gladly send your lordship a copy, or a score of copies for acceptance, but that my objects – public and personal – would best be promoted by your Lordship ordering the little work from your own bookseller.

By the way I have been influenced to write for an Edinburgh periodical of note – a series of papers intitled 'Recollections of the late George Canning in his public career and private life.' I do not think that anything like justice has been done to Mr. Canning's memory. I have done my best to supply the deficiency. The two first print papers are now in Edinburgh. They reach to the Addington administration – and I am pursuing my congenial tone. Can your Lordship (need I say ***can*** *for no one could do it more effectively) supply me with any authentic statement of Canning's miscellaneous pieces in prose and poetry or in short any hints casting light upon the memory of him who when living was all light? Mr. Backhouse I have applied to but he has intentions of authorship himself at some distant day.*[xiv]

Hatherton duly replied and judging from Mulock's gratified response, supplied interesting material. Mulock, however, had by now determined to turn his articles on Canning into that of a full biography having withdrawn the manuscript from the periodical for which it had been intended (that is of course, unless the editor of the paper, for whatever reason, had decided – or been prevailed upon - that the material was unsuitable) and, with the decision to enlarge the work, now wished to dedicate it to Hatherton:

'My Lord, 18th November 1840.

I wish to assure you how deeply I am gratified, and how beneficially I am informed by your Lordship's truly obliging letters. They contain much curious personal knowledge of Mr. Canning which (with your kind permission) I can turn to excellent account.

I was aware that little intercourse of a private or friendly nature had subsisted between Lord Wellesley and Mr. Canning – though I have myself heard Mr. Canning speak in the highest terms of his Lordship. I remember an expression of Lord Wellesley with reference to one of the many ministerial overtures – "was he to consider himself in the suite of Mr. Canning," which gave me to conceive that some jealousies were, at the time, fomenting in the breasts of the two eminent men. But I might have been mistaken.

I knew Mr. Huskisson well and at one period corresponded with him. He was exactly what you say, the businessman of lead, whether in or out of office, and I always considered him as a sort of intellectual purveyor for Mr. Canning. I will do my best to convey my high estimate of Mr. Huskisson's merits.

Your anecdote of Mr. Canning's conduct during the interregnum at the Foreign Office is indeed honourable to his memory. I hope you will allow me to make use of it. I had a letter from Mr. Canning when he was appointed Governor-General of India and I could trace in the tone of it, his reluctance to leave England. I agree with you that our Oriental Empire was no mean sphere of action for Canning, but it was not a suited one. The gorgeous barbarism of India would not have satisfied a mind so long exercised with European refinements. The triumphs of the senate – the celebrity gained in still more popular assemblies. Mr. Canning's heart would have hankered after the hustings – even when 'sole sir' of the eastern world. His passion was for acquiring and maintaining a mental ascendancy over free men and Hindustan would, in his view, have been relegation from all dignified usefulness – to a scene of slavery.

Had you, allow me to ask, much communication with Mr. Canning in 1827 during his brief premiership? Is it true that he disclosed to George 4th his inward intention of resorting to the Whigs if the Tories proved restive and that the King by his abrupt discovery of Canning's design caused the sudden resignation en masse of the magnates in the cabinet who resented his proposed proceeding? Nothing of this can be clearly collected from the Parliamentary debates of the day – in which the point most needing explanation is carefully concealed.

Finding that my materials increase, and that the subject is really a fruitful and agreeable one, I have withdrawn my manuscript already completed from the periodical where it was meant to appear and the whole of my papers will be thrown into a substantive volume which a London publisher of wealth and probity desires to have from me as soon as it is possible. If therefore your kindly feelings and excellent judgement shall combine to furnish me with any further details concerning our illustrious men pray do so. From Mr. Backhouse – you will readily infer from the enclosed note

– I have nothing to expect; and if he encourages the least expectation of becoming Mr. Canning's biographer himself it would be unfair to encroach upon his store of information.

I met more than once, the present Lord Haddington, at Gloucester Lodge (which by the way presents itself in all its loneliness as I now look from my own window) I think his Lordship and other friends of Mr. Canning would feel inclined to aid me in my undertaking – although I must not calculate upon meeting such cordial responsiveness to my request as I have experienced from Lord Hatherton!

I do not wish to task you upon many special points – but should prefer your Lordship jotting down what came within the sphere of your personal knowledge. Such reminiscences have a peculiar raciness.

The Duke of Wellington has written to me, and takes an interest in my pamphlet – so have kind Earl Talbot and my old friend Sir Fowell Buxton and Croker and others of some note. But I find very few persons who believe that we are actually at war – most people consider our present operations very much as the Cockney's view a sham fight. But 'ere long matters will be seen in a more serious light.

With renewed acknowledgements for your great considerate kindness to me, I have the honour to be, with great respect, your Lordship's obedient and obliged servant.

Thomas Mulock.

I will give you the title of my work:

'Recollections of the late Right Honourable George Canning in his public career and private life; interspersed with sketches of some of his most distinguished contemporaries.'

Heaven doth with us, as we with torches do;
Not light them for themselves; for if our virtues
Did not go forth of us, 'twere all alike
As if we had them not – spirits are not finely touch'd
But to fine issues!
Meas. For Meas. Act 1, Scene 1.

Would you have any objection to my inscribing the work to your Lordship in the shape of a short preliminary letter? I owe you acknowledgement for what you have already done."[xv]

Mulock's article on the threatened war with the world, the underlying theme of which was to urge the conduct of the nation along Christian principles, may not have stirred many hearts but it was noticed by the *Staffordshire Gazette*, which observed that in dealing with the China Question and the War Question, the author had placed his readers in a more advantageous position for viewing the real bearings of the several great matters of dispute. Mulock had commented:

"We are to all appearance, on the verge of a war, ore tremendous in its aspect than any with which nations have hitherto been desolated, and a war, too, for which the most argumentative. Prosy, protocoling dabblers in diplomacy, cannot assign even an ***unreasonable*** *cause."* Further quotations from Mulock's article were included: *"We have no hesitation in affirming the war with China to be the product of English commercial covetousness. No national interests were at stake – no national honour was in jeopardy- no political punctilio was transgressed; and we have chosen to quarrel with a great empire because British smugglers, under the name of merchants, had the hardihood to brave the displeasure of a despot, who in a freak of benevolence, resolved that foreigners should not make millions by selling poison to his subjects."*

The editor of the newspaper recommended the article to whoever could afford it, concluding: It speaks a sober and matured mind for its author; one who has evidently had opportunity for observation, and deep research.[xvi]

Stanzas on the birth of the Princess Royal[xvii] written by Dinah Maria Mulock, aged 14, had been sent to the *Staffordshire Advertiser* 'by a correspondent' at the time of the Princess's birth, under cover of a letter dated 22nd November 1840, and appeared in that newspaper in January 1841.[xviii] The correspondent in question was Dinah's father to whom she had given the poem 'to do what he liked with,[xix]' and another poem by Dinah appeared in an issue of the

paper in April, coinciding with that of a contribution from Thomas Mulock (given here), entitled *'Lines written on recollecting an evening view of Mont Blanc from the opposite shore of the Lake Geneva'*

'I have not wandered with unheeding eye
'Midst nature's marvels; I have sought to blend
My mind with what I gazed on, and to pry
Into the hidden worth of charms that lend
A loveliness to earth. My soul would rend
The cloud that veils our vision, and behold
The inward grace and glory that transcend
Our farthest thought of beauty, see unrolled
Creation's page, and mark what truths are brightly told!

And never did here meet my gladdened glance
A wonder more awakening than the sight
Of that cloud-mingling mountain, on which dance
The dying splendours of the sunset light
That gilds the glowing west. The icy height
Seems crown'd with roses; momently they fade
As deeper sinks the daystar, but his flight
Flings hues more tender still than first arrayed
The enskyed snows which here a heavenly hand hath laid!

And now those tints are vanished, with the rays
That gave them borrowed being, and now crowd
Before us the pale vapours; day decays
More palpably; a cold uncoloured cloud
Spreads sadly o'er the giant crag a shroud
Dimensionless. The evening shadows fall
And find us still to contemplation vowed;
For death hath darkened o'er us, and the pall
Of our own pensive thoughts at length envelopes' all!'

Mulock added an explanatory note: *"Rousseau, the warbler of poetic prose, and Lord Byron, the Prince of poets, have anticipated me in noticing the couleur de rose which blooms over the summit of Mont Blanc for a short time before the setting of the sun; but I do not think that either of them has stated the series of observable changes which I have attempted to delineate. Mont Blanc is capped with unyielding snows, and this clear white coronet is distinctly discerned; suddenly the peak reddens, and the dyes descend, becoming gradually deeper and fuller, until the whole perceptible portion of Mont Blanc is, to use Shakespeare's phrase, 'incardine.' For nearly twenty minutes this bright tinge presents itself with unaltered beauty to the eye, and then commences that change which I have sought to describe."*[xx]

At this time Mulock's association with Charles James Mathews led to a meeting with William Charles Macready, another noted actor of the day –then managing the Theatre at Drury Lane. Macready had fallen out with Mathews and Mulock, whether on his own initiative or by the persuasion of Mathews, had contacted Macready citing as introduction a previous meeting (of which Macready had no recollection) at the home of Mr. Young.[xxi] The purpose of this meeting was for Mulock to restore harmony to the Mathews/Macready's relationship; but it was a lost cause. The controversy between the two actors had arisen from Belvedere Boucicault, a potential playwright who used the pseudonym Lee Morton, having allegedly submitted a play to Madam Ventris at Covent Garden, who had it rejected following which it was submitted to Macready at Drury Lane. Macready having read the play - so went the story put about by the author, though perhaps in jest - agreed to accept it if it's best parts – the speeches of a woman – were transferred to the part that Macready would play. It was perhaps a poor jibe from a disappointed and frustrated author but Mathews having heard it spread the story throughout the profession, many of whose members were delighted to 'take the rise' from a by no means too popular Macready. Mulock visited Macready, who made clear that after what had passed Mathews had no claim on him whatsoever; the subject was discussed and Mulock left the house with Macready convinced that his injured feelings were understood, but having agreed to write to Mulock clearly expressing that he (Macready) did not allege that Mathews had originated the slander. Macready wrote as agreed the letter was sent to Mulock, who acting as go-between replied to Macready enclosing a letter from Mathews. This Macready indignantly would not read, annoyed that Mulock had even thought to enclose it. Whether Macready then returned the

letter to Mulock (which seems probable) is not clear but shortly afterwards Mulock again wrote to Macready who indignantly felt that Mulock had distorted the situation alleging that Macready assumed too much self-importance; and that he cherished an un-extinguishable hatred towards Mathews arising from envy of that man's professional success! This Macready determined was a letter that no person with any pretension to gentlemanly character could write and no gentleman could possibly receive, and promptly returned the letter by post. In a later comment Macready described Mulock as 'that old twaddle.'[xxii]

During the early part of 1841 Mulock renewed his correspondence with Hatherton on the subject of the proposed biography of Canning. Hatherton was by no means enthralled by Mulock's subject matter and in his journal recorded:

"Read for an hour a manuscript chapter of Mulock's intended Life of Canning – a total want of incidents about his life, but some wonderfully powerful writing in it on the public events of his time."[xxiii]

Hatherton appears now to seek to distance himself from the proposal to have the work dedicated to him suggesting instead Lord Seaford, the former Charles Ellis (who had been Canning's second in the infamous duel with Castlereigh) as a more appropriate person to receive the distinction. Mulock continued unabashed:

'My Lord, March 29th 1841.

I send your Lordship the rough draft of my 'Introductory letter' which you will read as an unpolished sketch – susceptible of much improvement – I hope your Lordship will not ask me to desist from my undertaking upon ***any*** *ground, save that of* ***possible*** *inconvenience to your lordship – for I feel now just as I did some months since that to no person whatever could I address a letter with more propriety concerning Mr. Canning than to Lord Hatherton.*[xxiv]

This was followed a few days later with another pointed address:

My Lord, April 3rd 1841.

Conceive my surprise on receiving this day a letter from an old attached political friend of Mr. Canning (to whom I had afforded the perusal of my 'Introductory letter to Lord Seaford) in which (former) there is the following passage:

"I doubt whether some of your expressions may not partake of the character of wormwood to Lord Seaford, whose politics are **now** so decidedly opposed to those which Mr. Canning adorned – though once in union with his!"

Will you excuse my enquiring of your lordship whether this quoted statement is correct in point of fact? If it be so, I shall feel it my duty to devote a few pages to the special consideration of this great epidemic change which seems to have come over the principles of public men.

I have just received a letter from Viscount Canning[xxv] *which is, in my opinion, not unremarkable for reverence to his father's memory. His lordship seems desirous to check instead of furthering my proposal for publication – and solely upon the ground of personal expediency – a plea which has no influence whatever with me – and so I have informed his lordship by return of post. On your lordship's return to town I will gladly show your lordship this somewhat curious correspondence.*

I have not as yet heard from the Marchioness of Clanricarde[xxvi] *– who still retains the portion of which your lordship perused.*

To which there was added a postscript:

P.S. If your lLordship should happen to meet Mr. Monkton, it would gratify me to be remembered to him as he showed me much kindness under peculiar circumstances.[xxvii]

Recalling Mulock's candid critical expression regarding Monkton, given in the published attack on the Staffordshire magistrates, it is not clear whether Mulock was engaging in sarcasm, though I think that doubtful; alternatively, Monkton, a Visiting Justice to both the Stafford prison and the Stafford asylum, may have given encouragement or advice during the time of Mulock's confinement in the asylum. However, the relationship, such as it was, between Hatherton and Mulock now appears to have taken a less cordial tone, Hatherton's acumen perhaps sensing

that it were better that greater distance should be between them, and having, however unintentionally, dropped Lord Seaford (then residing in Paris) into the mire, exchanged correspondence with his noble friend who had sought opinion regarding Mulock:

Paris, April 1841.

My dear Hatherton,

Many thanks for your details about Mr. Mulock. If he considers you to have abandoned Canning's principles I should consider him to be not by any means well qualified to give a fair and true account of Canning's political life. This, however, I have not thought it necessary to tell him in my answer to his letter, though I have said that in your answer to my reference you have "expressed yourself in terms of the highest praise and commendation as to his talents," and I have taken the liberty of quoting your opinion as concurring entirely with my own, that none of Canning's friends could, with propriety, in any degree, countenance such a publication, as he has in contemplation, without Lord Canning's sanction, and, as he states that he is already in communication with Sir Stratford Canning, and that he has submitted his manuscript to Lady Clanricarde, I must beg leave to decline any communication with reference to his work till I know what may be their opinion and wishes.

Seaford.

Hatherton's opinion of Mulock recorded in his private journal is clear:

"Letters – one to Mulock, who is quite mad, though no one could discover it from his works – his mind has about it much of that excitability which was so fearfully apparent in his idol Canning. There is great affinity in their minds."[xxviii]

Mulock persisted in his pursuit of a biography of Canning with another letter to Hatherton:

My Lord, April 8th 1841.

I acknowledge to the fullest extent the friendliness and frankness with which your lordship has responded to my natural and proper queries concerning Mr. Canning and his political connections – but I see at a glance that any further mention of the subject would be disagreeable to your lordship. I pledge myself to abstain from any additional trespass. What I asked respecting Lord Seaford arose out of ***your Lordship's suggestion that I should substitute Lord Seaford for your Lordship in my proposed introductory letter.*** *I find upon inquiry that if I were to assume Lord Seaford's adherence to Mr. Canning's political principles, I should be guilty of a great mistake – that's all. And I begin to perceive that my wisest course would be to address the said letter to Mr. Canning's statue near Westminster Abbey – I might look for a little permanence in* ***that*** *quarter – but not in the present race of politicians – who, however, are not accountable for their conduct to me.*

It is I assure your lordship a great relief to my mind that I am ***now*** *enabled to complete a life of Mr. Canning not only without the aid of Mr. Canning's family and reputed friends, but with the clear conviction that their contingent succour would do me more harm than good. This is perfectly explained in my correspondence with Viscount Canning and the Marchioness of Clanricarde – but as your Lordship expresses a repugnance to read it, I will of course comply with your Lordship's desire.*[xxix]

Lord Seaford upon whom now rested the dubious distinction of receiving Mulock's accolade of the 'Introductory Letter,' then wrote to Hatherton seeking assistance in avoiding the compliment and enclosed a letter from Mulock with a copy of (Seaford's) reply that expressed the opinion that any such publication, without regard for any feelings of the late politician's family and without sanction from that quarter, would be highly improper and unwarrantable. Seaford, in his letter to Hatherton, further said that he should have preferred not to reply to Mulock's letter, but felt unable to allow it to pass without notice, and did not wish to sanction by silence the addition of his (Seaford's) name to the introductory letter. Seaford added a postscript to the letter soliciting its return as he wished to show it to Lord Canning who was expected to pass through Paris shortly.[xxx]

Whatever disappointment Mulock suffered through Hatherton's disinclination to be farther prevailed upon, it did not prevent the submission of another letter in which, extolling Hatherton's political virtues and prospect of government office, Mulock was quick to offer advice, perhaps even support, upon Ireland:

My Lord, April 21st 1841.

*I perceive the public journals circulate the statement that your Lordship is to be offered the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland or some equally important office on this side of the water. I do not ask your Lordship to furnish me with any information upon the subject – but I think it right to reassure your Lordship that in the forthcoming volume of my Life of Canning (I have made a management to produce the **first** volume in August) I shall austerely abide by my pledge not to make any use of your Lordship's name, which might have the effect of exposing your Lordship to misconstruction.*

I have always been of opinion that the present government must be inclined to avail themselves of your Lordship's talents and usefulness if so no feelings of my own shall interfere with your Lordship's expressed wishes. I owe your Lordship this frank declaration of my intentions, because you treated me cordially and confidentially – let me also thank your Lordship for the flattering mention which (I find by a letter received recently from his Lordship) you made of me to Lord Seaford.

Should the Lieutenancy of Ireland be tendered for your Lordship's acceptance (and a very judicious arrangement would it be on the part of ministers) I hope your Lordship will not be deterred from taking office by any sense of the difficulty in governing Ireland. Admitting the increased labour and responsibility ("heavier toil, superior pain") of Irish rule, there would be no more real difficulty in governing Ireland than in presiding over the Brewood Union.[xxxi] *All that is required in government of men is **justice** which includes very subordinate principle of action – for **mercy** is not (as some wrongly suppose) an antagonist attribute – but **justice** in its milder exercise – Toryism in its sternest would infallibly drive Ireland into rebellion – therefore no wise man can contemplate the revival of such a system without grief and alarm. But neither can that shifting sway deserve the name of government which should truck to mob agitators and thus virtually renounce all reasonable rule for a moment's popularity.*

I write as an Irishman – wholly void of Irish prejudice and sensible of the vast importance of cementing the true union of Great Britain and Ireland. Dissolve that union and both nations will politically perish.

You will be glad to hear that by a most felicitous chance, I have obtained from some obscurer members of Mr. Canning's family – an invaluable mass of memorials of that illustrious man, and placed unreservedly at my disposal, letters (and many too) containing such proofs of his private worth, and the warmth of his domestic affections as will more illustrate his character than if I had all Lord Canning's family archives at my command.

*But I do not quarrel with Viscount Canning for withholding what he is possessed of – and I shall **dedicate** my work to his Lordship and prefix the 'Introductory Letter to Lord Seaford.' The latter has no claim upon me for exemption as your Lordship undoubtedly had.*

Yet again there was another postscript:

P.S. I have had a letter from the Marchioness of Clanricarde and an interview of three hours with Sir Stratford Canning, but I expected nothing and received nothing in the way of direct aid or countenance. Patronage would not be compatible with literary freedom.

*Have just received (Wednesday p.m.) the enclosed note from Lord Seaford to which my answer is appended – please return it – I have worded all mention that it was your Lordship who suggested the **substitution** very properly.*[xxxii]

Hatherton privately complained:

"Quantities of letters, some from that troublesome man Mulock and one from lord Seaford, begging my assistance to prevent him from addressing an 'introductory letter' in the prefix to his forthcoming work 'The Life and Times of Mr. Canning' and which contains remarks on 'Reform' which would appear intended as a satire on the principles and conduct of two-thirds of Mr. Canning's friends since his death."[xxxiii]

The concern expressed in regard to a publication of the life of Canning, and in particular the association of a specific person so that it might give rise to the thought that that individual approved, or gave some authority to the contents of the work, led Hatherton to write to Seaford, and it is clear from the letters that Hatherton in responding to Mulock's initial contact, had been exercising a gentlemanly response, that he now regretted and was aware of the volatility of Mulock's temperament:

April 24th 1841.

My dear Seaford,

Although having dug my own name out of Mulock's book with difficulty, I was most anxious to avoid further communication with him, I have not been asked to refuse you the services you desire. I have written to him to tell him my opinion that he has no right to address any letter to you against your wish and that I think you right to object: that it is not in his interest, if he persists in publication (which he will) to make enemies of Mr. Canning's family and friends – and have expressed my strongest hopes that he will comply with your desire. I must beg of you, however, not again to mention my name to him. He is so excitable that I am afraid of getting into a quarrel with him by letter, which would never end. He has afforded me a fair opportunity of saying what I have done to him, by having himself written to inform me of his determination to publish though he has no countenance from Mr. Canning's friends, and having mentioned in his letter the substance of the communications that passed between you and him.[xxxiv]

There was then a further letter from Seaford to Hatherton, in which a trace of exasperation can readily be found:

Paris, April 27th 1841.

My dear Hatherton,

Many thanks for your good offices with Mr. Mulock – though they have not been successful. I received a letter from him, on the same day with your last, and what he says, in reply to that part of my letter, in which I advert to his compliance with your request, is that he *"considers the cases completely different – that he complied with your wishes chiefly upon the ground of the personal friendship with which you have honoured him, and subordinately in connection with certain confidential communications which had entirely satisfied his judgement, but that I had assigned no sufficient reason why he should abstain from addressing to me, wholly relating to Mr. Canning, whose friendship I enjoyed, whose political principles I professed and to whose party I belonged."* And therefore he could not agree to forego the only advantages he was likely to desire from every knowledge of Mr. Canning.

To this letter I shall return no reply.[xxxv]

During 1841 Mulock published, priced 6d, an open letter to the Reverend John Hawker,[xxxvi] the minister of Eldad Chapel, Plymouth, a lengthy theological argument concerning the Holy Ghost, comprising some twenty-four octavo pages (that in deference to any possible reader of this article I will avoid inflicting upon him or her). The letter began:

"The ***good remembrance*** *which I sincerely cherish of your late excellent father, and the brotherly kindness which I am happy to entertain towards yourself, are united considerations which influence me to address you upon one of the most important subjects that ever engaged the solemn spiritual attention of the Church of Christ. I am through the Grace of God about to detect, lay open, and utterly refute one of the most grievous errors that has ever marred the progress and obscured the glory of the Blessed Gospel – for the error to which I refer has not come in the shape of heresy, against which the church might bear a continued truthful testimony – but in the more subtle and dangerous guise of an acknowledged Christian certainty, which called forth neither cavil nor controversy. This prevalent and universally subsisting error in past and present times, is contained in the assumption that it is an act of the Holy Ghost to convince believers in Jesus of sin – a position which upon the irrefragable authority of the Lord Jesus Christ and his holy apostles, I undertake with all confidence, entirely to deny and disprove. Upon this momentous theme, which is wholly supernatural and divine, I desire neither to receive nor impart any instruction save that which may be drawn from the Holy Scriptures – the living fountains of eternal truth. Nothing which bears the title of theology can afford me the slightest assistance, for as I have already intimated, preachers and teachers have unwittingly concurred in propagating the fearful fallacy which lies at the root of all perversions of Christianity – and which with the Lord's blessing and accompanying power, I now proceed to open up and overthrow."* The letter concluded: *"Nothing in my judgement, will more efficiently conduce to these glorious results, than such a dissemination of sound scriptural knowledge, concerning the office and operation of the Holy Ghost the comforter, as shall remove every stumbling block out of the way of the Lord's people and keep them from being bowed down, blinded and beguiled by the diabolical delusion that the Holy Ghost convinces believers of sin. It is a lying device of the devil, and it has been heedlessly propagated by good men who have failed to notice Christ's exposition of the two-fold office of the Holy Ghost towards the Church and the world respectively. To the 'faithful in Christ,' yea, to the weakest in faith, the Holy Ghost is, invariably, the Comforter; to the unbelieving world, whether the profane or the religious world, but particularly the latter, the Holy Ghost is declared by Christ to be the reprover of sin – 'because they believe not in me.'* (John XVI 9).[xxxvii]

At this time Mrs. Mulock was in poor health and in September, 1841, Mulock wrote to Mrs. Mayer at Dalehall, Staffordshire, to thank her for the concern she had expressed over his wife's health and for the hospitality extended to his daughter Dinah, on an occasion when Dinah had stayed with her, and how his daughter had expressed discontent with life ever since leaving the Staffordshire area:

Brompton, September 15th 1841.

Dear Mrs. Mayer,

Fully aware of the affectionate interest you take in our present domestic distress, I write a few lines to assure you that my dear Mrs. Mulock is getting over the crisis of her malady – that she suffers no acute pain – and, although feeble, has the enjoyment of refreshing rest and sufficient appetite. My confident belief is that she will ultimately derive great benefit from this sore trial. She desires her kindest love to you all as one of her most esteemed and faithful friends. What can we say in requital for your great and salutary kindness to our dear daughter? From time to time she has most pleasingly convinced us that she has lacked any ingredients of human happiness since her adjournment at Dalehall. When Mrs. Hyde is settled at home I have promised Maria shall visit her, but I know it will be a severe wrench to Maria's feelings to part from you all, with whom she has spent such pleasant hours, but we feel that our dear girl has trespassed over largely on your great hospitality. We desire our joint kindly remembrance to Mr. Mayer. Pray tell Mr. Mayer from me that there is a much stronger probability of an amicable interchange of commodities with France under the present government, and for this simple reason that the Whigs carried their speculative principles of Free Trade beyond what nations are inclined practically to sanction. But I must offer an apology for smuggling politics into a billet and remain, dear madam,

Yours most respectfully and respectfully,

Thomas Mulock[xxxviii]

There now came a further letter to Lord Hatherton:

June 30th 1842.

Dear Lord Hatherton,

In order to recreate my mind by varying the labour of preparing for publication my 'Life and Times of Canning,' I am engaged in conjunction with one of my oldest and most talented friends (Sheridan Knowles) in delivering lectures of which I enclose your lordship the syllabus – but Kensington is somewhat out of the range of London lovers of literature so that I did not venture to solicit your lordship's attention to the subject of our local lecturing.

So much interest has, however, been excited by the lectures, that it is suggested to us that if the course were repeated at the Hanover Square Rooms, at the hour of 2 p.m. and at a more aristocratic rate of admission (say half-a-crown) the speculation would in all likelihood be successful. All that we require as a preliminary is a few subscribers so as to justify us in hiring rooms of so unexceptionable a description. Now will you lordship with your wanted candour and manliness say whether you can or will give me any aid in this matter? My high estimate of the true dignity of literature totally forbids me from resorting to the ordinary arts by which men puff or intrigue themselves into notice, but honourable patronage is wholly different from that sort of favour which is conceded to obsequiousness.

The lectures (I can vouch for Knowles) are of the loftier cast than auditors commonly meet with and being entirely extempore, they awaken more interest. This might be urged upon your lordship's innumerable friends, or a portion of them. I never felt quite at ease about Canning's life until I resolved to proceed upon my own resources, and abstain from all personal solicitation to his surviving friends, who I perceived would, ***una voce,*** *follow the example of Viscount Canning – who plainly informed me that he wished for no published life of his father from any quarter. I quarrel not with his lordship's determination, but neither can he shake mine.*

The fact is, the ***only*** *information I wanted is abundantly supplied me, I mean as to Canning's* ***early history and that of his father.*** *All that I have obtained from the letters of Mrs. Hunn* (Canning's mother) *to her daughter – delightful letters too, and containing the most ample interesting and hitherto perfectly unpublished details – all of which I have included in my first volume now completed. I must exercise my own discretion, as all communication with Viscount Canning his lordship has rendered impracticable and I have no wish for it. I have also a great number of Canning's letters to the members of his family, springing from his mother's* ***third*** *marriage.*

It will rejoice you to learn that in all this information there's a light of loveliness upon Canning's character far beyond all his splendours as a statesman, orator and legislator – he shows himself continually one of the most amicable of men in all the relations of private life.[xxxix]

Quite how these proposed lectures succeeded, or were received, I am unclear, presumably - as Mulock turned to other ideas in respect of financial prospects - not very profitably. He did, however, seek support from persons other than Hatherton and days before writing to his lordship had written to Leigh Hunt (the editor of *The Examiner* who had printed material relating to Mulock's 'exploits' at Oxford back in 1825):

'My Dear Sir,

Consult your own convenience in being an auditor of "my bit of nonsense," as Winifred Jenkins says – but I must plead earnestly for your presence tomorrow evening, when I can promise you a right good lecture from our friend Sheridan Knowles – I am domiciled in this neighbourhood and must expect the proverbial treatment of 'prophets in their own country' – Knowles comes from the precincts of Bloomsbury and should receive a welcome stranger's greeting.

Apart from all estimate of his delightful literary labours, Knowles and I have been close and cordial friends for thirty-three years – just about the time when I first shook hands with another poetical worthy yclept Leigh Hunt – my introducer being Charles Young – So come and hear Knowles, even at the risk of bereaving me of one of my most intellectual auditors – when the Irish orators and oratory are to be discussed – or mangled.

Yours, my dear sir,
Very faithfully,
Thomas Mulock.

P.S. Surely you must have some gentlefolk in your vicinage, who would prefer a good lecture to sleight of hand, under the name of science – or a bad concert of quinzied vocalists.

Have you seen C. Mathews? He has just sent to me – but I visited him, where Byron and Moore once visited you.[xl]

In 1842 matters to do with Mrs. Mulock's inheritance came before the courts, Mrs. Mulock being a beneficiary and a trustee - subject to the interests of her mother, Mrs. Mellard - under the will of her late father.[xli] Perhaps this was for Mulock a frustrating experience and may, coupled with his experience of confinement in the Stafford Lunatic Asylum, have led him to become involved with the formation of a society in respect of heirs at law, 'A Society for the Protection of Alleged Lunatics, and for the assistance of those whose property was unjustly detained, and others." In this enterprise Mulock joined John Thomas Perceval (son of the late Spencer Perceval, assassinated whilst premier) and others, and an office for the Society was opened at Southampton Street.[xlii] The formation of this Society, though generally referred to as 1845, may have been earlier coming into being in the February of 1843. Mulock, from 14, Chatham Place, Blackfriars, wrote to his brother-in-law and former friend, Reade, defending the 'Heirs at Law Society' from allegations that it had been victimising its clients. Mulock, reputedly, was secretary of the Society. From this correspondence with Reade it would seem that the former troubles between the brothers-in-law had to some extent been patched up. Then at the end of the month or early in March there was a visit to Staffordshire, when Mulock stayed with a Mrs. Wilson at Barton. While there William Parker, widower of the third of the Mellard daughters, sent a carriage for Mulock who was taken to Lysways Hall near Lichfield, upon which he commented: *"A more delightful residence I have rarely seen, and I must say that Mr. Parker's establishment is very complete and respectable, everything on a gentlemanly scale, and he seems to be very comfortable."* William Parker, a county magistrate, had been a victim of the Chartist riots of 1842, when his house at Shelton, Stoke-u-Trent, was burned down, necessitating his move to Lysways Hall.[xliii]

Mulock once again fairly exploded onto the national scene in June 1843 when he directed observations on the state of affairs in Ireland to the attention of the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel and Earl De Grey, in an article 'Ireland – Her Rulers and Her Agitators:

"As an impartial Irishman, a devoted subject of the British crown, and a well-wisher to your government, I implore you to consider whether some hitherto untaken step is not required in order to quell the tumult which so unhappily pervades in Ireland.

Have you seasonably, sufficiently, and paternally warned the susceptible and misled people of Ireland to desist from their present proceedings? – for, by not doing so, you leave the popular mind open to the uncontrolled influence of agitators. Place your government in dignified yet benignant communication with the Irish people, and all may yet be well.

The vast assemblages in Ireland are either lawful or unlawful; and this great point should not be any longer enveloped in doubt. If they are lawful, it is unworthy on the part of upright rulers to visit with vengeance magistrates who attend meetings not declared to be illegal, and the quick spirit of a tributary country is roused resentfully by this exercise of arbitrary authority. If, on the other hand, these gigantic gatherings of the populace are unlawful, the plain course is to state the truth in a royal proclamation, couched in firm, though kindly language – pointing out to the beguiled people the uncompromising determination of government to maintain the existing polity of the State, and indicating the legal modes of giving expression to the popular sentiment, so as not to endanger the public peace. Such an appeal to the mind and affections of the Irish nation would, in my opinion, still the alarming disquietudes which now shake the sister island, and, at the least, would have the effect of placing Irish malcontents, in case of their continued contumacy, clearly in the wrong.

But, Sir, the large meetings in question are unlawful, not merely (as alleged by Lord Lyndhurst) because they may prove detrimental to the public peace, but upon a much plainer and just ground, in strict accordance with the whole analogy of British constitutional law – BECAUSE THOSE MEETINGS ARE NOT CONVENED BY ANY LAWFUL COMPETENT AUTHORITY. This is the true test of the legality or illegality of a public meeting; and to the neglect of that test, even by eminent crown lawyers, may be ascribed much of the disorder which has harassed England as well as Ireland of late years. It is not the conduct of a public meeting which evidences its legality – it is its constitution. The Repeal of the Union also, though a very inexpedient, and (as I think) a very foolish subject, is not a theme which it is unlawful to discuss; but meetings convened by irresponsible persons, clothed with no acknowledged authority, are, beyond all question, unlawful assemblages, and the government should tell the people the plain truth, and prohibit them from repairing to such disorderly, and it may be, perilous public meetings. My impression is strong that the people of Ireland would immediately submit themselves to the wise warning of their rulers, and yield contentedly to a faithful exposition of the law. I will not venture to estimate the evils of a contrary course of policy.

Pray pardon the freedom of this communication. I feel for my erring countrymen, and I perceive the perplexity of your position as first minister of the crown, and if I were circumstanced as you are I would forgive, yea, prize the friendly suggestions of an honest though humble communicator of Christian counsel. A single false step at this important juncture might shake the British Empire to its foundations. May God in His mercy avert the greatest of all calamities – the horror of a civil war!

I have no motive for addressing you but the public good. I want nothing – wish for nothing which your power or patronage could bestow, and I earnestly request you will not trouble yourself to acknowledge the receipt of this letter.

I have the honour to be, Sir, with much respect, your obedient servant,
Thomas Mulock.

The Duke of Wellington, replied with a brief, contemptuous message:

"Field Marshal the Duke of Wellington presents his compliments to Mr. Mulock. As it appears that Mr. Mulock has addressed the minister the duke concludes that he will give him an answer. He is one of the few men in these days who do not meddle with questions over which they have no control."

This gave Mulock opportunity to maintain the correspondence:

"Mr. Mulock presents his deep respects to the Duke of Wellington, whom he has always considered (since first he had the honour of being made known to Sir Arthur Wellesley) as one of the most eminent men of any age or nation.

Mr. Mulock ventures to assure his grace that he (Mr. M.) cannot be fairly classed with the multitude of idly ambitious persons who "meddle with questions over which they have no control." But Mr. Mulock thinks it perfectly possible that a plain Christian man may see and set forth truths (not schemes and speculations) which have escaped the attention of renowned statesmen and legislators."

Sir Robert Peel, then the Prime Minister, also thought fit to offer a put-down, in effect calling Mulock an old woman:

"Sir Robert Peel presents his compliments to Mrs Mulock, and begs leave to acknowledge the receipt of his communication of the 10th instant.

Little may then have been known of the matter had not Mulock, either aware of the potential amusement to be derived from the letters by political opponents of the Duke and Sir Robert, or anxious to bring to the attention of whoever he could that he corresponded with the high and mighty, and consequently was of importance, sent them for publication to the Freeman's Journal, whereupon they became public knowledge. The letters were seized upon by the *Morning Chronicle*:

.

"We have heard much of his grace's answers to individuals who have troubled him with communications since he has been, as he is pleased to regard himself, an "irresponsible" member of the cabinet. His famous reply to the Paisley Weavers is matter of history. Of unpublished letters, which could hardly be regarded as private, but which, nevertheless, have not been given to the world by those who received them, we have thought it right to take any notice. But the following correspondence with Mr. Mulock is given to the world by Mulock himself, printed by him, and disseminated with gratuitous zeal. Mr. Mulock is one of that by no means inconsiderable class of persons who imagine that they know how to set all things right in Ireland. The secret he (conscientious man as he is) thinks himself bound in duty to communicate to Peel and the Duke. Accordingly he writes them a letter, in which he states the position of the Government with respect to the meetings in Ireland not so ill.
He then goes on, with some harmless twaddle, to state his reasons for thinking that the meetings are illegal, and might with safety and propriety be put down. But though he communicates these views to the two ministers, he is very reasonable in not troubling them further. Nothing can be more proper than the conclusion of his letter:-

"I have no motive for addressing you but the public good. I want nothing – wish for nothing which your power or patronage could bestow, and I earnestly request you will not trouble yourself to acknowledge the receipt of this letter.

I have the honour to be, Sir, with much respect, your obedient servant,
Thomas Mulock."

What a delightful correspondent for a minister! He wants nothing – not even an answer! But both his correspondents think an answer his due; and accordingly he gets the two without delay and how characteristic a reply! Nothing to commit the premier – even to Mulock! Mulock may believe that Sir Robert Peel means to put down the meetings or legalise them. He can bring nothing against him to bind him to either. But the Duke's is the choice morsel:

"Field Marshall the Duke of Wellington presents his compliments to Mr. Mulock. As it appears that Mr. Mulock has addressed the minister, the Duke concludes that he will give him an answer. *He* is one of the *few men* in these days who *does* not meddle with questions over which *they* have no control." The compliments are tersely gracious. There then follows a sentence answering for Peel's sending an answer; but not answering rashly. The Duke does not assert that Peel <u>will</u> answer: but "as Mr. Mulock has addressed <u>the</u> minister" (The Duke is no minister, Mulock, though in the cabinet, leader in the Lords, and Commander-in-Chief) the Duke <u>concludes</u> that he (that is, <u>the</u> minister), will give him (Mulock) an answer."

But the grammar and construction of the third and concluding sentence are irrefragable. In the foregoing sentence, "he" serves for Peel, and 'him' for Mulock. Then, suddenly, without notice, 'he' turns into the Duke himself. It cannot be meant that Peel, who governed the last verb, should as he has an indefeasible right in grammar, continue to be designated as 'he,' and govern the next verb. Peel is not one of the few men, &c! Oh, no! The Duke means himself. Then, observe the concords. "He is one of the few men" so far, so good – "who <u>does</u> not meddle with questions." Does not! Who does not? The few men. But, few though they be, still they have as good a right to a plural verb as millions would. In the next clause of the sentence, however, the plural is restored. "Over which they have no control." The nearest approach that we can make to the putting this sentence into shape with its present concords, would be by reading that "The Duke is one who does not meddle with questions over which a few men have no control." But this cannot be the meaning, and so we suppose that his grace meant to say "Field Marshal the Duke of Wellington is one of the few men who <u>do</u> not meddle with questions over which they have no control."

At whom is the hit? - obviously at Peel; you, Mulock, have written to Peel and me. Peel, I conclude, will answer you: but I shall not; for I am one of the few men who do not meddle with questions over which they have no

control. What then is Peel? Obviously, one of the many men who meddle with questions over which they have no control, but no one denies that the measure is applicable to the minister. And alas! Is not there too much truth in it as applied to one who leaves great national interests to be the sport of chance or other men's wills; and, meddling with the high concerns of Government, does not venture to exercise over them a vigorous control?[xliv]

It would be a shame to leave this little episode without remarking on another disparaging comment that the Duke suffered at the time:

"Another Epistle from the Duke of Wellington:

The Field Marshal, who on all occasions, parades the assertion that he is an irresponsible and powerless member of the cabinet, for the purpose of getting rid of troublesome or officious correspondence, ought by all means, to spare some portion of his £120 per diem for the employment of some person to soften down his bad manners and correct his execrable grammar."[xlv] (But reader - if such there be - observe, the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House of Lords were at that time obliged to write their own letters; no thousands or so a year each to pay for secretarial services!)

But Mulock had another shot left in his locker and amidst the hubbub wrote:

"Mr. Mulock begs leave to inform the editor of the Times, that a supposed emendation in a brief note from the Duke of Wellington to Mr. Mulock, is not authorised by his grace's autograph. Mr. Mulock had not the temerity to alter the Duke's text, nor did he conceive that his grace's meaning was affected by the questionable concord."

The political amusement over for the moment, in September 1843, the delicate state of health of son Thomas, led the Mulocks' to spend some weeks at Ramsgate, on the Kent coast, a holiday from which they all returned to London in a hale and hearty state of health.[xlvi]

When in December 1843, Mulock published a letter to the Reverend J. A. Wallinger, minister of Bethesdo Chapel, York Street, Bath, Mulock's address was given as 8, Southampton Row, Russell Square, London. In the letter Mulock lectured the Reverend gentleman and bemoaned the condition of the Christian Church generally. The letter gives further example of what appears to have been an attempt to generate income from such of the general public who were interested in the finer points of theological disputation. How many copies were printed and how much he – or his family – benefited from the exercise would be interesting to discover, given what appears to have been the financial plight that loomed over them:

"Reverend and Dear Sir,

I am pressed in spirit to write you, not for the purpose of provoking controversy, but with the view of setting before you, as a minister of Christ, certain precious truths, which the Lord hath recently revealed, opened and applied to my soul, by the power of the Holy Ghost. If you have been taught already, and before myself, these Divine verities, it will confirm my joy; and if I shall prove helpful to you, let the God of Glory be magnified thereby.

For some time past, my mind has been directed towards a vein of mournful meditation on the ignoble, desolate and indigent state of the true church of Christ. I cannot be mistaken, as to Zion's calamitous condition, for it hath been my own, and I am an undoubted son of the Lord Almighty, elected by his love, redeemed by his blood, called by his grace, and sanctified by his Spirit: and yet, how lowly is my lot! How miserably short of the dignity, happiness and prosperity, spiritual and temporal, which constitute the rightful, purchased ***inheritance of the saints in light!***

Much and earnest did I intreat the Lord, to vouchsafe unto me a revealed knowledge of the true ***causes*** *of the church's* ***banishment,*** *that our long and sore* ***captivity*** *might be mercifully* ***turned away****. Lam ii 14. At length, it pleased the only wise God, to visit me with the* ***renewing of the Holy Ghost****, and to enable me to understand from the scriptures of truth, the real source of all the church's sinfulness and sorrow. Dan ix 22. I was shown, from the word of life, that for ages and generations the disciples of the Lord Jesus have lost sight of the great truth, found amongst the* ***first principles*** *of the doctrine of the everlasting gospel, and standing as it were at the very threshold of the sanctuary of God, namely, that every believer, from the moment that he receives faith in Christ's death, becomes thereby* ***freed from the dominion of sin****, and for evermore. He is therefore enjoined to* ***reckon himself dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord****. Rom vi 11. If a professor of the gospel be not* ***freed from sin,*** *he must be the* ***servant of sin,*** *an alien from grace, and actually under the wrathful curse of the law,* ***having no hope, and without God in the world:*** *whereas, a believer in Christ, whether weak or strong, a babe in Christ or an established saint, is*

equally ***made free from sin, is become a servant of God, hath his fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life.*** *Rom vi 22. Such is the true, scriptural state of believers in Jesus, and where this blessed standard of faith is not maintained, holiness and happiness depart from churches and individual disciples of the Lord. No spiritual mindedness, no righteousness and true holiness, no fruitfulness in thought, word or work, no church- fellowship, no brotherly kindness can possibly subsist, where confession is not made by believers, that they are* ***free from sin****; that is, freed from the* ***power, actings, filthiness and misery****,of sin, through the death of God* ***manifest in the flesh.*** *In fact, we do not* ***confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh****,1 John 1v 2, except that we avow ourselves to be personally, presently and eternally freed from the* ***dominion of sin;*** *and hath he not done so? Moreover, how can we be said to* ***believe with the heart,*** *that our great Mediator hath* ***finished transgression****, if* ***sin dwelleth in us****, potently and permanently, instead of Christ dwelling in us* ***the hope of glory****? That a child of God, regenerated by his grace, may be rendered* ***wretched*** *by indwelling sin, I can, with my brother Paul, amply attest, Rom. Vii 24; but I must also boldly affirm, that the cause of indwelling sin, and consequent* ***conflic****t in a regenerate person, is* ***falling from grace****, in ceasing to believe in his* ***freedom from sin****, through the death of Immanuel.*

This the Lord hath shown me, with such divine power and clearness, that I do not state it as a peradventure, but as an infallible certainty of Christ's glorious gospel. We cannot ***live Christ,*** *unless we are personally partakers of Christ's* ***death,*** *for righteousness and holiness come to us exclusively through the* ***new covenant,*** *and* ***that*** *covenant is of no force to us, except we realise by faith the death of the testator. Heb. Ix 17.*

As soon as the church ***let slip*** *the true doctrine of the* ***application*** *of Christ's death to believers, darkness, delusion, error, heresy, schism and sensuality, overspread every professing Christian community. And after miserable ages of merited blindness and bondage, the Lord is now risen up to plead the cause of his afflicted people,* ***to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound****. Isa. Lxi 1. The church must be redeemed by the great* ***Deliverer*** *from the power, malice and craftiness of the devil; and this will be effected by sending forth the Holy Ghost with more than Pentecostal power, to testify unto God's elect, that they are* ***freed from sin;*** *and belief in Christ's death will also free them from the tyranny of Satan; for* ***through his death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.*** *Heb. Ii 14. And thus, the pillars of the huge temple of antichrist, the systems of sham Christianity, which have so long oppressed the earth, will totter to their eternal fall. Babylon will go* ***into perdition,*** *with her beast and false prophet, and the glory of the New Jerusalem will shine forth with inconceivable lustre.* ***Peace will be within her walls, and prosperity within her palaces. The tabernacle of God will be with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.*** *Rev. xxi 3.*

As I do not exact from others, what I would not myself readily render, I joyfully confess before men and angels, that through the death of Christ, the Lord our Righteousness, and the God of my salvation, I am ***freed from sin.*** *I can say, with truth and gladness of heart, that my* ***warfare is accomplished, mine iniquity is pardoned, and I have received from the Lord's hand double for all my sins.*** *Isa. Xl 2. Being the* ***Lord's freeman,*** *I am able and willing, through the exceeding riches of his grace, to walk before him in truth, love, righteousness and peace, as becometh the* ***Godly in Christ Jesus****. I am confident that the* ***Holy Ghost*** *will verify my* ***good confession*** *of our precious and adorable Christ, and that he will raise up a cloud of faithful witnesses, bearing triumphant testimony to the renewed liberty of the Lord's long bondaged people."*[xlvii]

By the April of 1844 it would seem that Mulock's connection with the Institution for Assisting Heirs-at-Law was diminishing and that he was in doubtful financial circumstances, as he wrote to Reade expressing an interest in qualifying in law, perhaps with the hope that help of a financial nature, would be forthcoming from his erstwhile benefactor:

"Long years ago did I think, as you do, that my strong sense of right and justice would disqualify me from the legal profession. But, through the Grace of God, I see very differently now. The bar is a high and honourable scene of exertion and extensive usefulness, and the more corruption prevails amongst its members the more need there is of a man of Christian integrity to shine as a light in that darkened sphere. Let me hear from you early, for my name is already on the books for admission to Gray's Inn, and the fees (though very moderate to me as having been a member of the University of Oxford) are still beyond my present ability to meet."

Mulock's antipathy towards the legal profession constantly found expression, but now in dire straits and without any meaningful income, like the condemned prisoner, the immediate prospect ahead appeared to concentrate his mind. However, nothing appears to have come from this sally and the projected valiant excursion to bring about the reformation of the legal profession did not materialise; instead his hostility towards lawyers was to resurface and increase through his next venture.

In 1844 Mulock had joined in a venture for a proposed company to build a direct railway line from London to Manchester, with a branch line to York; the man behind this scheme was an engineer named Remington. It must be said at the outset that Mulock displayed a great deal of commercial naivety in the matter, though he was undoubtedly sincere. Having come into contact with Remington through that gentleman's brother, letters were exchanged between the engineer and Mulock and the two men, having satisfied each other as to their respective sincerity, agreed on the formation of a railway company for a direct line from London to Manchester, a scheme that Remington had first advanced, without success, some four years earlier. In the absence of any mention of financial remuneration for Mulock, it must be assumed that there was a tacit understanding between the two men that the company would bring its own reward in due course.

Mulock set about his task with zeal and secured the services of a solicitor, named Wedlake, to deal with legal details. In furtherance of the project Mulock travelled to Bedford where he spent some days, setting up a meeting presided over by the Mayor of the town, to seek support from the inhabitants for the proposed line that was to pass close by and thus prove a great boon. The meeting proved to be one of the largest public meetings that the town had then experienced and after Mulock's address on the subject, the meeting passed resolutions in favour of the project.[xlviii] In the October Mulock was at Stoke, as a speaker for the proposed line that would also have branch lines through the Potteries to Crewe, he also ventured to other towns in the cause of the proposed company (Remington said that in all they went to eleven different places), but when back in London the progress hoped to be made with the company had not materialised, and it was decided that more support would be forthcoming for the venture if the services of a solicitor, named Ashurst were obtained, as that man was able to secure the support of wealthy Manchester businessmen. This measure agreed the names of eighteen gentlemen were duly obtained as a committee and Mulock was formally appointed as secretary to the provisional company; but still no mention of financial remuneration for his troubles!

An advertisement for the proposed railway line, taking up one and three-quarter columns, appeared in the November of 1844. The instance I quote was in the *Staffordshire Advertiser*, I believe that the same advertisement appeared in numerous other newspapers:

Direct London, Manchester and York Railway, via Bedford:

Taking in its route Chipping Barnet, St. Alban's, Luton, Silsoe, Ampthill and Reading; diverging thence North-Westwards to Manchester by Wellingborough, Kettering, Market Harborough, Leicester, Loughborough, Derby, Uttoxeter, Cheadle, Leek and Macclesfield; and North-Eastwards to York, by Higham Ferrers, Thrapston, Oundle, Stamford, Grantham, Newark, between Retford and Gainsborough, to Thorne, Snaith and Selby.

The capital of the Company was to be £7,000,000 in shares of £50 each, a deposit of £2-10s to be laid on each share bid. The London Office of the enterprise was to be at the Bull and Mouth Hotel, St. Martin's-le-Grand until suitable offices could be obtained near to the Royal Exchange. Thomas Mulock appeared as secretary of the proposed company and the names of proposed committee members were given as well as the names and area of residence of some 270 Noblemen, gentlemen and merchants who had endorsed the scheme.

Applications for shares were to be submitted under the following format:

Gentlemen,

I request you to allot me .....shares of £50 each in your proposed railway. And I agree to accept such shares as shall be allotted to me, and also to pay the deposit thereon, and to execute the Parliamentary contract and subscribers agreement when required.

Dated the .....day of.....1844.[xlix]

Towards the end of 1844, it appeared to Mulock that Ashurst, the newly acquired solicitor, was intent on taking over the railway project as his personal concern, seeking to edge out both Remington and Mulock. There was some dispute, too, over the terms on which the Manchester businessmen were prepared to support the scheme, terms that did not conform to Mulcok's principles. The company having been provisionally registered (such company's at that time had to submit details to a House of Commons Committee to gain approval) the Manchester businessmen whose names had been put forward as being in support of the original prospectus withdrew from the project and over the course of months a dispute wrangled on; a rival railway company for the same purpose was then proposed by Ashurst, and Mulock's involvement with the proposed railway company having now become irksome, he ceased to be secretary. For a while the now two rivalling companies advertised at the same time for the same project, but eventually the two

concerns united with Remington, the engineer, and the scheme went ahead. Mulock's endeavours, although they had contributed much leg work to the formation of the proposed company, met with no reward, and he contemplated entering upon litigation, but wisely came to the conclusion that he was unlikely to receive any money at all and would probably be left with costs incurred through losing the action, and in bitter fury over the whole affair, he contributed several letters to the *Mining Journal*, in which he constantly reviled the legal profession as a whole. What soured this even more for Mulock, was that the solicitor who was supposedly looking after the interests of the proposed company, was also involved in the successful alternative line. It was as though there had been betrayal. Mulock, as secretary to the original committee, became harassed and he complained that he was being 'placarded' at Manchester 'as a swindling emissary of a bubble company', and threatened with insolvency proceedings![l]

That many investors at the time may have entertained reservations as to whether the undertaking was feasible is readily shown:

"This last week the direct principle has been placed before the public, with a pretension not usual in undertakings of the kind, in the instance of the project called the Manchester and York Direct Railway. This, with a capital of seven millions, and a total disregard of the impediments to its adoption presented by the previous appearance of other plans, of locality, or of time, comes before the world on the 1st of November for the funds requisite for its execution. It is to be laid before Parliament in the ensuing session with field plans, sections, books of reference, assents and dissents, obtained for 295 miles of way, an undertaking that is physically impracticable; and, allowing everything that may be due to the committee, it is remarked by persons familiar with the pursuit, that no names are to be found among the members composing it, which have been identified with railway affairs. Mr. Mulock is a gentleman comparatively unknown, and Mr. Remington seems to be equally so in the capacity of an engineer. To suppose, therefore, that a share list could be completed on the basis stated is regarded as conveying the impression that Manchester is determined to cut down the charge for the transportation of goods to the lowest price by the shortest route."[li]

Ever solicitous to the problems of others, in April, 1844, Mulock published a letter containing advice for a Member of Parliament:

"To W. B. Farrand, Esq., M.P.

Sir,

The conversation which I had the pleasure to hold with you yesterday, led me to ponder more deliberately upon your present position as an arraigned member of parliament; and as to the course which, if placed in your circumstance, I should feel myself bound to adopt.

This morning I have perused the past night's discussion in the House of Commons growing out of the motion of Sir Robert Peel, which motion was subsequently carried, and I now confidently tender you the advice which, in my Christian judgement, is calculated to meet your case.

I think you should, in obedience to the order of the house, attend in your place tomorrow evening, and there and then respectfully protest against the exercise of ANY JURISDICTION on the part of the House of Commons in the matters at issue between yourself, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Hogg.

The charges you alleged against those parties were not uttered by you primarily in your place in parliament – were parts of a speech delivered by you at a public meeting; and if you have either wilfully or unwittingly urged false, or malicious, or injurious calumniations – fully reported by means of the public press – Sir James Graham and Mr. Hogg are entitled to seek redress from the ordinary legal tribunals, and that redress will be the readier from your recorded acknowledgement of the expressions imputed to you.

But the House of Commons cannot rightfully be converted into a court of pleas, to try the truth of alleged libellous or defamatory matter uttered outside the walls of parliament. Their privileges, if so extended, would swallow up all constitutional judicature in this land of law. The true course for the presumedly injured parties to pursue is to resort to the proper courts at Westminster.

Sir James Graham and Mr. Hogg can readily find professional advocates; and as for yourself, sir, you can, I think, feel no difficulty in securing the services of the learned member for Bath, whose forensic talents you are, of

course, at liberty to retain in your behalf, although he has exhibited himself as an amateur adversary in the House of Commons.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Thomas Mulock.[lii]

[i] As previously noticed I am indebted to Karen Bourrier for this information.
[ii] Staffordshire Advertiser 30th May 1840.
[iii] The Liverpool Mercury 3rd July, 1840
[iv] See 'Notes and Queries February 1924.
[v] See Sally Mitchell.
[vi] See Missus Craik's Birth Centenary, T. Pape, Transactions of the North Staffordshire Field Club, 1926/7 volume lx pp 82-95, WSL.
[vii] While the bazaar took place in 1838 Mulock's reference to the church 'losing her tithes' may refer to the incident at Chelmsford of John Thorogood, in 1840, imprisoned for non-payment of church rates and whose situation led to the abolition of compulsory church rates: 3/4th Victoria cap 93, 'An act to amend the act for the better regulation of Ecclesiastical courts in England'
[viii] See: Victoria County History of Staffordshire, volume 6, page 248.
[ix] The 'reverend rector' refers to W. E. Coldwell, rector of St. Mary's, Stafford, who was also a member of the visiting committee that exercised supervision of the asylum and who was in office at the time of Mulock's confinement. 'Aberrations of mind!' I am indebted to Randle Knight for much information concerning these and other events mentioned in this account.
[x] Doctor Chalmers, a theologian renowned for his addresses.
[xi] Vicar of Christ Church who was also a member of the visiting committee to the asylum.
[xii] The Duchess of Sutherland.
[xiii] Thomas Brutton was the governor of the prison from 1821-1849. Those condemned to death were executed in public outside the gate of the prison.
[xiv] SRO D260/M/F/S/27/14/45 folio 113. (Hatherton Letters)
[xv] SRO D260/M/F/S/27/14/45 folio 43. (Hatherton Letters)
[xvi] Staffordshire Gazette and County Standard, 21st November, 1840
[xvii] Victoria Adelaide Maria Louise, born 21st November 1840.
[xviii] Staffordshire Advertiser 16th January 1841.
[xix] See 'Old Newcastle,' T. Pape; also Staffordshire Advertiser 26th October 1912.
[xx] Staffordshire Advertiser 3rd April 1841.
[xxi] Possibly Charles Mayne Young, a celebrated actor of the day.
[xxii] See 'The Diaries of William Charles Macready, vol 2 pages 127-130
[xxiii] SRO D260/M/F/5/26/21. (Hatherton Journals)
[xxiv] SRO D260/M/F/S/27/14/45 folio 83. (Hatherton Letters)
[xxv] George Canning's son.
[xxvi] George Canning's daughter.
[xxvii] SRO D260/M/F/S/27/14/45 folio 85. (Hatherton Letters)
[xxviii] SRO D260/M/F/5/26/21. (Hatherton Journals)
[xxix] SRO D260/M/F/S/27/14/45 folio 88. (Hatherton Letters)
[xxx] SRO D260/M/F/S/27/14/45 folio 91. (Hatherton Letters)
[xxxi] Brewood, a small town in Staffordshire.
[xxxii] SRO D260/M/F/S/27/14/45 folio 92. (Hatherton Letters)
[xxxiii] SRO D260/M/F/5/26/21 (Hatherton Journals 22nd April 1841)
[xxxiv] SRO D260/M/F/S/27/14/45 folio 95. (Hatherton Letters)
[xxxv] SRO D260/M/F/S/27/14/45 folio 96. (Hatherton Letters)
[xxxvi] The reverend John Hawker had left the Church of England in protest at Catholic emancipation; his followers had raised sufficient money to build a chapel for him at Plymouth. This later became abandoned and was taken into use as St. Peter's Church.
[xxxvii] 'The Glorious Liberty of the Children of God,' T. Mulock, WSL pbox 5/7/7/2.
[xxxviii] See 'Old Newcastle,' T. Pape.
[xxxix] SRO/D260/M/F/5/27/15
[xl] Mulock may have met Leigh Hunt during the time at Liverpool; Hunt had been imprisoned for two years having written scurrilous comments on the Prince Regent in the 'Examiner' a paper that he edited with his brother. The man named Young, referred to as introducing Mulock to Hunt in the early part of the century, was possibly Charles Mayne Young, who also had roots at Liverpool.
[xli] See 'Old Newcastle,' T. Pape.
[xlii] See Thomas Mulock: An Historical Sketch, Elihu Rich, also Advocacy or Folly: The alleged Lunatic's Friend Society, 1845-1863, Nicholas Hervey, The Mental Health Service User Movement in England, Dr. Jan Willcroft, Wikipedia, Internet..
[xliii] Notes and Queries, February 1924.
[xliv] The Freeman's Journal, 20th June, 1843; The Morning Chronicle, 27th June 1843. Numerous other newspapers of the day also carried the account.
[xlv] The Liverpool Mercury, 30th June 1843
[xlvi] See 'Old Newcastle,' T. Pape.
[xlvii] WSL sub box N/2/3.
[xlviii] Staffordshire Advertiser 15th June 1844.
[xlix] Staffordshire Advertiser 9th November 1844.
[l] Staffordshire Advertiser 19th October 1844.

[li] 'Money Market and City News,' Morning Post, 11th November, 1844
[lii] London Standard, 26th April, 1844