

Some general points about the transcription.

It is a moot point whether these should be read in a colloquial or a formal style. I have gone for a colloquial version - trippingly upon the tongue, as it were. If you felt this was too colloquial, and wanted a more formal style, then several changes would be needed, especially:

- the reduced vowels in such words as 'and', 'as', and 'for' would need replacing by full vowels; at the moment, for example, unstressed 'and' is shown as ən or ənd
- unstressed 'of' is here usually ə (as in 'cuppa tea') , but it would need its 'f' sounding
- 'with' would have its full 'th' - 'with' instead of 'wit' (as in modern Irish)
- final consonant clusters would not be reduced, e.g. 'must' instead of 'mus'

A major decision relates to initial 'h', which was often dropped in those days without any feeling of this being an uneducated use. I have omitted it except when it is obviously a strongly stressed word. This means that some lines, to a modern ear, sound quite 'uneducated'. You could restore all the 'h's if you wanted. Doubtless there were Holofernes-type people at the time who insisted on pronouncing every 'h' because it was there in the spelling. Note the different effects, e.g. here::

and havin cləɪmd the ste:p-up heɪnləɪ hill,
ənd avin cləɪmd the ste:p-up əɪnləɪ ill,

The second version is more authentic but perhaps more difficult to understand?

Note that if you do leave out the 'h', the pronunciation of 'and' would probably change:

səch civil wɑ:ɪ is in mɪ lʌve ənd ɛ:te,
or ...ən hɛ:te