Curtis C. Breight (Yale University) begins this issue with a response to Marion Colthorpe's article 'The Theobalds entertainment for Queen Elizabeth I...' in the last Newsletter. Transcriptions by Robert Alexander (Point Park College, Pittsburgh) from some of the Percy family papers contain records of more amusements of the nobility. Reed's interest in musical matters is represented in a paper from Dr Eileen White (York, England) that gives new information on one of the York waits and in a note on the text of a seventeenth-century bawdy song from J. Anne George (King's College, London, England) that demonstrates just why minstrelsy and its performers were frequently linked with ruffians and rascals.

Curtis C. Breight

Entertainments of Elizabeth at Theobalds in the early 1590s

Marion Colthorpe's transcription of Hatfield ms 140/94 is a valuable addition to the pieces of a puzzle otherwise known as the 1591 Theobalds entertainment, and as Miss Colthorpe argues, this document does prove the authenticity of the gardener/molecatcher debate available in BL ms Egerton 2623, ff 17-18. Colthorpe's accompanying essay, however, is open to question at a number of major and minor points. First, there is some evidence that the entertainment lasted not from 10-20 May but from 10-14 May (see HMC Hatfield, Part IV, p 115; and Burghley's letter to Edward Dyer printed in Strype's Annals of the Reformation [1824 edn], iii. 2. 620). The problem with the briefer period is that the Privy Council met at Theobalds on 16 and 18 May, and it would have been unusual for the councillors to remain at Theobalds while the queen went elsewhere. Since there is no definite evidence, this minor issue remains unresolved. Curiously, E. K. Chambers cites the Hatfield reference (The Elizabethan Stage, iv. 105) but does not comment on the discrepancy in dates.

Colthorpe's discussion of the authorship of the gardener/molecatcher debate is also problematic. First she considers Robert Cecil, presumably because he wrote the hermit's greeting for a 1594 entertainment at Theobalds and because the gardener/molecatcher debate refers to his new garden at Pymms; there is, however, no real evidence to warrant the statement that 'it is possible, perhaps even probable' that Cecil wrote them. Then...
Colthorpe proceeds to another non sequitur in her consideration of John Lyly. She cites G. K. Hunter's book on Lyly but draws a different conclusion: 'Hunter pointed out that there is no external evidence that Lyly wrote any of these unsigned entertainments, and that the style which seems so characteristic of Lyly was not peculiar to him alone. Nevertheless on stylistic grounds there is a strong case for Lyly's being the author of the Gardener's and Molecatcher's speeches and the verse inscription. 'What Hunter actually said is that there is 'no evidence' (ie, neither internal nor external evidence) for Lyly's authorship of any of the entertainments printed by Bond, and that 'it was Bond's error' (both in general and in his specific attribution of entertainments to Lyly, I presume) 'to see Euphuism as the style of a man rather than that of a generation' (John Lyly [1962], 84). Why cite Professor Hunter's authoritative demolition of the 'style' argument (even by way of distortion), but then assert a 'strong case' for Lyly's authorship 'on stylistic grounds'? Indeed, why make the 'strong case' for Lyly in the paragraph following the statements about Robert Cecil's 'possible, perhaps even probable' authorship of the speeches?

This too is a relatively minor point, but in the paragraph on the Cecilian authorship question Colthorpe first raises the major issue of Collier's possible fabrication of the 1591 hermit's verse petition initially printed by Collier in 1831 and available in BL Ms Egerton 2623, ff 15–16. She informs us that Cecil's '1594 Oration is in prose, and the "petition" in 1591 "not much differing" from it may have been a similar speech in prose, but surely was not the quite different Hermit's Speech in blank verse which Collier printed and which he tried to pass off as by Peele.' Colthorpe seems to be arguing here for a substantial difference between prose and verse, but what did Cecil's hermit mean in 1594 when he called his current petition 'not much differing' from his 1591 request? In 1591 the hermit pleaded with the queen to be 'restored' to his 'cell', ie, the hermitage which Burghley had supposedly usurped, and to be awarded a 'wrytt / for a peaceable possessyon of the same' (Egerton 2623). Here is the hermit's 1594 'petition':

...I heare it comonly reported he [ie, Burghley] had [hath in ms] no disposition to putt out tennants, so am I most sure he will never remove me whom ye Majestie hath placed. Onlie this perplexeth my soule, and causeth cold blood in everie vayne, to see the life of my Founder [Burghley] so often in perill....In this my anxiety have I addressed myselfe to your sacred person, whom I beseech to consider...that Sonnes are not ever of their Fathers conditions; and it may be, that when my young Master shall possesse this, which now under my Founder I enjoy...he may be catched with such liking of my dwelling, as he will rather use it for a place of recreation than of meditation; and then of a Beadman shall I become a Pilgrime....I beseech your Majestie to take order, that [t]heis gray haires may be assurances for my aboade, that, howsoever I live obscure, I may be quiet and secure, not to be driven to seeke my grave, which though it may be every where, yet I desire it to be here (Nichols, Progresses of Elizabeth, iii.244). (See Appendix.)

In other words, the hermit is afraid of losing his hermitage again, and he wants the queen to guarantee a lifelong lease, ie, to guarantee that Robert Cecil will fulfill the conditions of the 'wrytt' awarded by the queen in 1591. Colthorpe confidently informs us that 'surely' the 'quite different Hermit's Speech in blank verse' of 1591 could not have been what the 1594 hermit was referring to in his prose address, but this judgement
appears to be based on a misinterpretation of 'petition'. It does not mean the entire address, in which case the difference between the prose of 1594 and the verse of 1591 would have been a significant difference, but rather it means 'request'. In other words, the hermit's request in 1594 was 'not much differing' from his request in 1591 because both cases concerned his residence in the hermitage. In modern terms, his anxiety is a fear of eviction. Hence Colthorpe fails to recognize that the hermit is drawing a comparison based on the content of the speeches, not the form. Indeed, if difference of form were essential here, would not the supposed forger Collier have noted the discrepancy and then have composed the supposedly fake 1591 greeting in prose? After all, Collier wasn't stupid.

Colthorpe concludes her essay with a much more detailed yet equally misguided attempt to advance her fabrication argument. She reminds us of Collier's mendacity in attempting to attribute the entertainment to Peele through a reference to W. W. Greg's early article, and then points out the contradictions between Collier's introduction to the 1591 hermit's greeting and certain historical facts. She correctly refutes Collier's naively sentimental assertions that Burghley had withdrawn from public life because of deaths in his family to reside 'in some obscure cottage in the neighbourhood of Theobalds', but she distorts Collier's assertion that Burghley 'did not himself make his appearance to welcome' the queen to mean that Burghley did not appear at all. Failure to be on hand for Elizabeth's arrival is not equivalent to failure to turn up at all. Although it would have been unusual for the putative host to be absent at the queen's arrival, the undeniable authentic mock charter (see Sotheby's Catalogue, 15-16 Dec 1980, Lot 299) leaves open the possibility that the hermit's repossession of his hermitage will result in the eviction of Burghley, who would then make his appearance before the queen. The essential point, however, is that Colthorpe's argument refutes Collier's assertion of Burghley's retirement, but it does not refute the verse greeting. Collier asserts that Burghley made 'occasional visits to court', but the hermit says 'he often quitts the place [the hermitage] and comes to court'—hardly a withdrawal from public life. Much more importantly, Colthorpe fails to consider the symbolic nature of Elizabethan entertainments: she fails to recognize what scholars on both sides of the Atlantic (eg, Sydney Anglo, Gordon Kipling, Louis Montrose, Roy Strong) have been telling us for years, namely, that Renaissance ceremony was a complex and fundamentally political form of cultural practice.

In 1591 Burghley was concerned to promote his younger son, Robert Cecil, as his political heir. What better way to do so than to feign a symbolic withdrawal from his natural position as host of the Theobalds entertainment and place his son in the limelight instead? The withdrawal is also a metaphor broadly hinting at Burghley's oft-anticipated death (he wasn't getting any younger), and so Robert Cecil's assumption of Burghley's ceremonial role confidently informed the court that Cecil would fill his father's (political) shoes. Such a device would not have been missed by the 'aspiring minds' who attended the event, including Essex (especially), Raleigh, Robert Carey, etc. At the beginning of the entertainment Robert Cecil was a mere second son, but by the end of the entertainment he had been knighted and Burghley was angling for the secretaryship vacated by Walsingham's death. Essex had his own candidate for the post (William Davison); as usual, however, the earl eventually lost. And while Essex was off in France playing the Spenserian knight for Henry iv's ill-fated wars, Burghley effected a more important coup by engineering the promotion of his newly knighted son to the privy council (August, 1591). This must have been rather astonishing to Essex, who himself did not reach the council until 1593. Robert Cecil did not in fact officially gain the secretaryship until 1596, but his rise to the privy council was a de facto assumption of power, and Burghley was giving his son plenty of governmental experience by assigning him tasks such as the interrogation of two recently captured priests (see Calendar of State Papers, Domestic 1591–1594, pp 38–60, etc).
In fact, Burghley’s ceremonial machinations are akin to the courtly strategies recommended by George Puttenham in *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589). Undoubtedly Burghley was grieved by the deaths of his mother, daughter, and wife (mentioned in the hermit’s 1591 greeting), but such mishaps could be exploited for political gain by the astute courtier (“to winne remorse by lamentable reports”, as Puttenham sagely advises). This may seem a grim or heartless business, but political and personal survival in the Elizabethan court were extremely difficult, and Burghley was the most successful survivor of them all. While lesser men (quite literally) lost their heads, Burghley coolly managed to exercise his power and, as well, pass on his political legacy to a mere second son. He was not averse to feigning a ‘sickness in his sleeve’ (Puttenham again), nor to indulging in strategic grief. Elizabeth was suspicious of his motives, I think, in the banal sentiments and abrupt instructions to Burghley on the occasion of his mother’s death (expressed through her Latin secretary, Sir John Wooley): “She was old, as her Majesty saith, and you wise. And therefore, her death, happening according to natural course, is to be taken moderately of you. To withdraw therefore your troubled mind from private grief to public cogitations, she prayeth your Lordship to think upon the speedy dispatch of commissioners for Munster with all the haste you can” (cited by Conyers Read, *Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth* [1960], 407). This is hardly compassionate, but rather an implicit recognition by the astute Elizabeth that her chief statesman was neglecting important duties, and perhaps political ends. But if we acknowledge in general that courtly life was a complex and dangerous game, how specifically does the authentic part of the Theobalds entertainment function to support my theory of Burghley’s strategic yet fictive withdrawal?

The gardener/molecatcher debate concerns the construction of a presumably real garden at Pymms that is also, more importantly, an allegorical garden. The verse inscription on the box supposedly unearthed by the gardener alludes to Elizabeth as a ‘virgin’ who has reigned thirty-three years; she is, however, a Nestorean queen, and thus her reign so far represents only the ‘fourth part of her yeares’. In the gardener’s speech we learn that the garden at Pymms had been cast into four quarters, but that only one quarter was complete. In this quarter the gardener framed a ‘maze’ consisting of flowers representing the virtues, graces, and muses – standard mythographic fare employed to flatter Elizabeth. The gardener then planted an arbour of eglantine at the command of Robert Cecil and quoted Cecil’s comment on this flower: ‘Eglentine quotho I moste honour, and yt hath the bene towlde mee that the deeper yt is rooted in the grounde the sweeter it smelth in the flower makinge it ever so greene, y’ the Son of spaine att the hotteste cannot parche it’ (Egerton 2623).

Eglantine, of course, is a symbol for Elizabeth, as Roy Strong has amply demonstrated (*The Cult of Elizabeth* [1977], 68–71; *The Renaissance Garden* [1979], 46–7), and the reference to Spain is an obvious allusion to the Armada victory. But it is also, more importantly, a much larger political idea: the flower Elizabeth will resist the potentially withering sun of Spain in the future as well, since the Spanish threat was just as cogent in 1591 as it had been in 1588, if not more so. But most importantly of all, the virgin queen is represented as flourishing in the Cecilian garden, specifically in Robert Cecil’s new garden at Pymms. The allegory would have been obvious to the courtly spectators: Elizabeth will be politically secure if planted firmly in Cecil’s garden, i.e., in Cecil’s sphere of political power, which the queen must allow to operate by promoting him as Burghley’s political heir. Shakespeare employs a similar idea in *Macbeth* when Duncan says, ‘I have begun to plant thee and will labour / To make thee full of growing’ ([. iv]).

The molecatcher’s speech is even more politically explicit about the services to be provided by Robert Cecil. The molecatcher informs us that ‘good clerkes toulde me that moles in fildes were like ill subiectes in commonwelthes, w’here always turninge up the place in w’here they are bredde. But I will not trowble your mat [366x234]butevery daye praye on my knees, y’ all those that be heavers at your state maye com to a moles blessinge
a knocke on the pate and a swinge on a tree' (Egerton ms). The molecatcher, as a servant of Robert Cecil, is entrusted with the metaphorical task of uncovering and destroying domestic traitors as a prelude to the firm establishment of the Elizabethan state. Although his task (according to the gardener) is supposedly finished, there is nothing to prevent new moles from returning to the unplanted quarters of the intended garden, in which case the molecatcher would be required to root them out again. All of this, I would suggest, covertly refers to the intelligence-gathering activities masterfully managed by Walsingham in the past, and which Robert Cecil promises to manage in future if awarded the secretarial post. He and his father were already currently engaged in grilling two captured priests about the subversive activities of English exiles and the intentions of Philip II, and the overall implication of this symbolic debate is that Elizabeth should fear neither internal nor external aggression — so long as she remains under Cecilian management.

If this interpretation is tenable, we have a good explanation for Burghley's 'absence' as a symbolic absence — a message to the queen that she must look to the future for a competent successor to the aging Burghley's political power — and what better successor (in the Cecilian view) than the shrewd second son? With this in mind, let us return to the document questioned by Colthorpe. The splendid mock charter signed by Christopher Hatton is undoubtedly authentic, and since it is dated 10 May we can speculate that it was composed either before the queen's arrival or as a response to the hermit's greeting. In the former case we must assume a connivance between the devisers of the Cecilian entertainment and some person or persons in the queen's entourage, an unprecedented practice in entertainments that were customarily left to the discretion of aristocratic hosts. In the latter case we would assume that the charter was composed as a formal response to the hermit's request, a practice not unlike the queen's improvisational involvement in other ceremonies (eg, her brilliant acceptance of the English Bible during her pre-coronation entry; her role in awarding the May Lady in Sidney's Wanstead entertainment, etc). But regardless of these two possibilities, the charter could have served as a quaint device to allow for the appearance of the symbolically absent Burghley, since the hermit's repossess of his hermitage would seem to result in the 'eviction' of Burghley. In any event, it is certain that the charter represents a response to a petition by a hermit.

It seems that in this case the responsibility for proving forgery lies with the questioner rather than the defender of the document, especially in view of Collier's subsequent production of an authentic manuscript of the gardener/molecatcher debate. And as I have pointed out above, Colthorpe's argument refutes Collier's naively sentimental misinterpretation of Burghley's retirement, but not the greeting itself. Indeed, the opening of Colthorpe's final paragraph tells us something about her scholarly method: 'As for the manner of the speech, as opposed to the matter, in its phraseology it is frequently un-Elizabethan, but to dignify it with further analysis would be akin to taking a sledge-hammer to crack a nut....' Literary critics and historians are precisely in the business of 'dignifying' texts with analysis, and it is a pure evasion to condemn its phraseology as 'frequently un-Elizabethan' without citing even a single example. Indeed, Colthorpe hardly deals with 'manner' or 'matter'. But if she fails to prove that it is a forgery, there are nonetheless some relevant questions to ask which might help to clarify the issue. As W.W. Greg pointed out, Collier's transcription of the manuscript contains some errors. Why would a forger misread his own forgery? Is this a forger's clever trick to preclude any suspicion of forgery? Also, why would a forger misunderstand his own forgery? One phrase of Collier's introduction which Colthorpe refrains from quoting is Collier's assertion that 'Robert Cecill... was the person who pronounced the [hermit's] speech'; this is simply wrong, since the hermit says that
...my fownder kepsett his hermytage
and gave me warrant to provyde for all
a task unfytyng one so base as I
whom nether soons nor servantts would obey
the younge lyke to scorne my poor advyce
becawssse that he hear after in this place
was to becom the gardian of this howsse.... (Egerton ms)

The 'younge' is Robert Cecil, and so Robert Cecil could not have been the speaker. Would Collier purposely misunderstand his own forgery this badly, even to mislead potentially suspicious readers? Although Colthorpe is privileged to question this document because of what she calls Collier's 'unsavoury reputation as a literary forger', we must also acknowledge that between forgeries Collier performed a great deal of honest scholarly work, and we should wonder what was at stake for Collier in this case. Clearly the hermit's greeting is insignificant in comparison to the famous Shakespearean forgeries. Indeed, the recent debate sparked by Dewey Ganzel's book-length attempt to exonerate Collier from forging the Perkins (Shakespeare) Folio may result in a 'hung jury', and therefore preclude us from simply assuming — on the basis of reputation — that Collier forged anything.

Finally, it is significant that the hermit refers specifically to 'my noble Lo. hyghe Admirall' (Charles Howard), 'this young La. Veare', 'my L. hyghe chancelor' (Christopher Hatton), and 'y'ma L. Chamberlayn' (Henry Carey). We know that these people were present at the entertainment because of lists available in Hatfield House, Cecil Papers 140/33–34 and 143/65–68, and Collier could have learned of Hatton's presence through Sype. But could Collier have known that the other three figures were in attendance? If not, it seems unlikely that a forger would provide these names unless he were certain that they were present. In essence, the hermit's greeting could be a forgery, but Colthorpe's decision that it is a forgery is supported by no real evidence; we can, I believe, regard it as genuine until someone adduces convincing evidence to the contrary.

APPENDIX

The following document is a transcription of a previously unpublished version of the 1594 hermit's speech in Lambeth Palace Library (Lambeth Palace ms 2858, ff 188–192). It is useful to have a transcription of this manuscript because it provides a few readings significantly different from the Bodleian manuscript transcribed by Nichols (Bodleian ms Rawlinson D. 692, ff 106–109) and printed in Progresses, iii.241–5. It is additionally useful to compare the two manuscripts because Nichols made a few mistakes in transcription. The notes list variants and instances where Nichols' text is unreliable. I shall not consider Nichols' editing procedures (orthography, punctuation, capitalization, abbreviation, paragraph division, etc), but reveal why it is advisable for scholars of Elizabethan/Jacobean ceremony to check, whenever possible, Nichols' transcriptions against the manuscripts. The following transcription is as literal as possible, and the expansion of certain abbreviations is indicated by italics. In the notes the Lambeth manuscript will be referred to as L. and the Bodleian as B.

---

...my fownder kepsett his hermytage
and gave me warrant to provyde for all
a task unfytyng one so base as I
whom nether soons nor servantts would obey
the younge lyke to scorne my poor advyce
becawssse that he hear after in this place
was to becom the gardian of this howsse.... (Egerton ms)
The Hermittes oration at Theobalds
1594 penned by Sir Robert Cecill

Most gratious soveraigne I humbly beseech you not to impute this approachinge approachinge soe neere to yo" sacred presence soo rudeulye att yo" comminge to this house to be a presumption of begger for I hope when yo" Ma"e shalbe remembered by me whose I am and howe gravouslye yo" have heretofore on the like occasion relieved my necessity, yo" Maestie wilbe pleased to receive my thanks uppon my knees with all humilitie. I am the poore hermite yo" Maesties Beadsman whose att yo" last comminge thither where god grante yo" ma'aigne many yeares upon my complaynte by yo" princelye favo" was restored to my herydtadg by an Injunction when my founder uppon a strange concept to feed his owne humo" had placed me contrary to my profession in his house amongst a number of worldlings and retreyd my self in this poore cell where I have ever since by yo" only goodnes (most princely and powerfull Queene) lived in all happynes of content be happines spendinge three partes of the daye in Repentance the fourth in prayinge for yo" Maestie That as yo" vertues have ben the worlds wonder so yo" daies may see the worlds end. And surely I am of oppinion I shall not flatter my self I thinke my prayers have not ben fruiteles though millions have joyned in the like in that since my Resolution not only all yo" actions have mervelously prospered and yo" enimies ben defaced; but which most amazeth mee to whose longe experience nothinge can seem strange wth theis same eyes doe I beholde yo" the selfsame Queene in the same estate of person strength and beautye in wth soe many yeares past I behelde yo" fyndinge no alteraation but in admiration, Insomuch as I am perswaded when I looke aboute me on yo" trayne, that tyme which catcheth every bodie leaves yo" only untouched and nowe most Gratious lady as I have most humbly thanke yo" for that wth is past soo being constrayned to trouble yo" Maestie with another petition, not much different from the former I have presumed to prepare for yo" an offeringe only as a token of my devotion though meeter for an hermitt to present as a badge of his solitarye life then for soe great a Monarche to receive but my poverty cannot amend yt.

I am as yo" Maestie seeth an olde aged man apt to be full of doubts, and experience hath taught mee, that manye mens promises are no charters yet is not my founder to be mistrusted whose worde is a Seale to others And I heare yt commonly reported he hath no disposition to put out Tenants, Soe I am most sure hee will never remove me whose yo" Maestye hath placed onlie this perplexeth my soule causeth colde bloode in every vaine to see the life of my founder soo often in perill, nay his desire is hastie as his age to Inherit his Tombe being natures tennte. But this I heare which is the greatest comforte and none of your lest vertues that when his body being laden with yeares oppressed with sicknes havinge spent his strength for publique service desireth to be ridd of worldly cares by endinge his dayes yo" maestie wth a bonde of Princely care yeaven when he is most grievouslye sicke and lowest brought, holds him back and ransometh hym. In this my Anxietye have I adressed my self to yo" sacred person whom I beseech to consider It is not rare that sonnes are not ever of their fathers condicons, And yt may that when my yonger master shall possesse this wth nowe under my founder I enioye where of I hope there shalbe noe haste hee may be catched wth such likinge of dwellinge as he will rather use yt for a place of recreation then of meditacion; then of a beadsman shall I become a pilgryme And therefore seeinge I heare yt of all the countrye folke I meet wth, that yo" Maestie doth use hym in yo" service as in former tyme have done his father my founder and that although he his experience and judgment be noe way comparable yet as the reporte goeth hath some thinge in hym like the childe of suche a parent I beseech yo" Maestie to take order that theis gray haires may be assurance for my abode that howsoever I live obscure I may be quiett.
and secure not to be driven to seeke my grave which though I may be every where yet I desire yt may be here. This may be done if yo' will but enioyne hym for your pleasure whose will is to him a lawe not to deny me the favo' formerly procured of his father att the motion of that Goddes of whom he holds hym self a second creature And nowe a little further to acquaynt yo' MaLewthmy happe, thoughe I must arme my self with patience, my founder to leave all free for yo' and yo' Trayne hath commited to my nest all his unlegged birds beinge the comfort of his age and his precious lewell being to some of them grandfathers to other ill dervyd from his good oppinion of me But suche a wanton chardge for a poore olde man as nowe they heare of the arivall, of such an Admirable worke of nature A man must pluck their quils or els they will dayly flye out to see yo' Maiestye suche is the workinge of the grandfathers affection in them and yo' vertue and beautye to this charge I will hye me, seeing yt is my desire and for all yo' maistyes favour I can but contynue my bowed prayers for yo' and in token of my poor affection present yo' on my knees tris trifes agreeable to my profession by the use whereof and by my constant faythe I live free from all temptation the first is a bell of golde not bigg the second is a booke of good prayers garnished wrh the same mettall the third is a candle of virgin waxe meet for a virgin Queene with booke bell and candle being hallowed in my cell with good prayers I assure my self by whomsoever they shalbe kept induced with a constant faiethe their shall never come so muche an Imagination of any spirit to offend him. The rest whereof I will still retayne in my self for my dayly use in ringinge the bell and giving light in the night for the increase of my devotion whereby I may be free to my meditation and prayers for yo' Maisties contynuance in yo' prosperity in health and princely comfort.

NOTES

1 Nichols' date of '1593-4' is '1594' in
2 b inserts 'my' after 'this'
3 The repetition of this word is a scribal error
4 b inserts 'a' after 'of'
5 b hither
6 b come
7 t. fails to close the parenthesis here
8 b hermitage. It is probable that the t. reading is simply a scribal error
9 b him selfe, a better reading than t.
10 b my
11 b peerlesse
12 t. fails to close the parenthesis here
13 The t. phrase 'yf content be happines' is not in b
14 b restitucon, a better reading than t.
15 b miraculously
16 b inserts 'all' after 'and'
17 Nichols reads 'defeated' here, but b presents a problem. In b, 'defeated' has been corrected to 'defaced' in what appears to be the same hand. The ink of the correction is much darker than that of surrounding words, but this may have been caused by the scribe's desire to emphasize the correction by pressing down harder on the page, and this darker ink is matched by the darker words in bold style which commence each paragraph. Apparently Nichols rejected the correction without considering that all of Elizabeth's enemies had not been 'defeated' by 1594, but had certainly been 'defaced'. This is one of a few places where it is worth checking Nichols' transcription against the manuscript.
18 B inserts 'that' after 'but'
19 B only yo'
20 B thanked. It is probable that the t. reading is simply a scribal error
21 B differing
22 Nichols inserts 'it' after 'yet', but this reading is not in B
23 B scale
24 B also reads 'thath', but Nichols gives 'had', an erroneous reading or alteration which misleadingly implies that the 'founder' (Burghley) is dead or retired.
25 B am I
26 B inserts 'and' after 'soule'
27 B 'Tennant'. The t. reading is probably just a scribal error, but it is remotely possible that the scribe understood it to mean 'tent'. In this somewhat less-than-plausible case, the tomb would be metaphorically viewed as a tent, and we may recall the famous problem of how to stage the 'tent' scene in Act V of Richard III. In that play, the sleeping figures may have been presented to the audience in a way that suggested death and the tomb, especially since a series of ghosts enters to address the sleepers. Richard's discomfort is visually enhanced by this tomb-like enclosure, which also recalls Clarence's dream of suffocation and the off-stage completion of his murder in a butt of wine.
28 B his
29 B wth a band of princelie, kindnes even
30 B inserts 'be' after 'may'
31 B young
32 B inserts 'and' after 'meditacon'
33 B you, a better reading than t.
34 B also reads 'experience', but Nichols gives the nonsensical reading 'expence'. This is another place where an interested scholar benefits from checking the manuscript against Nichols.
35 B inserts 'he' after 'goeth'
36 B also reads 'theis', but Nichols gives 'heis', either a printing error or the equivalent of 'his'. 'Theis' is, of course, the correct reading, since the hermit is an old man who is presumably pointing to his own gray hair as he utters the phrase, but 'heis' is not completely nonsensical, since it could be taken to refer either to Burghley or to Robert Cecil.
37 B assurances
38 B it, but t. provides the better reading because of the hermit's fear of becoming a pilgrim
39 B omits 'but'
40 B Jewells, a better reading than t.
41 B Grandfather, a better reading than t.
42 B others, a better reading than t.
43 B all, a better reading than t.
44 B the, a scribal error which Nichols does not correct
45 B destiny
46 B vowed, a better reading than t.
47 B inserts 'poore' after 'theis'
48 B omits 'the'
49 B omits 'my'
50 B 'The First is a Bell not bigg but of gold'
51 B virgins
52 B inserts 'this' after 'with'
53 B there, a better reading than t., unless t. is simply a strange spelling variation
54 B inserts 'as' after 'muche', a better reading than t.
55 B them
56 B like
57 B cell
58 B in
59 B inserts 'me' after 'giving'