

The Tulip and Its Streaks: Contexts of *Rasselas* X

ROBERT FOLKENFLIK

QUOTING the passage from *Rasselas* on "the business of a poet" in the later nineteenth century, Leslie Stephen calls it "a fragment, the conclusion of which is perhaps the most familiar of quotations from Johnson's writings." And in our own day W. K. Wimsatt has called "the often-quoted tulip passage" one of the three "least escapable" critical statements on universality in Johnson's writing. One of the assumptions behind the importance placed on this chapter of *Rasselas* during the last two hundred years is evident in Sir John Hawkins's biography of Johnson: "He has in this Abyssinian tale given us what he calls a dissertation on poetry, and in it that which appears to me a recipe for making a poet, from which may be inferred what he thought the necessary ingredients"¹ This is the assumption, recently challenged, that Imlac is Johnson's mouthpiece. The uneasiness about the status of Imlac in this chapter has hinged on the observation that the beginning of chapter XI undercuts Imlac and may possibly cast doubt on the validity of what he says. For this reason W. J. Bate went back upon himself in *The Achievement of Samuel Johnson* and ascribed less importance to the chapter than he had in *From Classic to Romantic*.²

But of late there have been some attempts to show similarities between Imlac and another character of Johnson's who might at first glance appear to be poles apart from him — Dick Minim. Alvin Whitley, Geoffrey Tillotson, Paul Fussell and Howard Weinbrot have all compared Imlac to Minim. Clarence Tracy may have been the first

to focus closely on the distinctions between Johnson and Imlac in this chapter. He says that in the statements on the dignity of the poet "apparently Johnson is producing a parody."³ Though he cannot identify a source (he suggests, very tentatively, Milton), no one has since gone farther. Most recently, Howard Weinbrot has attempted to list with precision the points with which Johnson agrees and disagrees by reference to his statements elsewhere. Though my findings tally roughly with Weinbrot's point by point, the method is open to question, for Johnson can be found writing and talking on both sides of most of these issues. A good example of the difference between us can be found in Weinbrot's treatment of the penultimate sentence of the chapter, in which Imlac claims that the poet "must write as the *interpreter of nature*, and the legislator of *mankind*, and consider himself as presiding over the thoughts and *manners* of future generations; as a being superior to time and place" (my italics). Weinbrot says that "Johnson would deny" this position:

In the *Preface to Shakespeare* Johnson observes that Shakespeare neither demanded "any ideal tribute upon future times" nor "had any further prospect than of present popularity and present profit." Though this attitude is not necessarily the ideal for Johnson, it is clear that he shares Shakespeare's emphasis upon the need to please the audience before one.⁴

The point is worth making, but one can hardly write Q.E.D. at the end. In *Rambler* No. 136 Johnson says in his own person and without irony that the duty of an author is "to deliver examples to posterity, and to regulate the opinion of future times." And yet in the context of *Rasselas* X Weinbrot is right that Johnson disagrees with Imlac. Further observation of the art as well as the critical contexts of this chapter may enable us to establish what Johnson thought with more exactness, and the historical place of this dissertation on poetry should emerge from such an examination.

To begin with, Shelley may have taken the concept of the poet as "legislator" from *Rasselas* X, but Imlac's des-

cription of the dignity of the poet derives from Renaissance theory. Indeed, though I need not claim indebtedness, Imlac's statement shares even verbal parallels with the "Preface to *Volpone*." The poet, says Ben Jonson, "comes forth the *interpreter*, and arbiter of *nature*, a teacher of things divine, no less than human, *a master in manners*; and can alone (or with a few) effect the business of *man-kind* . . . (italics mine).⁵ Samuel Johnson, as I argue elsewhere, does not agree with Ben Jonson's earlier statement that the good poet must be a good man.⁶ Johnson rejects the Classical-Renaissance notion of the *Bonus Orator* because of his recognition that the writer is apt, as he describes him in *Rambler* No. 77 to be a "vicious Moralist," fallen man in the Pauline tradition, who points others to the good he does not practice. This rejection has some bearing on the way we should apprehend Imlac's words.

Two sentences later chapter XI begins with the now well-known deflation of Imlac:

Imlac now felt the enthusiastic fit, and was proceeding to aggrandize his own profession, when the prince cried out, "Enough! thou hast convinced me that no human being can ever be a poet."

The problem is to see what in Imlac's speech this undercuts. And I think that we can determine the answer by showing the function of Rasselas's rebuke and its context in the work. The whole chapter is "A Dissertation upon Poetry," which, as Weinbrot has noted, cannot help but remind us that the "Dissertation on the Art of Flying" ended four chapters earlier in a lake.⁷ We might notice that the rhetoric of aggrandizement runs through a number of paragraphs:

To a poet *nothing* can be useless.
All the appearances of nature I was therefore careful to study. . . .
 But the knowledge of nature is *only half* the task of a poet. . . .
 His labour is *not yet at an end*. . . .

Such a buildup cries out for Rasselas's "Enough!"⁸

But there are other contexts to consider. *Rasselas* is a book about the closed field of human scope and the endlessness of human quest. The "Conclusion in which Nothing is Concluded" puts the questors on the road back to Abyssinia. In this world where human possibilities are distinctly limited, those who attempt to put themselves beyond the range of humanity are satirized most strongly. The inventor and the astronomer concern themselves with things that are physically remote from other men and the inventor tries literally to lift himself above them.⁹ Imlac's description of the poet as "presiding over the thoughts and manners of future generations" is of a piece with the intention of the princess "to found a college of learned women in which she would preside" (Chapter XLIX). His contention that the poet should "consider himself . . . as a being superior to time and place" is echoed in the chapter on the "wise and happy man" to whom *Rasselas* listens "with the veneration due to the instructions of a superior being" and in the astronomer, who thinks he controls the weather and the seasons. We ought to recall that *Rasselas* X begins with Imlac's observation that "Wherever I went, I found that poetry was considered as the highest learning, and regarded with a veneration somewhat approaching to that which man would pay to the angelic nature." The answer to this comes from Imlac himself in chapter XVIII when *Rasselas* wants to become the disciple of the "wise and happy man.": "'Be not too hasty . . . to trust or to admire the teachers of morality: they discourse like angels, but they live like men.'" The antidote to such thinking is to be found in Imlac's advice to the astronomer: "keep this thought always prevalent, that you are only one atom of the mass of humanity, and have neither such virtue nor vice, as that you should be singled out for supernatural favours or afflictions" (Chapter XLVI). Imlac's advice, which has behind it the doctrine of uniformitarianism, explains why his Johnsonian conception of the poet should be swallowed whole and admired

by Percy Bysshe Shelley, who would hardly subscribe to Samuel Johnson's conception of man. Ben Jonson's insistence that the poet "can alone (or with a few) effect the business of mankind" is exactly the kind of aggrandizement that Samuel Johnson has in mind in his undercutting of Imlac.

I think it would be idle at this point for me to go one by one through the ideas of *Rasselas* X. Professor Weinbrot has already done this, and however much my method differs from his, it would be difficult not to learn a great deal from the knowledge he has distilled and deployed in his article. Yet since his very first sentence refers to the "lamentably famous tenth chapter of *Rasselas*," perhaps I can show why it is justly famous, if often misinterpreted, by focussing on the best known passage in it: Imlac's comments on "the streaks of the tulip."

First, to rehearse the more obvious contexts, there are distinct limitations on the role of the natural world as opposed to human nature in Johnson's thinking. Johnson was not a botanist, and his opposition of moral knowledge to "the knowledge of external nature" in the *Life of Milton* explains in part why one does not need much in the way of minute particularity in describing flowers. "A blade of grass," as he said to Mrs. Thrale, "is always a blade of grass: men and women are my subjects of inquiry."¹⁰ And if in the oft-forgotten second clause of the "streaks of the tulip" sentence, Imlac says that the poet should not "describe the different shades in the verdure of the forest," this does not imply that he should ignore the "shades of character" which Johnson praises Milton for discerning.¹¹ Numbering the streaks of the tulip is to poetry what noticing the rate of Addison's pulse is to biography (*Rambler* No. 60).

The interpretation of this passage is contingent on recognizing the art of the passage. Imlac has been interrupted by *Rasselas* and his brilliantly overstated rejoinder (easily one of the most memorable critical statements in literary

history) is an example of the kind of talking for victory at which his creator excelled. The very mention of the tulip and its streaks is all the more striking in a tale which avoids particulars.

Numbering the streaks of the tulip — the action is grotesquely extravagant, something for the Queen of Hearts's gardeners to do when they finish painting the roses red. Who, we may ask, *does* number the streaks of the tulip? What poets, to go one literal-minded step farther, mention tulips in their poetry at all? Certainly few of the major Romantics. There are no tulips in the poetry of Wordsworth, Coleridge or Keats (and I rather suspect that the "Fairy mocking as he sat on a streak'd Tulip" at the beginning of Blake's *Europe* is a nose-thumb at winking and blinking Dr. Johnson). If Wordsworth's intention, as expressed in the "Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*" was that "ordinary things should be presented to the mind in an unusual aspect," there was room in his poetry for daffodils, daisies and violets half-hidden, but no place for the gaudiness of a tulip. I think, however, that if we inquire into the associations of the tulip chiefly through its appearance in seventeenth and eighteenth-century poetry, we may come to see why the most famous tulip in literature is to be found not in a poem but in Johnson's *Rasselas*. I am not arguing that these associations were all in Johnson's mind, still less that the passages are in any way sources for Imlac's statement; yet I would draw attention to the coherent image built up by them all and the fact that a goodly number of tulips turn up in the literature of Johnson's own age and the century before.

One of the longest flower definitions in Johnson's *Dictionary* is "tulip" a two-hundred-and-sixty-three word account which includes "the properties of a good *tulip* according to the best florists of the present age." The five points which follow stipulate the number of leaves and the size, regularity and position of the stripes, though not their number. All this information comes from Phillip Miller's

The Gardener's Kalandar (1732). The word "tulip" does not appear in England until the later half of the sixteenth century and then in travellers' accounts of a strange Persian flower. There are no tulips in Shakespeare. The tulip is not only exotic (in that naughtiest of oriental tales Vathek refers to Nouronihar as "this beautiful tulip, whose colours I soon shall restore . . ." ¹²) but also the most artificial of hybrids. It is hardly surprising that Thomas Tickell's version of the commonplace perception of nature as art in "Kensington Gardens" includes only one actual flower, the tulip:

Each walk, with robes of various dyes bespread,
Seems from afar a moving tulip-bed,
Where rich brocades and glossy damasks glow,
And chintz, the rival of the showery bow.¹³

Johnson may indeed have found the tulip a bit chintzy. And Goethe's Werther, artist and revolutionary *manqué*, finds it an emblem of the hypercultivation and triviality of civilization. The torrent of true genius is constructed by "the sober gentlemen . . . whose precious little summer-houses, tulip-beds and vegetable gardens would be ruined by it."¹⁴

In the eighteenth century the associations were, appropriately, varied though related. The tulip, as James Hervey points out in his "Reflections on a Flower Garden," seems to be more an individual flower than a species:

In a grove of tulips, or a knot of pinks, one perceives a difference in almost every individual. Scarce any two are exactly alike.

But on the next page he turns to a somewhat different subject:

Did ever *beau* or *belle* make so gaudy an appearance, in a birth-night suit? Here one may behold the innocent wantonness of beauty. Here she indulges a thousand freaks, and sports herself in the most charming diversity of colours. Yet I should wrong her, were I to call her a *coquet*.¹⁵

If Hervey goes on to moralize his prose and defend the tulip's seeming "wantonness" as a display of the glories of

God, other authors put the emphasis elsewhere. In Thomson's "Spring" we find an intermediate passage:

Then comes the tulip-race, where Beauty plays
Her idle freaks: from family diffused
To family, as flies the father-dust,
The varied colours run; and, while they break
On the charm'd eye, the exulting Florist marks,
With secret pride, the wonders of his hand.¹⁶

Thomson, of all the eighteenth-century poets, is perhaps the most important for an understanding of the tulip passage in *Rasselas* X. Johnson even thinks that the word "freak" used as a verb, was introduced into English by Thomson, though it is actually Miltonic. The fact that Johnson makes this observation in the *Dictionary* four years before he wrote *Rasselas* suggests that the issue of "idle freaks," particularities of nature, was one to which he had given thought. We cannot, however, simply maintain either that Imlac is a Minim-like target of Johnson or that, as Wimsatt suggests, Johnson changed his mind when he wrote the *Life of Thomson* and only then wrote favorably of such poetry.¹⁷ His praise of Thomson's "wide expansion of general views, and his enumeration of circumstantial varieties" could well take Thomson's tulip passage into account.¹⁸ Johnson's criticism is more flexible than it is usually given credit for being. He frequently makes a theoretical remark which his practical criticism immediately subverts. In *Rambler* No. 122 for example Johnson considers some historians: Clarendon's "diction is . . . neither exact in itself, nor suited to the purpose of history But there is in his negligence a rude inartificial majesty, which, without the nicety of laboured elegance, swells the mind by its plenitude and diffusion."¹⁹ A reader of the *Life of Milton* will easily think of other examples.

If we see the pride of the gardener in Thomson's passage, we can also find suggestions that the tulip itself is proud, a rather hubristic flower:

The morn awakes the Tulip from her Bed;
E'er noon in painted pride, she decks her Head:
Rob'd in rich dyes she triumphs on the Green,
And every Flow'r does Homage to their Queen.²⁰

Such passages as this from Garth form a backdrop for the ironies of the Scriblerians. Pope makes the analogy between tulips and beauties explicit in the "Epistle to a Lady":

Ladies, like variegated Tulips, show,
 'Tis to their Changes half their charms we owe;
 Their happy Spots the nice admirer take,
 Fine by defect, and delicately weak.²¹

Pope's lines have something of a botanist's exactness without minuteness. The spotted tulips are weaker plants, though it has taken modern biology to show that we owe such variegated beauty to a virus.²² What is more important here, however, is the association of the tulip's beauty with a moral failing. The overtones of sin and pride are put to brilliant use by Swift at the conclusion of "The Lady's Dressing Room" after Strephon, having inopportunistically observed Celia's cabinet, begins cursing her cosmetic fraud in a deracinated manner:

If *Strephon* would but stop his Nose; . . .
 He soon would learn to think like me,
 And bless his ravisht Sight to see
 Such Order from Confusion sprung,
 Such gaudy Tulips rais'd from Dung.²³

As we have already seen, the place of the tulip among flowers is equivocal, but Andrew Marvell's "The Mower Against Gardens" in a passage which reflects interestingly on "The Lady's Dressing Room" traces the beauty of tulips back to original sin:

Luxurious Man, to bring his Vice in use,
 Did after him the World seduce
 And Flow'rs themselves were taught to paint.
 The Tulip, white, did for complexion seek;
 And learn'd to interline its Cheek:
 Its Onion root they then so high did hold,
 That one was for a Meadow sold.²⁴

Here, more explicitly than in Swift's metaphor, original sin and cosmetics go hand in hand, but Marvell brings in another important aspect of the subject, that Dutch stock-market madness of 1634 known as Tulipomania. The tulip is the flower which gained or lost fortunes for its owners,

and the prices before the crash were based on the rarity of the plant, precisely the kind of minute particulars Imlac attacks. Even in Johnson's own time rare specimens could go for fifty pounds, enough as Johnson figures elsewhere to provide the minimum human requirements for a year.²⁵ This is an example of the dangerous prevalence of the imagination which is attacked explicitly in later chapters of *Rasselas*. In *Idler* No. 30 he deals with the related "restlessness of mind" of those who, having all wants supplied "sit down to contrive artificial appetites." Among his catalogue of such beings he observes that "one makes collections of shells, and another searches the world for tulips"

By this time my single-flowered anthology may seem like a new form of tulipomania, but I think that we can find the final clues to Johnson's selection of the tulip among the seventeenth-century poets, for if the Romantics had little use for tulips and the poets of the eighteenth century wrote of them frequently enough, if in passing, the poets of the seventeenth century, especially those tinged by the poetics of the Metaphysicals, could write whole poems about them. Richard Leigh's "Beauty in Chance" (1675), an anticipation in some ways of Gerald Manley Hopkins's "Pied Beauty," is devoted to tulips, and makes at least one point with which Imlac would be in agreement:

Their sev'ral *Streaks* and *Stains* who thus would trace,
As vain a Project, and successless tries;
As he, who *Proteus* paints with one *fixt face*,
Or limns the *necks* of Doves, with all their *dies*.²⁶

If, however, one wished to speculate that Johnson's comment on tulips was directed at any poet in particular, a good guess would be Cowley.²⁷ In the *Life of Cowley* Johnson says, "Considering botany as necessary to a physician, he retired into Kent to gather plants; and as the predominance of a favourite study affects all subordinate operations of the intellect, botany in the mind of Cowley turned into poetry."²⁸ Johnson does not discuss these poems, but he certainly had read them. When he wants to damn Cowley's

When Imlac says that the poet "is to exhibit in his portraits of nature such prominent and striking features, as recall the original to every mind; and must neglect the minuter discriminations, which one may have remarked, and another have neglected, for those characteristics which are alike obvious to vigilance and carelessness," he is making a statement perfectly consistent with the *Life of Cowley*. Since the *Life of Cowley* appeared in 1779, it seems hardly likely that Johnson changed his mind on the issues when he came to write the *Life of Thomson* less than two years later (as Wimsatt suggests). We should rather take that *Life* as showing the limits of particularity which Johnson was always willing to allow: the "enumeration of circumstantial varieties" within a "wide expansion of general views." And we must remember that Johnson believes one should judge by perception not principles.

The passage seems to have had some effect on his contemporaries. Three years after the publication of *Rasselas* Aspasia in Daniel Webb's dialogue *Remarks on the Beauties of Poetry* says "These distinctions are too subtle for me. I shall never be brought to consider the beauties of a Poet in the same light that I do the colours in a tulip."³³ And over fifty years later in *Pride and Prejudice* one of Johnson's greatest admirers satirized Mr. Collins's lack of taste in terms which could be drawn from *Rasselas X*:

Here, leading the way through every walk and cross walk, and scarcely allowing them an interval to utter the praises he asked for, every view was pointed out with a minuteness which left beauty entirely behind. He could number the fields in every direction, and could tell how many trees there were in the most distant clump.³⁴

Mr. Collins literally can't see the forest for the trees. Here is the kind of aesthetic numbering that Johnson would also ridicule.

Bate was right to go back upon himself and deemphasize *Rasselas X*. The touchstone method is not more satisfactory for a critic than for a poet. Despite the essential consistency of much of the criticism in *Rasselas X* with the

rest of Johnson's criticism, I think we may say of Johnson, as Johnson does of Shakespeare, "He that tries to recommend him by select quotations will succeed like the pedant in Hierocles, who, when he offered his house to sale, carried a brick in his pocket as a specimen." We may continue to admire *Rasselas X*, however. Set in its context it offers the wary a mixture of brilliant criticism and subtle art. If its unsettling blend of statements with which Johnson agrees and disagrees has often led to confusion that is a sign of our willingness to reduce his complexity to more easily digestible terms.

It is precisely *because* Imlac is so frequently Johnson's mouthpiece that Johnson undercuts him in this crucial chapter. Johnson is as wary of self-aggrandizement in his most admirable character as he is in himself.⁸⁵ Totally privileged views do not exist for human beings. Although Johnson greatly admires the "comprehensive" mind, and his requirements for the epic poet are in the tradition of the Renaissance critics, he sees the intolerable human burdens placed on the poet. The tenth chapter of *Rasselas* is, as Imlac's closeness to Ben Jonson at the conclusion suggests, at once a last statement of the Renaissance conception of the poet and a critique of it.

NOTES

¹Stephen, *Samuel Johnson* (New York, n. d. [1878], English Men of Letters), pp. 178-80; Wimsatt and Cleanth Brooks, *Literary Criticism: A Short History* (New York: Knopf 1957), p. 320; Hawkins, *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL. D.* (London: J. Buckland, 1787, 2nd ed.), p. 368.

²New York: Oxford University Press, 1961, pp. 199, 240 n. 30.

³Whitley, "The Comedy of *Rasselas*," *ELH*, 23 (1956), 48-70; Tillotson, "Imlac and the Business of a Poet," *Studies in Criticism and Aesthetics, 1660-1800: Essays in Honor of Samuel Holt Monk*, ed. Howard Anderson and John S. Shea (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967), pp. 296-314; Fussell, *Samuel Johnson and the Life of Writing* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1971), pp. 232-34; Weinbrot, "The Reader, the General, and the Particular: Johnson and Imlac in Chapter Ten of *Rasselas*," *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 5 (1971), 80-96. Tracy, "Democritus, Arise!: A Study of Dr. Johnson's Humor," *Yale Review*, 39 (1949), 308.

- ⁴Weinbrot, 84. My text for *Rasselas* is that of R. W. Chapman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1927).
- ⁵For Shelley's indebtedness to Johnson, see Kenneth N. Cameron, "A New Source for Shelley's *A Defence of Poetry*," *Studies in Philology*, 38 (1941), 629-44; the idea of the poet as legislator had received a renewed impetus, apart from Johnson's handling of it, in the work of Rousseau and Kant. For Jonson see *The Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937), V, 17. I have normalized the spelling.
- ⁶In a forthcoming book, *Samuel Johnson, Biographer*.
- ⁷Weinbrot, 86.
- ⁸Arthur H. Scouten has suggested, convincingly to my mind, that the movement in the chapter is from truth to falsity as far as Johnson's attitudes are concerned. See "Dr Johnson and Imlac," *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 7 (1973), 508.
- ⁹Earl R. Wasserman, in a paper entitled "*Rasselas* and other Modes of Literary Subversion" I heard at a meeting of the Upstate New York College English Association (October, 1971) now published in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, emphasizes the importance for Johnson here of the traditional opposition of star knowledge and self knowledge.
- ¹⁰Hester Lynch Piozzi, *Anecdotes of the Late Samuel Johnson*, LL. D. (London, 1786), p. 100.
- ¹¹*Life of Milton, The Lives of the English Poets*, ed. George Birkbeck Hill (London: Oxford University Press, 1905), I, 170.
- ¹²1786 (New York, 1928), p. 146.
- ¹³*A Complete Edition of the Poets of Great Britain* (London, 1795), VIII, 434.
- ¹⁴*The Sorrows of Young Werther* (New York: New American Library, 1962), p. 31. The original term is "Tulpenbeete."
- ¹⁵*Works* (London, 1769), pp. 41, 42.
- ¹⁶*The Complete Poetical Works of James Thomson*, ed. J. Logie Robertson (London: Oxford University Press, 1951), p. 23, 539-44.
- ¹⁷Brooks and Wimsatt, *Literary Criticism*, p. 329. Wimsatt has returned to chapter ten recently. See "In Praise of *Rasselas*: Four Notes (Converging)," in *Imagined Worlds: Essays on Some English Novels and Novelists in Honor of John Butt*, ed. Maynard Mack and Ian Gregor (London: Methuen, 1968), pp. 111-36.
- ¹⁸*Lives*, III, 299.
- ¹⁹*The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson*, ed. W. J. Bate and Albrecht Strauss (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), IV, 289.
- ²⁰Samuel Garth, quoted by Charles Gildon, *The Art of Poetry* (London, 1718), II, 405.
- ²¹*The Twickenham Edition of Pope's Poetical Works* (London: Methuen, 1950-1967), III, ii, 52, le., 41-44.

- ²²Elizabeth Adams Daniel, "Pope's 'Moral Essays' and 'Tulipomania'," *Notes and Queries*, 204 (1959), 397-98.
- ²³*Poems*, ed. Harold Williams (London, 1958), II, 530, l.e., 136, 141-43. Since completing this essay, I have found some pertinent discussion of tulip passages in the Scriblerians. See Christine Rees, "Gay, Swift, and the Nymphs of Drury-Lane," *Essays in Criticism*, 23 (1973), 1-21.
- ²⁴*The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, revised by Pierre Legouis and E. E. Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), I, 44, l.e., 1-2, 12-16.
- ²⁵The specifically Dutch associations of the tulip suggest the possibility that Johnson may also have had in mind the minute depiction of still lifes by the genre painters, though I think that Lodwick Hartley overemphasizes this possible connection in a rejoinder to Weinbrot, *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 8, (1975), 329-36. He usefully draws attention to the painterly phraseology in the tulip passage and to parallels in Reynolds.
- ²⁶*Poems*, Repr. by Hugh Macdonald (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 25, last stanza.
- ²⁷Interestingly, Pope's other reference to tulips in his poetry appears in "The Garden," an early imitation of Cowley.
- ²⁸*Lives*, I, 12.
- ²⁹*Ibid.*, 42.
- ³⁰*The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Abraham Cowley*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (Edinburgh: Constable, 1881), II, 181-82.
- ³¹*Lives*, I, 45.
- ³²*Ibid.*, 20.
- ³³London, 1762, p. 36.
- ³⁴*The Novels of Jane Austen*, ed. R. W. Chapman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), II, 156: Vol. II, chap. 5.
- ³⁵I am in agreement with Arthur H. Scouten's "Dr Johnson and Imlac," which insists that "Johnson had to be on guard against the vanity, or the logical trap, of exempting his own 'choice of life' from 'Hope's delusive mine,'" p. 506.