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It is the sound of the visual herald when he reveals truth and an interjection which appears repeatedly in Blake's work. 'Lo' is a word which proclaims that men see with their minds, travel mentally, and wage 'Mental War.'

2 The phrase appears repeatedly in Her. Los is, of course, the fourth Zoa — he says so in J. 42: 11, 23-24.


REYNOLDS ANNOTATIONS: Marcia Allentuck, going through my xerox and elaborate transcript, noted the following slips in the Doubleday simplified report:

Angle brackets shd enclose "Here...Circumstances" (P 639: p 87), "Broken...Sublime" (P 641: p 102), "The...Operations" (P 643: p 131), "To...Science" (P 644: p 135), "How...Species" (P 645: p 149), "Demonstration...Intuition" (P 648: p 200), and "These...Colour" (P 651: p 279). On P 645: p 152, no brackets shd be around the second "Never!"
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P 14. Night line 44 Graze shd be Grase (The 8 is angular but not a 2).

P 51 line 10 Hands deprest shd be Heads deprest (Depressing!)

P 61 line 5 Human shd be lower case human

P 62 line 26 enclos'd shd be enclos'd

P 146 line 27 revolve shd be revolve

P 181 line 29 tragic shd be spelled tragic

P 202 line 20 Universal Concave can be emended to Universal Conclave (as the context pretty much demands)

P 270 Several persons have collated the Hebrew of the Laocoon inscriptions with the engraved plate and kindly noted that the printers misspelled Lilith and King Jehovah, although Blake had them both right. In Lilith a Heh appears instead of the final Thav. In Malekth Jehovah three incorrect letters appear, Daleth instead of Khaph, Sophith, Kheth instead of Heh, and Resh instead of Vav.

(P 277 TIRIEL: The substantive variants in the new edition by Bentley, "were" for "was" in l: 2 and "dales" for "dales" in l: 27, are simply misprints, as one can see from the facsimile).

P 287 line 101 loud (since it is an emendation) shd be /lou'd/

Pp 287-8 William F. Halloran (who is writing about this in BNYPL) makes a convincing case for emending the dialogue by moving lines 105-9 to come after line 120.

P 493 From Cratetos shd be spelled from Cratelos (clear enough in N; now first observed by W. H. Stevenson)
P 669 On design on 101, add this inadvertently omitted paragraph at the end of the inscription:

Whatever Book is for Vengeance for Sin & whatever Book is Against the Forgiveness of Sins is not of the Father but of Satan the Accuser & Father of Hell.

*** The following should be added as a separate entry: On drawing LB 32 in the British Museum Print Room -- a design for a title page. (The title sketched in begins with "The" but consists, in two further lines, of strokes not perhaps meant to form actual words).

Angels to be very small as small as the letters that they may not interfere with the subject at bottom which is to be in a stormy sky & rain separated from the angels by Clouds.

P 729 note on 32: 15 Kerabim. The lemma is right as transcript of what Blake actually wrote, Khaph the first letter. But to spell Kerabim it should be Kaph. The "correction" gets the second letter wrong, however, following Keynes (Dalet instead of Resh) and does not correct the first. (PS: The new Keynes is corrected). ** But wait! What first letter Blake meant to write is not at all that certain. The plate shows a strong dot just left of the top bar of the letter. Kaph would have the dot within its curve, but Khaph would have no dot. Take your choice. It really looks as though Blake wrote and meant Kerabim, not Cherubim, and all this "error" is among us editors and printers.

P 732 insert this for 49: 35: Void / ground rdg on plate, scribal error influenced by line 33; correct reading supplied from Milton 5: 22, which Blake was rather absently copying.

P 732 52: 20 bloody pain shd be bloody plain

P 733 add 55:20 Conclave / emendation of textual Concave

69: 1 combined / mended by pen from conjoined (in the Mellon copy) This is true, but too simple; Blake etched "combined", mended it by cutting the plate to form "conjoined", and only in the Mellon copy restored "combined" by pen and ink.

P 734 add: 98:45 the Covenant of / mended from thy Covenant to the Covento: which we emend to the Covenant of (But restored by pen in the Mellon copy to thy covenant -- I argue nevertheless for the emended reading: all this is in "Suppressed and Altered Passages..." SB XVII (1964) 38-39).

P 736 Deleted matter noted in Bentley's Tiriel -- or in my own notes, and now perhaps called for:

4: 79 The secret / The gloom 1st rdg
4: 79 like / torn like 1st rdg del
5: 22 sun / silep / 1st rdg: but Bentely may be right: ?plea/sure? /
6: 40 art / child art 1st rdg
6: 49 fall / mended from fall
8: 21 drone / foolish crawling drone 1st rdg
4.

Two Problems in The Four Zoas

W. H. Stevenson

University of Dadan.

I wish to discuss two problems which puzzled me as I was preparing The Four Zoas for the Longmans edition of Blake's poetry. Both involve the arrangement and organisation of the Nights; neither can be finally determined, since we cannot be sure that Blake himself had made up his mind. He has certainly not made any decisions clear on paper. Unfortunately, an editor must make decisions, and the discussion which follows is largely an account of the reasons which led me to answer these problems as I did. Throughout this work I was involved in a fruitful cooperation with D. V. Erdman, and so I had better stress that these arguments are entirely my own. All references are to the Erdman edition of 1965.

The two problems are, first: Where does the Second Night begin?--and the second, which has attracted more attention: What did Blake mean to do with Night VIII?

Almost all editions have passed over the first question with ease. The MS presents a series of Night-headings; Night the First on p. 3 is plain, and so is Night the Third (on p. 37) now, although Blake had had other thought as a series of erasures shows. About Night the Fourth there is no doubt at all. It follows, then, that the remaining chapter-heading must be the Second, cryptic though it is in its reading Night the... (twice written First, and once Third; never Second, according to Erdman, p. 747). But does it follow? Only if it is essential that a Night must start on one of these pages headed Vala in large script. Most editors have considered the marginal insertion