Speech 15 was to the Second Conference with the Committee of Ninety-nine in regard to the Title of King on 13th April 1657. Tries to rebut their arguments, used in former Conference, in favour of the Title. Not of necessity; at best only of expedience or advantage. John Hampden and the Ironsides. Leaves the matter undecided. Conference to be renewed.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

MY LORD,

I think I have a very hard task on my hand. Though it be but to give an account of myself, yet I see I am beset on all hands here. I say, but to give an account of "myself:" yet that is a business very comprehensive of others;-'comprehending' us all in some sense, and, as the Parliament have been pleased to shape it, comprehending all the interests of these Three Nations!

I confess I have two things in view. The first is, To return some answer to what was so well and ably said the other day on behalf of the Parliament's putting that Title in the Instrument of Settlement. (This is the First thing; what the Second is, does not yet for a long while appear.) I hope it will not be expected I should answer everything that was then said: because I suppose the main things that were spoken were arguments from ancient Constitutions and Settlements by the Laws; in which I am sure I could never be well skilled,-and therefore must the more ask pardon for what I have already transgressed 'in speaking of such matters,' or shall now transgress, through my ignorance of them, in my 'present' answer to you.

Your arguments, which I say were chiefly upon the Law, seem to carry with them a great deal of necessary conclusiveness, to inforce that one thing of Kingship. And if your arguments come upon me to inforce upon me the ground of necessity,-why, then, I have no room to answer: for what must be must be! And therefore I did reckon it much of my business to consider whether there were such a necessity, or would arise such a necessity, from those arguments.-It was said: "Kingship is not a Title, but an Office, so interwoven with the fundamental Laws of this Nation, that they cannot, or cannot well, be executed and exercised without 'it,'-partly, if I may say so, upon a supposed ignorance which the Law hath of any other Title. It knows no other; neither doth any know another. And, by reciprocation,-this said Title, or Name, or Office, you were farther pleased to say, is understood; in the dimensions of it, in the power and prerogatives of it; which are by the Law made certain; and the Law can tell when it (Kingship) keeps within compass, and when it exceeds its limits. And the Law knowing this, the People can know it also. And the People do love what they know. And it will neither be pro salute populi, nor for our safety, to obtrude upon the People what they do not nor cannot understand."

It was said also, "That the People have always, by their representatives in Parliament, been unwilling to vary names,-seeing they love settlement and known names, as was said before." And there were two good instances given of that: the one, in King James's time, about his desire to alter somewhat of
the Title: and the other in the Long Parliament, where they being otherwise, rationally moved to adopt the word "Representative" instead of "Parliament," refused it for the same reason. (Lenthall tries to blush.)-It was said also, "That the holding to this word doth strengthen the 'new' settlement; and hereby there is not anything de novo done, but merely things are revolved into their old current." It was said "That it is the security of the Chief Magistrate, and that it secures all who act under him."-Truly these are the principal of those grounds that were offered the other day, so far as I do recollect.

I cannot take upon me to refel those grounds; they are so strong and rational. But if I am to be able to make any answer to them, I must not grant that they are necessarily conclusive; I must take them only as arguments which perhaps have in them much conveniency, much probability towards conclusiveness. For if a remedy or expedient may be found, they are not of necessity, they are not inevitable grounds: and if not necessary or concluding grounds, why then they will hang upon the reason of expediency or conveniency. And if so, I shall have a little liberty 'to speak;' otherwise I am concluded before I speak.- Therefore it will behove me to say what I can, Why these are not necessary reasons; why they are not-why it is not (I should say) so interwoven in the Laws but that the Laws may still be executed as justly, and as much to the satisfaction of the people, and answering all objections equally well, without such a Title as with it. And then, when I have done that, I shall only take the liberty to say a word or two for my own grounds. And when I have said what I can say as to that 'latter point,,-I hope you will think a great deal more than I say. (Not convenient to SPEAK everything in so ticklish a predicament; with Deputations of a Hundred Officers, and so many "scrupulous fellows," "considerable in their own conceit," glaring into the business, with eyes much sharper than they are deep!)

Truly though Kingship be not a 'mere' Title, but the Name of an Office which runs through the 'whole of the' Law; yet it is not so ratione nominis, by reason of the name, but by reason of what the name signifies. It is a Name of Office plainly implying a Supreme Authority: is it more; or can it be stretched to more? I say, it is a name of Office plainly implying the Supreme Authority: and if so, why then I should suppose,-I am not peremptory in anything that is matter of deduction or inference of my own,-but I should suppose that whatsoever name hath been or shall be the Name under which the Supreme Authority acts-(Sentence abruptly stops; the conclusion being visible without speech!) Why, I say, if it had been those Four or Five Letters, or whatever else it had been! That signification goes to the thing, certainly it does; and not to the name. (Certainly!) Why, then, there can no more be said but this: As such a Title hath been fixed, so it may be unfixed. And certainly in the right of the Authority, I mean the Legislative Power,-in the right of the Legislative Power, I think the Authority that could christen it with such a name could have called it by another name. Therefore the name is only derived from that 'Authority.' And certainly they, 'the primary Legislative Authority,' had the disposal of it, and might have detracted 'from it,' changed 'it:'-and I hope it will be no offence to say to you, as the case now stands, "So may you." And if it be so that you may, why then I say, there is nothing of
necessity in your argument; and all turns on consideration of the expedience of it. (Is the Kingship expedient?)

Truly I had rather, if I were to choose, if it were the original question,—which I hope is altogether out of the question (His Highness means, afar off, in a polite manner, "YOU don't pretend that I still need to be made Protector by you or by any creature!"),—I had rather have any Name from this Parliament than any other Name without it: so much do I value the authority of the Parliament. And I believe all men are of my mind in that; I believe the Nation is very much of my mind,—though it be an uncertain way of arguing, what mind they are of. I think we may say it without offence; for I would give none! (No offence to you, Honourable Gentlemen: who are here, by function, to interpret and signify the Mind of the Nation. It is very difficult to do!)—Though the Parliament be the truest way to know what the mind of the Nation is, yet if the Parliament will be pleased to give me a liberty to reason for myself; and if that be one of your arguments—("That:" what, your Highness? That the mind of the Nation, well interpreted by this Parliament, is really for a King? That our Laws cannot go on without a King?—His Highness means the former mainly, but means the latter too; means several things together, as his manner sometimes is, in abstruse cases!)—I hope I may urge against it that the reason of my own mind is not quite to that effect. But I do say undoubtingly (let us think about other things, 'about the mind of the Nation and such like,' what we will), What the Parliament settles is what will run, 'and have currency,' through the Law; and will lead the thread of Government through this Land equally well as what hath been. For I consider that what hath been was upon the same account, 'by the same authority.' Save that there hath been some long continuance of the thing (This thing of Kingship), it is but upon the same account! It had its original somewhere! And it was with consent of the whole,—there is the original of it. And consent of the whole will 'still,' I say, be the needle that will lead the thread through all; (The same tailor-metaphor a second time,) and I think no man will pretend right against it, or wrong!

And if so, then, under favour to me, I think these arguments from the Law are all not as of necessity, but are to be understood as of conveniency. It is in your power to dispose and settle; and beforehand we can have confidence that what you do settle will be as authentic as the things that were of old,—especially as this individual thing, the Name or Title,—according to the Parliament's appointment. 'Is not this so? It is question not of necessity; we have power to settle it as conveniency directs.' Why then there will (with leave) be way made for me to offer a reason or two to the other considerations you adduced: otherwise, I say my mouth is stopped! (His Highness is plunging in deep brakes and imbroglios; hopes, however, that he now sees daylight athwart them.)

There are very many inforcements to carry on this thing. (Thing of the Kingship.) But I suppose it will 'have to' stand on its expediency—Truly I should have urged one consideration more which I forgot (Looks over his shoulder in the jungle, and bethinks him!),—namely the argument not of reason only, but of experience. It is a short one, but it is a true one (under favour), and is known to you all in the fact of it (under favour) (A damnable iteration; but too
characteristic to be omitted); That the Supreme Authority going by another Name and under another Title than that of King hath been, why it hath been already twice complied with! (Long Parliament, called "Keepers of the Liberties of England," found compliance; and now the "Protectorate" finds.) 'Twice:' under the Custodes Libertatis Angliae, and also since I exercised the place, it hath been complied with. And truly I may say that almost universal obedience hath been given by all ranks and sorts of men to both. Now this, 'on the part of both these Authorities,' was a beginning with the highest degree of Magistracy at the first alteration; and 'at a time' when that 'Kingship' was the name 'established': and the new Name, though it was the name of an invisible thing, the very Name, I say, was obeyed, did pass current, was received and did carry on the 'Public' Justice of the Nation. I remember very well, my Lords the Judges were somewhat startled: yet upon consideration,—if I mistake not,—they, there being among them (without reflection) as able and as learned as have sat there,—though they did I confess, at first, demur a little,—they did receive satisfaction, and did act, as I said before. (Untwist this extraordinary WITHE of a sentence; you will find it not inextricable, and very characteristic of Oliver!) And as for my own part (My own Protectorate), I profess I think I may say: Since the beginning of that change,—though I should be loath to speak anything vainly,—but since the beginning of that change to this day, I do not think there hath been a freer procedure of the Laws, not even in those years called, and not unworthily, the "Halcyon Days of Peace," from the Twentieth of Elizabeth to King James's and King Charles's time. I do not think but the Laws have proceeded with as much freedom and justice, and with less of private solicitation, since I came to the Government, as they did in those years so named,—'Halcyon.' I do not think, under favour,—(His Highness gets more emphatic)—that the Laws had a freer exercise, more uninterrupted by any hand of Power, in those years than now; or that the Judge has been less solicited by letters or private interpositions either of my own or other men's in double so many years in all those times 'named' "of Peace!" (Sentence involving an incurable Irish-bull; the head of it eating the tail of it, like a Serpent-of-Eternity; but the meaning shining very clear through its contortions nevertheless!) And if more of my Lords the Judges were here than now are, they could tell us perhaps somewhat farther. -- And, therefore, I say, under favour: These two Experiences do manifestly shew that it is not a Title, though never so interwoven with our Laws, that makes the Law to have its free passage and to do its office without interruption (as we venture to think it is now doing): 'not a Title, no;' and if a Parliament shall determine that another Name run through the Laws, I believe it will run with as free a passage as this 'of King ever did.' Which is all I have to say upon that head.

And if this be so, then truly other things may fall under a more indifferent consideration: and so I shall arrive 'at the Second thing I had in view,' at some issue of answering for myself in this great matter. And all this while, nothing that I say doth any way determine as to my final resolution, or 'intimate any' thought against the Parliament's wisdom in this matter; but 'endeavoureth' really and honestly and plainly towards such an answer as may be fit for me to give. The Parliament desires to have this Title. It hath stuck with me, and doth yet stick. And truly, as I hinted the other day, it seemed as if your
arguments to me did partly give positive grounds for what was to be done, and partly comparative grounds; stating the matter as you were then pleased to do,-for which I gave no cause that I know of, that is, for comparing the effects of Kingship with those of such a Name as I at present bear, with 'those of' the Protectorship 'to wit.' I say I hope it will not be understood that I contend for the name; or for any name, or any thing 'of a merely extraneous nature;' but truly and plainly 'for the substance of the business,'-if I speak as in the Lord's presence; ay, in all right things, as a person under the disposal of the Providence of God,-neither "naming" one thing nor other; but only endeavouring to give fit answer as to this proposed Name or Title. For I hope I do not desire to give a rule to anybody-‘much less to the Parliament.’ I professed I had not been able,-and I truly profess I have not yet been able,-to give a rule to myself 'in regard to your Proposal.' I would be understood in this. (Yes, your Highness. "That it is not doubt of the Parliament's wisdom; that it is not vain preference or postponement of one 'name' to another; but doubt as to the substantial expediency of the thing proposed, uncertainty as to God's will and monition in regard to it,-that has made and still makes me speak in this uncomfortable, haggling, struggling and wriggling manner. It is no easy thing forcing one's way through a jungle of such depth! An affair of Courtship moreover, which grows and has to grow by the very handling of it! I would not be misunderstood in this.")

I am a man standing in the Place I am in (Clearly, your Highness); which Place I undertook not so much out of hope of doing any good, as out of desire to prevent mischief and evil (Note this),-which I did see was imminent on the Nation. I say, we were running headlong into confusion and disorder, and would necessarily 'have' run into blood; and I was passive to those that desired me to undertake the Place which I now have. (With tones, with a look of sorrow, solemnity, and nobleness: the brave Oliver!) A Place, I say, not so much of doing good,-which a man lawfully may, if he deal deliberately with God and his own conscience,-a man may (I say) lawfully, if he deal deliberately with God and his own conscience; a man may lawfully, as the case may be (though it is a very tickle case), desire a Place to do good in! (Window once more into his Highness! "Tickle" is the old form of TICKLISH: "a tickle case indeed," his Highness candidly allows; yet a case which does occur,-shame and woe to him, the poor cowardly Pedant, tied up in cobwebs and tape-thrums, that neglects it when it does!) I profess I had not that apprehension, when I undertook the Place, that I could so much do good; but I did think I might prevent imminent evil.-And therefore I am not contending for one "name" compared with another;--and therefore have nothing to answer to any arguments that were used for preferring 'the name' Kingship to Protectorship. For I should almost think any "name" were better than my "Name;" and I should altogether think any person fitter than I am for such business; (Your Highness?-But St. Paul too professed himself "the chief of sinners,"--and has not been altogether thought to "cant" in doing so!)--and I compliment not, God knows it! But this I should say, That I do think, you, in settling of the peace and liberties of this Nation, which cries as loud upon you as ever Nation did for somewhat that may beget a consistence, 'ought to attend to that;' otherwise the Nation will fall in pieces! And in that, so far as I can, I am ready to serve not as a King but as Constable 'if you like!' For truly I
have, as before God, often thought that I could not tell what my business was, nor what I was in the place I stood in, save comparing myself to a good Constable set to keep the peace of the Parish. (Hear his Highness!) And truly this hath been my content and satisfaction in the troubles I have undergone, That you yet have peace.

Why now, truly,-if I may advise,-I wish to God you may but be so happy as to keep the peace still! If you cannot attain to such perfection as to accomplish this 'that we are now upon,' I wish to God we may still have peace,-that I do! But "the fruits of righteousness" are shewn in "meekness;" a better thing than we are aware of!-I say therefore, I do judge for myself there is no such necessity of this Name of King; for the other Names may do as well. I judge for myself. I must say a little (I think I have somewhat of conscience to answer as to the matter), why I cannot undertake this Name. (We are now fairly entered upon the Second head of method.) And truly I must needs go a little out of the way, to come to my reasons. And you will be able to judge of them when I have told you them. And I shall deal seriously, as before God.

If you do not all of you, I am sure some of you do, and it behoves me to say that I do, "know my calling from the first to this day." I was a person who, from my first employment, was suddenly preferred and lifted up from lesser trusts to greater; from my first being a Captain of a Troop of Horse; and did labour as well as I could to discharge my trust; and God blessed me 'therein' as it pleased Him. And I did truly and plainly,-and in a way of foolish simplicity, as it was judged by very great and wise men, and good men too,-desire to make my instruments help me in that work. And I will deal plainly with you: I had a very worthy Friend then; and he was a very noble person, and I know his memory is very grateful to all,-Mr John Hampden. (Hear, hear;-a notable piece of History!) At my first going out into this engagement, I saw our men were beaten at every hand. I did indeed; and desired him that he would make some additions to my Lord Essex's Army, of some new regiments; and I told him I would be serviceable to him in bringing such men in as I thought had a spirit that would do something in the work. This is very true that I tell you; God knows I lie not. "Your troops," said I, "are most of them old decayed serving-men, and tapsters, and such kind of fellows; and," said I, "their troops are Gentlemen's sons, younger sons and persons of quality: do you think that the spirits of such base and mean fellows will ever be able to encounter gentlemen, that have honour and courage and resolution in them?" Truly I did represent to him in this manner conscientiously; and truly I did tell him: "You must get men of a spirit: and take it not ill what I say,-I know you will not,-of a spirit that is likely to go on as far as gentlemen will go:-or else you will be beaten still." I told him so; I did truly. He was a wise and worthy person; and he did think that I talked a good notion, but an impracticable one. (Very natural in Mr Hampden, if I recollect him well, your Highness! With his close thin lips, and very vigilant eyes; with his clear official understanding; lively sensibilities to "unspotted character," "safe courses," &c. &c. A very brave man; but formidably thick-quilted, and with pincer-lips, and eyes very vigilant.-Alas, there is no possibility for poor Columbus at any of the Public Offices, till once he become an Actuality, and say, "Here IS the America I was telling you of!") Truly I told him I could do somewhat in it. I did
so-'did this somewhat:' and truly I must needs say this to you, 'The result was,'-impute it to what you please,-I raised such men as had the fear of God before them, as made some conscience of what they did; (The Ironsides; yea!) and from that day forward, I must say to you, they were never beaten, and wherever they were engaged against the enemy, they beat continually. (Yea!) And truly this is matter of praise to God:-and it hath some instruction in it, To own men who are religious and godly. And so many of them as are peaceably and honestly and quietly disposed to live within 'rules of' Government, and will be subject to those Gospel rules of obeying Magistrates and living under Authority-(Sentence catches fire abruptly, and explodes here)-I reckon no Godliness without that circle! Without that spirit, let it pretend what it will, it is diabolical, it is devilish, it is from diabolical spirits, from the depth of Satan's wickedness-(Checks himself)-Why truly I need not say more than to apply all this 'to the business we have in hand.'

I will be bold to apply this to our present purpose, because it is my all! I could say as all the world says, and run headily upon any thing; but I must tender this 'my present answer' to you as a thing that sways upon my conscience; or else I were a knave and a deceiver. 'Well;' I tell you there are such men in this Nation; godly men of the same spirit, men that will not be beaten down by a worldly or carnal spirit while they keep their integrity. And I deal plainly and faithfully with you, 'when I say;' I cannot think that God would bless an undertaking of anything, 'Kingship or whatever else,' which would, justly and with cause, grieve them. True, they may be troubled without cause; and I must be a slave if I should comply with any such humour as that. (Leaves the matter open still!) But I say there are honest men and faithful men, true to the great things of the Government, namely the Liberty of the People, giving them what is due to them, and protecting this Interest (and I think verily God will bless you for what you have done in that)-(Sentence broken; try it another way)-But if I know, as indeed I do, that very generally good men do not swallow this Title,-though really it is no part of their goodness to be unwilling to submit to what a Parliament shall settle over them, yet I must say, it is my duty and my conscience to beg of you that there may be no hard things put upon me; things, I mean, hard to them, which they cannot swallow. (The Young Lady will and she will not!) If the Nation may be as well provided for without these things we have been speaking of (Kingships, &c.) as, according to my apprehension, it may.-'then' truly I think it will be no sin in you, it will be to you as it was to David in another case, "no grief of heart in time coming," that you have a tenderness even possibly (if it be their weakness) to the weakness of those who have integrity and honesty and uprightness, and who are not carried away with the hurries I see some taken with-("A Standard lifted up," the other day!-We have had to turn the key upon them, in Chepstow, in the Tower and elsewhere)-that think their virtue lies in despising Authority, in opposing it! I think you will be the better able to root out of this Nation that 'disobedient' spirit and principle,-and to do so is as desirable as anything in this world,-by complying, indulging, and being patient to the weakness and infirmities of men who have been faithful, and have bled all along in this Cause;-and who are faithful, and will oppose all oppositions (I am confident of it) to the things that are Fundamentals in your Government, in your Settlement for Civil and Gospel Liberties. (Not ill said, your Highness; and really could
not well be better thought!-The moral is; "As my old Ironsides, men fearing
God, proved the successful soldiers; so in all things it is men fearing God, that
we must get to enlist with us. Without these we are lost: with these, if they will
be soldiers with us (not noisy mutineers like Wildman, Harrison and Company,
but true soldiers, rational persons that will learn discipline),-we shall, as
heretofore, hope to prevail against the whole world and the Devil to boot, and
'never be beaten at all,' no more than the Ironsides were. See, therefore, that
you do not disaffect THEM. Mount no foolish cockade or Kingship which can
convert THEM, rational obedient men, true in all essential points, into
mutineers."

I confess, for it behaves me to deal plainly with you-(Young Lady now flings a
little weight into the other scale,-and the Sentence trips itself once or twice
before it can get started)-I must confess I would say-I hope I may not be
misunderstood in this, for indeed I must be tender in what I say to such an
audience:-I say I would have it understood, That in this argument I do not
make a parallel between men of a different mind, 'mere dissentient
individuals,' and a Parliament, 'as to,' Which shall have their desires. I know
there is no comparison. Nor can it be urged upon me that my words have the
least colour that way. For the Parliament seems to have given me liberty to
say whatever is on my mind to you; as that 'indeed' is a tender of my humble
reasons and judgment and opinion to them: and now if I think these objectors
to the Kingship are such 'as I describe,' and 'that they' will be such; 'if I think
that they are faithful servants and will be so to the Supreme Authority, and the
Legislative wheresoever it is,-if, I say, I should not tell you, knowing their
minds to be so, then I should not be faithful. I am bound to tell it you, to the
end you may report it to the Parliament. (Parliament very jealous lest the
Army be thought of greater weight than it. We try to carry the scales even.)

I will now say something for myself. As for my own mind, I do profess it, I am
not a man scrupulous about words, or names, or such things. I have not
'hitherto clear direction'-But as I have the Word of God, and I hope shall ever
have, for the rule of my conscience, for my information and direction; so truly,
if men have been led into dark paths (As this matter of the Kingship is to me
even now; very "dark" and undecidable!) through the providence and
dispensations of God-why surely it is not to be objected to a man? For who
can love to walk in the dark? But Providence doth often so dispose. And
though a man may impute his own folly and blindness to Providence sinfully,-
yet this must be at a man's own peril. The case may be that it is the
Providence of God that doth lead men in darkness! I must needs say I have
had a great deal of experience of Providence; and though such experience is
no rule without or against the Word, yet it is a very good expositor of the Word
in many cases. (Yes, my brave one!)

Truly the Providence of God hath laid aside this Title of King providentially de
facto: and that not by sudden humour or passion; but it hath been by issue of
as great deliberation as ever was in a Nation. It hath been by issue of Ten or
Twelve Years Civil War, wherein much blood hath been shed. I will not
dispute the justice of it when it was done; nor need I tell you what my opinion
is in the case were it de novo to be done. (Somewhat grim expression of
face, your Highness!) But if it be at all disputable; and a man comes and finds
that God in His severity hath not only eradicated a whole Family, and thrust
them out of the land, for reasons best known to Himself, but also hath made
the issue and close of that to be the very eradication of a Name or Title-!
Which de facto is 'the case.' It was not done by me, nor by them that
tendered me the Government I now act in: it was done by the Long
Parliament,-that was it. And God hath seemed Providential, 'seemed to
appear as a Providence,' not only in striking at the Family but at the Name.
And, as I said before, it is blotted out: it is a thing cast out by an Act of
Parliament; it hath been kept out to this day. And as Jude saith, in another
case, speaking of abominable sins that should be in the Latter Times,-he doth
farther say, when he comes to exhort the Saints, he tells them,-they should
"hate even the garments spotted with the flesh."

I beseech you think not that I bring this as an argument to prove anything.
God hath seemed so to deal with the Persons and the Family that He blasted
the very Title. And you know when a man comes, a parte post, to reflect, and
see this done, this Title laid in the dust,-I confess I can come to no other
conclusion. ("But that God seems to have blasted the very Title;"-this,
however, is felt to need some qualifying.) The like of this may make a strong
impression upon such weak men as I am; and perhaps upon weaker men (if
there be any such) it will make a stronger. I will not seek to set up that which
Providence hath destroyed, and laid in the dust; I would not build Jericho
again! And this is somewhat to me, and to my judgment and my conscience.
This, in truth, it is this that hath an awe upon my spirit. (Hear!) And I must
confess, as the times are,-they are very fickle, very uncertain, nay God knows
you had need have a great deal of faith to strengthen you in your work, you
had need look at Settlement!-I would rather I were in my grave than hinder
you in anything that may be for Settlement of the Nation. For the Nation
needs it, never needed it more! And therefore, out of the love and honour I
bear you, I am forever bound, whatever becomes of me, to do 'what is best for
that;'-'and' I am forever bound to acknowledge you have dealt most
honourably and worthily with me, and lovingly, and have had respect for one
who deserves nothing.

Indeed, out of the love and faithfulness I bear you, and out of the sense I have
of the difficulty of your work, I would not have you lose any help (Help of the
Name "King;" help of the scrupulous Anti-King people:-it is a dark case!) that
may serve you, that may stand in stead to you. I would willingly be a sacrifice
(King, Protector, Constable, or what you like), that there might be, so long as
God shall please to let this Parliament sit, a harmony, and better and good
understanding between all of you. And,-whatever any man may think,-it
equally concerns one of us as another to go on to Settlement: and where I
meet with any that is of another mind, indeed I could almost curse him in my
heart. And therefore, to deal heartily and freely I would have you lose nothing
(Not even the Scrupulous.) that may stand you in stead in this way. I would
advise, if there be 'found' any of a froward, unmannerly or womanish spirit,-I
would not that you should lose them! I would not that you should lose any
servant or friend who might help in this Work; that any such should be
offended by a thing that signifies no more to me than I have told you it does.
That is to say: I do not think the thing necessary; I do not. I would not that you should lose a friend for it. If I could help you to many 'friends,' and multiply myself into many, that would be to serve you in regard to Settlement! And therefore I would not that any, especially any of these who indeed perhaps are men that do think themselves engaged to continue with you, and to serve you, should be anywise disobliged from you.

'I have now no more to say.' The truth is, I did indicate this as my conclusion to you at the first, when I told you what method I would speak to you in. I may say that I cannot, with conveniency to myself, nor good to this service, which I wish so well to, speak out all my arguments as to the safety of your Proposal, as to its tendency to the effectual carrying on of this Work. (There are many angry suspicious persons listening to me, and every word is liable to different misunderstandings in every different narrow head!) I say, I do not think it fit to use all the thoughts I have in my mind as to that point of safety. But I shall pray to God Almighty that He would direct you to do what is according to His will. And this is that poor account I am able to give of myself in this thing.