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Scholars are frequently surprised to learn that critics of earlier literary eras passed considerably different judgments on contemporary authors from those bestowed by posterity. Writers such as Blake or Thoreau, all but overlooked in their own age, are now regarded by most critics as literary giants of their times. Others such as Cowley or Southey, who received laurels of seemingly immortal fame from their contemporaries, have all but faded into oblivion. Another writer in this latter group, distinguished by an especially precipitous decline in popularity, is Edward Young. Today, e Night the First, the most readily available of the nine poems of his once immensely popular The Complaint: or, Night-Thoughts on Life, Death, and Immortality, is all but forgotten.

Two major influences contributed to the decline in Young's reputation. First, an obvious change has occurred in literary taste since the mid-eighteenth century. Readers have grown impatient with most long, didactic poems, and there can be little doubt that Night-Thoughts is an example of this type of poetry. Yet, as the following chapter will demonstrate, a second and perhaps even more decisive influence was responsible for the abruptness of Young's fall from popularity. From the time that Night-Thoughts first appeared until the 1920's, most critics
mistakenly viewed it as autobiographical. Misguided attempts at autobiographical interpretation, along with incomplete and in some cases derogatory biographical information about the author, led critics of the mid-nineteenth century to accuse Young of being "insincere," a charge these earnest Victorians apparently regarded as one of the most serious that could be lodged against an author or his works. Over one hundred years later, neither the reputation of Night-Thoughts nor that of its author has recovered fully from this charge.

This dissertation on Young's Night the First has two purposes. The foremost of these is to provide readers of the poem with a reliable text, one which will permit them to read and appreciate Night the First for what it is, rather than for what generations of careless printers and publishers have made it. No new editions of Night-Thoughts have been published in the last hundred years, and the most readily available texts are so corrupt that close analyses, with careful attention to subtle nuances of expression and meaning, are extremely risky if not downright dangerous for a literary critic. The second purpose is to provide the reader with a solid understanding of the poem by brushing away the myths that have grown up around it over the years and by presenting in their place more soundly based interpretations.

The material to fulfill these two purposes is arranged in the following manner. Chapter II (''Critical Introduction'') provides a survey of past and present criticism of Night-Thoughts
and a close analysis of *Night the First* based on an authoritative text. Chapter III ("Textual Introduction") surveys and resolves the problems confronting the textual critic of *Night the First* and, in so doing, forms the bibliographical underpinning for a critical edition. Chapter IV ("The Text of *Night the First*") provides an authoritative "old-spelling" edition of the poem. The three appendixes which follow this text give deviations from the copy-text, list substantive variants, and annotate obscure or complicated passages in the poem. A bibliography of the most editorially significant editions of *Night the First* and of the most important works of criticism on the poem completes the study.

Although the reputation of writers in any age is subject to change, a decline in popularity is not always irreversible, especially when the decline results from corrupt texts and critical misinterpretations. The most noteworthy demonstration of this fact is seen in the poetry of John Donne, which fell from popularity after the author's death, only to be restored to prominence in the early part of the twentieth century. Although such a shift in critical opinion is, no doubt, partially explicable in terms of changes in literary taste, one must also note that this revaluation did not begin until Sir Herbert Grierson had edited a critical edition of Donne's poems in 1912. Whether a similar bright future lies ahead for *Night the First* and for Young's *Night-Thoughts* as a result of the present textual study rests in the hands of future scholars and literary critics.
CHAPTER II: CRITICAL INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the literary scholar with a survey of past and present criticism of Night-Thoughts and a close analysis of Night the First based on an authoritative text. None of the nine poems of Night-Thoughts is likely to be very familiar, even to many specialists in Restoration and eighteenth-century literature. This unfamiliarity with Night-Thoughts and Night the First suggests that a general overview of both is now needed.

Part One of this chapter provides a brief history of Night-Thoughts prior to the twentieth century. Present neglect of the work contrasts sharply with the extremely high popularity that it enjoyed in the decades that followed its composition. Part One traces this initial popularity, the generally high critical esteem in which Night-Thoughts was held until the mid-nineteenth century, and the precipitous decline in popularity that it suffered during the Victorian period. The shift in opinion resulted in part from changes in taste but primarily from charges of "insincerity" against the author. These charges stemmed from misguided attempts to interpret Night-Thoughts autobiographically.

Part Two provides an overview of the most significant developments in twentieth-century criticism of Night-Thoughts. Much of this scholarship has been directed toward correcting the
misunderstandings of earlier critics by exposing the weaknesses of autobiographical interpretation of the poem. Twentieth-century scholarship is also marked by a more informed appreciation of eighteenth-century literary theory and aesthetics than earlier criticism, and, in this context, a number of scholars have studied the relationship of Night-Thoughts to other poetic, theological, and scientific works of the period. Finally, the twentieth century has seen significant bibliographical studies of Young's letters and his printed texts, including Night-Thoughts.

Part Three provides a critical analysis of Night the First as a poem in its own right (as distinct from all the other Nights which together constitute the work). This close study, which is needed because critics of Night-Thoughts have thus far focussed attention either on the work as a whole or on the later Nights, is made possible by the critical text presented later in this dissertation.
A clear demonstration of the early popularity of *Night-Thoughts* is readily apparent from a glance at its publication history, since even the sceptic cannot deny that a large number of editions usually indicates a large number of readers. *Night the First* was initially published by Robert Dodsley in 1742 as a folio entitled *The Complaint; or, Night-Thoughts on Life, Death, and Immortality*. Dodsley published at least six more individual editions of this poem between 1742 and 1744. By 1746, *Night-Thoughts* had grown to encompass nine independently-published poems, and the long title originally given to the first *Night* had come to designate the whole. At least fourteen authorized editions of collected *Nights*, all of which include *Night the First*, appeared before Young's death in 1765. Numerous editions of Young's collected *Works* and also separate editions of *Night-Thoughts* continued to be published throughout the remainder of the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century, both in English-speaking lands and on the continent as well.

The pre-publication background of *Night-Thoughts* is uncertain, since no manuscript is extant for any of the *Nights* and since Young's correspondence is largely silent on the subject of their composition. As Henry Pettit has noted, "The origin of the poem is obscure; its occasion conjectural, the circumstances of its composition almost entirely unknown, and only the barest facts of
its publication available."\(^5\) Despite the fact that the poem is written in first person singular and that most eighteenth and nineteenth-century readers viewed the "I" in Night-Thoughts to be Young himself, the verifiable clues about the poem's beginnings are insufficient to support an assumption that it is autobiographical.

Indeed, by his own choice, it was not immediately clear to some contemporary readers that Edward Young was the author of the work.\(^6\) The 1742 folio, like all subsequent editions and later installments of Night-Thoughts published during the author's lifetime, was anonymous. Young already had established his reputation as a poet and dramatist, and he chose to have Dodsley publish the work anonymously to test its appeal on the basis of intrinsic merit rather than past achievements of its author. Yet, even though Young apparently did not even let friends know that the poem was his, the secret of authorship was not well-kept. Dodsley divulged Young's name to inquirers as early as August 1742.\(^7\)

In any event, Young must surely have been gratified by the overwhelmingly favorable initial reception that Night the First received. Some of its early readers, such as Benjamin Victor, may have considered its theme a "melancholly unfashionable subject,"\(^8\) but the large number of editions printed bears silent testimony to the fact that they read and enjoyed it just the same. Not all of the early popularity of the work was strictly literary. Many of the readers apparently were more interested in determining the identity of the characters named in the poem than in a critical
study of the work itself. Also, a number of religious leaders such as Charles Wesley, who regarded *Night-Thoughts* as next to the scriptures in importance, were more interested in the religious values that the work set forth than in its merits as poetry.

The most impressive tributes to the poem, however, come neither from the sheer number of editions published nor from the high praise of contemporary theologians, but rather from the remarks of the best known men of letters. Samuel Johnson wrote in his *Lives of the English Poets* that *Night-Thoughts* exhibits a very wide display of original poetry, variegated with deep reflections and striking allusions, a wilderness of thought in which the fertility of fancy scatters flowers of every hue and of every odour. This is one of the few poems in which blank verse could not be changed for rhyme but with disadvantage. The wild diffusion of the sentiments and the digressive sallies of imagination would have been compressed and restrained by confinement to rhyme. The excellence of this work is not exactness, but copiousness; particular lines are not to be regarded; the power is in the whole, and in the whole there is a magnificence like that ascribed to Chinese Plantation, the magnificence of vast extent and endless diversity.

The most significant point here is that Johnson, who seemed to regard the reading of *Paradise Lost* as almost a burden—"one of the books which the reader admires and lays down, and forgets to take up again"—speaks of the much lengthier *Night-Thoughts* as intellectually stimulating. This view of *Night-Thoughts* contrasts sharply with that held by many twentieth-century readers, who are more likely to regard the poem as merely gloomy, repetitive, and uninspiring.
Boswell is even more effusive in his praise for *Night-Thoughts* than his mentor, remarking in his *Life of Johnson* that the work, which he esteemed "as a mass of the grandest and richest poetry that human genius ever produced," not only has all the merits that Johnson so well brings in view, but a power of the Pathetick beyond almost any example that I have seen. He who does not feel his nerves shaken, and his heart pierced by many passages in this extraordinary work, particularly by that most affecting one, which describes the gradual torment suffered by the contemplation of an object of affectionate attachment, visibly and certainly decaying into dissolution, must be of a hard and obstinate frame.

To all the other excellencies of *Night Thoughts,* let me add the great and peculiar one, that they contain not only the noblest sentiments of virtue, and contemplations on immortality, but the Christian Sacrifice, the Divine Propitiation, with all its interesting circumstances, and consolations to a wounded spirit, solemnly and poetically displayed in such imagery and language, as cannot fail to exalt, animate, and soothe the truly pious. No book whatever can be recommended to young persons, with better hopes of seasoning their minds with vital religion, than YOUNG'S *NIGHT THOUGHTS.*

Even the independent thinking Blake regarded *Night-Thoughts* as a work of sufficient importance that he was willing to labor for two years in preparing a series of 537 watercolor illustrations of the text. Richard Edwards, the publisher of this illustrated edition, remarks in his introduction that in "an age like the present of literature and of taste, in which the arts, fostered by the general patronage, have attained to growth beyond the experience of former times, no apology can be necessary for
offering to the publick an embellished edition of an English classic; or for giving to the great work of Young some of those advantages of dress and ornament which have lately distinguished the immortal productions of Shakspeare and of Milton." Thus, however odd it might strike us today, Night-Thoughts at one time was considered to rank among the great masterpieces in the English language, and Young was given honors similar to those bestowed on Shakespeare and Milton.

After the mid-nineteenth century, however, Young's reputation suffered a sharp decline, and the popularity of Night-Thoughts faded rapidly. The shift in opinion was caused in part by increasing censure of what critics regarded as the inherent weaknesses of the work—its length and its apparent gloominess. But these liabilities had long been recognized, even during Young's lifetime, as the following couplet, written just after the publication of Night the Ninth (The Consolation) in 1746, suggests:

After so many dismal Nights were past
'T was just that Consolation came at last.

A more significant factor in the decline was a questioning of the poet's "sincerity." As early as 1819, Thomas Campbell notes in his Specimens of the British Poets that Young was, in truth, not so sick of life as of missing its preferments, and was still ambitious not only of converting Lorenzo, but of shining before this utterly worthless and wretched world as a sparkling, sublime, and witty poet. Hence his poetry has not the majestic simplicity of a
heart abstracted from human vanities, and while the groundwork of his sentiments is more darkly shaded than is absolutely necessary either for poetry or religion, the surface of his expression glitters with irony and satire, and with thoughts sometimes absolutely approaching to pleasantry. His ingenuity in the false sublime is very peculiar. The sentiments may have been shared by other men of letters of this time, although new editions of Night-Thoughts continued to appear, culminating in the publication in 1854 of the Nichols-Doran edition which is now the standard text for Young's works.

The crushing blow to Young's reputation as one of the major poets of English literature was delivered in 1857 by George Eliot, in an article entitled "Worldliness and Other-Worldliness: The Poet Young." After a scathing introduction in which Eliot describes Young as "a poet whose imagination is alternately fired by the 'Last Day' and by a creation of peers, who fluctuates between rhapsodic applause of King George and rhapsodic applause of Jehovah," she begins her discussion of Night-Thoughts by focussing on lines 210-212 of Night the First. These are the lines in which the speaker refers to the deaths of three loved ones "e'er thrice yon Moon had fill'd her Horn" (I, 212). In these lines, Eliot assumes the validity of the almost universally-accepted autobiographical interpretation of Night-Thoughts. This interpretation, to be discussed in greater detail in Part Two, was based on a belief that Young wrote Night-Thoughts to express and, in so doing, alleviate his deep personal grief over the deaths of his wife, of his step-daughter Elizabeth Lee, and of her husband.
William Temple. Having done sufficient biographical research on the poet to confirm that these three individuals did not indeed die within the time constraints set forth in the poem (i.e., all within one single three month period), she makes the observation: "Since we find Young departing from the truth of dates, in order to heighten the effect of his calamity, or at least of his climax, we need not be surprised that he allowed his imagination great freedom in other matters besides chronology, and that the character of 'Philander' can, by no process, be made to fit Mr. Temple."

Eliot could perhaps have exercised her talents to greater advantage by using this finding to demonstrate the shortcomings of the customary autobiographical interpretation of *Night-Thoughts*; instead, she makes this evidence the cornerstone of her argument that "One of the most striking characteristics of Young is his radical insincerity as a poetic artist." This trait, she asserts, underlies Young's penchant for abstractions and his neglect "of concrete objects or specific emotions." She demonstrates this point by noting how rarely "we come on any allusion that carries us to the lanes, woods, or fields," and then remarks that Young "sees Religion coming down from the skies, with this world in her left hand and the other world in her right; but we never find him dwelling on virtue or religion as it really exists--in the emotions of a man dressed in an ordinary coat, and seated by his fire-side of an evening, with
his hand resting on the head of his little daughter . . . ."25

In short, Eliot uses the inevitable inconsistencies of an inaccurate critical theory to "prove" that the poet was "insincere," and then blames this "insincerity" for Young's "flaws" as a writer. These "flaws," in sum, are that he lacked a Romantic poet's love of nature and a Victorian novelist's skill in portraying the subtle shades of human emotion. While Eliot states her aesthetic views in brilliantly witty terms, today's literary scholar is likely to be more forgiving of Young's failure to anticipate shifts in English literary tastes that were not to occur until long after his death in 1765.

Despite the obvious bias in Eliot's critical standards, there can be little doubt that her contemporaries accepted her censures of Young. Carlyle remarked that the article was "One of the best things she ever wrote."26 In his History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century, originally published in 1876, Leslie Stephen echoes Eliot: "There is as little of really deep sentiment as of sincerity; for, in fact, Young's hatred of the world revealed the disappointed patronage-hunter, rather than the religious enthusiast; and, instead of a uniform flow of poetry, or even of rhetoric, he lashes himself into a never-ending series of antitheses. The unnatural strain is felt in every line; each paragraph bristles with a number of points . . . ."27 Indeed, if anyone doubts that Eliot's charges were what one critic has termed a "fatal blow"28 to Young's reputation, he or she need only glance at Pettit's bibliographies of the poet's works in England and the United States.29
No editions of Young were published in these countries after Eliot's 1857 article, save for a handful of reprints. The fact that Eliot's objections are not logically grounded, however, does not mean that eighteenth-century readers were correct in assuming Night-Thoughts to be one of the great masterpieces in the English language; it does mean that the work came to be seriously misunderstood. Part Two of this chapter shows how twentieth-century critics have corrected some of the most serious of these misunderstandings.

PART TWO: TWENTIETH-CENTURY RE-EXAMINATION OF NIGHT-THOUGHTS

The reputation of Night-Thoughts reached a low ebb by the beginning of the twentieth century; since that time a number of critics have re-examined the work. They have challenged some of the Victorians' censures, most notably the alleged "insincerity," and they have made significant advances in three areas of Young scholarship. First, because a few scholars have examined the internal structure of Night-Thoughts, virtually all serious critics now agree that the four major named characters (Philander, Narcissa, Lucia, and Lorenzo) are depictions of fictitious rather than actual persons. Second, modern scholars have achieved a more informed appreciation of eighteenth-century literary theory than earlier critics, and some have studied Night-Thoughts in relation to other poetic, theological, and scientific works of the period. Finally, bibliographical studies of Young's letters and published works have helped clear the way for more reliable texts.
Walter Thomas' *Le Poète Edward Young*, the first full-length biography of the author, provided the impetus to re-examine the autobiographical interpretation of Night-Thoughts. Thomas embraces the assumption that Night-Thoughts is indeed autobiographical, but he questions the traditional identifications of Philander as Young's son-in-law Henry Temple and of Narcissa as Young's step-daughter Elizabeth Lee. He argues instead that the true identity of Philander is Thomas Tickell, Young's old university friend, who died 23 April 1740. Walter Thomas suggests that Tickell's death, unlike Temple's in August of the same year, would have been within the three-month time limit imposed by lines 210-212 of Night the First, since he accepts the traditional identification of Lucia as Young's own wife (Mrs. Young died 29 January 1740). Also, the biographer asserts that Tickell fits the description of Philander better than Temple. He argues that Young did not correct the erroneous identification of Philander as Temple because such an action might have cast doubt on the identification of Narcissa as Young's step-daughter Elizabeth Lee and thus have revealed a dark secret from the poet's past. Thomas speculates that the real Narcissa was actually an illegitimate daughter who died in 1740 after the death of Mrs. Young but before that of Tickell: "C'était peut-être une fille naturelle reconnue par le père, acceptée par sa femme, mais désavouée par le moraliste. Peut-être encore l'enfant est-elle née trop tôt, Young ayant anticipé en quelque sorte sur les droits du mariage. Le problème demeure insoluble. Si le fait de l'existence de cette enfant semble ressortir des
This bizarre theory is preposterous in light of the flimsy "evidence" that Thomas provides and the complete absence of any indication, either in Young's own correspondence or elsewhere, of the existence of this hypothetical daughter. Indeed, the thought of a middle-aged man of the cloth who had remained single until the age of forty-seven suddenly experiencing an impatience for "les droits du mariage," in itself, seems rather implausible. The real value of Thomas' investigation was that it opened the door for subsequent critics to attack the autobiographical myth itself.

Nearly twenty years passed before H. W. O'Connor responded to Thomas' arguments, dispelling forever the too easy assumption that the named characters in Night-Thoughts could be equated with actual persons. By demonstrating convincingly that the Narcissa episode in Night the Third is really based on a scene in a play by George Farquhar entitled Sir Harry Wildair rather than on an event involving Young and a family member, O'Connor places all three deaths of Night-Thoughts in a fictional and literary context rather than in an autobiographical one. In this context Young's treatment of the deaths is no different from that of any other writer of fiction, who, by definition, "lies."

In a subsequent article, Isabel St. John Bliss demonstrates that the protean characteristics of Lorenzo result from attributes given him by Young: "various aspects of what was at the time considered atheism." Thus, in
Nights I-III Lorenzo is simply a libertine, enjoying life, its pleasures and follies, and thinking not at all of the necessity of preparing for death. In Night IV he becomes a deist for the most part, depending entirely on reason and not accepting Christian revelation. . . . In Night V he becomes an advocate of Shaftesbury's theory of ridicule . . . . In Night VI and Night VII he is an atheist in rejecting immortality and in seeing everything as a flux of essences. In Night VIII he is still a libertine, devoted to the world, and a deist in his denial of the inspired nature of the Bible. In Night IX he is quite definitely an atheist, denying God, believing the world the result of chance and fate, and unlike the deists unaffected by the evidences of natural religion.  

By showing Lorenzo to be "chameleon-like in his shades of infidelity," Bliss reveals that Young uses the character Lorenzo, in part at least, to organize the theological arguments presented throughout Night-Thoughts.

In his "History of Young's Night Thoughts," Henry Pettit builds on this idea that Young uses the named characters to provide a structure for the nine poems. He argues that the types of deaths that Philander, Narcissa, and Lucia suffer provide the "framework for a three-dimensional complaint. The death of Philander is sudden, 'No warning given'; that of Narcissa is early, 'long before her Hour'; that of Lucia is gradual, 'O the long dark Approach thro' Years of Pain.' Thus, sudden, early, and slow approaches of death can all be dealt with in the poem without transcending the limits of the occasion."  

Nearly two hundred years, therefore, elapsed before even scholarly readers came to realize that Night-Thoughts is not an
autobiographical lamentation, with Young "making the publick a
party in his private sorrow." The settling of this point has,
in turn, permitted the second significant twentieth-century
advance in Young scholarship. Critics have now begun to appreciate
Night-Thoughts as a work of literature and to compare it with
other literary, theological, and scientific works of the period
rather than solely in relation to actual or suspected events in
the life of its author.

This critical attitude toward Night-Thoughts has also been
nurtured by a more far-reaching understanding of eighteenth-
century non-satirical poetry in general, a poetry which one
critic, Marshall Brown, terms "the urbane sublime." Brown
attempts to overturn the common practice of dividing eighteenth-
century poets into two camps, "the comic and the serious, the
clever and the pompous, the critically detached and the uncritically
self-involved, or, more simply, the good and the bad." He
suggests that the popularity of such long and seemingly pedestrian
works as Young's Night-Thoughts does not suggest a want of taste on
the part of eighteenth-century readers, but rather a different kind
of taste, one which held that it is neither proper nor effective to
maintain a high pitch of emotional intensity throughout a work of
literature. Because of this "inherent discretion," Brown argues
that the urbane sublime may appear inconsistent to the twentieth-
century reader: "both high and light, sophisticated and primitive,
liberal and aristocratic, elevated but capable of describing the
most mundane phenomena, innovative and yet doggedly conventional."

In Night-Thoughts, Brown argues, the urbane sublime "is a liberal style, conducive to ease and familiarity. It reflects an artful effort to domesticate the supernatural and irrational and to deprive them of their terrors." Thus, far from being a "mournful, angry, gloomy" piece, written by a poet usually depicted as using for his lamp a human skull with a candle in it, the real purpose of Night-Thoughts is to allay terror. Its very "length, expansiveness, and infinite repetition constitute the best anodyne against the fear of death." Brown also concludes that while the widespread use of first person forms in Young and other poets of the age has struck later readers as insincere, this impression is "misleading." Brown suggests that instead "of condemnation, Eliot's brilliant dissection of Young ought thus properly to have led to the insight that all the poetry of the period, even including apparently confessional outpourings, is deliberately and consciously artificial."

One aspect of the urbane sublime that Brown does not discuss at length is its propensity for gathering ideas and allusions from many sources. Most eighteenth-century men of letters preferred in literature a universal range rather than pure self-contemplation. Young wrote within the context of the literature of his time, so that even the highly-introspective Night-Thoughts displays the influences of other literary, theological, and scientific works. Twentieth-century critics have come to understand the extent and nature of this drawing from contemporary ideas and writings.
Probably the most important literary reference in Night-Thoughts is to Pope's Essay on Man. In Night the First, the speaker compares the poem with Pope's:

*Man too he sung: Immortal man I sing;*
*Oft bursts my Song beyond the bounds of Life;*
*What, now, but Immortality can please?*
*O had He prest his Theme, pursued the track,*
*Which opens out of Darkness into Day!*
*O had he mounted on his wing of Fire,*
*Sor'd, where I sink, and sung Immortal man!*
*How had it blest mankind? and rescued me?*

(I, 452-459)

Modern critics, noting here the unmistakable suggestion that while Young admired Pope's work he felt that it was in some way incomplete, have investigated the relationship between the two poems. Since, as we have seen, little is known about the circumstances under which Young composed Night-Thoughts and since the language in Night the First implies that Young saw his poem as an extension of Pope's work to the afterlife, critics take an almost untenable position when they argue that the work began specifically as an answer to Pope's poem. Yet as Martin Price has remarked, "Young's poem asks to be set beside Pope's." Several twentieth-century critics have demonstrated significant differences in the view of man expressed by the two authors, and the concluding lines of Night the First suggest that Young was indeed clearly aware of these differences.

The most obvious difference is between Young's "Immortal man" and Pope's apparently all-too-mortal man. One scholar, Mary Hall, suggests that Young's purpose in writing Night-Thoughts is to "emphasize the immortal nature of man which Young thought Pope had
discounted. She concludes that by the end of *Night the Ninth*, man was not "left in a melancholy awareness of his own impotency, but rather was to be gladdened by his divinity. This movement from melancholy to joy was achieved when man was persuaded to see his real nature." While her last statement is valid, Hall's implication that *Night-Thoughts* is in some way a correction of Pope's views is unconvincing. "*Immortal* man" was not part of Pope's stated subject in *An Essay on Man*.

Another critic, Daniel Odell, examines the issue more deeply and concludes that the essential difference between *Night-Thoughts* and *An Essay on Man* originates in the two authors' differing philosophies about the nature of the great chain of being. Odell argues that while Pope regards the great chain as "static in the sense that God has given all created things various fixed natures," Young views the chain as dynamic, believing instead that the Redemption results in an "endless progress which the virtuous can begin in this life. Who, asks Young, can look upon the Cross and fail to see in himself a 'terrestrial god' (IV, 495)?" This fundamental difference, in turn, leads to a significant disagreement between the two poets on the course of action that mankind should pursue. According to Odell, Pope suggests that to be "happy, then, man should be content with the nature given him and neither wish for, nor attempt to attain, the traits peculiar to some other link." Young, on the other hand, argues that man must use Christ's teachings and example "to deify himself and participate
in the divine nature by exercising the power of proper choice to begin here on earth those 'evolutions of surprising fate' (IV, 510) which are the essential qualities of life after death."57

That Odell's argument has some validity may be seen by comparing opening lines from Pope's Essay on Man with lines from Night the First. The passages are similar in their attempt to answer the question of where man should direct his thoughts. The answers that the two poets give, however, are quite different. Pope writes,

Say first, of God above, or Man below,
What can we reason, but from what we know?
Of Man what see we, but his station here,
From which to reason, or to which refer?
Thro' worlds unnumber'd tho' the God be known,
'Tis ours to trace him only in our own.
(I, 17-22)58

To this idea that man should be content with his present state, Pope adds a corollary—that man should not aspire to the realm of angels:

In Pride, in reason Pride, our error lies;
All quit their sphere, and rush into the skies.
Pride still is aiming at the blest abodes,
Men would be Angels, Angels would be Gods.
Aspiring to be Gods, if Angels fell,
Aspiring to be Angels, Men rebel;
And who but wishes to invert the laws
Of ORDER, sins against th'Eternal Cause.
(I, 123-130)

Young, on the other hand, thinks it blameworthy in man not to turn his thoughts to seek the realms of angels:

Yet man, fool man! here burys all his Thoughts;
Inters celestal Hopes without one Sigh.
Prisoner of Earth, and pent beneath the Moon,
Here pinions all his Wishes; wing'd by Heaven
To fly at Infinite; and reach it there,
Where Seraphs gather Immortality,
On life's fair Tree, fast by the throne of God;
What golden Joys ambrosial clust'ring glow,
In His full beam, and ripen for the Just,
Where momentary Ages are no more?
(I, 134-143)

Clearly, Young expresses his view of life in terms quite different from Pope's in An Essay on Man and leaves no doubts in the reader's mind as to what he means when he states that he sings "Immortal man" (I, 458). Martin Price suggests that unlike "Pope, who tries to show man reasonable aspiration within his present state, Young's aim is to launch the soul into flight . . . ."59 Nevertheless, Young's high praise for Pope and Young's wish not that Pope had written An Essay on Man differently but rather that he had pursued the theme further, suggests that the two works complement, not oppose, one another.

One scholar goes so far as to suggest that Young's choice of topic (i.e., immortal man) "marks a change of direction away from the earth-centered ethics and aesthetics of the major Augustan writers."60 While one may question this sweeping generalization, it is evident that Young's thought was influenced by some unconventional sources. Besides drawing on the traditional Greek and Roman models, Young's poetry (as reflected in Night-Thoughts) draws heavily on some of the very sources that Augustans like Swift usually disparaged and often subjected to ridicule--theological polemics and scientific inquiries.

In her article, "Young's Night Thoughts in Relation to Contemporary Christian Apologetics,"61 Isabel St. John Bliss
demonstrates that an "understanding of the purposes and popularity of Young's *Night Thoughts* is possible only through a realization of their relation to contemporary Christian thought." Bliss notes the great number of theological works combatting the arguments of "atheism" and "deism" in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and she suggests that these issues are present throughout *Night-Thoughts* and predominate in *Nights* VI through IX, in which the speaker engages in arguments with Lorenzo. Citing Young's apparent borrowings from such works as Thomas Burnet's *The Sacred Theory of the Earth* (a physico-theological treatise which attempts to give a scientific account of the creation of the world) and Samuel Clarke's *A Discourse Concerning the Being and Attributes of God* (a theological work, strongly tinged by Lockean theory, which attempts to refute the arguments of Thomas Hobbes), Bliss suggests that one of the major reasons for the great contemporary popularity of *Night-Thoughts* was that Young "was giving poetical expression to the theories that were felt to be vital to the religious life of the time." In conjunction with his borrowings from contemporary theological writings, Young's *Night-Thoughts* also shows the influence of eighteenth-century scientific thought. Bliss is cognizant of Young's interest in "the science and astronomy of the day" and devotes considerable attention to this important influence. Young's use of science is seen especially clearly in his "Moral Survey of the Nocturnal Heavens" (from *Night the Ninth*, 11. 598-2095),
in which the speaker leads a figurative tour through the universe to demonstrate "proofs of the existence of God from the evidence of nature in order to combat the disbelief of the atheist, represented by Lorenzo." 66 This lengthy passage of Night-Thoughts demonstrates the poet's grasp of Newtonian science and of the infinity of time and space. 67 Indeed, Marjorie Nicolson goes so far as to state that no poet "was ever more 'space intoxicated' than Edward Young, nor did any other eighteenth-century poem or aesthetician equal him in his vast obsession with the 'psychology of infinity'—the effect of vastness and the vast upon the soul of man." 68 Nor was Young's knowledge of science limited to astronomy. Scholars have noted his familiarity with biology and the microscope, 69 his familiarity with studies of the human mind, 70 his thorough understanding of Newtonian theory of light, 71 and his acquaintance with the developing science of geology. 72 Young sees no conflict between science and religion; in fact, the concepts of infinity of time and space which science instills further reinforce one of the most important theological beliefs expounded in Night-Thoughts: that man should seek to achieve the full potential of his immortal nature by turning his attention from finite earthly concerns toward the infinite. 73

Finally, in addition to the study of Night-Thoughts in a broad critical context, a third advance in the twentieth-century re-examination of Young's poetry is Henry Pettit's textual criticism. His definitive edition of The Correspondence of Edward
Young, a major effort in scholarship, provides for the first time an accurate text and comprehensive collection of extant letters written by Young. This work is invaluable for future biographers and scholars of Young because it dispels the impression that he was an unfeeling man who cared only about fame and preferment. Also, for textual critics and editors, the correspondence between Young and his printers and publishers affords valuable insights concerning his methods of writing, revising, and proofreading. Pettit also made a more direct contribution to textual scholars with his "History of Young's Night Thoughts" and his Bibliography of Young's Night-Thoughts. The former, an unpublished doctoral dissertation, provides records on the publication of the early editions of Night-Thoughts from the Stationer's Register, and gives a detailed history of eighteenth and nineteenth-century criticism of the work. The latter is an invaluable guide through the wilderness of authorized and pirated editions of Night-Thoughts published before Young's death in 1765. Pettit's bibliographical studies proved invaluable in the establishment of the critical text of Night the First which follows in Chapter IV of this dissertation.

PART THREE: A CRITICAL STUDY OF NIGHT THE FIRST

Before Dodsley collected the first four Nights and published them as a single volume, Night the First bore as its title, "The Complaint: or, Night-Thoughts on Life, Death, & Immortality." It
is uncertain whether the subsequent decision to use this title to
designate the collection of four, six, and finally all nine Nights
and the decision to abbreviate the title of Night the First to "On
Life, Death, & Immortality" was that of the author or his publisher.
Yet, however well the original title might fit the work as a whole,
it serves as a singularly effective heading for the first Night.
The three major components of this title ("The Complaint,"
"Night-Thoughts," and "Life, Death, & Immortality") set forth respectively
the theme, the voice and structure, and the major subjects of Night
the First. A close study of each of the three components, rather
than a diffuse overview, will serve as the best introduction to the
poem. Such an approach will help to show the form and rhetoric of
Young's Night the First and may help dispel the generally accepted
twentieth-century view, as expressed by one recent critic, that
Night-Thoughts is a "loose" work and manifests "a woolgathering
tendency." 

A. The Theme: "The Complaint"

That Night the First is in some way a complaint is clear from
the opening lines, in which the speaker salutes "Sleep" and remarks
that he wakes from "short, (as usual) and disturb'd Repose" (I, 6-7).
The cause of this complaint, most eighteenth and nineteenth-century
critics assumed, is grief caused by the death of three loved ones
within a very short period of time: "Thy shaft flew thrice, and
thrice my Peace was slain; / And thrice, e'er thrice yon Moon had
fill'd her Horn" (I, 211-212). Such an occurrence seems to
represent a misfortune worthy of complaint, even if we do not
accept the assumption that Young himself is the speaker. Yet, can it be that the true nature of the complaint lies deeper than the personal disaster which the speaker has experienced? Indeed, is it possible that the three deaths serve only as an unusually poignant example pointing to another, more fundamental complaint?

An examination of the lines in the paragraph immediately preceding the reference to the three deaths reveals this root cause:

O ye blest scenes of **permanent** Delight!
Full, above measure! lasting, beyond bound!
A Perpetuity of Bliss, is Bliss.
Could you, so rich in rapture, fear an End,
That ghastly Thought would drink up all your Joy,
And quite unparadise the realms of Light.

(I, 180-184)

Young's point is that no real happiness can exist in this world because, as the third line of the passage quoted above states, true happiness exists only if it is unending. The emphasis on the words "**permanent**" and "**Perpetuity**" drives this point home. Young apparently revised his original text to add line 181A ("A Perpetuity of Bliss, is Bliss") to summarize the major theme of the poem. Thus, because the so-called joys of this world are not well-suited to satisfy the needs of a being "Of subtler Essence than the trodden Clod" (I, 99), the real complaint, which is the theme of **Night the First**, is that man immerses himself in an order of things for which he is ill-suited and thus subverts his true nature:

Yet man, fool man! here burys all his Thoughts;
Inters celestial Hopes without one Sigh;
Prisoner of Earth, and pent beneath the Moon,
Here pinions all his Wishes; wing'd by Heaven
To fly at Infinite; and reach it there,
Where Seraphs gather Immortality,
On life's fair Tree, fast by the throne of God:
What golden Joys ambrosial clust'ring glow,
In His full beam, and ripen for the Just,
Where momentary Ages are no more?

(I, 134-143)

Young's purpose in his often-maligned imagery is to present the conclusion that man foolishly lets himself be imprisoned by earth-bound concerns, in which his possibilities for fulfillment are extremely limited, rather than infinite like his capacities. The complaint, then, lies in what the poet sees as the essential irony of the human condition, where a "Miniature of Greatness absolute" (I, 77) and an "Heir of Glory" (I, 78) confines himself to the mere "Vestibule" of existence (I, 123) rather than seeking "Life's Theater" (I, 124).

Young emphasizes this idea repeatedly throughout Night-Thoughts and expresses it in especially clear terms in Night the Seventh. This passage reinforces the essential theme of Night the First:

Is it that things terrestrial can't content?
Deep in rich pasture will thy flocks complain?
Not so; but to their master is denied
To share their sweet serene. Man, ill at ease
In this, not his own place, this foreign field,
Where Nature fodders him with other food
Than was ordain'd his cravings to suffice,
Poor in abundance, famish'd at a feast,
Sighs on for something more, when most enjoy'd.

Is Heaven then kinder to thy flocks than thee?
Not so: thy pasture richer, but remote;
In part, remote: for that remoter part
Man bleats from Instinct, though, perhaps, debauch'd
By Sense, his Reason sleeps, nor dreams the cause.
The cause how obvious, when his Reason wakes!
His grief is but his grandeur in disguise;
And discontent is immortality.

(VII, 37-53)
Because the earth and its transient occupations and joys are so ill-suited for what the poet views as man's true nature, "The man who merits most, must most complain" (VII, 272). It is this complaint against the general human predicament which is ultimately the theme of Night the First, although obviously Young did not see all complaining (e.g., Lorenzo's) as a noble sign of man's immortality.

B. The Voice and Structures: "Night-Thoughts"

One critic, George Saintsbury, unflatteringly suggests that Night-Thoughts is "an enormous soliloquy—a lamentation in argumentative and reflective monologue, addressed by an actor of superhuman lung-power to an audience of still more superhuman endurance." Perhaps without being fully aware of the significance of what he says, Saintsbury expresses an important discovery about the voice in Night-Thoughts. In drama, a soliloquy is usually the means by which a character reveals his inner feelings and thoughts to the audience. That Night the First in some way resembles a soliloquy becomes clear in the opening lines, where the speaker identifies the occasion ("I wake") and then draws the reader's attention to the mode of expression in the poem by echoing a passage from perhaps the most famous soliloquy ever written: "How happy they who wake no more! / Yet that were vain, if Dreams infest the Grave." (I, 7-8).

Although the importance of this dramatic mode that Young employs in Night-Thoughts has yet to be directly explored, a more recent critic than Saintsbury has also touched on its most readily
apparent characteristics. Night-Thoughts, Marshall Brown writes, "is not a silent meditation, but rather a long monologue addressed to a reprobate named Lorenzo, and Young is careful . . . to lighten the tone with ironic sallies, and to intersperse frequent parenthetical asides and self-reference, all so as to preserve a conversational feeling. . . . The rhetoric is informal and completely non-periodic; the current of thought never stops, but only ebbs and flows as each sentence funnels into a successor of greater or lesser intensity." Although one may question the contention that Night-Thoughts is conversational, Brown's recognition of the "current of thought" which "ebbs and flows" throughout the collection of nine Nights is an important point, one which deserves further examination as it applies to Night the First. That Young should choose for his poem a voice that simulates the inner workings of a human mind—"Thoughts," as he himself proclaims in the title—is no accident.

Either directly or through other authors, Young was probably acquainted with at least some of the theories that John Locke sets forth in An Essay Concerning Human Understanding. One is that within the mind there exists an ever-changing stream of thoughts which flows continuously: "'Tis evident to any one who will but observe what passes in his own Mind, that there is a train of Ideas, which constantly succeed one another in his Understanding, as long as he is awake." This train of ideas can be influenced by both sensory perceptions of external events and an internal process which Locke terms "the Association of Ideas." "Some of our Ideas," Locke
argues, "have a natural Correspondence and Connexion one with another: It is the Office and Excellency of our Reason to trace these, and hold them together in that Union and Correspondence which is founded in their peculiar Beings." But in addition to this logical expected type of association, Locke also asserts that custom and chance may lead to unique unions of ideas in the minds of different individuals:

Custom settles habits of Thinking in the Understanding, as well as of Determining in the Will, and of Motions in the Body; all which seems to be but Trains of Motion in the Animal Spirits, which once set a going continue on in the same steps they have been used to, which by often treading are worn into a smooth path, and the Motion in it becomes easy and as it were Natural. As far as we can comprehend Thinking, thus Ideas seem to be produced in our Minds; or if they are not, this may serve to explain their following one another in an habitual train, when once they are put into that tract, as well as it does to explain such Motions of the Body.84

These two related theories, the train of ideas and the association of ideas, are evident in the sometimes unusual transitions and apparent ramblings of Night the First. Obviously, we would be overstating the case if we were to argue that Night the First is a "stream-of-consciousness" work along the lines of such twentieth-century novels as Joyce's Ulysses or Woolf's The Waves.85 Nevertheless, a close examination of the poem does reveal that a definite relationship does exist between external events and the thoughts in the speaker's mind. In addition, transitions occur in the speaker's thoughts which are characteristic of Locke's theories
An examination of *Night the First* clarifies the similarity between this contemporary theory of the mind and Young's voice and structure. As the poem opens, the speaker wakes from restless sleep (I, 6-10), and that unpleasant awakening leads him to reflect on his unhappy fate (I, 11-17), the nature of which remains unstated at this point. He then takes note of the silence and darkness of the night around him (I, 18-22). This external stimulus—or conspicuous absence of stimulus—reminds him of the Last Judgment (I, 23-27), a prospect that calls up apprehensions about adequate preparation for eternity (I, 28-53). Then a second external sensory stimulus intrudes on the speaker's train of ideas, as a "Bell strikes One" (I, 54). This event leads the speaker to reflect on the passage of time (I, 55-59) and, again, on the prospect of eternity (I, 60-66) and the nature of man (I, 67-89). At this point another physical event occurs—the speaker apparently drifts off to sleep briefly, dreams, and once again awakes (I, 90-91). He recalls the dreams, and this recollection leads him to reflect that man's ability to dream is proof of an immaterial soul (I, 92-105). Further reflections on this soul and on eternity (I, 106-133) lead the speaker to conclude that true bliss lies only in eternal joys, not in earthly joys (I, 116-193), not even in domestic ones (I, 194-199). Domestic joy is a topic that carries a very strong private association for the speaker, since it painfully reminds him of the grief he suffered when three loved ones died within a very short
interval (I, 201-211). As the wakeful speaker mulls over his personal sorrows while looking out the window of his bedchamber, he happens to notice the moon (I, 212-214). This external sensory stimulus shifts his train of ideas and leads him to compare the moon's ceaseless change with the transience of human happiness and to reflect subsequently on his own sorrow and the generally unhappy state of mankind (I, 214-319). The thought that some persons are actually deceived into trusting the reality of earthly joy apparently triggers in the speaker's mind another association—his acquaintance with a self-contented young man, Lorenzo, whom he would warn to stand on guard against all joys which can have an end and against a reluctance to face the inevitable prospect of death (I, 320-436). The identity of Lorenzo never becomes clear from the context of this or any of the subsequent Nights, and since the speaker is alone with his thoughts in the middle of the night, he is at most framing mental arguments. Finally, an external event, the first since the sight of the moon in lines 212-214, intrudes on the speaker's thoughts: a lark's song announces the approach of dawn (I, 437). As Night the First nears its conclusion, the sleepless speaker and the poet seem to converge, and the lark's song leads this speaker/poet to reflect that his own thoughts are also a kind of song with "Immortal man" as its subject. In short, Night the First traces the thoughts of a sleepless individual, the speaker, from the time that he awakes from restless dreams (I, 9) just before one o'clock
The preceding summary is useful for showing the basic similarity between contemporary theory of the mind and the transitions in the poem. By itself, however, this information is somewhat misleading because it creates the impression that Night the First is merely a collection of loosely related thoughts, linked only in the context of the speaker's personal associations. A closer examination of the poem, however, reveals a clear dialectic. Night the First has seven major parts, and an examination of these parts shows the carefully-balanced structure of the whole. The first part includes the opening half of the fictional frame of the poem, introducing us to the speaker and the setting, along with an invocation to the Deity (I, 1-53). The second part, which heralds the beginning of the body of the poem as the bell strikes one, consists of general reflections on man, his paradoxical virtues and flaws (I, 54-153). The third part is characterized by a train of ideas turning inward: the speaker censures himself for being guilty of the faults cited in the previous section, and he then descends into self-pity over the loss of three loved ones (I, 154-232). The fourth part is marked by a conflict, the speaker's struggle between self-pity and the recognition that his sufferings are not unique but part of the common plight of mankind (I, 233-293). The fifth part is characterized by a triumph over mere personal sorrow and self-pity, as the speaker reflects on a world that deserves his compassion (I, 294-319). The sixth part shows a
train of ideas turning outward, as the speaker directs his thoughts into arguments which might make the complacent sinner Lorenzo see the transience of earthly joys and might convince him to prepare for death (I, 320-436). Finally, the seventh major part of Night the First is the closing frame (I, 437-459); these lines both conclude the poem and open the door for a sequel. Thus, we can see that while contemporary theories concerning mental processes may have contributed to the transitions within the poem, Young also carefully provides an overall structure to support his speaker's thoughts.

C. The Major Subjects: "Life, Death, & Immortality"

Given the voice and the structure of Night the First, we can now touch on the major subjects—life, death, and immortality. Of these, immortality is the single most important topic throughout Night-Thoughts as a whole, as the narrator himself announces ("Immortal man I sing"—I, 452). The fact that this proclamation does not occur until the end of Night the First, however, suggests that immortality, while a vision or perspective underlying all of the poem, is to be the main subject of explicit discussion in subsequent installments. Thus, the related topics of life and death dominate Night the First, and they are shown against the backdrop of eternity.

There is no one point at which Young's speaker ceases to reflect on life and begins reflecting on death, or vice versa. Instead, what one sees in Young's treatment of these subjects is a seemingly endless series of paradoxes, all of which are part of
the one great paradox, sometimes explicit and sometimes implicit, that what we call death is really life, and what we call life is not really that at all:

*LIFE'S THEATER AS YET IS SHUT, AND DEATH, STRONG DEATH ALONE CAN HEAVE THE MASSY BAR,*

(I, 124-125)

It is only through death, then, that one can experience, as Young puts it, "real life" (I, 128). As one critic has suggested, life "without the insight provided by death is blind to ultimate reality. It is death which forces man from the silken cocoon in which an unthinking man lives. Death brushes away the clouds of darkness, giving man insight into a new state of awareness free from material concerns." 88

An understanding of this central paradox clarifies why the setting for the poem is night. Young reverses the usual association of light with life and darkness with death. This point is important to note because one of the censures of *Night the First* by critics such as Eliot is the paucity of references to external events and objects. Except for the bell, the sight of the moon, and the lark, the only sensory stimulation is the absence of stimuli itself—silence and darkness. Thus, most of the train of ideas in the poem consists of associations among various thoughts, a method which Eliot soundly condemned as evidence of a want "of genuine emotion" and "human sympathy." 89 However, this poetic method could not have been an oversight by a mind that is oblivious to "the beauty and the healthy breath of the common landscape." 90 The absence of sensory objects is so
complete that it could only have occurred as a very deliberate
and laborious effort on the part of the author. This painstaking
deletion of external objects may, in part, reflect the influence
on Young of Samuel Clarke, one of the most prominent of the early
eighteenth-century Christian apologists.\textsuperscript{91}

The significant twist in Clarke's view of the human mind is
that the senses, while providing the means through which man
receives his knowledge of the universe, are not wholly beneficial.
Rather, it is through the exercise of two internal attributes,
reason and will,\textsuperscript{92} that man lives up to his God-given potential.
Unfortunately, man seldom chooses to do so: "Few make a due use of
their Natural Faculties, to distinguish rightly the essential and
unchangeable Difference between Good and Evil; Fewer yet, so attend
to the natural Notices which God has given them . . . . But through
Supine Negligence and Want of Attention, they let their Reason (as
it were) sleep, and are deaf to the Dictates of common Understanding,
and, like brute Beasts, minding only the Things that are before their
Eyes, never consider any thing that is abstract from Sense, or
beyond their present private temporal Interest."\textsuperscript{93} Thus, while
the senses have an essential use in the development of the mind,
they later come to play a negative role, distracting the mind
from "Reason" and "Will/Resolve":

In the generality of Men, the Appetites and
Desires of Sense, are so violent and importunate;
the Business and the Pleasures of the World,
take up so much of their time; and their Passions
are so very strong and unreasonable; that, of
Themselves, they are very backward and unapt to
employ their Reason and fix their Attention upon
moral Matters. . . . it is very difficult for Men to withdraw their Thoughts from Sensual Objects, and fasten them upon things remote from Sense: And if perhaps they do attend a little, and begin to see the reasonableness of governing themselves by a higher Principle, than mere Sense and Appetite; yet with such Variety of Temptations are they perpetually incompassed, and continually solicited; and the Strength of Passions and Appetites, makes so great Opposition to the Notions of Reason; . . . they yield and submit to practise those things, which at the same time the Reason of their own Mind condemns; and what they allow not, That they Do.  

Young also takes note of these harmful effects of sensory distraction and extends Clarke's opinions concerning the senses to a still further extreme. According to Young, it is through sensory deprivation—the silence and darkness of night (I, 28-29)—that the two great virtues of man, reason and resolve, are best nurtured. Thus, night for him represents a benevolent force, directing the mind away from transient outward objects and inward toward permanent truths.

So, gloomy as Night the First might appear to most modern readers, the poem is actually optimistic. It is a study of the mental processes of one man, the speaker, whose thoughts, being nurtured to "Reason" by night, move from the doubt and mere self-pitying sorrow of the first half (I, 1-232) to a deeper sympathy for the general human situation (I, 294-459). Thus it is that the speaker's invocation is answered:

Nor let the vial of thy Vengeance pour'd  
On this devoted head, be pour'd in vain.  
(I, 52-53)

In the end, he no longer merely bemoans the deaths of Philander, Narcissa, and Lucia, for he has learned the proper attitude toward
life, death, and immortality from their passing. Only from this perspective is a true understanding of Night the First possible.

D. Conclusion

This introduction to Night the First represents an initial step toward a complete revaluation of Young's Night-Thoughts. Modern criticism often focusses on subtle nuances of expression, and critics have learned in the harsh school of experience that serious dangers exist when one attempts to base complex interpretations on specific words and phrases in corrupt texts. Since Night the First represents the most widely-read portion of Night-Thoughts, the critical text of the poem in Chapter IV of this dissertation should help dispel some inaccuracies that have come into existence as the result of textual corruptions and permit other scholars to make careful examinations of the poem. Unfortunately, a complete critical revaluation of Night-Thoughts will continue to be delayed until an accurate text for all nine Nights is available.
NOTES

1 The reader should be aware that the following discussion is an overview. Those interested in studying a detailed history of the initial reception and subsequent critical reputation of Night-Thoughts should see Henry J. Pettit, "A History of Young's Night-Thoughts," Diss. Cornell 1938; and "The English Rejection of Young's Night-Thoughts," Univ. of Colorado Studies in Language and Literature, 6 (1957), 23-38. Since Professor Pettit's dissertation has never been published and his article appears in a publication that is not widely available, I provide a brief background sketch of my own.


4 Young's first known explicit reference to Night-Thoughts does not occur until several months after the appearance of the earliest edition of Night the First. In a letter dated 20 November 1742, he promises to give a copy of the poem to Sir Thomas Hamner. This letter appears in The Correspondence of Edward Young, 1683-1765, ed. Henry Pettit (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1971), pp. 149-150. All quotations in this dissertation from Young's letters are from Pettit's definitive, "old-spelling" text, to which I subsequently refer as Correspondence.

The only known clue that Young gave concerning his work-in-progress occurs in a 3 May 1742 letter to the Duchess of Portland. There he mentions that the sickness and impending death of a fellow clergyman "brings to my memory some Lines wh/ ich/ I have formerly read, whether it be in Fletcher perhaps Your Grace can tell. After the Author has represented a good man whose name is Philander on his Deathbed behaving to ye Surprize of All about Him, He ads--
As some tall Towr, or lofty Mountains Brow
Detains the Sun, Illustrious from its Height,
When rising Vapours, & descending Shades,
In Damps, & Darkness, drown ye Spatious Vale,
Philander thus augustly reard his head
Undampt by Doubt, undarkend by Despair:
At that black Hour, whIch/ general Horror sheds
On the low Level of Inglorious minds,
Sweet Peace, & Heavenly Hope, & humble Joy,
Divinely beamd on his exalted Soul,
With incommunicable Lustre, bright;"

(Correspondence, p. 140)

Brackets are mine. We do not know whether the Duchess was taken
in by Young's coyness or when he undeceived her, but any reader
who is familiar with Night-Thoughts knows that the source of these
lines, with a few changes, was the yet-unpublished Night the
Second, which first appeared in December 1742 (Pettit, "History;"
p. 46).

This clue gives us two indications about the composition of
Night-Thoughts. First, Young apparently spent seven or eight
months revising his poems before having them printed. The lines
quoted in the letter appear near the end of the second Night,
suggesting that Young had completed both Night the First and Night
the Second when he wrote the letter in early May, before even the
first Night had been published. Over seven months elapsed between
the letter and the publication of Night the Second. Also, the
manner in which Young speaks of Philander in the letter—as a
character in a book rather than as a sorely-missed personal friend—
suggests that he probably did not identify Philander with any one
actual person.


6 Ibid., pp. 1, 89-92.

7 That Dodsley had indeed made known the fact that Young was
the author is demonstrated by an August 1742 letter from Benjamin
Victor to the poet. Victor writes, "I found from your bookseller,
Mr Dodsley, that you have carefully concealed your name, on purpose
to try the force of your poem; but you are too good a writer to be
able to conceal yourself from your admirers. I hear we are to have
the happiness of reading two books more. If I was your bookseller
I should greatly solicit you to add your name, because it would call
the attention of those readers who are led by mode, consequently
encrease the sale of the poem" (Correspondence, p. 143).

8 Correspondence, p. 143.

9 See Pettit, "History," pp. 2-15. Pettit notes that the most
common identifications of Philander, Narcissa, and Lucia are Henry
Temple, Elizabeth Lee, and Mrs. Young respectively. Young married Lady Elizabeth, the widow of Col. Francis Henry Lee, in August 1730. She had a son (Charles Henry) and two daughters (Elizabeth and Caroline) by her previous marriage and a son, Frederick, by her marriage to Young. Young's stepdaughter Elizabeth married Henry Temple (the eldest son of the first Viscount Palmerston) in June 1735. She died the following year on 8 October 1736, but Temple, unlike Philander, did not precede his wife in death. Temple remarried in 1738 and died on 18 August 1740. Mrs. Young died on 29 January 1740. The reader will note, as Pettit states, that the "three months of the poem / within which the three characters are supposed to die/f become in real life 47 months" ("History," p. 9). This inconsistency eventually led critics to charge Young with "insincerity," a charge that ultimately caused the popularity of Night-Thoughts to plummet. See, below, pp. 11-18 for a further discussion of this subject.

10 See W. R. Hughes, "Dr. Young and his Curates," Blackwood's Magazine, 231 (1932), 623. In fact, Wesley was so impressed by Night-Thoughts that he printed, without authorization, several of the Nights in his Collection of Moral and Sacred Poems from the Most Celebrated English Authors. He soon encountered legal complications for his obvious infringement of copyright (see Pettit, "History," pp. 102-103).


12 Ibid., I, 183. Of Paradise Lost, Johnson adds, "None ever wished it longer than it is. Its perusal is a duty rather than a pleasure. We read Milton for instruction, retire harassed and overburdened, and look elsewhere for recreation . . ." (I, 183-184).


14 Edward Young, The Complaint, and The Consolation; or, Night Thoughts (1797; facsimile rpt. New York, 1975), p. iii. The sad state into which Young's reputation has subsequently fallen from the late eighteenth century, when he was among such company as Milton and Shakespeare, is best seen in the prefatory comments to this facsimile by Robert Essick and Jeni joy LaBelle. With some hyperbole, they remark that "Today it is Blake's illustrations which alone protect Young's poetry against the tooth of time and razure of oblivion" (p. iii).

15 Pettit, "History," pp. 137-140.
Westminster and Foreign Quarterly Review, 67 (1857), 1-42. That critics at this time still considered Young to rank among the great poets and that Eliot saw herself in the role of iconoclast is evident from her own words: "it would be difficult to say anything new of Young, in the way of admiration, while we think there are many salutary lessons remaining to be drawn from his faults" (p. 26).

Ibid., pp. 1-2.

See, above, note 9 for biographical facts about these three persons.

Ibid., p. 11. The source of Eliot's information concerning the discrepancies in the dates is Herbert Croft's biographical essay, which Johnson incorporated in his "Life of Young." The paragraphs containing this information are included in some editions of Johnson's Lives but deleted from others. For a general background on the textual problems with the "Life of Young" and Croft's "subtle derogation of Young's character," see Henry Pettit, "The Making of Croft's Life of Young for Johnson's Lives of the Poets," PQ, 54 (1975), 333-341.


Ibid., p. 27.

Ibid., p. 30.

Ibid., p. 30.


See, above, note 2.

Walter Thomas, Le Poète Edward Young (1683-1765): Étude sur sa vie et ses oeuvres (Paris, 1901). It may strike the reader as paradoxical that the first complete biography of Young was
written when Young's popularity had apparently hit an all-time low. Despite the decline in the reputation of Night-Thoughts in Great Britain and the United States, however, the work apparently remained popular on the continent well into the twentieth century. For this reason it is not so surprising that in 1901 Thomas, a Frenchman, thought that a complete study of the poet's life and works was needed. See, above, note 3 for additional sources of information on the popularity of Night-Thoughts on the continent and its influence on French, German, and Spanish authors.


32 Ibid., p. 144.

33 Thomas describes a visit that an enthusiastic Swiss reader of Night-Thoughts, Vincenz Bernhard Tschamer, paid Young in January 1751. During this visit Tschamer apparently asked about the identities of the named characters. We do not have Young's account of this meeting or any background on what communication problems may have occurred (see note 37), but we do have Tschamer's account, in Thomas' biography, of how Young responded to the inquiry: "Voici ce que Mr Young lui-même nous a appris: Lucia fut son Epouse et Mère de Narcisse; elle était Sœur du Comte de Litchfield auquel le cinquième Livre des Pensées est adressé, et petite-fille du roi Charles II par sa Mère. Narcisse avant sa Mort ayant été mariée à Philandre, fils de Milord Palmerston, C'est par cette famille et par celle de Lucia que le Dr Young se trouve allié à quelques Maisons des plus distinguées dans le royaume. Philandre et Narcisse moururent tous les deux dans un Voyage qu'ils avaient entrepris en France pour rétablir leur Santé et dans lequel leur digne Père les accompagna. Leurs morts se suivirent avec un très court intervalle. Young lui-même profondément affligé par cette double perte prit encore au passage de Calais à Douvre une fièvre qui le mit au bord du Tombeau. Ces tristes accidents furent l'Ocasion et le Sujet des Pensées nocturnes qu'il composa effectivement dans le Silence de ces Nuits que l'affliction et les insomnies lui rendirent encore plus noires" (Thomas, pp. 599-600); also quoted in Correspondence, p. 359n). For alternative views to Thomas' explanation for Young's motives in endorsing the traditional identification of the three characters (i.e., to avoid revealing the existence of an illegitimate daughter), see, below, note 37.

34 Ibid., p. 169.

35 Walter Thomas bases his argument on two pieces of "evidence." First, he notes that persons and books he consulted gave differing dates and locations for Narcissa's death in France (pp. 149-164). This confusion, however, is not surprising, since Night-Thoughts had long been popular in France and a great deal of
factually inaccurate and conflicting folklore had grown up around the Narcissa story. The second piece of "evidence" Thomas cites is that when he went to Welwyn to examine the parish register to trace the birth dates of Young's children, he found that fifteen pages covering the years 1730 through 1740 had been cut out. He speculates that the culprit was Young himself, who mutilated the documents to hide the birth of his hypothetical illegitimate daughter (pp. 167-169). The argument, of course, is implausible, since the pages could have been removed for any number of reasons by any number of individuals. Moreover, one of the most unlikely persons to commit such an act would have been Young, since as rector of Welwyn he could better have hidden this information by preventing the entry of the record in the first place. A far more logical explanation for the missing pages is that they were simply stolen by a Young enthusiast who, like Thomas interpreted Night-Thoughts autobiographically, but who preferred to conduct his research in the privacy of his own home.


37 Still, a deeper question remains as to whether Young actually misled Tscharner intentionally by confirming the autobiographical interpretation. We know from other correspondence that Young was not confident of his ability to communicate in foreign languages (see Correspondence, p. 531). Therefore, one plausible explanation of Tscharner's account of their meeting is that a communication problem occurred and the subtleties of Young's response were lost, as it were, in the translation thus making it appear that he confirmed the standard autobiographical interpretation of his poem. Moreover, even if Tscharner's account of what Young said is accurate, it still doesn't prove that Night-Thoughts is autobiographical. O'Connor argues, very convincingly, that Young may have been caught in a trap which prevented him from revealing the truth: "He would forthwith have been charged with insincerity, with feigning a poignancy of grief that the circumstances did not warrant—in short, with tacitly cheating the public into buying his work, although he had merely accepted an interpretation which the public itself had placed upon his poem. The ultimate result would have been the complete alienation of all those who had believed the poem to be the outpouring of a genuine sorrow induced by the pathetic incidents related in the first three Nights" (p. 147). The reader cannot but note ironically that if these indeed were Young's fears, they were well-founded. By remaining silent Young merely postponed this alienation of his readers for a century.

38 Isabel St. John Bliss, "Young's Night Thoughts in Relation to Contemporary Christian Apologetics," PMLA, 49 (1934), 55-56.

39 Ibid., p. 68.
Walter Thomas, in *Le Poète Edward Young*, first tried to make such an argument by citing alleged evidence of hostility between Young and Pope and by noting that the great chain of being and man's middle place in that chain are treated in both poems (pp. 342-349, 363-365). The former argument is unconvincing because of Young's high praise for Pope in the closing lines of *Night the First* and in Pope's own praise for *Night-Thoughts* as "the best thing . . . these twenty years" (from a letter by Pope to Shenstone in *The Letters of William Shenstone*, ed. Marjorie Williams, 1939, p. 59). The latter argument, in and of itself, is inconclusive, since most eighteenth-century literary works either directly or indirectly allude to the great chain.


Daniel W. Odell, "Young's *Night Thoughts* as an Answer to Pope's *Essay on Man*, *SEL*, 12 (1972), 484.

Price, p. 349.


For a discussion of evidence suggesting that this added line was indeed Young's, see, below, p. 78.

The text quoted is from Edward Young The Complete Works, ed. James Nichols, with a life of the poet by John Doran (London 1854), 2 vols. This is the standard edition, and all subsequent quotations from Young's poetry (except, of course, Night the First) are from this source. The reader should be strongly warned, however, that during my textual study of Night the First, I noted numerous and sometimes serious corruptions in the Nichols text. It is almost certain that similar corruptions exist in subsequent Nights as well. My quotations from this source are included only to illustrate certain points, not to buttress a critical argument.


Ibid., pp. 183-185, 394.

Ibid., p. 395.

Ibid., p. 396.

Two differences between the twentieth-century stream-of-consciousness technique and that of Night the First are immediately conspicuous. In stream-of-consciousness narration, a greater interplay usually exists between a character's thoughts and external events than characterizes Young's poem. External stimuli are rare in Night the First. Also implicit in most stream-of-consciousness works is the assumption that the most significant part of the mind is the subconscious. Young, who had neither Freud nor Jung from whom to learn psychology, seems only vaguely aware of the existence of the subconscious: e.g., in his reference to dreams with their "antic Shapes, wild Natives of the Brain" (I, 97).

See, above, pp. 16-17 and also the note on line 320 in Appendix C.
In this context it is not entirely inconceivable that Lorenzo may even represent a residual thirst for fame and fortune in the speaker's own mind, which he seeks to exorcise through an internal dialogue in which he refutes arguments of his alter ego.

88 Hall, p. 454.
89 Eliot, pp. 30, 42.
90 Ibid., p. 29.
91 Marjorie Hope Nicolson has already explored the reasons for Young's exclusion of colors from Night-Thoughts in Newton Demands the Muse: "Into the camera obscura of perpetual night Young retired in order that Reason, the godlike faculty of man, might see light pure, not discolored, refracted, inflected. There is no color in the world of the Night Thoughts; there is only light, the 'confluence of ethereal fires From urns unnumber'd' streaming from the steep of heaven" (p. 150). Isabel St. John Bliss ("Young's Night Thoughts," pp. 40-41) has identified Clarke as one of the Christian apologists with whom Young was familiar, but she does not examine the similarity between the attitudes of the two authors concerning the senses.

92 In A Discourse Concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of the Christian Revelation (1706; facsimile Stuttgart, 1964), Clarke writes: "So it is very unreasonable and blame-worthy in practise, that any Intelligent Creatures, whom God has made so far like unto himself, as to endue them with those excellent Faculties of Reason and Will, whereby they are enabled to distinguish Good from Evil, and to chuse the one and refuse the other, should ... allow themselves to ... Act contrary to what they know is Fit to be done" (pp. 62-63). Clarke's definitions of the terms "Reason" and "Will" coincide with the "Reason" and "Resolve" of line 30 of Night the First. From the context of this line, it is evident that Young also defines reason as the ability to distinguish between good and evil, mortal and immortal, temporal and spiritual. And like Clarke, he stresses "Resolve," the will to act on the dictates of "Reason," as a "column of true Majesty in man" (I, 31).

93 Ibid., pp. 194-195.
94 Ibid., pp. 198-199.
CHAPTER III: TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

This chapter sets forth the results of my examination of the texts of Edward Young's Night the First. In Part One, I provide an overview of the peculiar problems facing a textual editor of this poem. The first of these problems is the absence of Young's manuscript of the poem. The second is the large number of "lifetime" editions (i.e., the twenty-one editions published during Young's life and the first one published after his death), which gave the author many potential opportunities to make revisions. Since it is almost certain that Young's manuscript was destroyed, the first of these problems is essentially insolvable. The second problem is not quite so great as it initially appears because Young almost certainly did not make changes in very many of the "lifetime" texts and because those revisions that he did make are not extensive. Even with these mitigating conditions, however, the task of separating authorial changes from textual corruptions remains formidable. To aid in this task, I provide evidence that leads to two general hypotheses. These hypotheses explain Young's usual methods of emendation and they apply equally to any of his works. My first hypothesis is that Young submitted his revisions by letter and, hence, seldom (if ever) altered accidentals—capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and italics—as he might have done had he submitted a marked-up copy of the text. My second hypothesis is that Young usually corrected only the first published edition of a work and normally did not concern himself with the textual accuracy of subsequent editions.
In Part Two, I provide a bibliographical description of each "lifetime" text of *Night the First* and an extensive analysis of its substantive and accidental variants for the purpose of establishing the presence or absence of authorial intervention. When evidence concerning the text under consideration is ambiguous, I apply the hypotheses established in Part One to show the most probable explanation. Together, these two parts document a generally steady deterioration in the accuracy of texts published after the first and second editions and, in so doing, form the bibliographical underpinning for the critical text of *Night the First* that follows this chapter.

**PART ONE: BACKGROUND**

The first major textual problem is the absence of a manuscript of the poem. As a result this textual study of Young's *Night the First* is, of necessity, limited to published documents. Except for an autograph letter in which Young quotes eleven lines,¹ I found no manuscript of any of the nine *Nights*, nor is a future textual critic likely to find one. The absence of manuscripts of Young's works can best be explained by a passage in his will: "I appoint my Nephew Harris, & ye Revd Mr Jones to be my Executors; & (in a particular manner,) desire of them, that all my manuscript writings, whether in Books, or Papers, immediately on my decease may be burnt; my Book of Accounts only excepted."² To insure compliance with this request, Young added a codicil two years later: "To Mrs Hallows. It is my dying Request, that You would see all Writings whatever, whether in Papers or Books,
(except my Book of Accounts) burnt, & destroy'd, as soon as I am dead. Which will oblige yr Dearest Friend Ed: Young." Mary Hallows' response to an inquiry by George Keate after Young's death confirms the destruction of the poet's writings: "The good Dr, Sir, burnt most of his Manuscripts, long before his death, & left orders that every thing of that nature shod be destroyed . . . ." Thus, if Young had not already destroyed the manuscripts of Night-Thoughts, they almost certainly burned under the watchful eye of his trusted housekeeper.

The second major textual problem is caused by the large number of editorially-significant editions of differing forms. The earliest printed text of Night the First is a folio of twenty pages that Robert Dodsley published in late May or early June, 1742. Between that date and the months immediately after Young's death in April 1765, the poem appeared in twenty-one more distinct editions bearing the imprint of Young's authorized publishers. This large number of "lifetime" editions (i.e., the twenty-one editions published during Young's life and the first one published after his death) creates obvious bibliographical problems, since the occasions for authorized revisions as well as for corruption of the text were many and since no manuscript exists as a touchstone for authorial intent. My examination of these twenty-two editorially-significant texts revealed that of the original 459 lines in the poem, only three remained unchanged! Also adding complexity to the publication history of Night the First is the fact that Night-Thoughts appeared in five different forms during the author's lifetime (see Table 1). Robert Dodsley published seven editions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGLUM</th>
<th>DECLARED EDITION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NO. OF NIGHTS</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb1</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb2</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nc</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>Third,Fourth</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nf</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ng</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>&quot;1743&quot;?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nh</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nj</td>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nk</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duodecimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nl</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nm</td>
<td>&quot;1751&quot;?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duodecimo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duodecimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duodecimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Np</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nq</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>9 + Works</td>
<td>Duodecimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duodecimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duodecimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nt</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>9 + Works</td>
<td>Duodecimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duodecimo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Publication Facts about the Twenty-two "Lifetime" Editions which include 
Night the First.
between 1742 and 1744 that include only Night the First. During this period he also published a collection that includes Nights I-IV. Later, as Young's work on Night-Thoughts progressed, Dodsley published three editions of a collection that includes Nights I-VI. From 1749 through 1765, Robert Dodsley (joined by Andrew Millar and occasionally by brother Joseph Dodsley) published in nine editions a collection that includes all nine Nights. Finally, during this same period a number of publishers (including the Dodsleys and Millar) issued two editions of Young's collected Works in which all nine Nights appear. That Night the First appeared in these five different forms is textually significant; my examination of the "lifetime" editions showed that the variants in texts in the same form are more closely related than those in texts in differing forms, even when the latter are nearer to one another in sequence of publication.

The textual problems posed by the large number of "lifetime" editions and by the different forms in which these editions appear, however, are lessened by our knowledge that Young never made an extensive revision of Night the First. Young's correspondence demonstrates that although he once had considered extensively revising Night-Thoughts, he rejected that plan in 1755: "My heart fails me now at what I have design'd. My Additions, which are large, will only Disgust former Purchasers; & lengthen what for its general Use is too long already." Perhaps this decision also stemmed from a reluctance to alter an already-established work which continued to be widely read. While Young may possibly have revised one of the subsequent Nights, my
examination of the editorially-significant texts of *Night the First* reveals no evidence of extensive alteration. This finding greatly simplifies textual analysis of the poem, since most critics would argue that if the author extensively rewrote a literary piece (as Wordsworth reworked his *Prelude* and Dickens rewrote the ending of *Great Expectations*), the early and the late versions must stand apart as two textually-independent entities. Such a problem apparently does not exist with *Night the First*, since I found no major revisions.

Furthermore, Young's relationships with his printers and publishers, as seen in his correspondence, lead us to question the likelihood of even minor authorial correction of editions published after the 1742 folio. The extant letters between Young and Samuel Richardson, the printer of the later "lifetime" editions of *Night-Thoughts*, shed light on the author's practices as a corrector of his own works. The most telling exchanges between author and printer concern the publication of the 1749 edition (*Nk*). That edition is especially important in the textual history of the poem because it is the first consolidation of all nine *Nights* into a single volume, and therefore might appear a likely candidate for Young's revision or correction. In the first of the letters regarding the 1749 edition, Richardson promised the poet an accurate text of "Night Thoughts, in I vol.12 mo. which I am desirous to put to press myself, in hopes that it will not be the less correct for it . . . ." An examination of this letter to Young, however, reveals that the main topic is not some abstruse textual subtlety or even some pragmatic textual change, but Richardson's
perplexity about what to do with the entire preface to the poem. This preface had originally appeared as an introduction to the individually-issued editions of *Night the Fourth*. Among other things it expresses doubt as to whether the author would continue *Night-Thoughts* beyond the first four *Nights*. In 1749, after over five years had passed and five more *Nights* had been added to the poem, the preface was hopelessly out of place. Richardson, gathering all nine *Nights* into a one-volume edition, faced a very practical question of what to do with this out-of-date material. The fact that such a question would even have to be asked at so late a time raises serious doubts about Young's commitment to monitoring the accuracy of his text. His response of 10 September 1749 shows little desire to get involved in textual revision, but rather a wish to find a quick solution to the problem that Richardson had pointed out: "I thank your kind care for the next edition of Night Thoughts; the preface you mention may be entirely omitted." ¹¹ Richardson heeded the request and printed the first single-volume collected edition (*N*ₖ) in 1749 without a preface; Young wrote to the printer in December of that year to "return my most cordial thanks for the great trouble your friendship has taken for me in correcting the press." ¹²

It is instructive to note that Richardson, not Young, was still dissatisfied with this disposition of the matter. In preparing a "small new edition" (either *Nₘ* or *Nₙ*) about a year later, he went to the trouble of writing a preface himself that he sent in a letter to Young's housekeeper, Mary Hallows, requesting that she bring it to the author's attention. ¹³ Young acquiesced in the printer's proposal, and thus
the matter was finally resolved by Richardson, who did the work and reluctantly (and indirectly) bothered the author for approval. This exchange of correspondence demonstrates that Young was not a likely source of variants in this and subsequent editions of the poem. He apparently preferred to have the printer "correct" the "minor" details and "fix" the accidentals as necessary.

Nevertheless, while the problems facing the textual critic of Night the First are not so formidable as they would have been had the author made frequent and extensive changes, Young indisputably made some minor revisions and corrections. Since my examination of the "lifetime" texts reveals that the total number of variants is extremely large but that the number of these variants attributable to Young is very small, it is clear that we need guidelines to aid us in separating corruptions of the text from bona fide authorial emendations. The letters between Young and Richardson concerning the publication of The Centaur Not Fabulous, An Argument drawn from the Circumstances of Christ's Death, and Conjectures on Original Composition—the only extant letters which deal extensively with textual matters—are invaluable because by revealing how and when Young did emend his works¹⁴ they permit us to draw hypotheses that can help us determine the probable manner in which Young revised Night the First. Judging from the nature and substance of the correspondence between Young and Richardson, viz., discussion of revision and correction of the three works with no reference to marked-up copies of the text, we can draw our first hypothesis: letters were Young's only channel for listing desired emendations. Use
of letters as the sole mode of revision makes thorough correction improbable. In a marked-up copy, extensive changes can be made easily by striking undesired readings and supplying emendations. In a letter, however, the location of each change must be identified and the nature of the change fully explained. Young's letters of correction give us no reason to think that he went this far to insure textual accuracy. Furthermore, another hypothesis emerges from an examination of the correspondence: when Young did submit a letter of correction, he apparently did so only once, immediately after he had reviewed the first edition. Even then, his emendations were not numerous. In many cases, Young ordered revisions only after Richardson had called attention to problems in the first edition text.

The correspondence between Young and Richardson cannot in itself settle individual textual questions; for example, Young's blanket statement that "All your remarks are most just. I find that I am safer in your hands than my own; I beg you, therefore, to blot, add, alter, as you think good . . ." does not really address any of Richardson's numerous and very specific queries concerning The Centaur Not Fabulous. But the correspondence does permit us to make two hypotheses which can serve as guides for establishing the authority of variants when findings from a physical analysis of the text itself are ambiguous. First, in the absence of more conclusive evidence, it is reasonable to infer that if Young revised Night the First, he did so by letter(s) to the printer or publisher rather than by return of a hand-corrected copy of the text. Second, it is most probable that if Young sent such a letter (or letters), he sent it soon after the publication of the first edition.
rather than after a subsequent edition. Therefore, substantive changes in the second edition of Night the First are more likely to be the author's than are substantives appearing in later editions or than any alteration whatsoever of accidentals.

My research leads me to conclude that the text of Night the First underwent a generally steady deterioration as publication progressed, since no one really devoted much attention to insuring accuracy. The foregoing evidence suggests that Young had little interest in the tedious job of maintaining the textual purity of Night-Thoughts once he was satisfied with his own literary efforts. The evidence in Part Two will demonstrate that Young overlooked corruptions involving accidentals and also some corruptions involving substantive changes. Nor could a printer and his staff be expected to serve in the capacity of bibliographers. Even Richardson's comments (see above, note 15) show him to be mainly a literary critic of his friend's works, not a textual critic.

PART TWO: AN ANALYSIS OF TWENTY-TWO EDITIONS OF NIGHT THE FIRST PUBLISHED FROM 1742 THROUGH 1765.

The purpose of the following discussion is to present detailed evidence concerning the authority of each of the twenty-two editorially-significant Night the First texts. I have arranged the material according to the five major forms in which the poem appeared (individually-issued Nights, the collection of Nights I-IV, collections of Nights I-VI, collections of Nights I-IX, and texts of Night the First that appear as part of Young's collected Works) because the editions within each of these forms are most closely related in terms of textual
derivation. The ordering of the five sections themselves and of the texts within each section is chronological. Since the tendency is greater for new corruptions to be introduced than for old ones to be removed, this sequence consequently represents a generally descending order of textual accuracy. I have found it necessary to tailor my material according to the peculiarities of the individual text under discussion, but each entry does provide three essential types of information: (1) a brief bibliographical description of the text along with my best estimate of the line of derivation, (2) an analysis of new variants that includes an assessment of the authority of each substantive variant, and (3) a concluding statement on the authority of the text as a whole based on the preceding evidence and conjectures. Together, these discussions of individual editions provide the necessary background material for my critical text of Night the First in Chapter IV of this dissertation.

A. INDIVIDUALLY-ISSUED EDITIONS.

Robert Dodsley published all seven of the individually-issued texts of Night the First between 1742 and 1744; I discuss these texts first since they represent the earliest editions of the poem and since all later editions are ultimately derived from one or more of them. These individually-issued editions are especially significant because they are closest to the author's lost manuscript in accidentals and because most of the substantive changes which I have identified as Young's occur first in them. Dodsley was also publishing subsequent Nights at the same time that he published some of these editions of Night the
First, but he did not put together the first collected edition (Nf) until after he had already published texts Na through Ne. Dodsley published edition Nh after he had made at least one collection (Nf), perhaps to permit readers to complete their sets of individually-issued Nights; however, Nh does not incorporate variants that first appeared in the collection.

1. Edition Na. The earliest text of Night the First is the 1742 folio published by Robert Dodsley. This book collates $A^2B-E^2$; 10 leaves, pp. $1-374-20$. The full title is The Complaint: or, Night-Thoughts on Life, Death, & Immortality (see Figure 1). I have collated six copies of the first edition, and my examination shows the type to be of the same setting. I found no textual variants or other differences among these copies except for the numbering of one line and the spacing of type on the title-page. This evidence suggests that a clearly identifiable and stable first edition of Night the First exists against which all subsequent editions can be compared for substantive and accidental variants.

Since no manuscript of Night the First apparently exists and since Young almost certainly did not make changes in accidentals in subsequent editions (except, perhaps, in a line in which he also made a substantive change), the 1742 folio, which is the closest extant document to the author's lost manuscript, most nearly follows Young's idiosyncracies, habits, and preferences—especially in matters of capitalization, spelling, punctuation, and use of italics. Although the foibles of a number of press functionaries may have found their way into edition Na, these corruptions are at a minimum in the earliest text and (as we shall see
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in the discussion of subsequent texts) gradually compound as time passed and later editions were printed from new settings of type.

2. Editions Nb1, Nb2, and Nd. The next logical step in my projected textual analysis of the poem should be an examination of the second edition; unfortunately, three different editions in quarto proclaim themselves the second. The collation for all three is A-D⁴; 16 leaves, pp. [1-274-30 25-327]. Two of these texts bear the date 1742, but a line of type on the title page differs (compare the word "COMMONS" on Figures 2 and 3); the other "second" edition (see Figure 4) bears the date 1743. My examination of the three texts reveals that each is indeed a separate edition, in that more than half of each was printed from a unique setting of type. Although sheet D is from the same setting of type for both 1742 "second" editions, sheets A, B, and C are from completely different settings. All four sheets of the 1743 "second" edition differ in typesetting from either of the 1742 texts.

Henry Pettit established a publication date of 31 July 1742 for the edition with "COMMONS" printed in large capitals (Nb1), and he argues that Dodsley published the other 1742 edition (Nb2) later, some time between 31 July and 30 November of the same year. Although a more recent bibliographer would reverse the order of publication for these two editions, my analysis of the variants in both texts confirms Pettit's hypothesis. Edition Nb1 varies in thirty instances from the first edition text (Na). Edition Nb2 incorporates all of these variants except two (corrections of obvious typographical mistakes in lines 75 and 76) and introduces twelve additional minor variants involving accidentals. Therefore, Nb2 was clearly the later of the two texts,
and it was set from a copy of Nbl. 23

Since we now know with certainty that Nbl is indeed the genuine second edition, we must determine the authority of its 30 new variants. One-third of these variants, ten in all, represent substantive changes in the text. Might they be the author's? Although Young's correspondence is silent on the subject of the three "second" editions of Night the First, I have already shown in Part One of this chapter that the author usually sent his corrections and revisions to the printer on a separate sheet and that his interest in correcting the poem was usually strongest just after the first edition appeared. This pattern of revision probably resulted from Young's tendency to notice and change relatively minor infelicities in wording that escaped his detection until he had seen them in print.

My examination of the ten substantive variants in edition Nbl confirms that all indeed fit the pattern just described and, therefore, are probably the author's. Five of the variants are clustered toward the end of the poem (lines 432, 434, 437-439), where the most sweeping change entails an apparent revision of a three-line passage. In the first edition this passage appears as:

The shrill Lark's sprightly Mattin awakes the Morn;
I strive, with mournful Melody to cheer
(Grief's sharpest Thorn hard-pressing on my Breast)
The sullen Gloom, sweet Philomel! . . .
(ll. 437-440, edition Na)

The lines are then emended to read:

The sprightly Lark's shrill Mattin wakes the Morn;
Grief's sharpest Thorn hard-pressing on my Breast,
I strive, with wakeful Melody, to cheer
The sullen Gloom, sweet Philomel! . . .
(ll. 437-440, edition Nbl)
The changes in the second passage obviously provide a more precise reading and smoother syntax. Lines 438 and 439 are reversed to give a more logical sequence, and "awakes" becomes "wakes" to give a metrically-regular line. It is difficult to say whether the bird or the song should logically be "shrill"; however, the change in line 438/439 of "mournful" to "wakeful" is typical of Young's pattern of revision. Young occasionally became so wrapped up in his main line of thought that he permitted a phrase that was outrageous or absurd to stand. Such apparently occurred here, where in the first edition the poet would cheer the sullen gloom with a mournful song. Also characteristic of this pattern of revision is the change in line 432, where the ludicrous "On" gives way to "O'er." These two variants definitely appear to be the author's. Furthermore, it seems likely, since a precedent now exists for limited authorial intervention in this edition, that the other changes in these lines are also Young's. The lines, as printed in Nlb, probably duplicate the way that the author wrote them in his hypothetical lost letter to Dodsley in which he set forth desired corrections to the poem. As such, the variants more closely embody Young's final choices than do the first edition readings.

The five other substantive variants in edition Nbl also are apparently the author's. The last four words of line 42, which had read "Nature, and of Woe" are revised to "Nature, and of Soul" with the insertion of italics accompanying the change in wording. The revision emphasizes the interaction between the external world and the internal world of the speaker and clarifies the next line, which refers to "This double Night." A similar change by the author occurs in line 188, which
is shown below as it originally appeared in context:

Safe are you lodg'd above these rowling Spheres;
The baleful influence of whose giddy Dance,
Sheds sad Vicissitude on all beneath.
How teems with Revolutions every Hour?
And rarely for the better; or the best,
More mortal than the common births of Fate.
(ll. 185-190, edition Na)

In edition Nbl, line 188 becomes, "Here teems with Revolutions every Hour;" a revision that alters the meaning of the whole passage. The change emphasizes the contrast between the permanent happiness of those in heaven ("above these rowling Spheres") and the unstable happiness of men on earth ("Here"). Italics stress this point, and the punctuation change is dictated by the emendation. The revision in line 82 ("amaz'd" becomes "aghast") also improves parallelism and is probably the author's. Finally, the revision in line 66 ("mercies" becomes "bounties") is probably Young's simply because only the author would care enough to make such a change.

Although the substantive variants appear to be Young's, the many accidentals almost certainly are not. Unless Young acted in a manner contrary to his usual practice, the medium for his emendations was a letter. As we have seen in Part One, it is highly improbable that Young would attempt to correct accidentals in such a letter unless these happened to occur in lines in which he made substantive changes. When these accidental variants give readings more characteristic of the author, the improvement can probably be attributed to vigilance or luck on the part of a compositor or proofreader.

Edition Nbl2, with its incorporation of almost every Nbl1 variant along with the introduction of several new textual corruptions, is
obviously a derived edition and shows no signs of authorial revision or correction. A new typographical mistake (l. 109) and two new punctuation marks appear, six nouns formerly beginning with lower case letters start with upper case letters, and three spelling changes occur. At best, these variants represent efforts by the printing house to make the text more consistent internally than Na and Nb1; but they are nevertheless corruptions of the text, and in several cases they alter or blur Young's points of emphasis. In edition Na, lines 168-170 read:

How richly were my noon-tide Trances hung
With gorgeous Tapestries of pictur'd joys?
Joy behind joy, in endless Perspective!

In edition Nb2, the initial letters of "joys" (l. 169) and "joy" (l. 170) are capitalized. Since capitalization, much as italics, is a form of emphasis, the changes detract from the meaning of the passage and almost certainly are not the author's. In Young's conceit, earthly joy is like a work of graphic art because it only gives the illusion of being real (three-dimensional). It follows, then, that "Tapestries" and "Perspective," the two key words in the conceit, be highlighted by capitalization. The variants in edition Nb2 probably represent an attempt by a compositor or corrector who, noticing that the initial letters of surrounding nouns were capitalized, tried to regularize the text. A similar change can be found in line 216, which originally read, "How wanes my borrow'd bliss?" In edition Nb2 the word "bliss" becomes "Bliss." As a result, the emphasis on the italicized "borrow'd" is weakened and some of the impact of the passage is lost. The use of capitalization and italics is a significant part of Young's style, and the liberties taken in edition Nb2 give it the mark of a derived,
The third of the "second" editions (Nd), which Dodsley probably published early in 1743, has a more complicated derivation. This quarto incorporates variants from both Nbl and Nb2. My examination of the text shows that the setting of type is new in all four sheets, and also reveals that sheet A derives from Nb2 while sheets B, C, and D derive from Nbl. More significantly, however, I have discovered that forty new variants appear, two of which involve substantive changes. This number of variants is higher than one would expect to find in a derived edition, even in accidentals, when compared with the number of new variants appearing in other editions of Night the First. Also, we have already seen from Young’s letters concerning the revision of his other works that he seldom made emendations to the text except in the second edition and that he did not concern himself with accidentals. We have also seen that such revisions were probably made in the true second edition of Night the First (Nbl).

My examination of the variants in Nd provides no evidence to support an argument for further authorial intervention. The first of the substantive changes occurs in line 286; the passage containing this line appeared thus in edition Na:

A Part how small of the terraqueous Globe
Is tenanted by man? the rest a Waste,
Rocks, Deserts, frozen Seas, and burning Sands;
Wild haunts of Monsters, Poisons, Stings, and Death:
Such is Earth's melancholy Map! But far
More sad! this Earth is a true Map of man:

(11. 283-288)

In edition Nd, "Wild" becomes "With," changing the fourth line of the passage to read, "With haunts of Monsters . . . ." While the change
simplifies the syntax somewhat, it also obscures the meaning of the original passage. Young's conceit here is that a map of the world is an emblem of earth's inhospitability to man. The perils enumerated in line 186 ("Monsters, Poisons, Stings, and Death") are the figures that contemporary cartographers so commonly drew in terra incognita. The uninhabited geographic regions of line 285—"Rocks" (mountains), "Deserts" (uninhabited places), "frozen Seas" (polar regions), and "burning Sands" (deserts)—were the unexplored, dimly-known areas on the map where the viewer of the map is threatened respectively by abominable monsters, poisonous serpents, stinging dragons, and burning death. Young's point is that such areas are the haunts of these perils and thus are not to be inhabited by man. The substitution of "With" for "Wild" dilutes this meaning by implying that the unexplored places merely contain the haunts. An obvious corollary to the second reading is that a prudent man can coexist safely in these areas simply by sidestepping the haunts and the perils that lurk within them. This latter meaning is clearly inconsistent with that of the larger passage; therefore, it is implausible that the change of "Wild" to "With" was the author's.

The other substantive change appears in line 295. This line is part of a passage that originally read

What then am I, who sorrow for myself?
In Age, in Infancy, from other's aid
Is all our Hope; to teach us to be kind.
That, Nature's first, last Lesson to mankind:
(11. 294-297, edition Na)

In other words, we learn to help others ("to be kind") by being helped ourselves ("from other's aid"); this "Lesson to mankind" is the first ("in Infancy") and the last ("in Age") that nature teaches us. The fact
that the words "first" and "last" are in italics stresses this meaning. Substitution of "for" for "from" in line 295 obscures the passage, since a helpless infant or a person suffering the infirmities of age is physically unable to aid others, regardless of his good intentions but instead must receive the aid of those around him. This aid is therefore the first and last lesson in kindness that we receive during our lives. As with the earlier substantive change, the substitution of "for" for "from" is the sort of "correction" one would expect from a well-meaning press employee who may not have fully understood the context and, hence, supposed that the reading in the copy before him was in error.

Thus, the two substantive changes in edition Nd appear to be corruptions, possibly introduced by someone who thought that he was eliminating "obvious" mistakes. Since these two new variants are the only substantive changes introduced in Nd, their apparent invalidity seriously undermines our faith in variants involving accidentals. Although some of the accidentals could be corrections, most are manifestly errors (e.g., the comma omission in line 349 between "poor" and "pale"). The change of "Empires" to "Empire" (l. 195) is an apparent substantive variant which closer examination reveals to be a purely typographical mistake. Although minor in importance, at least one change in spelling ("ought" to "aught" in l. 151) runs counter to Young's usual choice. Finally, emphasis is lost in line 584 when "Many" becomes "many." In short, Nd provides little evidence to support an argument for intervention by Young. Its many variants, some of which enjoy a long life in subsequent editions, may easily trap the
unwary into suspecting authorial intervention. All evidence indicates that this text is derived from the two earlier "second" editions. It possesses more than its share of mistakes as well as some unwelcome "corrections" by a hand other than the author's.

3. **Edition No.** Before the 1743 "second" edition appeared, Dodsley published a "third" edition (No) in December 1742. This octavo, which collates A-C$^4$D$^2$; pp. [l-2] 3-25 [26-27] [28 blank], was apparently a small, cheap text of *Night the First* prepared for the Christmas season trade and has little textual importance.

My analysis of this edition reveals its close derivation from Nb1; no variants unique to Nb2 appear. The recurrence of an Nb1-unique typographical mistake ("absort" in line 75) further demonstrates the closeness of the derivation. All but two Nb1 variants appear in the text of No, and both exceptions involve corrections of obvious mistakes. Eleven new variants appear, none substantive and none suggesting any likelihood of intervention by the author. Two involve changes in typography (in l. 69, "He" becomes "HE" and in l. 180, "Ye" becomes "YE"). The remaining nine accidentals are scattered throughout the text; three are changes in capitalization and six are changes in punctuation. While the addition of a comma after "invert" (l. 335) may improve the text, the remainder of the variants are inconsequential and sometimes represent obvious corruptions. Some new variants in accidentals are to be expected any time a text is reset. Variants of that sort can be dismissed without further consideration. Edition No exhibits no signs of revision by the author, and no part of any subsequent edition (including Nd) derives from its text.
4. **Edition Ne.** Robert Dodsley published this text during the first half of 1743, prior to 11 June. This quarto represents another "third" edition of *Night the First*, and it collates A-D; 16 leaves; pp. 1-21 3-31 32. During the same year, this text was reissued with a cancellans title page proclaiming it to be the "fourth" edition. Only the title pages differ; the texts are from the same setting of type and identical in all respects. Edition Ne contains no variants originating in Nd or Ne. Rather, it is closely derived from two other editions—Nh and Nd. Unlike edition Nd, which also is derived from two sources, the cross-over point from one copy-text to the other is not clear. In spite of this minor complication, Ne poses no real textual problems. It is so closely derived from the two earlier texts that only six new variants, all in accidentals, appear. Four, involving the deletion of punctuation or italics, seem to have resulted merely from oversight. The remaining two variants involve minor changes in punctuation. Because of the paucity and relative insignificance of the new variants, it is virtually impossible to imagine any likelihood of intervention by Young. This edition is derived; it continues to include existing corruptions and introduces a few new ones of its own.

5. **Edition Nh.** Dodsley published this quarto "fifth" edition in 1744. Edition Nh collates A-D; 16 leaves; pp. 1-21 4-30 31-32 blank. It includes only *Night the First*; but perhaps though bibliographically disparate, it was (as Pettit suggests) part of a collection sold together with the texts of *Nights II, III, and IV* or was published so that persons with the other individually-issued *Nights* could
complete their sets. If Nh actually did appear after Nf and Ng had already been published, it was not influenced by the texts of these collections. Rather, Nh was derived from two earlier quarto editions of Night the First. My analysis of the variants reveals a derivation from Nb2 and Ne. Sheet A closely derives from edition Nb2; sheets B, C, and D closely follow edition Ne. As a result, edition Nh includes two bad readings ("With" in line 286 and "for" in line 295). Except for a few probably fortuitous restorations of earlier forms, only fourteen new variants appear. The only new substantive variant, omission of the word "of" in line 281, is clearly the result of a mistake during typesetting. As for the accidentals, two are obvious typographical errors ("wrestless" in line 171 and "commot" in line 236). The remaining variants involve changes in punctuation and capitalization. Most are insignificant, although several are manifest corruptions of the text. Since we need positive evidence if we are to accept the authority of variants and such evidence is totally lacking, we can dismiss Nh as a derived, unauthoritative edition.

B. COLLECTED EDITION: NIGHTS I-IV

Nf, which Dodsley published on 11 June 1743, is the first collected edition of several Nights printed as a single volume. The collection, therefore, represents a major milestone in the printing history of Night-Thoughts, and my findings suggest that Young (contrary to his usual uninvolvedness in the printing process) actually reviewed Night the First and made four substantive changes. This octavo "fifth" edition includes Nights I-IV and collates A-K L\(^4\) (-L4); pp. [I-iv]
Leaf π is the fly-title; leaf A2 is missigned "A3" and leaf A3 is missigned "A4." Although textual evidence shows that Mf derives from two earlier editions (Ne2 and Ne), sixty-three new variants appear; three of these new variants are substantive changes. The first (a change in line 133 of "The life of Gods" to "The life Gods") is clearly a compositor's mistake, unique to this text.

The remaining two substantive changes are probably the author's. After line 181 a new line appears: "A Perpetuity of Bliss, is Bliss." This line provides closure to the thought of the previous two lines and adds a link to what follows. The addition is almost certainly Young's, since even an officious press functionary is unlikely to have introduced a line into the text. The third substantive change occurs in line 230, where "Sweet Comfort's blasted Clusters make me sigh" (Na) becomes "Sweet Comfort's blasted Clusters I lament" (Mf). Like the addition of line 181A, this change does not seem to be of the kind a corrector would make. The substantives in both lines 181A and 230 endure in all subsequent editions published during Young's lifetime by his authorized printers and publishers. It is unlikely that such important variants could completely escape detection by Young over so long a period if they were not authoritative. Other signs of Young's correction of the text include the restoration of "Wild" in line 286 ("Wild haunts of Monsters . . .") and of "from" in line 295 (". . . from other's aid").

These corrections suggest that the text was reviewed by familiar eyes, most likely the author's. The new accidentals, especially those involving punctuation, often seem more characteristic of the texture of Young's poetry than the earlier readings. However, since Young's
usual mode of revision was by letter and not by marked proofs or a marked copy of the text, it would be a dangerous precedent to attribute any of the accidentals to the author. These changes more likely reflect an attempt at standardization and internal consistency by a compositor or corrector. Except for Young's four substantive changes (two new readings and two restorations of earlier readings), Nf represents yet a further deterioration of the text of Night the First from those editions that preceded it.

C. COLLECTED EDITIONS: NIGHTS I-VI

The third milestone in the publication of Night-Thoughts occurred when Young had completed six Nights. At that point Robert Dodsley collected these Nights into a single-volume text which went through three editions (Ng, Ni, and Nj). The latter two editions, published after Young had completed all nine Nights, probably were sold together with a collection of Nights VII-IX to give readers a complete set of all nine Nights. George Hawkins published this second volume, and it was printed for him by Samuel Richardson. I find no evidence to suggest that Young reviewed or corrected the text of Night the First in any of these three editions. The alterations that do occur—some of them extensive—represent new corruptions and a continuing decline from the textual purity of the first edition folio.

1. Edition Ng. The title page of this "sixth" edition bears the date "1743," but Dodsley probably published Ng considerably later, possibly in early 1745. This octavo collates (frt+) A-K 4 L-M-S 4 (N as 'L'); pp. a-iv j v-viii j 11-167 j 168 blk j 169-214
Despite Pettit's argument for an intermediate text—a collection of Nights I-IV published after Nf and before Ng—my extensive search for such a volume proved fruitless. Perhaps if such an edition actually exists, persons owning it had their copies rebound to include Nights V and VI, which may have been sold as a separate unit as well as part of edition Ng. In any event Ng so closely resembles Nf that even if the phantom text does represent a separate, intermediate edition, it is probably editorially insignificant; my analysis of Ng revealed only twenty-five new variants, all of them of little importance. Two of these variants (in lines 81 and 133) correct typographical mistakes in Nf. Of the remaining twenty-three variants, six involve reduction to lower case of previously capitalized initial letters. Four variants are spelling changes and eight are punctuation changes. No new substantive variants appear, and the accidental variants show no consistent pattern of change. Nearly all appear to be corruptions which in some small way mar the texture of the poem and cause minor loss of meaning. Absolutely no evidence can be found in edition Ng to suggest intervention by the author.

2. Edition Ni. The "seventh" edition of Night-Thoughts, dated 1747, is an octavo that collates A-K L'M-S T (N as 'L'); i-iv v-viii 5-10 11-168 168 blk 169-214 '225-239' [230-236 blk 237-284 285-286 blk]. Ni derives from edition Ng and incorporates all but seven of the twenty-three Ng-unique variants. This volume is the first collected edition printed after all nine Nights had been published and, together with the 1748 edition of Nights VII-IX, forms a
complete set.

My examination of the text reveals a large number of changes—eighty-seven in all—but my analysis of these variants demonstrates that they are probably not Young's. Only three of the variants are substantive changes; the remaining eighty-four are accidentals, of which the majority (sixty-two) involve alterations in punctuation. Of the three substantive variants, only one represents a major change. This and one of the other two substantives appear in a passage that read thus in the first edition:

Think not that Fear is sacred to the Storm:
Stand on thy guard against the smiles of Fate.
Is Heaven tremendous in its Frown! most sure:
And in its favours formidable too;
Its favours here are Tryals, not Rewards;
A call to Duty, not discharge from Care;
And shou'd alarm us, full as much as Woes;
Awake us to their cause, and consequence,
O'er our scan'd Conduct give a jealous Eye;
And make us tremble, weigh'd with our Desert,
Awe Nature's tumult, and chastise her Joys,
Lest while we clasp, we kill them; may invert
To worse than simple misery, their Charms:
Revolted Joys, like foes in civil war,
Like bosom friendships to resentment sour'd,
With rage envenom'd rise against our Peace.

(11. 524–539, edition Na)

In Ni, line 332 ("O'er our scan'd Conduct give a jealous Eye") is omitted altogether. While this omission does not lead to total incoherence, it does create something of a non sequitur. It is by scanning our conduct that we realize our "Desert" is far different from the "favours" we now enjoy. Removal of the line might be construed as a minor improvement in syntax by increasing parallelism ("alarm us . . .
Awake us . . . make us"); it seems far more likely, however, that the compositor simply dropped the line. This missing line was never
restored in any subsequent edition during Young's lifetime, but none of these editions (as will be demonstrated below) was set from a text in which the line appeared. Since the passage still makes sense, it is quite plausible that the absence of line 332 never was noticed by anyone, not even by the author. Another substantive variant in the same passage is also suspect. In Ni, the word "Frown" in line 326 becomes "Frowns." This change ostensibly creates parallelism, since both "Favours" (l. 327) and "Frowns" are now plural. Yet it does not seem that the two are to be compared. An earlier variant capitalized the initial letter of the word "favours," thus reducing the original emphasis on "Frown," which until that time had been distinguished by its initial capitalization. By changing "Frown" to "Frowns" the impact is further diminished. Thus, an earlier corruption of the text (i.e., "favours" becoming "Favours") may have helped create a second unauthorized variant ("Frown" becoming "Frowns"). A similar change occurs in line 448, where the word "Flame" becomes "Flames" perhaps to parallel "Raptures." The line originally read: "I rowl their Raptures, but not catch their Flame" (Na). The passage in which this line appears addresses three great poets, Homer, Milton, and Pope. The "Flame" is the exalted state which poets such as these share in the height of their ecstasy. Thus, the speaker complains that although he can share their "Raptures," he has not captured this inspiration. In its plural form the word "Flame" has a slightly different meaning. Gone is the implication that all great poets share in one single "Flame" regardless of their era or nationality. Given this evidence, we are forced to conclude that the three substantive changes in edition Ni are most likely
the work of a careless or officious press employee, not of the author.

We have already seen that when Young revised his work, he did so invariably to improve substantive readings only. Since no evidence suggests that he made such changes in edition Νί, we can be almost certain that the author did not alter any of the accidentals. My examination of edition Νι indicates that the majority of variants involving accidentals are indeed manifest corruptions of the text, clearly uncharacteristic of Young's habitual practices and preferences. Because so many of these accidental variants (sixty-two) are changes in punctuation, however, I feel that it would be instructive for the reader to consider what Young's characteristic practices actually were.

Ideally, a textual critic could establish what were the author's practices by examining manuscripts of other poetry that he wrote. But since Young's manuscripts are not extant, we lack this valuable source of guidance. Nor are the printed editions of Young's other poems a reliable guide, since they were subject to the same unauthorized changes that occurred in Night the First. Ultimately, the only authoritative indications of Young's practices are his autograph letters. While the location of punctuation in blank verse (i.e., usually at the ends of lines) is vastly different from that in prose, the choice of punctuation mark used (e.g., semicolon or colon vs. period, semicolon vs. comma, question mark vs. exclamation point) depends largely on syntax and the author's preferences. To establish a base line for punctuation, I have made a study of twenty-five randomly-chosen, autograph letters that Young wrote from 1742 through 1755. Since this analysis involves matters of texture, the best we can hope to obtain are hypotheses based
on predominance and context.

The first point that becomes apparent is that Young used the colon and semicolon extensively, both in the twenty-five letters I examined and in the fragments of poetry quoted in a handful of other letters. Young's preference was clearly for long rather than short sentences, and in his long sentences he used these two marks of punctuation to connect major units of thought. The semicolon connects syntactically-related independent clauses, in many cases even if these clauses are already joined by a coordinating conjunction. Young used the colon to link syntactically-unrelated independent clauses. Perhaps the following example best demonstrates Young's practice: "Such is my opinion of Your Graces goodness, that I can chuse no Subject more agreeable to You than to speak of your Friends: Last Week a neighbour of poor Dr Clarkes now in Huntingdonshire calld on me; He told me our Friend was still living, & that his Physitian sayd He might possibly live four or five years longer: That is in ye ever blessed will of God: After this melancholy account, I will give Yr Grace something more comfort-able." In this passage we see that the use of the semicolon is similar to modern practice, although current usage would favor a period. The second colon is also used in the modern way, as when a statement illustrates or draws a conclusion from a preceding clause. The other two colons, however, connect two turns in thought into a single sentence. The modern grammarian would demand a period in both cases. The end punctuation (in line 6) of a passage quoted in this same letter further illustrates how Young's colon connects loosely-related ideas, even when the syntax appears to call for a period:
As some tall Towr, or lofty Mountains Brow
Detains the Sun, Illustrious from its Height,
When rising Vapours, & descending Shades,
in Damps, & Darkness, drown ye Spatious Vale,
Philander thus augustly reard his head
Undampt by Doubt, undisheart by Despair:
At that black Hour, \textit{which} general Horror sheds
On the low Level of Inglorious minds,
Sweet Peace, & Heavenly Hope, & humble Joy,
Divinely beamd on his exalted Soul,
With incommunicable Lustre, bright.

The letters also suggest that Young usually used commas between
dependent clauses joined by a coordinating conjunction but that he used
a semicolon when the clauses are independent. The following examples
illustrate Young's preferences: "I do assure Your Grace that I do, &
ever shall look on your Correspondence (as I ought) not onely as a great
Honour, but real Entertainment too." But, "As I take it, Madam, I am
directly in yr way to Nottinghamshire; & why shd You put yourselves to
an Inconveniency to avoid me?" As one would expect, it is not diffi-
cult to find exceptions to these general rules. However, when excep-
tions occur, Young's tendency is to strengthen the comma to a colon or
semicolon, rather than \textit{vice versa}. Finally, the letters reveal that
Young preferred a question mark as end punctuation for expressions
which might otherwise be considered exclamations, as the following
examples show: "How Happy then, & Wise is your Grace, who are fond of
Both these Books?" and "How One false Step naturally betrays us into
another?"

Given these general principles, I have attempted to judge authority
of the accidental variants in edition Ni. For example, of the sixty-
two punctuation changes that occur in this text, a majority involve the
substitution of a period for a colon or semicolon. This is definitely
not the type of change we would expect Young to make. Near the
beginning of the poem the semicolon after the word "lost" (Ka-Nh, l. 12) and the colon after "severe" (l. 14) become periods. Similar changes are found throughout Ni. Although we cannot know with certainty how Young actually punctuated any particular line since his manuscript is not extant, we can discuss the tendencies that we would expect to find in a large sample of his writing. Because the punctuation variants throughout Ni run counter to these expectations, it seems reasonable to assume that they entered the text by a hand other than the author's.

Thus, my analysis of edition Ni suggests that Night the First underwent considerable unauthorized change. As we have seen, the three substantive changes are not the author's. Furthermore, given what we know about Young's method of revision (by letter rather than by marked-up copy of the text), it is highly unlikely that Young revised the text merely to change accidentals. Finally, the many punctuation changes which do occur in edition Ni are not characteristic of Young's usual practices. Although none of Young's directions to the printer of Nights I-VI survive, we know that the three Nights in the second volume were covered by the following request to printer Samuel Richardson: "I ask a much greater favour of you, in correcting the press for me as to the octavo edition." Perhaps a similar request for the first volume may explain the many liberties taken. All available evidence strongly suggests that edition Ni continues, even hastens, the steady trend toward further textual corruption.

3. Edition Ni. Dodsley published the "eighth" edition, an octavo, in April 1749; it collates A B-N 0; pp. \( \sqrt{1-iv} \) \( \sqrt{1-27} \) 3-199 \( 200 \) blk. Ni includes Nights I-VI and was accompanied by the 1749 Volume II.
collection of *Nights* VII-IX. The text of *Night the First* closely follows *Ni* in all respects except for ten new variants and three fortuitous restorations of earlier readings. Of the three restorations, two (ll. 373, 381) correct obvious typographical mistakes, and the third ("He" to *he* in line 452) is also a correction, since the pronoun refers not to God, but to Alexander Pope. These corrections, however, are of the type that a press functionary would be much more likely to make than Young. Of the ten new variants, two are substantive changes, but both are clearly errors. In line 318, the word "Prosperity" becomes "Posterity," creating nonsense; in line 335 the word "we" is inadvertently omitted. Of the remaining eight variants, two are spelling changes, three are capitalization changes, and three are punctuation changes. The evidence from my analysis of the variants clearly indicates that *Nj* is a derived edition, since the compositors did so good a job of following their copy, viz. *Ni*.

D. COMPLETE SINGLE-VOLUME EDITIONS OF THE *NIGHT-THOUGHTS*.

Each of the following editions is a one-volume text that includes all nine *Nights*. Andrew Millar and Robert Dodsley published editions *Nk*, *Nl*, *Nm*, and *Nn*. James Dodsley's name is added to editions *No*, *Np*, *Nr*, *Ns*, and *Nu*. Except for two editions that may possibly have been piracies (*Nl* and *Nm*), the printer of all these texts but the last was Samuel Richardson. Richardson's nephew inherited the press and printed the posthumous edition (*Nu*). Although Young and Richardson were extremely close friends, their correspondence gives no indication that the author collaborated with the printer in correcting *Night-Thoughts*. 
Indeed, the discussion above in Part One of this chapter concerning Young's handling of the "Preface" to Night-Thoughts demonstrates the risk of our assuming any correlation between friendship and textual accuracy. My analysis of the variants in these nine editions shows that only a handful in edition No can safely be attributed to Young. These few authorized changes are far outweighed by the many textual corruptions that rapidly compounded during the printing of these editions.

1. Edition Nk. This duodecimo was published in January 1750, and the collation for an ideal copy is A2 12 8 2 B-0 P Q ; pp. 1-iv 1-32 3-326 327-332. As we have seen, Young apparently had no part in the changes that occurred in this edition, but left correction entirely to Richardson. Therefore, what we have in Nk is the first example of what we can in any sense call an "edited" text for Night the First. Richardson attempted to reconstruct the poem as he thought the author intended it to appear. Since Young had given his written approval, the textual critic could make an argument for accepting the revisions. Yet, how can we construe as authoritative an edition that the author probably never even examined closely? If it were merely a matter of the author's telling his printer to standardize spelling, capitalization, and punctuation from the manuscript, a decision to accept the changes might be proper. Here, however, we have a printer forced to determine the author's intent from an already corrupt text. The inevitable result is the introduction of further corruption.

Richardson's edition often does give the appearance of regularity in its treatment of accidentals. However, much of the original emphasis
is lost when the initial letters of all nouns are capitalized. One passage, for example, originally read this way:

Procrastination is the Thief of Time,
Year after year it steals, till all are fled,
And to the mercies of a Moment leaves
The vast Concerns of an Eternal scene.

(ll. 392-95, edition Ha)

Edition Nh capitalizes the initial letters of "year" (l. 393), "mercies" (l. 314), and "scene" (l. 395) while reducing "Eternal" to lower case. As a result the main issue, "Moment" versus "Eternal" is lost in the mass of capitalized words; also, one noun ("scene"), far less significant than its modifier, is emphasized by virtue of an upper-case initial letter. Nor is unauthorized capitalization the only new source of corruption, since a large number of other questionable variants (124) appears. All but two of these involve the form or spelling of words (e.g., "e'er" becomes "ere," etc.), punctuation, italics, and other non-substantive matters. A few give readings more in keeping with the practices of the first edition and Young's known preferences, but more often than not these new variants lead to patent corruptions of the text. We have seen, for instance, that Young frequently used the question mark where an exclamation point would ordinarily be expected. In edition Nh, twenty-five question marks are transformed to exclamation points. Such changes are not insignificant, since altered punctuation can distort the tone of a passage markedly and in some cases has a greater impact on meaning than many substantive variants. One noteworthy example is found in lines 162 and 165: "Night-visions may befriend, (as sung above) / Our waking Dreams are fatal" (Ha). In Richardson's new edition the punctuation is changed: "Night-visions
may befriend (as sung above): / Our waking Dreams are fatal" (Nk).
At first glance we are tempted to commend the printer for putting a colon where Young surely would have placed it. But the author would only have placed a colon at the end of line 162 if the parenthetical expression referred back to the phrase, "Night-visions may befriend."
An examination of the poem reveals that what are sung above (ll. 154-61) are not "Night-visions," but rather "Our waking Dreams."

Only two substantive changes occur in Nk; neither gives evidence of being the author's. One, a compositor's mistake, appears in line 210 ("could not One suffice" becomes "could not one One suffice"). The other occurs in line 188, where "Here teems with Revolutions every Hour" (Nbl) becomes "Here teems the Revolutions ev'ry Hour" (Nk). The word "Here" has a very specific meaning; it refers to the earth (as opposed to the more stable "Realms of Light" in line 184) and is therefore central to the contrast in the larger passage. It is unclear what the "corrector" understood "Here" to mean, but the substitution of "the" for "with" clearly demonstrates that his definition is not the specialized one that the passage demands. Such a change could surely not be Young's, and probably not even Richardson's, since we would expect either of them to have understood the context. Likewise, it is difficult to decide whom to credit with the more fortunate accidental variant ("ev'ry" instead of "every") which occurs in the same line. Since Richardson read many of Young's manuscripts, it could be argued that he was acquainted with Young's usual practice of eliding the "e" when it contributed to metrical smoothness. More likely this change, much like the standardization of initial capitals, was an attempt either by
Richardson or by one of his assistants to regularize the text. Ultimately, we are forced to dismiss Nk as a derived edition bearing no real authority from Young and incorporating many new textual corruptions.

2. **Edition Nl.** This octavo is dated 1750, and the ideal copy collates A-Bb Cc; pp. 1-4/5-404. Nl is derived from editions Nk and Ni. Most of the text (ll. 1-313, 353-459) closely follows Nk, with only thirteen variants; lines 314-351, however, follow Ni or Ni. It is unclear why this change occurs when it does, but the shift from Nk to Ni or Ni begins early on leaf Bl and ends in the middle of leaf Bl. Whether Nl is indeed a piracy as has been alleged or is a legitimate edition, its text for *Night the First* is clearly derived and shows no signs of authorial intervention. Of the new variants, two correct obvious typographical mistakes in edition Nk (ll. 133, 210). Two new typos are introduced ("said" for "sad" in line 117 and "elaps'd" for "elaps'd" in line 222). The remaining nine changes are minor and certainly none are Young's; three involve spelling, four punctuation, one italics, and one capitalization. All appear to be inevitable cases of a compositor erring or reverting to habitual practice rather than following his copy.

3. **Editions Im and In.** These two editions, both in duodecimo, are dated 1751 and bear the new preface proposed by Richardson. The smaller edition (Im), which collates A²-B²-R¹²; pp. 1-ii/iii iv/2-304, may be a piracy. The larger edition (In), collating 1 A²-B²-N¹²o⁴; pp. 1-ii/iii iv/2-296, is an indisputable product of Richardson's press. Although I was unable to determine conclusively whether Im is indeed a piracy,
I have been able—through a comparison of variants—to establish the relationship between the two texts themselves. This latter finding is significant from a textual critic's point-of-view, since up till now it has not been clear whether Mn derives from Nm, Nm from Nn, or whether both editions derive independently from an earlier text.

My examination of the two 1751 editions reveals that Mn closely follows Nk in matters involving capitalization. In edition Nm, however, nearly all the initial letters of nouns that had been uniformly capitalized in editions Nk and N^l are reduced to lower case. This change seems highly unusual, occurring so soon after the regularization that had been performed on the text of edition Nk. My analysis of variants other than capitalization shows that neither of the 1751 editions derives from a text prior to Nk. Also, edition N^l is eliminated as a possible source, because lines 314 through 351 (the distinguishing mark of N^l) in both Nm and Nn clearly derive from Nk instead. Moreover, a comparison of variants, in particular those in lines 135 (where Nm and Nn show "Interras," a spelling formerly unique to Nk) and 138 (where the distinctive variant "the" for "with," unique to Nk and N^l, is repeated in Nm and Nn), demonstrates that both editions almost certainly derive from Nk. Edition Nm varies from Nk in seventy-three instances (excluding capitalization); Nn varies from Nk in forty-two. The two editions share only fourteen variants not in Nk. The most probable conclusion, then, is that the two editions were independently derived. The number of variants in Nn (forty-two) is higher than for some other derived editions (such as N^l and N^l), but not without precedent (i.e., in edition N^l, which is clearly a derived text, forty new variants
appear). The number of variants in \textit{Nn} (seventy-three), however, does seem abnormally high and may indicate that this edition was derived from an unknown text, rather than directly from \textit{Nk}. The only point that the evidence conclusively demonstrates is that edition \textit{Nn} was not derived from \textit{Nm} or vice versa.

With a very few exceptions, the many variants in both edition \textit{Nm} and \textit{Nn} are minor and usually remove the text still further from first edition practices. In addition to the uncharacteristic pattern of capitalization in \textit{Nm}, numerous instances occur in which exclamation points replace question marks (ll. 68, 165, 166, 167, 169, 279). The paragraph beginning with line 134 is made part of the preceding paragraph, a change which a glance at the text shows to be almost certainly a mistake because of the major rhetorical shift at this point. The one substantive change in \textit{Km} ("pinion" to "pinions" in l. 4) adds an unpoetic sibilance to the line and, in view of the many other irregularities of this edition, is probably just another error. Moreover, the new variants in edition \textit{Nn} also give us little reason to suspect any authorial intervention. They primarily consist of minor changes in spelling, capitalization, and punctuation. The variants are scattered, and a number of them (such as the change of a semicolon to a colon at the end of line 327 and the addition of an exclamation point as end punctuation in line 453) seem clearly uncharacteristic of Young's preferences as reflected in his letters and the practices of edition \textit{Na}. The one apparent substantive change in \textit{Nn} ("wreck'd" becomes "wrack'd" in l. 209) is probably nothing more than an accidental misspelling of the original word. Since the variants are minor,
usually inconsequential or slightly inferior to original readings, both 
Nm and Nn can be dismissed as unauthoritative, derived editions that 
merely continue the drift away from the textual purity of the earliest 
edition.

4. Edition No. This duodecimo is dated 1755, and the copy I 
examined collates π1 A B-0 P ; pp. 1-ii  iii  1v  2-320. 70

Edition No follows Nn and incorporates all Nn variants except three 
minor accidentals which are probably fortuitous restorations of earlier 
readings. Of the thirty-one new variants, nine are changes in punctua-
tion, six in spelling, six in italics, three in capitalization, and one 
in paragraph division. This total of twenty-five is not excessive,
about what can be expected in a normal resetting of type. However, six 
new substantive variants also appear. These changes cannot be so easily 
dismissed, because this edition bears on its title page the claim "A New 
Edition, Corrected by the Author." My examination of the six variants 
suggests that Young indeed reviewed Night the First prior to the publi-
cation of edition No and made a few minor revisions and corrections.

Three of the six substantive variants are probably the author's. 
The most persuasive case that can be made for authorial intervention 
in this edition centers on the restoration of the correct reading in 
line 188 ("Here teems with Revolutions . . ."). I have noted that the 
variant in edition Nk was actually a corruption of the text rather than 
a correction. It is unlikely that the proper reading was restored by 
accident or by a Richardson correction, since the printer had permitted 
the change to stand through four editions (Nk, Nf, Nm, and Nn). Such 
a change would therefore almost certainly have been the author's.
Another variant that is probably Young's appears in line 512, where "Thou happy Wretch! by Blindness art thou blest" (Nm) becomes "Thou happy Wretch! by Blindness thou art blest" (No). The new reading corrects a minor flaw in prosody. Like the variant in line 55, we are not certain whether the change is the author's or the printer's, but it corrects the sort of problem that a poet would be likely to notice. Finally, line 448 incorporates a change that almost certainly is Young's: "I roll their Raptures, but not catch their Fire" (No). We have seen how the earlier corrupt reading, "Flames," was introduced (in Ni) for the original "Flame." The present change to a completely different word is not what we would expect from a compositor or even from a corrector; instead, it is almost certainly an attempt by Young to restore his original meaning. While one could argue that "Flame" represents Young's real choice and that had he referred to one of the earlier editions he would have chosen the original reading, it is more prudent in this case to defer to what was almost certainly the author's final verdict.

The source of the remaining three substantive variants is less clear. The first of these appears in line 35. What formerly had read, "But what are ye? THOU, who didst put to Flight" (Nm) is now printed as

But what are ye? ———
THOU, who didst put to Flight
(edition No).

This change obviously clarifies the meaning, since it is evident from the context that "ye" refers to "Silence, and Darkness" (l. 26) and that "THOU" refers to God and opens a new thought. Yet this internal
evidence is not sufficient to demonstrate authorial revision. Richardson or one of his employees could just as easily have seen the need for the change. The variant in line 209, where "wrack'd" becomes "wreak'd," also poses a problem. This change may very well be a correction by the author. But if Young checked a copy of Nn rather than an earlier text, he could have chosen "wreak'd" because it made better sense than the corruption "wrack'd." What he might not have remembered was that his original choice was "wreck'd," which appeared in all editions prior to Nn. Whether Young, Richardson, or some unknown press hand made the correction, the original reading is more likely to have been Young's real preference. Unlike the variant in line 448 ("Flames" becomes "Fire"), the need for a correction was obvious because the Nn reading made no sense. Finally, a variant that is almost certainly not the author's occurs in line 354, where "Death's subtle Seed within" (Nn) is changed to read "Death subtle Seed within" (No). This alteration leads to nonsense. Even when a comma is placed after "Death" in the subsequent edition, the "corrected" line (in edition Np) remains inferior to the original and merely compounds the error which originated in edition No. Thus, while evidence exists that Young actually did review edition No, his efforts at correction and revision appear to have been extremely limited.

Therefore, as in the case of edition Nbl and Nf, which Young also reviewed in a cursory manner, it would be rash to accept accidentals just because evidence supports the authority of some substantive changes. In most cases the accidentals are inconsequential or else contribute to readings less characteristic of Young's usual practices.
(as with the changes from "ev'ry" to "every" in line 179 and from "Foe?" to "Foe!" in line 279). Perhaps the dangers of drawing hasty and all-encompassing conclusions about the source of variants can best be seen in line 438, where "hard-pressing" becomes for the first time "hard pressing" (hyphen deleted). My analysis of a copy of Nn, the text from which edition No was derived, reveals an extremely faint, barely perceptible hyphen. Although the hyphen may not have been nearly invisible in all copies of Nn, probably the compositor, setting his type from a copy of Nn having a faint hyphen, did not notice the mark and unintentionally omitted it. Given these examples and the fact that the capitalization and punctuation are now so unlike those of the earliest editions, it seems foolhardy to argue that Young could have had any hand whatsoever in the accidental variants. Although edition No was indeed (as its title page asserts) "Corrected by the Author," the correction in Night the First was limited to no more than a maximum of five substantive variants.

5. Edition No. This octavo is the only known legitimate edition of the Night-Thoughts dated 1756; it collates A²B-H N⁸ (±5) O-Dd⁶ Del; pp. i-iv l 1 2-418.²² Like its predecessor, edition No, the title page of this text bears the claim that what follows is "A New Edition, Corrected by the Author." Far from being "Corrected," however, Night the First closely follows edition No in all respects. Except for twenty-five new variants, No incorporates all edition No variants but nine. These nine exceptions, almost certainly, are readings that vary independently from the copy-text and happen fortuitously to correspond to forms that appeared in earlier editions.²³ No substantive changes
occur in edition Nr, and none of the twenty-five new variants are of the type that we would expect Young to make. Three ("forgets" to "forget's" in line 244, "Sons" to "Son's" in line 260, and "Death." to "Death" in line 286) are obvious mistakes, and the remainder offer little, if any, evidence to suggest intervention by the author. Most of these new variants, like the change in capitalization in line 203 ("Great" becomes "great") or the switch from semicolons to exclamation points as end-punctuation (lines 229, 263, and 453), reflect a mechanical effort at standardization. As usual, the result is a text even more corrupt than before. Perhaps the only variant that significantly improves a reading is the comma inserted after "Death" in line 354. However, this change was almost certainly an effort, either by Richardson or one of his employees, to make sense of a passage which had lost its meaning through corruption.

6. Edition Nr. This duodecimo, published in May 1758, collates A²B₂C₁D₁E₁F₁; pp. i-ii i ii iv i v i vi i vii 2-320. Nr follows closely the general format and capitalization patterns of editions Mr, Mz, Ms, No, and Np. Only fourteen new variants appear. An analysis of the text strongly suggests that Nr was derived from both editions No and Np. The fact that variants unique to each of these earlier texts of Night the First appear throughout Nr indicates that a slightly different typesetting procedure was used from that of earlier editions. Probably, edition No was used as copy (since its patterns of capitalization are preserved in Nr), but had marked on it many of the Np changes. This procedure would explain why Nr so closely follows edition No in matters of capitalization but follows edition Np in almost all other
matters. It also explains why some errors in \(N_{2}\) (such as the paragraph divisions missing at lines 154 and 197) are corrected. If this hypothesis is valid, the changes can be safely attributed to the printer. These efforts exceed the pains that we would expect of Young, but probably reflect the care that Richardson was willing to take with his friend's poem. My analysis of the fourteen new variants, all accidentals, fails to show any alterations of the kind that Young would be likely to make, and we can dismiss them as further corruptions of the text. Eight scattered changes in punctuation, three in capitalization, one in spelling, one in italics, and one typographical mistake occur. As with edition \(N_{2}\), the words on the title page, "A New Edition, Corrected by the Author," are themselves probably derived from an earlier text.

7. Edition \(N_{2}\). This duodecimo, dated 1760, collates \(A^2 B^1 D^0 F^4\); pp. \(i\)-\(ii\) \(iii\) \(iv\) \(i\)-\(1\) 2-320. It closely follows edition \(N_{3}\), differing in only thirteen instances; all but two variants unique to \(N_{3}\) are incorporated. The two exceptions (line 159, where "darken" reverts to "darken'd" and line 387, where "slow sudden" reverts to "slow-sudden") seem to be corrections of either typographical mistakes or damaged letters. Of the remaining accidental variants, little evidence exists to support an argument for authorial intervention. The only change which might at first glance seem to be Young's is a lone substantive variant appearing in this passage:

Where is To-morrow? In another world.  
For numbers this is certain; the Reverse  
Is sure to none; and yet on this perhaps.  
This peradventure, infamous for lies,  
As on a rock of Adamant we build  
Our mountain Hopes; spin out eternal schemes,
As we the Fatal Sisters cou'd out-spin,
And, big with life's Futurities, expire.

(ll. 374-381 edition Na)

In edition Ne, the word "out" (l. 379) becomes "our." An examination of the conceit in this passage as well as that of an earlier passage in the poem reveals that the new reading is probably invalid. To "spin out" is an action involving a spider or silkworm which draws the material for the fabric it spins from within itself. The notion of death (the Fatal Sisters, who can "out-spin" any mortal) cutting short this process, leaves the insect/person filled with the unspun thread of anticipated life ("big with life's Futurities"). This conceit becomes less clear when "our" is substituted for "out." Furthermore, the "worm" imagery is not unique to this passage. It appears also in line 157:

How, like a Worm, was I wrapt round and round
In silken thought, which reptile Fancy spun,
Till darken'd Reason lay quite clouded o'er
With soft conceit, of endless Comfort here;
Nor yet put forth her Wings to reach the skies?

(ll. 157-161, edition Ne)

This second passage strongly resembles lines 374-381, which echo the same sentiments. Since the conceit was significant enough to Young that he used it twice, we would not expect him to make a change (as occurred in Ne) that would obscure its meaning. With the rejection of the only substantive variant in edition Ne, we have no evidence to suggest possible intervention by Young. The changes in this edition almost certainly represent a continuing loss of textual accuracy.

8. Edition Nu. This duodecimo is apparently the first posthumous edition of Night the First, although Richardson's nephew (who took over the shop after Samuel Richardson's death) may have published
it just before Young's death early in April 1765. In any event, it is unlikely that Young was in good enough health to revise the poem.

The text clearly derives from edition Ns and follows all Ns-unique variants except one ("measures" in line 92 becomes "Measures"). In ten cases I found readings other than those of edition Ns. Since no pattern exists to suggest that Nu derives from any edition other than Ns, these most likely are fortuitous restorations. Twelve new variants also appear. Most of these involve changes in spelling (such as "through" for "throu" in line 425, "restored" for "restor'd" in line 13, "Channel" for "Chanel" in line 502, "out-whirl'd" for "outwhirl'd" in line 215, and "Ore" for "Oar" in line 246) and almost certainly are not the author's. Finally, the apparent substantive variant in this edition is probably a mistake. In line 380, the word "could" (Ns) becomes "would" (Nu). The point is not our desire to "out-spin" the Fatal Sisters ("would"); rather, it is a matter of our ability ("could").

It is interesting to note that this apparent corruption is preceded by the unauthorized change in line 579 ("our" for "out") which first appeared in Ns. The progressive piling on of error is instructive, since what happened to this passage no doubt has also occurred in other parts of the poem as well. The changes in edition Nu do not indicate revision by Young, despite the presence of that now-familiar claim on the title page, "A New Edition, Corrected by the Author." Edition Nu is obviously a derived text, and its accuracy is far less than even the first of the one-volume editions (Nk). Both of these texts are far removed from the textual purity of the first edition folio of Night the First.
E. NIGHT THE FIRST IN YOUNG'S WORKS, 1757 AND 1762.

A set of four volumes entitled The Works of the Author of the Night-Thoughts. In Four Volumes. Revised and Corrected by Himself appeared in May 1757. The list of publishers for these volumes includes D. Browne, C. Hitch and L. Hawes, J. Hodges, H. Lintot, A. Millar, J. and R. Tonson, J. Rivington, C. Corbet, J. Rivington and J. Fletcher, J. Jackson, and R. and J. Dodsley. The text for Night-Thoughts takes up the whole of the third volume (Nights I-VIII) and the first eighty-five pages of the fourth (Night IX). An almost identical edition of the Works was printed in 1762. Both have been identified as products of Richardson's press. As was the case with three of the four one-volume editions of Nights I-IX that bore a claim of revision and correction by Young, the claim on the title pages of the Works does not seem to be valid, at least for Night the First. In my examination of the two editions of Night the First that appear in the Works, I discovered many new textual corruptions but no revisions or corrections that I could attribute to Young. Indeed, these two texts are probably the least reliable of the "lifetime" editions.

1. Edition Nq. Nq appears in Volume III of the first edition of Young's Works. The format and collation for an ideal copy of Volume III is 12°: π1 B12(B1+1)C-M12 N6; pp. i-iv, i-2, 3-276. The text of Night the First ends on page 18. One might expect such a text to include many new variants since it represents another milestone in the printing history of Night the First. However, only a few minor variants appear. Probably Young was so occupied with other work at this time and so afflicted with infirmities of the eye and hand that he did
not undertake a careful correction of his poem. In any event, the paucity of references to Night-Thoughts in Young's later correspondence apparently signifies that the author had set it aside. One major change does occur in edition Na. Initial letters of almost all the adjectives and common nouns (other than those beginning lines and sentences) that were capitalized in earlier editions are reduced to lower-case type. It is highly unlikely that the author requested this change. Even though Young asked that some of his later works be printed with a minimum of capitalization, this fact is not in itself sufficient to indicate that he desired a similar practice in Night-Thoughts. The decision probably was part of Richardson's effort to give a uniform appearance to all the pieces collected in the Works.

The text for Night the First in Na closely follows that of edition No; except for new variants, only six deviations (capitalization aside) occur. These deviations do not follow any particular pattern and are almost certainly fortuitous restorations of earlier readings. Of the twenty new variants, most are inconsequential and probably not the author's. In a few cases, such as line 3 (where the colon after "for-sakes" becomes a semicolon), the new readings do seem slightly more in keeping with Young's preferences. Other variants, such as the change of two question marks in line 87 (editions Na-No) to exclamation points, are clearly less characteristic of first edition practices. The more important variants, like those involving paragraph division, also change for the worse in Na. Passages that once were separate (ll. 154ff. and ll. 197ff.) are each made part of preceding paragraphs, even though an examination shows distinct rhetorical breaks at the
original divisions.

Only two substantive changes occur. The change in line 354 is really a restoration of the correct reading plus italics: "Death subtle Seed within" (No) back to "Death's subtle seed within" (Nq). The correction was probably not the author's, however, but an attempt by Richardson or one of his correctors to restore meaning to a passage so corrupt that it no longer made sense. Because the corrector was working with a copy of edition No, he would have been unaware of the earlier, less fortunate attempt at correction by adding a comma after "Death" (in edition Np). The apparent substantive change in line 367 is more easily disposed of as a mistake. Here, the word "Ere" becomes "Are," a change which makes no sense in the larger context and which creates an obvious subject-verb disagreement in the more immediate passage. Thus, Nq offers little evidence to suggest authorial intervention and can be safely dismissed as a derived edition.

2. Edition Nt. This text of Night the First appears in the third volume of the 1762 edition of Young's Works. The format and collation for an ideal copy of Volume III are 12°: [A] B-M N; pp. [i-iv] 3-276.86 It is almost certain that compositors set Nt using Nq as their copy, since only twenty-four variants between the two occur. Several of the changes correct mistakes unique to the 1757 Works (e.g., new paragraphs begin at lines 154 and 197; the stray semicolon after "wing'd" in line 137 disappears; the comma after the paragraph-ending word "God" in line 140 becomes a period; the reference to the deity in line 40 returns to upper case (from "thee" to "Thee"); and "Are" in line 367 once again becomes "Ere"). Of the remaining eighteen variants, some
are possibly corrections of longer-standing errors (e.g., the restoration of the hyphen to "hard-pressing" in line 439), but most are inconsequential ("invenom'd" returns to "envenom'd" in line 339). Only six totally new variants appear, all of which involve accidentals (e.g., l. 151, where the comma after "threaten" is deleted, or l. 174, where "phrensy's" becomes "phrenzy's"). Although a few of the changes may be corrections, most are merely the result of compositors' habitual practices and represent yet further corruptions of the text. No evidence suggests that any of the changes were Young's.

F. SUBSEQUENT EDITIONS.

I also examined other, later editions of Night the First in a more selective and cursory manner. Somewhat ironically, a number of these editions continue to claim to have been revised by the dead author. New corruptions appear, and these corruptions in turn give birth to new error. So, when the twentieth-century reader seeks out Night-Thoughts, he finds a modernized, corrupt text such as the standard 1854 Nichols unless he has had the misfortune to pick some worse edition. Although not much has been lost in terms of substantives (since there really are not many major substantive changes in the "lifetime" texts of Night the First), these editions are largely devoid of the subtle "meaning indicators" that we see in the earliest, most textually pure editions—namely, selective use of capitalization, italics, and punctuation. As a result, something is lost from the poem. Night the First seems to ramble, to lack the rhetorical tightness that these indicators originally helped to give it. This loss, in part, may have helped relegate
the poem to its present state of near oblivion in English studies.
NOTES

1 Young quotes lines 683-694 of Night the Second in a letter of 3 May 1742 to the Duchess of Portland (Correspondence, pp. 139-141).

2 Correspondence, p. 601.

3 Ibid., p. 602.

4 Ibid., p. 595.


6 The later Nights have similar individual printings.

7 This phenomenon apparently resulted because press functionaries preferred to set a new edition from an earlier printed text as similar as possible to the new edition in type, spacing, and page size.

8 Correspondence, p. 424. Brackets are mine.

9 The final thirty-eight lines of Night the Second disappear altogether in the later "lifetime" editions.

10 Correspondence, p. 326.

11 Ibid., p. 328.

12 Ibid., p. 339.

13 Ibid., pp. 346-347.

14 For The Centaur Not Fabulous, see Young's letters of 28 July 1754 (Correspondence, pp. 406-407), ? 22 January 1755 (p. 418), ? 26 January 1755 (pp. 418-419), 23 March 1755 (p. 422), and 30 March 1755 (pp. 422-423) and Richardson's letter of 21 January 1755 (pp. 416-417).

For An Argument from the Circumstances of Christ's Death, see Young's letters of 30 April 1758 (p. 459), 14 May 1758 (p. 472), 28 May 1758 (pp. 472-473), 4 June 1758 (p. 473), and Richardson's of 2 May 1758 (p. 470).

For Conjectures on Original Composition, see Young's letters of 21 December 1756 (p. 440), 20 January 1757 (p. 452), ? 20 December 1758 (p. 483), 7 January 1759 (p. 487), 11 January 1759 (p. 488), ? April 1759 (p. 493), April 1759 (pp. 495-496), ? Early May 1759 (p. 496), 25 May 1759 (pp. 500-501), ? Th. 31 May 1759 (pp. 502-503), ? Early June 1759 (p. 503), and Richardson's letters of ? late December 1756 (pp. 440-441), 14 January 1757 (pp. 445-451), 26 December
1758 (pp. 484-487), 24 January 1759 (pp. 488-492), 24 May 1759 (pp. 497-500), and 29 May 1759 (p. 501). Brackets are Pettit’s. The correspondence on the Conjectures is unique because it is an ongoing discussion of a work-in-progress and only later, after Richardson printed the final version, does the dialogue involve the revision and correction of a published work.

15 Perhaps an exchange of letters concerning the publication of The Centaur Not Fabulous best illustrates this process of emendation. After Richardson had printed and looked over the first edition of the book, he sent a letter to Young suggesting some problem areas that needed attention before a new edition should be set:

"In another edition I would humbly propose, in the 16th line of p. 24, instead of the word incredible, to add these, incomprehensible to our finite reason." Page 31, 32.—What, sir do the words, High Court of Justice, &c. allude to?

"Page 31.—For corpse read corps.
"Page 125, last line but two, for Centaur read Centaurs.
"Page 131.—Is there not some omission in the first line?
"Page 158, line 3, Heaven is on my side already—Query? In another impression methinks it were to be wished that all from, If this is a man of pleasure, p. 161, to, from a higher hand, p. 163, were omitted, as it interrupts, by ludicrous images, emotions that were nobly excited.
"For the same reason, suppose, in p. 163, were omitted the words, Pain would I bury &c. to the end of the paragraph, real men, p. 164?
"Page 172, line 18, after cedar, put a parenthesis.
"Page 173.—Papal infallibility pretends not to foresee.
"Page 207, lines 18, 19, suppose they run thus in another impression—Oh! spare thy paternal tenderness, &c.
"Page 225.—Need five points so important be crowded into one letter?

"Page 252.—Suppose the words, may be Gods, be changed into these, may recover that likeness?
"Page 291.—Suppose the words, Thou Joseph, thou Jacob of Heaven, were omitted in another impression?
"Page 296, line 10, suppose it be read, nature of my design, and, I am willing to hope, the truth of history, &c.?
"Page 307, line 11, bodies, plural, its, singular.
"Page 314.—Bolingbroke Castle was not exposed to public view till since the new style began.
"Page 325, line 4, for leaves read leave.

"There are some other things that, in another edition, if I may be forgiven the above, I would take the liberty to suggest. Fired with the noble sentiments that abound in this admirable piece, how could an attentive reader forbear interesting himself in it, and to wish it all of a piece, lest the serious mind should be sorry for some condescending levities and images, and lest the lighter minds should take hold of such to evade the force of the diviner parts; and so less good should follow from the excellent performance than the pious author hoped for" (Correspondence, pp. 416-417, letter of 21 January 1755).
It is interesting to note that Young's response was far less detailed than his printer's query:

"All your remarks are most just. I find that I am safer in your hands than my own; I beg you, therefore, to blot, add, alter, as you think good; and let not delay or expense be any objection to anything now practicable, and you kindly wish to be done.

"And, particularly, I beg the favour of your eye and pen on the close now sent.

"Page 131, line 1st, should be, 'lower for their height.'

"N.B. For their is omitted, and I will pay some person for inserting it, through the whole edition" (Correspondence, p. 418, letter of [? 22 January 1755]). Brackets are Pettit's.

This exchange reveals two tendencies: first, that Richardson the printer was a more diligent proofreader of the text than Young the author; second, that in any event, this epistolary method of correction is at best a haphazard approach which can lead to the identification of only the most salient problems in the text—usually those involving substantives rather than accidentals.

16 Ibid., p. 418.

That Young once did provide instructions on accidentals is evident from the following request to Richardson. The occasion is the imminent printing of the second edition of the Conjectures on Original Composition: "Since the press is in haste, all I can say is, that I would have as few capitals as possible: I blotted them out of the latter part of the first edition; but forgot it in the former—which I would have of a piece" (Correspondence, p. 503).

Before we draw conclusions from this passage on Young's use of capitalization, we must note the circumstances under which the Conjectures was written. Young wrote this work late in his life when he was subject to disabilities of the eye and the hand. The manuscript was apparently a combination of his own writing and that of a scribe, possibly his housekeeper, Mrs. Hallows (Correspondence, pp. 488, 492). He describes his own handwriting during this period as "unintelligible" (p. 453) and distrusts the correctness of his scribe's copy (p. 488). Therefore, his purging of the capitalization may not have been so much a voluntary choice in this case as an effort to remove obvious and meaningless inconsistencies in the easiest manner possible.

18 Most readers apparently had these sets of Nights bound up together, usually in two volumes. I found few solitary copies of Night the First, except for Na, which has larger dimensions and thus could not so easily be bound with the smaller quarto editions of subsequent Nights.

19 Since the phrase "Night the First" appears at the head of the text (p. 3), the contemporary reader was led to expect that more Nights would be forthcoming, although no actual advertisement is to be found at the beginning or end of edition Na. The words "Night the First" appear on the title pages of all subsequent individually-issued editions of Night the First, and the original title—The Complaint: or,
Eight-Thoughts on Life, Death, and Immortality—came to stand for the entire work including all nine "Eights."

20 The six copies of edition Na that I examined were from the following libraries: Na1, The Henry E. Huntington Library; Na2, The Houghton Library, Harvard University; Na3 and Na4, The Humanities Research Center, University of Texas; Na5 and Na6, The Beinecke Rare Book Library, Yale University.

21 Thus, each represents a separate edition and not two "states" of the same edition as Pettit argues (Bibliography, pp. 16-17). I examined three copies of Nb1; two of these are in The Humanities Research Center, University of Texas and one is in the Houghton Library, Harvard University. I also examined two copies of Nb2; one is in the University of Colorado Library and one in the University of Michigan Library. I found no internal variants among the three copies of Nb1 nor between the two copies of Nb2.

22 Pettit establishes his dates on the basis of an advertisement in the 31 July 1742 London Evening Post (Bibliography, p. 16 and Library, 3 [1949], 299f.). D. F. Foxon, in his English Verse 1701: 1750: A Catalogue of Separately Printed Poems with Notes on Contemporary Collected Editions (London: Cambridge University Press, 1975), questions the evidence for this dating (I, 911). However, neither bibliographer considered textual variants, which indeed reveal that Nb1 preceded Nb2.

23 The fact that these two editions have a sheet printed from a common setting of type raises an interesting speculation. It may be that Dodsley found the demand for the poem so great that he decided to increase his order for copies after the type for the first three sheets had been redistributed, but while the type for the fourth sheet was still intact.

24 Bibliography, p. 17. The copy I examined was from the Humanities Research Center, University of Texas.

25 Line 92, the last on the last page of sheet A contains the fourth Nb2-unique variant. The variants that appear between lines 93 and 106 inclusive are either new or else common to both Nb1 and Nb2. Line 107 in the next sheet represents the first instance of an Nb2-unique variant not appearing. From this point to the end of the text, Nb1 variants appear. It is not unusual to see two editions being used for setting the type. That the switch occurs at a logical break in the physical structure of the book supports this explanation. Such an occurrence may suggest an interruption and later resumption of type-setting.

26 The number of new variants is high in an edition so similar in form to the text from which it was set.
The collation is from Foxon, I, 911. I examined a Xerox copy of an Ne text; the book itself is in the Houghton Library, Harvard University.

Bibliography, p. 17.

One unique feature of Ne among the "lifetime" editions is that every word beginning a new paragraph is printed in all capital letters. That Young did not meddle in such matters of typesetting, however, is implied in his remark to Richardson concerning the publication of a later work: "And I beg the favour of you to determine the manner of printing it; in which I shall thankfully acquiesce, for I understand nothing at all of it" (Correspondence, p. 407).

Bibliography, pp. 22-23. I examined three copies of Ne, one "third" edition (University of Colorado Library) and two "fourth" edition copies (University of Colorado Library). The type for all three texts is identical. Leaf D4, presumably a blank, is missing from the "third" edition.

All of sheets A and D follow edition Nb1 with the exception of two corrected typographical errors (in lines 75 and 76). Sheets B and C clearly show that both editions Nb1 and Nd were used when the type was set. It is impossible to define the shifts in copy-text, however, as they sometimes occur within the forme or even the page. This phenomenon may represent either a shift from one compositor to another, with one using edition Nb1 and the other using Nd as his copy, or else frequent interruptions and resumptions of the typesetting. Since my examination of the new variants reveals no signs of authorial intervention, it is almost certain that the idiosyncrasies of the print shop were to blame for the irregularities in derivation, not an author-corrected copy of Nb1 or Nd.

Foxon, I, 912. I have given Foxon's collation as the ideal, because both copies I examined (one from the Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, and one from University of Michigan Library) lacked leaf D4.

Bibliography, pp. 21, 23.

The last incident of an 132-unique variant in edition Nh occurs in line 92, the last line on sheet A. Thirty-five lines in sheet A support my theory of derivation, the first appearing on leaf A1. Only one ("vial" to "Vial") in line 52, which duplicates an Ne-unique variant, runs counter. Since edition Nh is obviously not derived from Nh and since a number of changes in capitalization do occur, this change is in fact probably an independent new variant. An overwhelming 93 lines support my hypothesis that sheets B, C, and D are derived from edition Ne; only three run counter to this theory. Each of these three is probably a fortuitous return to an earlier form.
About the only noteworthy aspect of edition Eh is that an apparent stop-press correction exists. In one text, line 288 ends in a colon; in the other, it ends in a period.

For example, the capitalization of the initial letter of "rock" (l. 378) shifts emphasis away from the more important noun "Adamant." The same type of textual corruption can be seen in line 394 ("mercies becomes "Mercies" and shifts emphasis from "Moment") and in line 396 ("This" becomes "this," making its referent less clear). Use of capitalization for emphasis is a key feature of Young's style.

The text through line 99 has seventeen new variants from the copy-text. All except one of the old variants from the copy-text (i.e., variants first appearing in edition Nb1, Nb2, Ne, Nd, or Ne) are consistent with my theory that this portion of the text is derived from edition Nb2. That one exception, a change of "Thought" to "thought" in line 10, was probably an independently-derived new variant that just happens to be identical to an earlier variant. The fact that many of the new variants in edition Ef involve capitalization increases the odds of an independent reversion to an earlier variant. For the remainder of the text, a trace of variants beginning at line 105 shows that 43 support my contention that Ne is the text from which this portion of Ef is derived, while only nine variants run counter to this hypothesis. Of these nine, one (l. 138) reverts to the first edition reading and probably is another fortuitous restoration. One corrects an obvious typographical mistake in Ne (omission of close parenthesis, line 425), and one may have been an effort at spelling standardization ("sudden" instead of "suddain" in line 425 to conform with lines 384 and 385). Corrections of the two faulty substantives, introduced in Nd and continued in Ne (l. 195 and l. 286), were probably made by the author. The remaining four (in lines 210, 305, 325, and 415) do not follow any pattern and, therefore, are probably independently derived, just like completely new variants.

I have numbered the new line 181A to avoid confusion when I compare earlier texts not having this addition with those that have it.

Except in edition Nh, which is derived from Nd and Ne, and which is not an authoritative text.

But in a number of cases, such as the change of end punctuation in line 304 from a colon to a semicolon, the new variant is less characteristic of the author's usual practice.

Bibliography, pp. 30, 36-37.

Ibid., pp. 29-30.
44 The copy of $M_i$ that I examined for this study is a microfilm of the text in the University of Illinois Library. The collation is from Foxon, I, 914.

45 The phantom text is cited in Pettit's Bibliography (p. 29) and discussed in Foxon (I, 914). Pettit, however, gives no source for this edition, and Foxon remarks that all copies he examined were actually $M_r$.

46 The copy of $M_i$ that I examined for this study is from the University of Colorado Library, and it follows the collation given by Foxon (I, 914).

47 Four of the seven $M_r$ variants not followed were themselves altered to give totally new readings. One obvious typographical error (l. 353) is corrected, and the remaining two (ll. 303 and 441) apparently return fortuitously to earlier readings.

48 Naturally, I did not include in this sample letters that are known to exist only by their appearance in old magazines (like much of the Young-Richardson correspondence) and letters in a hand other than Young's.

49 Correspondence, pp. 139-40.

50 Brackets are mine. This short passage illustrates a number of other points as well. The reader can note Young's use of the ampersand (&) instead of "and," his omission of the apostrophe in contractions ("Towr," "reard," "undarkend," "beamd"), his preference for "t" and "d" (rather than "ed" suffixes, and his use of "re" rather than "er" spelling (e.g., "Iustre"), and his omission of the apostrophe from a possessive ("Mountains Brow"). Young quotes another passage of poetry in a later letter, but the paper has been torn and a number of endings are lost. What remains again confirms Young's choice of few periods, even in poetry:

O Thou, whom Athens Lady of the Main,
Empress of Elegance, amongst her Sons
May count, Her letter'd Sons; proud to exchange
For thine, in borrowed guise, with mi torn off
Wrought to such just perfection of de torn off
Such truth of falsehood, ev'n her gen torn off
More Attic Thou in Taste, in dicti torn off
Than Atticism's self! One Hybla torn off
or thy young brow with rich tiara crowned,
Soft persias manufacture, dost thou wear
The form of Mage, of Satrap, of immortal,
(like Sparta's King of old, without his guilt Medising;) Well the great Atossa, famed
first Epistolograph, may boast the palm
T'invent, but must from all her Glory shrink,
When thy Cleander rears his beamy head,
Refulgent o'er the Letter-writing Tribe.

(Correspondence, pp. 154-155)
Brackets are Pettit's. These lines also confirm Young's selective use of capitalization and his use of punctuation inside the parentheses rather than outside. Contractions are again frequent, but here Young added apostrophes.

51 Correspondence, pp. 156-157.

52 Ibid., p. 162: "I beg my humble Duty to my Lord Duke, & a thousand Thanks for all his Favours; particularly for his Last."

53 Ibid., pp. 151, 239. Some caution must be exercised, however, in the application of this general rule. In two instances, an exclamation point appears in Night the First (edition Nk) where we would normally expect a question mark ("Yet why complain? or why complain for One!"— line 233, and "Is Heaven tremendous in its Frown!"— line 326). While these exceptions are few and may, in fact, be corruptions of correct readings in the manuscript, we should realize that no such rules can be correct in 100% of the cases because hardly any author is absolutely consistent in his practices.

54 Ibid., p. 276.

55 The copy of Nk that I examined is from the University of Colorado Library and follows the collation given by Foxon (I, 914).

56 Bibliography, pp. 30-31, 37.

57 Ibid., p. 38.

58 Foxon, I, 915. The copy of Nk from the University of Colorado Library that I examined lacked the final leaf. The text of Night the First ends on page 15 (leaf B8). I collated the Colorado Nk with a Xerox of another copy of Nk in the Humanities Research Center, University of Texas. No internal variants appear.

59 Edition Nk appears to be derived from edition Ni, either directly or through Nj. As a result, many of the corruptions in punctuation that first appeared in Ni also found their way into Nk.

60 The only exception occurs in line 227, where the initial letter of the word "Desart" (in "And finds all Desart now") is changed to lower case, presumably because it was viewed as an adjective rather than a noun.

61 For example, see lines 155-156. The first-edition lines read: "How was my Heart encrusted by the World? / O how self-fetter'd was my groveling Soul?" In Nk an exclamation mark ends each line.

62 See discussion, above, pp. 69-70.

63 Foxon, I, 915. The last page of Night the First is 22, leaf
I examined a copy of YX from the University of Colorado Library and also a Xerox copy of YX in the Humanities Research Center, University of Texas.

Pettit maintains that the ornament on the title page and the illustration facing the title page of edition YX are the same as those in edition N (Bibliography, p. 40). But William B. Sale, Jr., in Samuel Richardson: Master Printer (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950), notes that the title page ornament in edition YX is an imitation of one of Richardson's (p. 220). My analysis revealed that both the ornament and the illustration in edition YX resemble those in N rather than N. However, the N ornament (and especially its left side) is slightly different from the N ornament, possibly indicating a careful forgery.

See discussion, above, pp. 56-58.

The collation is the same for both copies I examined, one from University of Colorado Library and one from Oberlin College Library. The text of Night the First ends on page 17. Sale identifies this edition as "probably a piracy" (p. 221), but Pettit identifies it as the "small" edition to which Richardson refers in his letter to Mary Hallows concerning his proposed new "Preface" (Bibliography, pp. 40-41). Editions N and N, in which many upper case letters are also moved to lower case, might appear at first glance to derive from N. However, my analysis of N and N shows that in all matters except capitalization, they bear little resemblance to N. Excluding capitalization, none of the many N-unique variants reappeared in the 1757 Works.

The collation is Pettit's (Bibliography, p. 41). The text of Night the First ends on page 13. I could find only one copy to analyze, a Xerox of the volume in the Houghton Library, Harvard University.

It is true that extensive capitalization would increase the amount of upper-case type that a printer would need to have on hand. If, as we would expect, printers of pirated editions exercised greater austerity in equipping their shops than did more established, legitimate printers like Richardson, a shorter supply of type may explain why several of the pirated editions of Night-Thoughts—as edition N may also be—were printed without capitalization of the initial letters of nouns.

The collation is the same as that given by Pettit (Bibliography, p. 41). I examined two copies of No, the volume at Case Western Reserve University Library and a Xerox of the copy in the Humanities Research Center, University of Texas.

See discussion, above, pp. 90-91.

This collation of the copy at Case Western Reserve University...
Library is the same as Pettit's general collation (Bibliography, p. 42). I also examined Xeroxes of two copies of Np at the Humanities Research Center, University of Texas.

73 A good example of this phenomenon occurs in line 396, where the word "This" (in edition No) becomes "this," a form appearing elsewhere only in edition Nh. Since no other Nh-unique variants appear in Np, it would be absurd to see any connection between the two texts.

74 See discussion, above, p. 96.

75 Bibliography, p. 43. I was able to locate only one copy of Mr, a Xerox of Might the First from the text in the Houghton Library. The collation is Pettit's. Might the First ends on p. 14.

76 A total of eighty-two cases exist in which editions Mn, Mo, Np, and Nh (minus capitalization variants) differ from one another. To determine the most probable source of Mr, I compared the variants in each of these editions with the text of Mr. The vertical columns below distinguish each of the four editions examined. When its variant is the one appearing in Mr, it is counted on the "FOR" side. When its variant does not appear in Mr, the variant is added to the "AGAINST" side.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mn</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Np</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nh</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the reader would expect, in many cases only one edition varies, leaving three identical readings. For this reason, the "FOR" column has a higher total than the "AGAINST" column. Clearly, Mn and No are not the source of derivation for Mr. Editions No and Nh are close enough in the tally, however, that both may have been used to establish Mr.

77 Edition Np is discussed, below, pp. 102-104.

78 I examined a copy of Ms at the Western Reserve Historical Society, Cleveland. The collation matches Pettit's (Bibliography, p. 43). The text of Might the First ends on page 14. I also examined two Xeroxes of Ms copies in the Humanities Research Center, University of Texas.

79 I was able to locate only one copy of Nu, a Xerox of Might the First from the volume in the Humanities Research Center, University of Texas. Might the First begins on page 1 and ends on page 14.

80 Bibliography, pp. 42-43.

81 Sale (p. 223) discusses the 1757 edition as Richardson's; since
the 1762 edition was printed after Richardson's death, Sale does not treat it in his book. My examination of the ornaments and type shows that it is from the same printing house as the 1757 edition.

82 Bibliography, p. 42. The text of Night the First ends on page 18. The copy I examined was from Pettit's collection in the University of Colorado Library.

83 Although Young retained his literary abilities to the end of his life, the same could not be said of his physical health. Beginning at the end of 1749, Young mentions a painful affliction of the eye which made reading and writing difficult: "My Eye is just as it was, I can not make use of it without Uneasiness . . ." (Correspondence, p. 340). Such complaints grew increasingly more frequent in Young's correspondence during the remainder of his life. Also, beginning in 1752 Young began to experience either gout, arthritis, or some other ailment which caused painful swelling of his hand and often made it necessary for him to dictate his correspondence and other writings (p. 383). He informed his printers that his later manuscripts were either written illegibly in his own hand or irregularly in someone else's (pp. 408, 452, and 466).

84 See above, note 17.

85 That Nq was not derived from Nm, an earlier edition that also had little initial capitalization, is beyond dispute. An analysis shows that even the capitalization patterns of the two editions differ greatly. Compare these lines:

The bell strikes one. We take no note of time (Nm, I. 54)
The bell strikes One. We take no note of time (Nq)

How much is to be done? my hopes . . . (Nm, I. 61)
How much is to be done? My hopes . . . (Nq)

Midway from nothing to the Deity! (Nm, I. 74)
Midway from Nothing to the Deity! (Nq)

All men . . . but themselves (Nm, I. 423)
All men . . . but Themselves (Nq)

These are just a few examples of a great many differences between these two texts. Clearly, edition Nq is not derived from Nm.

86 Bibliography, p. 44. The text of Night the First ends on page 18. The copy I examined was from Pettit's collection in the University of Colorado Library.
CHAPTER IV: THE TEXT OF NIGHT THE FIRST

The following text of Night the First is an "old-spelling," critical edition. It is "old-spelling" in that it preserves or restores Young's choices in matters of form. It is critical in that it represents the results of a critical examination of all the materials that can possibly reveal what were the author's final intentions concerning his literary work.

The discussion in the preceding chapter confirms the wisdom of the practice, now common in editing, of selecting the earliest form of a work (rather than the last "lifetime" text) as the copy-text for a critical edition and of emending this text to incorporate known authorial revisions. The earliest form of a literary work—the author's manuscript or the printed text nearest to it—almost certainly comes closest of all surviving texts to embodying the author's intentions with respect to accidentals, the "texture of the text." No authoritative manuscripts of Night the First being extant, we must accept the next best means of capturing the author's intentions for spelling and punctuation. But, of course, into that earliest available form of the text the editor must introduce those substantive changes that can be identified as the author's. We need not concern ourselves with changes in accidentals that occur in later editions; there is little reason to think that Young ever altered the accidentals except in conjunction with a substantive change in the same line.

Because it is a critical text, what I present here will not be identical to the text found in any previous edition. Emendations of
the first-edition copy-text are of two types: those in later editions that I have shown to be the author's and those that are my own informed guesses in correcting patent errors. Emendations of this second type are occasionally necessary, since the copy-text for the present edition—the 1742 folio itself—was derived from an earlier, potentially more accurate source—the author's manuscript—and is therefore subject to corruptions similar to those in a text set from an earlier printed edition.

At times it is tempting to depart from the accidentals of the copy-text in favor of a later reading when such a reading is more characteristic of Young's practices as manifested in his autograph letters. For example, Young preferred the "re" ending to "er," and he also often elided the "e" in a word to maintain the metric regularity of the line. This evidence is not, however, sufficient to indicate that he wished such practices to be followed in the printed texts of his poetry. Nor is it safe to assume that later editions incorporating these practices have authority. For example, the same edition that replaces "Scepter" with the seemingly more characteristic "Sceptre" (l. 20) also substitutes "fancy'd" for Young's usual choice in his autograph letters, "fancy'd" (l. 11). The dangers of tampering with the copy-text can best be seen by considering lines 20-22:

Her leaden Scepter o'er a slumbering world:
Silence, how dead? and Darkness, how profound?
Nor Eye, nor list'ning Ear . . .

(Edition Na)

Our first inclination is to elide the "e" in "slumbering" for consistency with "list'ning" since this change would be more characteristic
of the author's usual preference for metric regularity. Such a change does, in fact, occur in a later text (Edition II). This change, however, is of the kind that we would more likely expect from a compositor or other press functionary than from the author. Also, we question what caused the original compositor to break the pattern if he were responsible for the inconsistency in practice in the first edition. We would have expected him to elide the "e" in both words or add it to both words if he departed from the text before him in favor of his usual practice. The most plausible explanation is that the compositor was merely following the manuscript. This explanation can be reinforced critically by arguing that the extra syllable which draws out "slumbering world" is for poetic effect as is the elision of the "e" in "list'ning Ear."

These instances demonstrate the risk of departures from the copy-text in favor of seemingly better readings. The whole idea of establishing a copy-text is to minimize the risk of making subjective decisions and to increase the probability of selecting the reading that the author intended. Therefore, copy-text readings will not be altered in this edition for the sake of appearance, metrical regularity, or insignificant consistency.

The present text retains first edition spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and italics. The only exceptions to this rule involve four matters of typography. First, I have converted the long "s" to the modern form of that letter. Second, I have set words printed in small capitals in lower-case letters except for the initial upper-case letter. Third, I have separated the "æ" ligature as "ae." Finally, I have joined words that in the copy-text were divided at the ends of
lines. Such word division in the printed text was simply a function of the size of the paper and of the type. Since I have in no way attempted to duplicate the physical appearance of the first-edition type, the benefits of preserving the original practices in these four matters would be minimal and would unnecessarily complicate the text. Furthermore, I have made an effort to provide a "clear" text so that an interested reader as well as a textual scholar can make good use of it. I have placed all notes in a series of three appendixes which follow the text.

Appendix A lists editorial emendations to the copy-text and notes all departures from the 1742 folio except for the four types of silent modernizations just mentioned. Each note first cites the earliest occurrence of the reading used in this text and then the original reading.

Appendix B is an historical collation of variants. This appendix lists in line-number sequence all substantive variants from the first edition found in the subsequent twenty-one editions that I examined. All such variants are noted, regardless of whether they are incorporated in the text of this edition. Spelling and punctuation changes that affect meaning are also included. The first edition reading is noted first, followed chronologically by all subsequent changes identified by edition.

Appendix C is a critical and historical commentary. This appendix annotates passages which have grown obscure due to changes in language, which contain important allusions, or which have been the subject of controversy among literary critics. Generally, these notes provide
background information on references to contemporary literature, events, or ideas. I have arranged these notes in line-number sequence.

Appendixes A and B tell the Young specialist and the textual scholar what evidence lies behind the major editorial choices and what alternatives to the readings selected for inclusion in this text exist. These notes will give the textual scholar the materials he needs to reconstruct his own text in the event that he disagrees with some of the editorial decisions. The purpose of Appendix C is to make the poem understandable for literary scholars who are not familiar with Young's life and the forces that helped shape his beliefs.
THE
COMPLAINT:
OR,
NIGHT-THOUGHTS
ON
LIFE, DEATH, & IMMORTALITY.

Sunt lacrymae rerum, & mentum mortalia tangunt. VIRG.
NIGHT THE FIRST.

ON

Life, Death, & Immortality.

HUMBLY INSCRIB'D

To the Right Honourable

ARTHUR ONSLOW, Esq;

Speaker of the House of Commons.
THE COMPLAINT.

NIGHT the FIRST.

TIR'D nature's sweet Restorer, balmy Sleep!
He, like the World, his ready visit pays,
Where Fortune smiles; the wretched he forsakes:
Swift on his downy pinion flies from Woe,
And lights on Lids unsully'd with a Tear.

From short, (as usual) and disturb'd Repose,
I wake: How happy they who wake no more!
Yet that were vain, if Dreams infest the Grave.
I wake, emerging from a sea of Dreams
Tumultuous; where my wreck'd, desponding Thought
From wave to wave of fancy'd Misery,
At random drove, her helm of Reason lost;
Tho' now restor'd, 'tis only Change of pain,
A bitter change; severer for severe:
The Day too short for my Distress! and Night
Even in the Zenith of her dark Domain,
Is Sun-shine, to the colour of my Fate.

Night, sable Goddess! from her Ebon throne,
In rayless Majesty, now stretches forth
Her leaden Scepter o'er a slumbering world:
Silence, how dead? and Darkness, how profound?
Nor Eye, nor list'ning Ear an object finds;
Creation sleeps. 'Tis, as the general Pulse
Of life stood still, and Nature made a Pause;
An awful pause! prophetic of her End.
And let her prophecy be soon fulfill'd;
Fate! drop the Curtain; I can lose no more.

Silence, and Darkness! solemn Sisters! Twins
From antient Night, who nurse the tender Thought
To Reason; and on reason build Resolve,
(That column of true Majesty in man)
Assist me: I will thank you in the Grave;
The grave, your Kingdom: There this Frame shall fall
A victim sacred to your dreary shrine:
But what are ye?----

THOU, who didst put to Flight
Primaeval Silence, when the Morning Stars
Exulting, shouted o'er the rising Ball;
O THOU! whose Word from solid Darkness struck
That spark, the Sun; strike Wisdom from my soul;
My soul which flies to Thee, her Trust, her Treasure;
As misers to their Gold, while others rest.

Thro' this Opaque of Nature, and of Soul,
This double Night, transmit one pitying ray,
To lighten, and to cheer: O lead my Mind,
(A Mind that fain would wander from its Woe,)
Lead it thro' various scenes of Life and Death,
And from each scene, the noblest Truths inspire:
Nor less inspire my Conduct, than my Song;
Teach my best Reason, Reason; my best Will
Teach Rectitude; and fix my firm Resolve
Wisdom to wed, and pay her long Arrear.
Nor let the vial of thy Vengeance pour'd
On this devoted head, be pour'd in vain.

The Bell strikes One: We take no note of Time,
But from its Loss. To give it then a Tongue,
Is wise in man. As if an Angel spoke,
I feel the solemn Sound. If heard aright,
It is the Knell of my departed Hours;
Where are they? with the years beyond the Flood:
It is the Signal that demands Dispatch;
How Much is to be done? my Hopes and Fears
Start up alarm'd, and o'er life's narrow Verge
Look down—on what? a fathomless Abyss;
A dread Eternity! how surely mine!
And can Eternity belong to me,
Poor Pensioner on the bounties of an Hour?

How poor? how rich? how abject? how august?
How complicate? how wonderful is Man?
How passing wonder He, who made him such?
Who center'd in our make such strange Extremes?
From different Natures, marvelously mixt,
Connection exquisite of distant Worlds!
Distinguishing Link in Being's endless Chain!
Midway from Nothing to the Deity!
A Beam ethereal sully'd, and absorpt!
Tho' sully'd, and dishonour'd, still Divine!
Dim Miniature of Greatness absolute!
An Heir of Glory! a frail Child of Dust!
Helpless Immortal! Insect infinite!
A Worm! a God! I tremble at myself,
And in myself am lost! At home a Stranger,
Thought wanders up and down, surpriz'd, aghast,
And wond'ring at her own: How Reason reels?
0 what a Miracle to man is man,
Triumphant distrest? what Joy, what Dread?
Alternately transported, and alarm'd!
What can preserve my Life? or what destroy?
An Angel's arm can't snatch me from the Grave;
Legions of Angels can't confine me There.

'Tis past Conjecture; all things rise in Proof:
While o'er my limbs Sleep's soft dominion spread,
What, tho' my soul phantastic Measures trod,
O'er Fairy Fields; or mourn'd along the gloom
Of pathless Woods; or down the craggy Steep
Hurl'd headlong, swam with pain the mantled Pool;
Or scal'd the Cliff; or danc'd on hollow Winds,
With antic Shapes, wild Natives of the Brain?
Her ceaseless Flight, tho' devious, speaks her Nature,
Of subtler Essence than the trodden Clod;
Active, aerial, tow'ring, unconfin'd,
Unfetter'd with her gross Companion's fall:
Ev'n silent Night proclaims my soul immortal:
Even silent Night proclaims eternal Day:
For human weal, Heaven husbands all events,
Dull Sleep instructs, nor sport vain Dreams in vain.

Why then their Loss deplore, that are not lost?
Why wanders wretched Thought their tombs around,
In infidel distress? are Angels there?
Slumbers, rak'd up in dust, Etherial fire?
They live! they greatly live a life on earth
Unkindled, unconceiv'd; and from an eye
Of Tenderness, let heav'ly pity fall,
On me, more justly number'd with the Dead:
This is the Desert, this the Solitude;
How populous? how vital, is the Grave?
This is Creation's melancholy Vault,
The Vale funereal, the sad Cypress gloom;
The land of Apparitions, empty Shades:
All, all on earth is Shadow, all beyond
Is Substance; the reverse is Polly's creed;
How solid all, where Change shall be no more?
This is the bud of Being, the dim Dawn,
The twilight of our Day, the Vestibule;
Life's Theater as yet is shut, and Death,
Strong Death alone can heave the massy Bar,
This gross impediment of Clay remove,
And make us Embryos of Existence free.
From real life, but little more remote
Is He, not yet a candidate for Light,
The future Embryo, slumbering in his Sire.
Embryos we must be, till we burst the Shell,
Yon ambient, azure shell, and spring to Life,

Yet man, fool man! here burys all his Thoughts;
Inters celestial Hopes without one Sigh:
Prisoner of Earth, and pent beneath the Moon,
Here pinions all his Wishes; wing'd by Heaven
To fly at Infinite; and reach it there,
Where Seraphs gather Immortality,
On life's fair Tree, fast by the throne of God:
What golden Joys ambrosial clust'ring glow,
In His full beam, and ripen for the Just,
Where momentary Ages are no more?
Where Time, and Pain, and Chance and Death expire?
And is it in the Flight of threescore years,
To push Eternity from human Thought,
And smother souls immortal in the Dust?
A soul immortal, spending all her Fires,
Wasting her strength in strenuous Idleness,
Thrown into Tumult, raptur'd, or alarm'd,
At ought this scene can threaten, or indulge,
Resembles Ocean into Tempest wrought,
To waft a Feather, or to drown a Fly.

Where falls this Censure? It o'erwhelms myself.
How was my Heart encrusted by the World?
O how self-fetter'd was my groveling Soul?
How, like a Worm, was I wrapt round and round
In silken thought, which reptile Fancy spun,
Till darken'd Reason lay quite clouded o'er
With soft conceit, of endless Comfort here,
Nor yet put forth her Wings to reach the skies?

Night-visions may befriend, (as sung above)
Our waking Dreams are fatal: How I dreamt
Of things Impossible? (could Sleep do more?)
Of Joys perpetual in perpetual Change?
Of stable Pleasures on the tossing Wave?
Eternal Sun-shine in the Storms of life?
How richly were my noon-tide Trances hung
With gorgeous Tapestries of pictur'd joys?
Joy behind joy, in endless Perspective!
Till at Death's Toll, whose restless Iron tongue
Calls daily for his Millions at a meal,
Starting I woke, and found myself undone.
Where now my Frenzy's pompous Furniture?
The cobweb'd Cottage with its ragged wall
Of mould'ring mud, is Royalty to me!
The Spider's most attenuated Thread
Is Cord, is Cable, to man's tender Tie
On earthly bliss; it breaks at every Breeze.

O ye blest scenes of **permanent** Delight!
Full, above measure! lasting, beyond bound!
A **Perpetuity** of Bliss, is Bliss.
Could you, so rich in rapture, fear an End,
That ghastly Thought would drink up all your Joy,
And quite unparadise the realms of Light.
Safe are you lodg'd above these rowling Spheres;
The baleful influence of whose giddy Dance,
Sheds sad Vicissitude on all beneath.
**Here** teems with Revolutions every Hour;
And rarely for the better; or the best,
More mortal than the common births of Fate.
**Each Moment** has its Sickle, emulous
Of Time's enormous Scythe, whose ample Sweep
Strikes Empires from the root; each **Moment** plays
His little Weapon in the narrower sphere
Of sweet domestic Comfort, and cuts down
The fairest bloom of sublunary Bliss.

Bliss! sublunary Bliss! proud words! and vain:
Implicit Treason to divine Decree!
A bold Invasion of the rights of Heaven!
I clasp'd the Phantoms, and I found them Air.
O had I weigh'd it e'er my fond Embrace!
What darts of Agony had miss'd my heart?
Death! Great Proprietor of all! 'Tis thine
To tread out Empire, and to quench the Stars;
The Sun himself by thy permission shines,
And, one day, thou shalt pluck him from his sphere.
Amid such mighty Plunder, why exhaust
Thy partial Quiver on a Mark so mean?
Why, thy peculiar rancor wreck'd on me?
Insatiate Archer! could not One suffice?
Thy shaft flew thrice, and thrice my Peace was slain;
And thrice, e'er thrice yon Moon had fill'd her Horn:
O Cynthia! why so pale? Dost thou lament
Thy wretched Neighbour? Grieve, to see thy Wheel
Of ceaseless change outwhirl'd in human Life?
How wanes my borrow'd bliss? from Fortune's smile,
Precarious Courtesy! not Virtue's sure,
Self-given, solar, ray of sound Delight.

In every vary'd Posture, Place, and Hour,
How widow'd every Thought of every Joy?
Thought, busy Thought! too busy for my Peace,
Thro' the dark Postern of Time long elaps'd,
Led softly, by the stillness of the Night,
Led, like a Murderer, (and such it proves!)
Strays, wretched Rover! o'er the pleasing Past,
In quest of wretchedness perversely strays;
And finds all Desart now; and meets the Ghosts
Of my departed Joys, a numerous Train!
I rue the Riches of my former Fate;
Sweet Comfort's blasted Clusters I lament;
I tremble at the Blessings once so dear;
And every Pleasure pains me to the Heart.
Yet why complain? or why complain for One?
Hangs out the Sun his Lustre but for me?
The single Man? are Angels all beside?
I mourn for Millions: 'tis the common Lot;
In this shape, or in that, has Fate entail'd
The Mother's throes on all of woman born,
Not more the Children, than sure Heirs of Pain.

War, Famine, Pest, Volcano, Storm, and Fire,
Intestine Broils, Oppression, with her heart
Wrapped up in tripple Brass, besiege mankind:
God's Image, disinherited of Day,
Here plung'd in Mines, forgets a Sun was made;
There Beings deathless as their haughty Lord,
Are hammer'd to the galling Oar for life;
And plough the Winter's wave, and reap Despair:
Some, for hard Masters, broken under Arms,
In battle lopt away, with half their limbs,
Beg bitter bread thro' realms their Valour sav'd,
If so the Tyrant, or his Minion, doom:
Want, and incurable Disease, (fell Pair!)
On hopeless Multitudes remorseless seize
At once; and make a Refuge of the Grave:
How groaning Hospitals eject their Dead?
What numbers groan for sad Admission there?
What numbers once in Fortune's lap high-fed,
Sollicit the cold hand of Charity?
To shock us more, sollicit it in vain?
Ye silken Sons of Pleasure! since in Pains
You rue more modish visits, visit here,
And breathe from your Debauch: Give, and reduce
Surfeit's Dominion o'er you: but so great
Your Impudence, you blush at what is Right!

Happy! did Sorrow seize on such alone:
Not Prudence can defend, or Virtue save;
Disease invades the chastest Temperance;
And Punishment the Guiltless; and Alarm
Thro' thickest shades pursues the fond of Peace:
Man's Caution often into Danger turns,
And his Guard falling, crushes him to death.
Not Happiness itself makes good her name;
Our very Wishes give us not our wish;
How distant oft the Thing we doat on most,
From that for which we doat, Felicity?
The smoothest course of Nature has its Pains,
And truest Friends, thro' error, wound our Rest;
Without Misfortune, what Calamities?
And what Hostilities, without a Foe?
Nor are Foes wanting to the best on earth:
But endless is the list of human Ills,
And Sighs might sooner fail, than Cause to sigh.

A Part how small of the terraqueous Globe
Is tenanted by man? the rest a Waste,
Rocks, Deserts, frozen Seas, and burning Sands;
Wild haunts of Monsters, Poisons, Stings, and Death:
Such is Earth's melancholy Map! But far
More sad! this Earth is a true Map of man:
So bounded are its haughty Lord's Delights
To Woe's wide empire; where deep Troubles toss;
Loud Sorrows howl; envenom'd Passions bite;
Ravenous Calamities our vitals seize,
And threat'ning Fate, wide-opens to devour.

What then am I, who sorrow for myself?
In Age, in Infancy, from other's aid
Is all our Hope; to teach us to be kind.
That, Nature's first, last Lesson to mankind:
The selfish Heart deserves the pain it feels;  
More generous Sorrow while it sinks, exalts,  
And conscious Virtue mitigates the Pang.  
Nor Virtue, more than Prudence, bids me give  
Swoln Thought a second channel; who divide,  
They weaken too, the Torrent of their grief:  
Take then, O World! thy much-indebted Tear:  
How sad a sight is human Happiness  
To those whose Thought can pierce beyond an Hour?  
O thou! whate'er thou art, whose Heart exults!  
Would'st thou I should congratulate thy Fate?  
I know thou would'st; thy Pride demands it from me.  
Let thy Pride pardon, what thy Nature needs,  
The salutary Censure of a friend:  
Thou happy Wretch! by Blindness thou art blest;  
By Doatage dandled to perpetual Smiles:  
Know, Smiler! at thy peril art thou pleas'd;  
Thy Pleasure is the promise of thy Pain.  
Misfortune, like a Creditor severe,  
But rises in demand for her Delay;  
She makes a scourge of past Prosperity,  
To sting thee more, and double thy Distress.  

Lorenzo. Fortune makes her court to thee,  
Thy fond Heart dances, while the Syren sings.  
Dear is thy Welfare; think me not unkind;  
I would not damp, but to secure thy joys:
Think not that Fear is sacred to the Storm:
Stand on thy guard against the smiles of Fate.
Is Heaven tremendous in its Frown? most sure:
And in its favours formidable too;
Its favours here are Tryals, not Rewards;
A call to Duty, not discharge from Care;
And shou'd alarm us, full as much as Woes;
Awake us to their cause, and consequence,
O' er our scan'd Conduct give a jealous Eye;
And make us tremble, weigh'd with our Desert,
Awe Nature's tumult, and chastise her Joys,
Lest while we clasp, we kill them; nay invert
To worse than simple misery, their Charms:
Revolted Joys, like foes in civil war,
Like bosom friendships to resentment sour'd,
With rage envenom'd rise against our Peace.
Beware what Earth calls Happiness; beware
All joys, but joys that never can expire:
Who builds on less than an immortal Base,
Fond as he seems, condemns his joys to Death.

Mine dy'd with thee, Philander! thy last Sigh
Dissolv'd the charm; the disenchanted Earth
Lost all her Lustre; where, her glittering Towers?
Her golden Mountains, where? all darken'd down
To naked Waste; a dreary Vale of Tears;
The great Magician's dead! Thou poor, pale Piece
Of out-cast earth, in Darkness! what a Change  
From yesterday! Thy darling Hope so near,  
(Long-labour'd Prize!) O how Ambition flush'd  
Thy glowing cheek? Ambition truly great,  
Of virtuous Praise: Death's subtle seed within,  
(Sly, treacherous Miner!) working in the Dark,  
Smil'd at thy well-concerted scheme, and beckon'd  
The Worm to riot on that Rose so red,  
Unfaded e'er it fell; one moment's Prey!

Man's Foresight is conditionally wise;  
Lorenzo! Wisdom into Folly turns  
Oft, the first instant, its Idea fair  
To labouring Thought is born. How dim our eye!  
The present Moment terminates our sight;  
Clouds thick as those on Doomsday, drown the next;  
We penetrate, we prophesy in vain,  
Time is dealt out by Particles; and each,  
E'er mingled with the streaming sands of Life,  
By Fate's inviolable oath is sworn  
Deep silence, "Where Eternity begins."

By Nature's Law, what may be, may be now;  
There's no Prerogative in human Hours:  
In human hearts what bolder Thought can rise,  
Than man's Presumption on To-morrow's dawn?  
Where is To-morrow? In another world.
For numbers this is certain; the Reverse
Is sure to none; and yet on this perhaps,
This peradventure, infamous for lies,
As on a rock of Adamant we build
Our mountain Hopes; spin out eternal schemes,
As we the Fatal Sisters cou'd out-spin,
And, big with life's Futurities, expire.

Not even Philander had bespoke his Shroud;
Nor had He cause, a Warning was deny'd;
How Many fall as suddain, not as safe?
As suddain, tho' for Years admonisht home:
Of human Ills the last Extreme beware,
Beware, Lorenzo! a slow-sudden Death.
How dreadful that deliberate Surprize?
Be wise to day, 'tis madness to defer;
Next day the fatal Precedent will plead;
Thus on, till Wisdom is push'd out of life:
Procrastination is the Thief of Time,
Year after year it steals, till all are fled,
And to the mercies of a Moment leaves
The vast Concerns of an Eternal scene.
If not so frequent, would not This be strange?
That 'tis so frequent, This is stranger still.
Of Kan's miraculous Mistakes, This bears
The Palm, "That all Men are about to live."
For ever on the Brink of being born:
All pay themselves the compliment to think
They, one day, shall not drivel; and their Pride
On this Reversion takes up ready Praise;
At least, their own; their future selves applauds;
How excellent that Life they ne'er will lead?
Time lodg'd in their own hands is Folly's Vails;
That lodg'd in Fate's, to Wisdom they consign;
The thing they can't but purpose, they postpone;
'Tis not in Folly, not to scorn a Fool;
And scarce in human Wisdom to do more:
All Promise is poor dilatory man,
And that thro' every Stage: When young, indeed,
In full content, we sometimes nobly rest,
Unanxious for ourselves; and only wish,
As dutious sons, our Fathers were more Wise:
At thirty man suspects himself a Fool;
Knows it at forty, and reforms his Plan;
At fifty chides his infamous Delay,
Pushes his prudent Purpose to Resolve;
In all the magnanimity of Thought
Resolves; and re-resolves: then dies the same.

And why? Because he thinks himself Immortal:
All men think all men Mortal, but themselves;
Themselves, when some alarming shock of Fate
Strikes thro' their wounded hearts the sudden Dread;
But their hearts wounded, like the wounded Air,
Soon close; where past the shaft, no Trace is found:
As, from the Wing no scar the Sky retains;
The parted Wave no furrow from the Keel;
So dies in human hearts the Thought of Death:
Even with the tender Tear which Nature sheds
O'er those we love, we drop it in their Grave.
Can I forget Philander? That were strange;
O my full Heart! But should I give it vent,
The longest Night, tho' longer far, would fail,
And the Lark listen to my midnight Song.

The sprightly Lark's shrill Mattin wakes the Morn;
Grief's sharpest Thorn hard-pressing on my Breast,
I strive, with wakeful Melody to cheer
The sullen Gloom, sweet Philomel! like Thee,
And call the Stars to listen: Every star
Is deaf to mine, enamour'd of thy Lay.
Yet be not vain; there are, who thine excell,
And charm thro' distant Ages: Wrapt in Shade,
Prisoner of Darkness! to the silent Hours,
How often I repeat their Rage divine,
To lull my Griefs, and steal my heart from Woe?
I rowl their Raptures, but not catch their Fire:
Dark, tho' not blind, like thee Maeonides!
Or Milton! thee; ah cou'd I reach your Strain!

Or His, who made Maonides our Own.

Man too he sung: Immortal man I sing;

Oft bursts my Song beyond the bounds of Life;

What, now, but Immortality can please?

O had He prest his Theme, pursued the track,

Which opens out of Darkness into Day!

O had he mounted on his wing of Fire,

Soar'd, where I sink, and sung Immortal man!

How had it blest mankind? and rescued me?

FINIS.
All departures from the 1742 first edition copy-text of *Night the First* (with the exception of the silent changes noted above in the introductory pages of Chapter IV) are noted in this appendix. The lemma, the variant adopted in this present text, is the word or phrase to the left of the bracket. The siglum which follows identifies the earliest occurrence of the variant. The word or phrase to the right of the semicolon is the copy-text reading. A caret (\^) signifies the absence of a punctuation mark; a wavy line (\_\_) represents the portion of the passage to the left of the bracket that has remained unchanged.

26 fulfill'd\_\_\_Nbl; fulfil'd

31 man\_\_\_Nbl; ~!

35-35A But what are ye? ----- THOU, who didst put to Flight\_\_\_No;

But what are Ye? Thou, who didst put to flight

38 THOU\_\_\_Nbl; thou

40 Thee\_\_\_Nm; thee

42 Nature . . . Soul \_\_\_Nbl; Nature . . . Woe

66 bounties\_\_\_Nbl; mercies

68 complicate\_\_\_Nbl; complicat

82 aghast\_\_\_Nbl; amaz'd

123 Day, . . . Vestibule; \_\_\_Nr; ~; . . . ~,
undone. $\_Nf; \sim$

Line inserted $\_Nf$; this line is lacking in Na.

Here ... Hour; $\_Nbl; \textit{How} ... \sim$

e'er $\_Nbl; ev'n

Clusters I lament; $\_Nf; \sim$ make me sigh:

One? $\_Ng; \sim$

thou art $\_No; art thou

Frown? $\_Nf; \sim$

close; $\_Nk; \sim$

O'er $\_Nbl; On

full $\_Nbl; swoln

sprightly Lark's shrill Mattin wakes $\_Nbl;

shri$ $\text{ll Lark's sprightly Mattin awakes}$

The order of these two lines is reversed in Na.

Grief's ... Breast, $\_Nbl; (\text{Grief's} ... \sim_a)$

wakeful $\_Nbl; mournful

Fire $\_No; Flame
APPENDIX B: CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF SUBSTANTIVE VARIANTS

All substantive variants among the "lifetime" editions are noted here. I also cite any punctuation change that significantly affects meaning. The symbols used are the same as in Appendix A, and the sequence of each entry is chronological.

4 pinion $\sim$ Na-Nj, Nq, Nt; Pinion Nk-Nl, Nm-No, Nr-Ns; pinions Nm; Pinions Np, Nu

14 A . . . change; $\sim$ Na-Nh; (~!)$\sim$ Nj-Nj, Nm, Nq, Nt; (~Change!)$\sim$ Nk-Nl, Nm-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu

15 Distress! $\sim$ Na-Nf, Nh, Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr; distress! Ng, Ni-Nj, Nm; distress; Nq, Nt; ~; Ns, Nu

21 dead? . . . profound? $\sim$ Na-Nj; ~! . . . ~! Nk-Nu

31 man! $\sim$ Na; ~ A Nbl-Nf, Nh, Nm, Nq, Nt; Man A Ng, Ni-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu

35 But what are Ye? Thou, who didst put to flight $\sim$ Na-Nd, Nf-Nh; ~ Thou ~ Ne; ~ THOU, ~ Ni; ~ ye? THOU, ~ Nj, Nm; ~ ye? THOU, . . . Flight Nk-Nl, Nm

But what are ye?------THOU, who didst put to Flight $\sim$ No-Np; ~ flight Nq, Nt; ~ Ye? ~ Nk-Ns, Nu

38 thou! $\sim$ Na-Nh; THOU! Ni-Nn; THOU, No-Nu

40 thee $\sim$ Na-Nk, Nn-Ns; Thee Nm, Nt-Nu

42 Nature . . . Woe $\sim$ Na; Nature . . . Soul Nbl-Nl, Nn-Nu; nature . . . soul Nm

52 vial $\sim$ Na-Nf; Vial Nk-Nj; Phial Nk-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; phial Nq, Nt

66 mercies $\sim$ Na; bounties Nbl-Nj, Nm, Nq, Nt; Bounties Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu

67 poor? . . . rich? . . . abject? . . . august? $\sim$ Na-Nj; poor, . . . rich, . . . abject, . . . august, Nk-Nu

146
Man? J Na-Ne, Nh, Nk-Nl, Nm-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; man? Nf-Ng, Nl-Nj, Nq, Nt; man! Nm

such? J Na-Nl, Nn-Nu; ~! Nm

Extremes? J Na-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; extremes! Nm; extremes? Nq, Nt

amaz'd J Na; aghast Nbl-Nu

reels? J Na-Ni, Nq, Nt; ~! Nk-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu

distrest? . . . Dread? J Na-Nbl, Nc, Ne; distress'd? ~ Nb2, Nd, Nf-Nj; distress'd! ~! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; distress'd! . . . dread! Nm, Nq, Nt

Life? . . . destroy? J Na-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; life? ~ Nm; life! . . . ~! Nq, Nt

New paragraph No-Nu

populous? . . . Grave? J Na-Nj; ~! . . . ~! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; ~! . . . grave! Nm; ~, . . . grave! Nq, Nt

sad J Na-Nk, Nm-Nu; said Nl

Shades: J Na-Nh; ~! Nl-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; shades! Nm, Nq, Nt

more? J Na-Nl, Nn-Nt; ~!Nm, Nu

Day; . . . Vestibule, J Na; Day, ~ Nbl-Nj; Day, . . . ~. Nk-Nl, Nn-Np; day, . . . vestibule. Nm; day, . . . vestibule; Nq, Nt; Day, . . . Vestibule; Nr-Ns, Nu

life of Gods J Na-Ne, Ng-Nj; life Gods Nf; Life ~ Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; ~ gods Nm, Nq, Nt

more? J Na-Nj; ~! Nk-Nu

expire? J Na-Nj, Nf; ~! Nk-Nq, Ns-Nu

ought J Na-Nc, Ne-Nn, Nu; aught Nd, No-Nt

No new paragraph Nq

World? J Na-Nj; ~! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; world! Nm, Nq, Nt

skies? J Na-Nj; Skies! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; ~! Nm, Nq, Nt
bepriend, ... above) \( Na-Nj \); befriend, ... above): \( Na-Nu \)

Impossible? \( Na-Nl \); impossible! \( Nm \); impossible? \( Nn-Nu \)

Change? \( Na-Nl \), \( Nn-Np \), \( Nr-Ns \), \( Nu \); change! \( Nm \); change? \( Nq \), \( Nt \)

Wave? \( Na-Nl \), \( Nn-Np \), \( Nr-Ns \), \( Nu \); wave! \( Nm \); wave? \( Nq \), \( Nt \)

life? \( Na-Nj \), \( Nq \), \( Nt \); Life? \( Nk-Nl \), \( Nn-Np \), \( Nr-Ns \), \( Nu \); \( Nm \)

joys? \( Na-Nb1 \), \( No-Nj \), \( Nq \), \( Nt \); Joys? \( Nj2 \), \( Nk-Nl \), \( Nn-Np \), \( Nr-Ns \), \( Nu \); \( Nm \)

Line inserted \( Nf-Ng \), \( Nj-Nu \)

rowing \( Na-Nj \); rolling \( Nk-Nu \)

How ... with ... ? \( Na \); Here ... \( Nj \); No-Nu; Here ... the ... \( Nk-Nn \)

Empires \( Na-Nc \), \( Ne-Nl \), \( Nn \); Empire \( Nq \); empires \( Nm \); Empires \( No-Np \), \( Nr-Ns \), \( Nu \); empires \( Nq \), \( Nt \)

No new paragraph \( Nq \)

words! ... vain; \( Na-Nh \); words, ... \( Nj \); \( Nj \); Words, ... \( Nk-Nz \), \( Nn-Np \), \( Nr-Ns \), \( Nu \)

heart? \( Na-Nj \); Heart! \( Nk-Nl \), \( Nn-Np \), \( Nr-Ns \), \( Nu \); \( Nm \)

New paragraph \( Nl-Nu \)

wreck'd \( Na-Nm \); wrack'd \( Nn \); wreak'd \( No-Nu \)

Archer! \( Na-Nc \), \( Nf-Ng \), \( Ni-Nl \), \( Nn-Np \), \( Nr-Ns \), \( Nu \); \( Nm \), \( Nq \), \( Nt \)

ev'n \( Na \); e'er \( Nb1-Nj \); ere \( Nk-Nu \)

bliss? \( Na-Nb1 \), \( Nc-Nj \); Bliss? \( Nj2 \); Bliss! \( Nk-Nl \), \( Nn-Np \), \( Nr-Ns \), \( Nu \)

Joy? \( Na-Nf \), \( Nh \); \( Nj \); \( Nf-Ng \), \( Ni-Nl \), \( Nn-Np \), \( Nr-Ns \), \( Nu \); joy! \( Nm \), \( Nq \), \( Nt \)

Peace, \( Na-Ne \), \( Nh \); \( Nf-Ng \), \( Ni-Nl \), \( Nn-Np \), \( Nr-Ns \), \( Nu \); peace! \( Nm \), \( Nq \), \( Nt \)

elaps'd \( Na-Nk \), \( Nm-Nu \); laps'd \( Nl \)
Fate; Na-Nl, Nn-No, Nr-Ns, Nu; fate; Nm, Nq, Nt; ~! Np
make me sigh; Na-Ne, Nh; I lament; Nf-Ng, Nl-Nu
New paragraph Na-Nu
One! Na-Nf, Nh; ~? Nq, Ni-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; one?
Nm, Nq, Nt
Oar Na-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns; oar Nm, Nq, Nt; Ore Nu
Dead? Na-Nj; ~! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; dead! Nm, Nq, Nt
there? Na-Nj; ~! Nk-Nu
Charity? Na-Nj; ~! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; charity! Nm,
Nq, Nt
vain? Na-Nj; ~! Nk-Nu
Right! Na-Nl, Nn; right! Nm; ~. Nq-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; right.
Nq, Nt
Temperance; Na-Nl, Nn-No, Nr-Ns, Nu; temperance; Nm, Nq, Nt;
~! Np
Calamities? Na-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; calamities! Nm;
calamities? Nq, Nt
Foe? Na-Nl, Nn, Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; foe! Nm, Nq, Nt; ~! Np
list of human Na-Ng, Ni-Nj, Nm, Nq, Nt; list human Nh;
List ~ Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu
man? Na-Nj; Man! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; ~! Nm, Nq, Nt
Sands; Na-Nj; ~! Nj-Nl, Nn; sands; Nm; ~! Nq-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu;
sands! Nq, Nt
Wild Na-Nc, Nf-Ng, Nl-Nu; With Nd-Ne, Nh
wide-opens Na-Nj; wide opens Nk-Nu
from Na-Nc, Nf-Ng, Nl-Nu; for Nd-Ne, Nh
Hour? Na-Nj, Nr-Ns, Nu; ~! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np; hour! Nm, Nq, Nt
thou! . . . art, Na-Nl, Nn-Ng, Nt; thou! . . . art! Nm;
thou, ~ Nr-Ns, Nu
art thou 7 Na-Nn; thou art No-Nu

Prosperity 7 Na-Nl, Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; Posterity Nj; prosperity Nm, Ng, Nt

Frown! 7 Na-Ne, Nh; ~? Nf-Ng; Frowns? Nl-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; frowns? Nm, Ng, Nt

Line lacking Ni-Nu

while we clasp 7 Na-Nl, Nk-Nu; while clasp Nj

cheek? 7 Na-Nj; Cheek! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; ~! Nm, Ng, Nt

Death's 7 Na-Nn; Death No; Death, Np; Death's Ng-Nu

eye! 7 Na-Nh, Nm, Nq, Nt; ~? Ni-Nj; Eye! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu

E'er 7 Na-Nj; Ere Nk-Np, Nr-Nu; Are Nq

out 7 Na-Nr, Nt; our Ns, Nu

cou'd 7 Na-Nj; could Nk-Nt; would Nu

safe? 7 Na-Nj; ~! Nk-Np, Nt-Nu; ~; Ng-Ns

home 7 Na-Nh; ~, Nl-Np, Nt, Nu; ~? Ng-Ns

lead? 7 Na-Nj; ~! Nk-Nu

content, we sometimes 7 Na-Nh; ~, we, sometimes, Nl-Nj, Nm, Nq, Nt; Content A we, sometimes, Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu

close, 7 Na-Nj; ~; Nk-Nu

On 7 Na; O'er Nbl-Nu

strange; 7 Na-Na, Nr-Ns, Nu; ~! Nn-Nq, Nt

swoln 7 Na; full Nbl-Nu

shriiLark's sprightly Mattin awakes 7 Na; sprightly Lark's shrill Mattin wakes Nbl-Nf, Nh; spritely Lark's shrill Mattin wakes Ng, Nl-Nj; spritely Lark's shrill Mattin wakes Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; sprightly lark's shrill matin wakes Nm; spritely lark's shrill matin wakes Nq, Nt
These two lines are in reverse order in Na only

438 (Grief's... Breast) / Na; Grief's... Breast, / Nbl-Nh; Grief's... Breast, / Ni-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; Grief's... breast, / Nm, Nq, Nt

439 mournful / Na; wakeful Nbl-Nu

447 Woe? / Na-Nj; ~! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; woe! Nm, Nq, Nt

448 rowl... Flame / Na-Nh; ~! Flames Nl-Nj; roll... Flames Nk-Nl, Nn; roll... flames Nm; roll... Fire Nl-Np, Nr-Ns, Nu; roll... fire Nq, Nt

453 Life; / Na-Nl, Nn-No, Nr-Ns, Nu; life; Nm, Nq, Nt; ~! Np

459 mankind?... me? / Na-Nh; mankind, ~! Nl-Nj, Nq, Nt; Mankind, ~! Nk-Nl, Nn-Np, Nr; mankind, ... me! Nm; Mankind, ... me! Ns, Nu
FIRST TITLE PAGE

Title. The Complaint, or, Night-Thoughts on Life, Death, & Immortality. This title appears on the first page of each of the individually-issued editions of Night the First (Na, Nb1, Nb2, Nc, Nd, Ne, and Nh). In the first collected edition of Nights (Nf), however, and in all subsequent collections, this full title stood apart from Night the First and designated the complete work. The significance of Young's choice of title is discussed, above, pp. 26-40.

Epigraph. Sunt . . . tangunt. VIRG. The quotation on the title page is from Virgil's Aeneid, I, 462, and it translates literally: "Such are the tears of things, and mortality touches the mind." A freer translation is, "Tears in the nature of things, hearts touched by human transience." (this and all subsequent translations are from The Aeneid of Virgil, trans. C. Day Lewis (New York, 1953). This quotation appears on the title pages of the individually-issued editions of Night the First, but in every one of the collected editions, the quotation appears apart from Night the First on the general title page for the entire collection.

This line which Young chose as his epigraph is central to the vision of Night the First and to that of Night-Thoughts as a whole.
In the *Aeneid* the words are spoken by shipwrecked Aeneas to his friend Achates as they stand concealed in the midst of the new city of Carthage. All around them the city is under construction, but the enthusiasm of the Carthaginians contrasts sharply with the emotions of the two exiled Trojans. They are reminded instead of their own city, now in ruins. Aeneas sees frescoes depicting scenes from the recent Trojan War and exclaims,

Oh, Achates, is there anywhere,  
Any place left on earth unhaunted by our sorrows?  
Look!--Priam. Here too we find virtue somehow rewarded,  
Tears in the nature of things, hearts touched by human transience.  

(I, 459-462)

The narrator of *Night the First* is himself a sort of latter-day Aeneas. Like the Trojan hero, he too is everywhere reminded of the transience of all things human and recalls sadly the loss of earthly joys. And like Aeneas in the first six books of the *Aeneid*, he sees beyond the present situation to a future Hesperia at the end of his sufferings.

SECOND TITLE PAGE

Title. Night the First. On Life, Death, & Immortality. This second, more specialized title for *Night the First* initially appeared in the earliest collected edition of *Nights* (*Nf*). This use of a separate title for *Night the First* continues in all the "lifetime" collected editions. The three topics--life, death, and immortality--are dominant throughout both *Night the First* and *Night-Thoughts* as a whole.
The individually-issued texts of Night the First have no preface. In some of the volumes that I examined, a preface did precede the text of Night the First, but this preface actually was part of Night the Fourth. When owners of sets of individually-issued Nights had them bound together, the person doing the binding sometimes moved the preface for Night the Fourth to the front of the volume, making it seem part of Night the First. Some form of this preface is also incorporated in every collected edition of Nights, except for Nj, Nk, and N#. Since this preface is textually-unrelated to Night the First, I have not included it as part of my critical edition. Perhaps the most reliable text for the preface is the one in the front of the first edition of Night the Fourth (published in 1743), although Young also gave authority to Richardson's later revision (see, above, pp. 56-58). The original preface read:

As the Occasion of this Poem was Real, not Fictitious; so the Method pursued in it, was rather imposed, by what spontaneously arose in the Author's Mind, on that Occasion, than meditated, or designed. Which will appear very probable from the Nature of it. For it differs from the common Mode of Poetry, which is from long Narrations to draw short Morals. Here, on the contrary, the Narrative is short, and the Morality arising from it makes the Bulk of the Poem. The Reason of it is, That the Facts mentioned did naturally pour these moral Reflections on the Thought of the Writer.

It is evident from the First Night, where three Deaths are mentioned, that the Plan is not yet compleated; for two only of those three have yet been sung. But since this Fourth Night finishes one principal and important Theme, naturally arising from all Three, viz. the
Subduing our Fear of Death, it will be a proper pausing Place for the Reader, and the Writer too. And it is uncertain, whether Providence, or Inclination, will permit him to go any farther. I say, Inclination, for This Thing was entered on purely as a Refuge under Uneasiness, when more proper Studies wanted sufficient Relish to detain the Writer's Attention to them. And that Reason (thanks be to Heaven) ceasing, the Writer has no farther Occasion, I shou'd rather say Excuse, for giving in, so much to the Amusements, amid the Duties, of Life.

Richardson's revision of the preface in 1750 consists merely of deleting the second and third paragraphs. No substantive changes occur in the first paragraph, which appears at the beginning of edition Nn.

Whether Young actually wished to have this preface precede the entire Night-Thoughts instead of Night the Fourth, for which he orginally wrote it, is debatable. Richardson's revisions eliminate material obviously related to Night the Fourth but, as Isabel St. John Bliss has suggested, the preface misleads readers as to the nature of the poem. She correctly argues that the "'facts' in Night IV are primarily the transitory nature of life and the promise of Christianity (with no development of the elegiac examples of Nights I-III). Reference to Young's recovery from serious illness and to his disillusionment with court promises may be considered 'real, not fictitious'; and that such facts did 'pour' these moral reflections cannot be denied" (Bliss, Edward Young, pp. 122-123). When the preface is moved to precede Night the First, however, most eighteenth and nineteenth-century readers misunderstood it. They
used the statement that all was to be taken as "real and not fictitious" to mean that the poem is Young's autobiographical lamentation about the deaths of three family members (see, above, pp. 10-14).

Dedication. Arthur Onslow. The dedication of Night the First to Onslow appears in every edition except the first (Na). The cause for this single exception was probably a late decision by the author to dedicate the poem. Young's specific reason for dedicating Night the First to Onslow remains a mystery. Onslow was Speaker of the House of Commons from 1728 to 1761 and a mutual friend of Young and Richardson. His influence secured for Richardson a number of government printing jobs—see Henry C. Shelley, The Life and Letters of Edward Young (London 1914), p. 17* and William B. Sale, Jr., Samuel Richardson: Master Printer (Ithaca 1950), pp. 76-77—but I found no record of any favors he had performed for Young that might have resulted in the dedication. Young and Onslow sometimes exchanged visits (see Correspondence, pp. 225, 345, 347, 351, and 353), and Young once presented him with a locket containing a lock of Milton's hair (pp. 405, 407). Onslow gave Young a folio Bible in 1751 (Pettit, "History," p. 59). Unfortunately, Young's correspondence and other biographical materials are silent on the question of whether Young's dedication of Night the First to Onslow resulted purely from friendship and respect for the Speaker or possibly from a specific ulterior motive,
such as Onslow's influence in the highly-political process of filling church vacancies.

8 if Dreams . . . Grave. This passage echoes Hamlet's famous soliloquy:

... To die, to sleep,
To sleep--perchance to dream. Aye, there's the rub,
For in that sleep of death what dreams may come
When we have shuffled off this mortal coil
Must give us pause . . .


Young himself was a dramatist, and his echoing here of the familiar Shakespeare passage perhaps identifies the way in which he intended the poem to be read--as a dramatic soliloquy by a wakeful narrator who reflects on the world around him and on his own thoughts in the dead of night. The voice and structure of Night the First is further discussed, above, pp. 30-36.

12 Reason. For a discussion of how Young uses this term in Night the First, see, above, p. 38, note 92.

18 Night, sable Goddess. The apostrophe is presumably to the goddess Night, who in classical mythology is one of the offspring of Chacs. Young makes this connection clearer in lines 220-222 of Night the Second:

When worlds, that count his circles now, unhinged,
(Fate the loud signal sounding,) headlong rush
To timeless Night and Chaos, whence they rose.

27 I can lose no more. This is the first specific reference in Night the First to the deaths of loved ones. The theme is dominant throughout the poem, especially in the passage concerning the death of Philander (ll. 344-358, 382-384, and 431-436). The deaths of Narcissa and Lucia are treated in subsequent Nights. Until the twentieth century, much of the criticism on Night-Thoughts attempted to identify the fictional characters in the poem with actual people. Recent critics have exposed the weaknesses of this approach, as I have shown, above, pp. 14-18. The significance of these three characters is not so much who they were, but rather how they died. The opening lines of Night the Sixth, which describe the death of Lucia, suggest that Young's characters depict three common ways in which a person can die--early, suddenly, or gradually:

SHE (for I know not yet her name in heaven)
Not early, like NARCISSA, left the scene;
Nor sudden, like PHILANDER. What avail?
This seeming mitigation but inflames;
This fancied medicine heightens the disease.
The longer known, the closer still she grew;
And gradual parting is a gradual death.
(VI, 1-7)

28-29 Silence, and Darkness! solemn Sisters. Young's solemn sisters do not correspond to any of the traditional offspring of the goddess Night in classical mythology. Young's liberties with the myths of the ancients, however, are not surprising when one remembers
his preference for "Originals" over "Imitators" and his high regard for a writer's imagination, as he made clear in his _Conjectures on Original Composition._

Silence and darkness represent the two qualities of night that Young most values in _Night-Thoughts._ The opinion that his speaker sets forth in subsequent _Nights_ is that stimulation of the senses usually distracts the mind from important thoughts and that the absence of sounds and light better enables the mind to exercise reason:

> By day the soul, o'erborne by life's career,  
> Stunn'd by the din, and giddy with the glare,  
> Reels far from reason, jostled by the throng.  
> By day the soul is passive, all her thoughts  
> Imposed, precarious, broken, ere mature.  
> By night, from objects free, from passion cool,  
> Thoughts uncontrol'd and unimpress'd, the births  
> Of pure election, arbitrary range,  
> Not to the limits of one world confined,  
> But from ethereal travels light on earth,  
> As voyagers drop anchor, for repose.  

(_V, 115-125_)

By freeing our thoughts from the objects of the world around us, the silence and darkness of night lead us further—to resolve, which for Young meant the will to act on the dictates of "Reason" (i.e., the ability to distinguish between good and evil):

> Hail, precious moments, stolen from the black waste  
> Of murder'd Time! auspicious Midnight, hail!  
> The world excluded, every passion hush'd,  
> And open'd a calm intercourse with Heaven,  
> Here the soul sits in council; ponders past,  
> Predestines future action; sees, not feels,  
> Tumultuous life, and reasons with the storm;  
> All her lies answers, and thinks down her charms.  

(_V, 194-201_)


It appears evident that Young regarded sense as the means of perception for this world and reason as the means of perception for the next. For a further discussion of these ideas and their relationship with eighteenth-century science and philosophy, see, above, pp. 36-40 and the notes, below, on lines 168-170 and 361-362.

44-46 **O lead** . . . **Death.** This passage may echo a similar appeal that Dante made to the poet Virgil in the opening canto of *The Divine Comedy, Inferno*:

E io a lui: 'Poeta, io ti richeggio
per quello Dio che tu non conoscesti,
a ciò ch'io fugga questo male e peggio,
che tu mi meni là dov' or dicesti,
sì ch'io vegga la porta di san Pietro
e color cui tu fai cotanto mesti.'

And I to him, 'Poet, I beseech you, by that God whom you did not know, so that I may escape this ill and worse, lead me whither you said just now, that I may see St. Peter's gate and those whom you term so woeful.'

(*The Divine Comedy, ed. and trans. Charles S. Singleton /Princeton, 1970*, Inferno, I, 130-135) The journeys of both Dante and Young have spiritual dimensions, but if Young was consciously echoing this passage from *The Divine Comedy*, his comparison is illuminating. Dante's travels are described as a physical voyage; Young's as a mental one (hence, "O lead my Mind").
A study of Night-Thoughts as a whole reveals the influence of contemporary philosophy on Young's thought; in particular, Lockean theories are often directly or indirectly present. These lines apparently follow from Locke's theory that a person's concept of time originates with the passage of thoughts, which are lost and replaced by new ones (An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, p. 195):

For First, By observing what passes in our Minds, how our Ideas there in train constantly some vanish, and others begin to appear, we come by the Idea of Succession. Secondly, By observing a distance in the parts of this Succession, we get the Idea of Duration. Thirdly, By Sensation observing certain appearances, at ... regular and seeming equidistant periods, we get the Ideas of certain Lengths or Measures of Duration, as Minutes, Hours, Days, Years, etc.

Locke's theory not only illuminates these rather perplexing lines in Night the First, but also helps to explain the structure of the poem, as Young set it forth in his preface to Night the Fourth (see, above, pp.154-55). The structure of the poem, he stated there, follows "what spontaneously arose in the Author's Mind." This phrase explains the speaker's tendency to move from a specific external event (e.g., "The Bell strikes One") to an internal sequence of reflections. The poem, in short, moves much as contemporary philosophers believed that the human mind does. For a further discussion on Young's voice and structure, see, above, pp. 30-36).
In this passage, with its series of astounding paradoxes and radical extremes which characterize the nature of man, Young echoes the opening lines of the second Epistle of Pope's *Essay on Man*:

Plac'd on this isthmus of a middle state,
A being darkly wise, and rudely great;
With too much knowledge for the Sceptic side,
With too much weakness for the Stoic's pride,
He hangs between; in doubt to act, or rest,
In doubt to deem himself a God, or Beast;
In doubt his Mind or Body to prefer,
Born but to die, and reasoning but to err;
Alike in ignorance, his reason such,
Whether he thinks too little, or too much;
Chaos of Thought and Passion, all confus'd;
Still by himself abus'd, or disabus'd;
Created half to rise, and half to fall;
Great lord of all things, yet a prey to all;
Sole judge of Truth, in endless Error hurl'd;
The glory, jest, and riddle of the world!

(*Essay on Man*, II, 3-18)

From this passage we can see that the two poets, like most other writers of the period, agree on man's middle state in the great chain of being and the paradoxes which this middle state implies. Beyond this basic agreement, however, the similarities between the beliefs of the two poets end. For an examination of their differing views on the proper pursuits of man, see, above, pp. 20-23. See also, below, the note on ll. 110-111.

92-97 What, tho' my soul . . . Brain. The images in this passage--a dark woods, a mountain, a swimmer in a lake, and the wild shapes--closely parallel those mentioned in Canto I of Dante's
The Divine Comedy, Inferno. But while the poet Dante encounters wild beasts, the poet Young encounters wild thoughts. See also, above, the note on ll. 44-46.

99 subtler Essence. When the speaker of Night the First asserts that man's soul is "Of subtler Essence than the trodden Clod," he uses a phrase that had greater significance for eighteenth-century readers than it does for most modern readers. Young's terminology reflects the ongoing philosophical discussion as to whether man's soul consists of matter or is immaterial. His source may have been Samuel Clarke's Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God (1705; facsimile Stuttgart, 1964).

In this essay, Clarke writes,

Thinking and Willing may possibly be, nay that they certainly and necessarily are Faculties or Powers of Immaterial Substances; Seeing they cannot possibly be Qualities or Affections of Matter; unless we will confound (as some have done) the Ideas of things; and mean by Matter, not, what the Word commonly is used to signifie, a Solid Substance, capable of Division, Figure and Motion; but an unknown Substance, capable of Powers or Properties entirely different from these . . ." (p. 189).

Young uses the theory that the mind is immaterial to argue for man's dual nature, physical and mortal but also spiritual and immortal. See, also, below, the note on lines 362-363.
They live! . . . unconceiv'd. These lines refer to that aspect of the great chain of being concept that A. O. Lovejoy, in The Great Chain of Being (Cambridge, 1936), calls the "principle of plenitude." This principle is "the assumption that no genuine potentiality of being can remain unfulfilled, that the extent and abundance of the creation must be as great as the possibility of existence and commensurate with the productive capacity of a 'perfect' and inexhaustible Source, and that the world is the better, the more things it contains" (p. 52). For Young this potentiality included the spirits of our deceased friends and various other, higher beings.

Young's belief that many such beings exist within the great chain between man and the Creator becomes clearer in passages of the Nights that follow Night the First. In Night the Ninth, for example, the speaker asserts:

I see His ministers; I see, diffused
In radiant orders, essences sublime,
Of various offices, of various plume,
In heavenly liveries distinctly clad,
Azure, green, purple, pearl, or downy gold,
Or all commix'd; they stand, with wings outspread,
Listening to catch the Master's least command,
And fly through Nature ere the moment ends;
Numbers innumerable! . . .

(IX, 877-885)

The deceased friends whom Young mentions in lines 106-121 of Night the First are one such type of angels who are present on earth but unperceived by mankind whom they are sent to help. As he suggests later, in Night the Third, they
Are angels sent on errands full of love;
For us they languish, and for us they die;
And shall they languish, shall they die, in vain?
Ungrateful, shall we grieve their hovering shades,
Which wait the revolution in our hearts?
Shall we disdain their silent, soft address;
Their posthumous advice, and pious prayer?

(III, 293-299)

On life's fair Tree . . . God. This passage alludes to
the topography of the heavenly Jerusalem depicted in Revelation 22:

And he shewed me a pure river of water of life,
clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of
God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street
of it, and on either side of the river, was there
the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits,
and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of
the tree were for the healing of the nations.

The larger passage (Ii. 134-144) also seems to echo the main
theme from The Aenied, that Aeneas must brave many discomforts and
dangers and turn his back on many joys so that he may finally arrive
in Hesperia, a theme very similar to that of Night-Thoughts if one
substitutes "mankind" for "Aeneas" and "heaven" for "Hesperia."
Hesperia was named for the Hesperides, who were "the three daughters
of Night, living far away to the west; they passed their time in
singing and guarding a tree in their garden, upon which grew golden
apples, and in this were helped by the dragon (or serpent) Ladon,
who was coiled around the tree" (Mark P. O. Morford and Robert J.
Lenardon, Classical Mythology [New York, 1971], p. 326). It is
interesting to note the skill with which Young is able to bring
together the major strands of *Night the First* in this passage. Here converge the parallels to *The Aenoid* which began with the quotation on the title page, the praises for the life-giving power of Night (in the allusion to the Hesperides, daughters of Night, and their tree), the Biblical themes of immortality and otherworldliness, and the great chain belief in a plenitude of beings between man and God.

156-161 0 how self-fettered . . . skies. For a discussion of the imagery in this passage, see, above, pp. 99-100.

168-170 How richly . . . Perspective. For a textual discussion of this passage, see, above, p. 71. The influence of the philosopher George Berkeley, who wrote at length, in *An Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision*, on the limitations of the sense of sight and its distortion of reality is also significant in this passage. Young uneasily accepted Locke's premise that the "Senses at first let in particular Ideas, and furnish the yet empty Cabinet" (*Essay*, p. 55). Lines 168-170 of *Night the First* reflect Young's (and Berkeley's) concern about the misleading information we receive through the senses. Berkeley suggested in his *Essay* (*The Works of George Berkeley*, ed. A. A. Luce and T. E. Jessop /London, 1964/, I, 171) that "the estimate we make of the distance of objects considerably remote is rather an act of judgment grounded on experience than of sense. For example, when I perceive a great number of intermediate objects, such
as houses, fields, rivers, and the like, which I have experienced
to take up a considerable space, I thence form a judgment or
conclusion that the object I see beyond them is at a great distance."
In a painting or a tapestry, depth is an illusion where experience
leads us to interpret falsely as three-dimensional an object that
is truly two-dimensional. Young parts company with Berkeley,
however, in his suggestion that a sensory void—silence and darkness
—is most conducive to true knowledge (see, above, note on 11. 28-29
and, below, note on 11. 361-362).

181A A Perpetuity . . . is Bliss. For a discussion of the
textual history and authority of this added line, see, above, pp.
78-79. The importance of this line in clarifying the theme of Night
the First is discussed, above, pp. 27-28.

200-202 I clasp'd the Phantoms . . . heart. This passage
echoes an incident in The Aeneid, in which Aeneas' wife Creusa
appears to him as a ghost and he attempts to embrace her:

Three times I tried to put my arms round her
neck, and three times
The phantom slipped my hands, my vain embrace;
   it was like
Grasping a wisp of wind or the wings of a fleeting dream.
   (II, 792-794)

207-212 Amid such mighty Plunder . . . Horn. This passage
refers to the deaths of Philander, of Narcissa, and of Lucia, to
which the speaker refers throughout Night-Thoughts. For a discussion
of these characters, see, above, pp. 15-18 and the note on line 27.
Also, see, below, notes on line 320 and on line 340.

213 Cynthia. This name was one of several for the goddess
Artemis, the twin sister of Apollo. As goddess of the moon, she
has sometimes been associated with night and the underworld. Young
appears to have associated her indirectly (as a mighty huntress) with
death, the insatiate archer of line 210.

235 are Angels all beside? This idea, that all persons are
watched over by angels, ties in with the concept of plenitude, dis­
cussed, above, in the note on ll. 110-111. That Young's answer to
the rhetorical question "are Angels all beside?" is "yes" becomes
clearer from a passage in Night the Seventh:

Hence Heaven looks down on earth with all her eyes;
Hence the soul's mighty moment in her sight;
Hence every soul has partisans above,
And every thought a critic in the skies;
Hence clay, vile clay, has angels for its guard,
And every guard a passion for his charge
(VII, 1094-1099).

Since man is at the midway point in the great chain of being, the
conflict between good and evil on earth is of supreme interest to
both sides.

238-239 The Mother's threes . . . Pain. This passage refers to
the curse on Eve for her part in the commission of the first sin:
"Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy
conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children . . ."
(Genesis 3:16). It also alludes to the passing of that curse to
all descendants of the first couple: "Wherefore, as by one man sin
entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon
all men . . ." (Romans 5:12).

240-259 War, Famine . . . vain. The evils encountered by the
speaker here appear to be derived from those that Aeneas met at the
beginning of his journey through the underworld:

Dinily through the shadows and dark solitudes they wended,
Through the void domiciles of Dis, the bodiless regions;
Just as, through fitful moonbeams, under the moon's thin light,
A path lies in a forest, when Jove has palled the sky
With gloom, and the night's blackness has bled the world of colour.
See! At the very porch and entrance way to Orcus
Grief and ever-haunting Anxiety make their bed;
Here dwell pallid Diseases, here morose Old Age,
With Fear, ill-promising Hunger, and squalid Indigence,
Shapes horrible to look at, Death and Agony;
Sleep, too, which is the cousin of Death; and Guilty Joys,
And there, against the threshold, War, the bringer of Death;
Here are the iron cells of the Furies, and lunatic Strife
Whose viperine hair is caught up with a headband soaked in blood.
In the open a huge dark elm tree spreads wide its immemorial
Branches like arms, whereon, according to old wives' tales,
Roost the unsolid Dreams, clinging everywhere under its foliage.
(Aeneid, VI, 268-284)

That Young's speaker should compare earth to Virgil's underworld is
consistent with the views set forth in Lines 117-121 of Night the
First.

283-288 A Part . . . man. For an explication of this passage,
see, above, pp. 72-73.
295-297 *In Age* ... *mankind.* For an explication of this passage, see, above, pp. 73-74.

320 Lorenzo. Although many generations of critics have at least attempted to identify the other three named characters in the poem (Philander, Narcissa, and Lucia) with real people, few have even guessed at the identity of this young man who is so frequently addressed throughout *Night-Thoughts.* As Walter Thomas suggests in *Le Poète Edward Young,* Lorenzo seems to be "un être composite" (p. 172) and cannot be identified as any one specific individual in the absence of clues to his personal life in any of the nine *Nights.* In *Night the Sixth,* we learn that his vices include ambition and avarice (VI, 221-226) and that he loves horseback riding (VI, 761-76); in *Night the Eighth,* we learn that his father scolds him for gallantries but lusts after others' gold (VIII, 552-554); and in *Night the Ninth,* we are told that Lorenzo himself has a young son named Florello (IX, 2148-2163). Given these clues, Lorenzo could be almost any witty young man of the world—but obviously not, as some early readers apparently assumed, Young's own son, who was only ten years old when the poem was written (see Johnson, *Lives of the Poets,* III, 379-382). In fact, a stronger case can be made for identifying Lorenzo as a composite of various aspects of atheism (see, above, pp. 16-17) or perhaps even as a "dark" or "worldly" side of the speaker himself (see, above, pp. 34).
Philander. Unlike Lorenzo, the identity of this character has been the subject of considerable debate. Critics have usually identified Philander with Henry Temple, son of the first Viscount Palmerston and Young's son-in-law (see DNB, 19, 495), or Young's friend Thomas Tickell (Thomas, Le Poète Edward Young, pp. 145-148). But neither of these identifications is convincing. The circumstances of Temple's death do not match Philander's; the absence of correspondence between Young and Tickell suggests that they were not close associates after 1730. In fact, perhaps the only connection that can be made concerning the references to Philander in Night the First is that they resemble some lines Young had written nearly thirty years earlier lamenting the death of his Oxford University companion, William Harrison.

Young speaks at length of his grief on the death of his friend Harrison in the closing passage of his Epistle to the Right Honourable George Lord Lansdowne. The description of Harrison's death (e.g., the distress of the speaker, the discussion of the cold body bereft of life, and especially the grim irony of a recent political success) very closely parallels the speaker's memory of Philander's death as set forth in Night the First:

O Harrison! I must, I will complain;
Tears soothe the soul's distress, though shed in vain.
Didst thou return, and bless thy native shore
With welcome peace? and is my friend no more?
Thy task was early done; and I must own
Death kind to thee, but, ah! to thee alone.
But 'tis in me a vanity to mourn;
The sorrows of the great thy tomb adorn:
Strafford and Bolingbroke the loss perceive,
They grieve, and make thee envied in thy grave.
With aching heart and a foreboding mind,
I night to day in painful journey join'd,
When first inform'd of his approaching fate;
But reach'd the partner of my soul too late.
'Twas past: his cheek was cold; that tuneful tongue
Which Isis charm'd with its melodious song,
Now languish'd, wanted strength to speak his pain,
Scarce raised a feeble groan, and sank again.
Each art of life in which he bore a part,
Shot like an arrow through my bleeding heart.
To what served all his promised wealth and power,
But more to load that most unhappy hour?
(Epistle to Lansdowne, 11. 496-517)

The similarity between the two poems, however, does not
necessarily mean that Philander is to be identified with
Harrison. If Young consciously drew on the topics of this earlier
poem or even from memories of his friend's death, the most
significant point remains the suddenness of Philander's death
rather than the details of his life. This topic is discussed,
above, p. 17, and in the note on line 27.

362-363 How dim . . . sight. See notes, above, on 11. 28-29
and on 11. 168-170. This passage resemble Locke's argument that
man is limited in his perceptions because of the limitations of
his senses. It is therefore conceivable that other beings may
"see" things that man cannot perceive: "And had Mankind been made
with but four Senses, the Qualities then, which are the Object of the
Fifth Sense, had been as far from our Notice, . . . and Conception,
as now any belonging to a Sixth . . . can possibly be (Essay, p. 120).
Young's source for this idea, however, may not have been Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* but perhaps Samuel Clarke's *Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God*. Clarke expresses the idea of lines 362-363 more explicitly than Locke:

> If therefore the Blind Man's want of Idea's be not a sufficient Proof of the Impossibility of Light or Colour; how comes our bare want of Idea's, to be a Demonstration of the Impossibility of the Being of Immaterial Substances? A Blind Man, they will say, has Testimony of the Existence of Light: Very true; so also have we, of the Existence of Immaterial Substances . . . But we, besides Testimony, have great and strong Arguments both from Experience and Reason, that there are such things as Immaterial Substances, though we have no Knowledge of their Simple Essence.

(pp. 163-164)

Thus, in Night the First "our eye" is indeed "dim" because we cannot see into the future or see immaterial essences as we can see material objects in the here and now. The significance of this idea to Young becomes clearer in Night the Sixth, where the speaker states:

> In this dark dungeon, where confined we lie, Close-grated by the sordid bars of sense; All prospect of eternity shut out; And, but for execution, ne'er set free.

(VI, 405-408)

379-381 *spin out* . . . *expire*. The "spinning" allusion echoes lines 156-161. For a discussion of the imagery in this passage, see, above, pp. 99-100.
406-407 Time lodg'd . . . consign. This difficult passage can be paraphrased thus: the present time over which they have control ("Time lodg'd in their own hands") they give as mere gratuities to folly (a "vail" is a "gratuity given to a servant or attendant; a 'tip'"—OED); the future, over which they have no control ("That lodg'd in Fate's") they entrust to their wisdom.

409-410 'Tis not in Folly . . . more. The source of these lines is evidently Biblical. Thus, "'Tis not in Folly, not to scorn a Fool" because Christ warned that whosoever calls his brother "Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire" (Matthew 5:22). However, it is "scarce in human wisdom to do more" because one is also warned against educating a fool: "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit" (Proverbs 26:4-5).

440 Philomel. The nightingale.

449 Maeonides. Homer.

451-452 Or His . . . sung. The allusion is to Alexander Pope, who wrote An Essay on Man ("Man too he sung") and translated the Iliad and the Odyssey ("made Maeonides our Own"). The relationship between Night-Thoughts and Pope's Essay is discussed, above, pp. 20-23.
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