

Ariel**10****Rapid #: -2661920****IP: 150.135.238.50**

Status	Rapid Code	Branch Name	Start Date
Pending	PAU	Van Pelt	7/11/2009 3:59:30 PM

CALL #: PR3532 .A47**LOCATION:** PAU :: Van Pelt :: Van Pelt Library

TYPE: Article CC:CCL

JOURNAL TITLE: Transactions of the Samuel Johnson Society of the Northwest

USER JOURNAL TITLE: Transactions of the Samuel Johnson Society of the Northwest

PAU CATALOG TITLE: Transactions of the Samuel Johnson Society of the Northwest.

ARTICLE TITLE: Dr. Johnson and the Scots

ARTICLE AUTHOR: Carnie, Robert Hay

VOLUME: 4

ISSUE:

MONTH:

YEAR: ~~1972~~ 1971

PAGES: 19-41

ISSN: 0828-6515

OCLC #:

CROSS REFERENCE ID: 652034

ID:

VERIFIED:

BORROWER: AZU :: Main Library**PATRON:** CARNIE,ANDREW H

PATRON ID:

PATRON ADDRESS:

PATRON PHONE:

PATRON FAX:

PATRON E-MAIL: carnie@email.arizona.edu

PATRON DEPT: LINGUISTICS

PATRON STATUS: Faculty

PATRON NOTES:

This material may be protected by copyright law (Title 17 U.S. Code)
System Date/Time: 7/13/2009 7:10:34 AM MST

DR. JOHNSON AND THE SCOTS - ANOTHER LOOK

by Robert Hay Carnie

'No private views or personal regard can discharge any man from his general obligations to virtue and truth.'

- *Rambler* 136

I should perhaps start off by giving some kind of justification for treating this hoary topic at all as Johnson's biographers and critics have already said much on his relationship with Scotland and the Scots. Several reasons for having 'another look' spring to mind. Firstly, it is a tribute to Johnson's greatness as a writer and a man that each generation keeps finding him vital enough to relate what he was, what he said, and what he wrote to the predominant cultural interests and concerns of their own generation. Concern about the *nature of prejudice* towards ethnic and national groups is one of the prime intellectual obsessions of our age. The groups on whom most of this concern now centres are the negroes and the Jews, but it is worth remembering that anti-Scot prejudice is not unknown in England or in Ireland, or for that matter anti-English prejudice in Scotland, even today. The nature of prejudice, whether it be ethnic, or national, remains depressingly the same. If Thomas Campbell's *Diary*, first published in 1854, is to be believed, Johnson himself related prejudices about the Scots to the more extensive prejudices against the negroes and the Jews. Campbell

tells us that Johnson, when telling a good story about the difficulties of mapping Scotland because of the difficulty of getting people to survey it, also observed 'talking of their nationality - he said they were not singular - the negroes and Jews being so too.'¹ It is perhaps significant that when Boswell records the story² he omitted the reference to the other two groups.

Secondly, Johnson, whose concern for accuracy and truth, in the recording of biographical and historical matter, has often been commented on, would surely have disapproved of the tendency of some of his biographers to play down or obscure his ethnic and national prejudices. When Malone suggested to Johnson that Addison's character was so generally admirable that it was a pity that he had mentioned some of his minor flaws, Johnson insisted that a man's vices as well as his virtues should be treated in his biography.³ In *Rambler* 96 he gives an allegorical representation of *truth* in which he says: 'Truth . . . must force her passage. Every avenue was precluded by Prejudice and every heart preoccupied with passion'.⁴ He presumably would have approved of an attempt to state dispassionately the truth about his attitude to the inhabitants of North Britain.

Thirdly, and most immediately, although there has been much brilliant *general* biographical work on Johnson, the few papers which deal in modern times *specifically* with Johnson's views on the Scots, are inadequate in their analysis of the nature of prejudice. One well-known paper, Karl Brunner's 'Did Johnson hate Scotland and the Scottish?'⁵ is unsuccessful because of Brunner's failure to define his key terms, hate and prejudice. In fact there are seven terms 'hate, prejudice, dislike, bias, disbelief

and challenge' scattered about his paper as if they were synonymous or nearly so. Brunner's main defence of Johnson against charges of 'hate and prejudice' is that he finds in the *Journey* a number of successful critical generalisations about Scottish problems which are based on adequate evidence and are, therefore, acceptable. The *hate-prejudice* equation of Brunner is not acceptable; it is perfectly possible to have feelings of prejudice against a group which do not manifest themselves in such a strongly emotional form as 'hate'. As for the successful critical generalisations about Scottish problems, any careful reader of the *Journey* will recognise their value. But the careful reader will also find statements like 'A Scotchman must be a very sturdy moralist, who does not love Scotland better than truth: he will always love it better than inquiry; and if falsehood flatters his vanity, will not be very diligent to detect it.'⁶ Generalisations such as these -- this was the one which so offended David Hume -- are surely accurately described as 'faulty and misleading generalisations about a national group' and clearly indicate the presence of prejudice.

What I attempt to do in this paper, therefore, is to relate *some*, but by no means *all*, of Johnson's comments on the Scots to an account of the nature of 'group prejudice' which would be generally acceptable.⁷ I also try to relate what we know of Johnson's general personality to the modern psychologist's stereotype of the 'prejudiced' as opposed to the 'tolerant' personality and their recognition of the fact that in strongly prejudiced persons, group prejudice is very often 'acted out' in some way, but in others attempts are made to control or repress it. Lastly, I try to

suggest some ways in which Johnson's great and characteristic philosophical 'travelogue' *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*⁸ was affected both in choice of language and selection of topics *both* by Johnson's anti-Scots prejudice and by his strong desire, while writing the work, to keep this prejudice under control, and suggest that modern critics could look more closely at this conflict.

The NED defines prejudice as a 'feeling, favourable or unfavourable, towards a person or thing, prior to, or not based on actual experience.' This definition is useful in that it points out that prejudice is often related to lack of knowledge of, or evidence about, the object or person concerned. It also reminds us that there are favourable as well as unfavourable prejudices, and that they come in matching sets. Religious prejudices frequently do. Johnson's tolerance of Roman Catholicism and his rejection of Calvinism are closely related to his own Church of England position which may well have led him into faulty generalisations about the Presbyterians as a group and about the nation which conformed to this kind of worship. The specific kind of prejudice which we are discussing here - a prejudice about an identifiable group like the Scots - is not really covered by the NED definition, and I think there is utility in Allport's definition⁹ of what he calls a 'negative ethnic prejudice'. 'Ethnic prejudice is an antipathy towards a group based upon a faulty or inflexible generalisation. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed towards the group as a whole, or towards an individual because he is a member of that group.' This definition has, I think, when applied to Johnson and the Scots, a number of valuable features. The use of the

word 'antipathy' to describe the emotional state involved, allows the gamut of that emotion to extend from a mild dislike (sometimes largely concealed) to the kind of violent hate now getting physical expression in Northern Ireland. There is strong evidence in the *corpus* of Johnson's observations about the Scots that his antipathy to them varied in its emotional intensity and that he felt the need sometimes to disguise the intensity by pretending to be jocular. It was generally of the *mild dislike* kind, although he himself, when roused, could use the word 'hate' to describe it.¹⁰ There were certain areas of Scottish culture, such as Calvinism; certain political identifications, such as Scottish Whiggism; and certain sociological circumstances, such as the spectacle of the Scot *on the make* in England, which could intensify in Johnson his emotional dislike of the Scots.

The use of the word 'inflexible' in Allport's definition reminds one that it is possible to correct faulty generalisations about a group on the basis of new knowledge and thus escape from prejudice. It is the erroneous pre-judgement which is apparently *not* reversible when exposed to new knowledge or experience which reveals the existence of the strongly prejudiced mind. One would have liked to have seen more evidence in Johnson of changes of attitude towards the Scots *after* he had visited Scotland despite Boswell's claim that Johnson returned from Scotland with his prejudices much lessened.¹¹ One may, of course, only become aware of the intensity of a prejudice when it is threatened with contradiction from new experience, and one discovers how difficult it is to control emotional rejection of new facts. The truly prejudiced

mind also dislikes being reminded of 'old facts' which have been conveniently pushed aside to sustain a prejudiced attitude. Johnson's angry outburst "Sir, you know no more of our Church than a Hottentot" to the discourteous Presbyterian minister who reminded him of the presence of 'fat bishops and drowsy deans' in the Church of England, can only be fully explained in terms of an emotional defence of a prejudice in favour of his own church. Johnson preferred to reject such 'old facts' as clerics like his relative, Parson Ford, and the moral deficiencies of Gibbon's Oxford.

A feature of ethnic or national prejudice, then, is that there are generally two elements involved: the first of these being an emotional attitude, either of favour or disfavour, and the second a set of beliefs about the behaviour patterns, personal habits, physical features, attitudes towards money and so on, of the group in question, which tend to be brought up when the national or ethnic group in question is under discussion. One has an expectation with *tolerant* people that the basic emotional attitudes will be modified or reversed by new knowledge and experiences, experiences, for example of the kind that Johnson had on his visit to Scotland. But with persons suffering from a serious prejudice about a group, this, in fact, rarely happens; it is more likely that some of the beliefs may be grudgingly altered in order to keep the basic emotional attitude intact. It is instructive to look at Johnson's attitudes towards the Scots both before and after the famed 1773 journey. Johnson's anti-Scot prejudice was well known and loudly expressed before he set out. Boswell was aware of it before he met

Johnson. After the journey, in 1778, Johnson said to Fanny Burney about the unfortunate North Briton, Macartney, in her novel *Evelina*: 'What makes you so fond of the Scotch? I don't like you for that; I hate these Scotch, and so must you. I wish Branghton had sent the dog to jail. That Scotch dog Macartney.'¹² There is no question of teasing Boswell on this occasion for Boswell was not present. Johnson's new knowledge, derived from his tour, about the delights of Scottish breakfasts, the hospitality of Scottish landed gentlemen, the learning and devotion to pastoral duty of Scottish ministers may have affected some of his beliefs about the Scots, but do not seem to have affected his basic emotional attitude towards them as a group, for expressions of his anti-Scot emotional attitude continue. Incidentally, Fanny recorded in her *Diary* a number of stories about Johnson and the Scots, but she disapproved of Boswell for *publishing* such material in his *Journal of the Tour* and the *Life*. She said in 1791: 'How many starts of passion and prejudice has he blackened into record, that else might have sunk, forever forgotten, under the preponderance of weightier virtues and excellences.'¹³

An example of how certain 'trigger' topics brought Johnson's political and religious prejudices to the surface is well illustrated in the story of the altercation between Boswell's father, Lord Auchinleck, and his guest. Boswell tells us that he had pleaded with Johnson to stay off such dangerous subjects as Whiggism and Presbyterianism on which his father and Johnson differed so widely. Johnson courteously replied: 'I shall certainly not talk on subjects which I am told are disagreeable to

the gentleman under whose roof I am, especially I shall not do so to *your father*.'¹⁴ Lord Auchinleck presumably had the same good intentions for he had invited Johnson to his house although he was 'as sanguine a Whig and Presbyterian as Dr. Johnson was a Tory and a Church of England man.' When the rain kept them indoors Auchinleck showed Johnson his collection of medals, including an Oliver Cromwell item, which led inevitably to Charles I. Boswell says: 'They became exceedingly warm and violent and I was very much distressed at being present at such an altercation between two men, both of whom I revered.' Most discussions of Johnson's prejudices do not take sufficient account of the fact that when he tried to control them and failed, the final explosion tended to be a violent one. Johnson says nothing of this incident in the *Journey*; Boswell spares us the details, and it was left to Sir Walter Scott to tell us that this was one of the few occasions that Johnson met his match in aggressiveness, for when he asked what good Cromwell had done his country, Auchinleck answered that he 'gart kings ken they had a lith i' their neck.'¹⁵

Another mark of prejudiced statement - as opposed to a rational generalisation - is that such statements are often elevated to the rank of 'universal propositions'. Statements of the form 'many Scotsmen are clannish and stick together when living outside Scotland' may well be true, and were correctly observed of the Scots living in London in the eighteenth century. They become statements of a group prejudice when expressed in the form 'all Scotsmen are clannish etc.' Johnson has a habit of elevating some of his shakier historical generalisations about

Scotland before the Union in this way: 'their tables were coarse as the feasts of Eskimeaux, and their houses as filthy as the cottages of the Hottentots',¹⁶ is a statement which ignores a lot of contrary evidence and shows its emotional bias, once again, in the choice of the 'Hottentot' image. Boswell records (August 29) that Johnson exaggerated on this subject: 'Dr. Johnson expatiated rather too strongly upon the benefits derived to Scotland from the Union, and the bad state of our people before it. I am entertained with his copious exaggeration upon that subject; but I am uneasy when people are by, who do not know him as well as I do, and may be apt to think him narrow-minded. I therefore diverted the subject.'¹⁷

If one grants, on the basis of this kind of evidence, that Johnson in his attitude to national groups like the Scots, the Americans and the French tends towards the stereotype of the 'prejudiced' as opposed to the 'tolerant' personality, it is an appropriate biographical question to ask how far the prejudicial state of mind conditioned Johnson's actions with regard to Scotsmen. A prejudice can lead to various kinds of action; one can, for example, *talk* against the disliked group and the evidence of the eighteenth century biographers is that Johnson did this a good deal, and, in fact, may have worked off most of his prejudice in this way. One can also *write* against the disliked group. Johnson did not do this at all in the direct *propaganda* sense although the last part of this paper does argue that his state of mind about the Scots did affect the writing of the *Journey* in various ways. It is well known that Johnson was prepared to 'talk for victory'. Reynolds has recorded the

great regard he had for veracity when writing.¹⁸ His notorious scepticism about things which could not be verified comes out clearly in his discussion of Ossian and is equally well documented. In the *Rambler* and *Idler* essays we can find passages, allegorical and otherwise, (e.g. *Rambler*, 106, 136) on the importance of truth and the difficulty that imperfect mankind has in achieving it. This regard for truth is genuine, and central to his way of thought, but it is absurd for apologists like Tyers and Murphy to say 'that he *always* talked as if he was talking on oath'.¹⁹ When the subject of discourse was droves of Scotsmen, republican rogues or Whig dogs, truth was often blurred by prejudicial emotion.

A third kind of action towards a disliked group is avoidance of members of that group. As far as Johnson is concerned the evidence is mixed. Despite his close relationship with that uncharacteristic Scot, Boswell, one would obviously expect him to avoid places like the British Coffee House²⁰ which were largely frequented by Scotsmen and where his name was anathema, and I know of no evidence that he ever went there. It is on record that he once dined in David Hume's company²¹ and that, on another occasion, to quote E. C. Mossner, the Great Moralists walked out on the Great Infidel. He can hardly be said to have sought out Boswell's company at the beginning of their relationship. In fact, Boswell obtruded himself upon him, but the close friendship which developed, with its surrogate father overtones, led to the visit to Scotland and a considerable extension of the list of Johnson's Scottish friends. Johnson had a fair number of Scottish acquaintances, for

example, Blair, Beattie, Hailes and Guthrie whom he apparently liked and admired, although he was sometimes at pains to stress that it was *despite* their Scottishness. He actually said of Blair: 'I love Blair's *Sermons*. Though the dog is a Scotchman and a Presbyterian and everything he should not be . . .'²² One is reminded of the prejudiced man's 'Some of my best friends are Jews, but . . .' There is a story in *The London Chronicle* which, if genuine, may well sum up Johnson's attitude to mixing socially with Scotsmen. When accused of hatred after his Scottish journey he is reputed to have said: 'Sir, you are exceedingly misinformed with respect to this matter; I do not *hate* the Scots: Sir, I do not *hate* frogs, in the water, though I confess I do not like to have them hopping about my bedchamber.'²³ There is, thankfully, no sign at all in Johnson of the more unpleasant forms of *acting out* a prejudice against a group, such as social discrimination or violence. He did not apparently discriminate against the Scots in the Club or anywhere else. He employed Scots as amanuenses in his Dictionary work, and he had, for a while, an amiable Scottish slut, Polly Carmichael, amongst the extraordinary collection of house guests to whom he gave charity.²⁴ There was a possibility of violence between Johnson and 'Ossian' Macpherson, but the Scot was the initial aggressor in this case.

In the case then, of Dr. Johnson and the Scots, I would regard the charge of prejudice against the Scots, often demonstrated in *speech*, coming out occasionally in *writing*, and almost not at all in *action*, to be proven. This qualified verdict would, I think, be acceptable to the

more perceptive of his friends and biographers. Mrs. Thrale, Fanny Burney, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Arthur Murphy and many others recorded the existence of the prejudice, and in their various ways deplored it. Boswell was in a particularly difficult position because of his close relationship with Johnson and because of the fact that Johnson very often used him as a scapegoat for the supposed sins of countrymen, and Boswell extenuates many of Johnson's anti-Scots remarks by stressing their playfulness. But he too had a regard for truth; despite Johnson's charge of a 'national propensity for falsehood.' He says: 'The truth is, like the ancient Greeks and Romans, he allowed himself to look upon all nations but his own as barbarians: not only Hibernia and Scotland but also Spain, Italy and France are attacked in the same poem (London).' And later on in the same passage: 'He was indeed, if I may be allowed the phrase, at bottom, much of a John Bull; much of a blunt true-born Englishman.'²⁵

I think it is pointless to seek now for the origins of this prejudice. The psychologists tell us that the factors which lead individuals to form prejudices are complex. Their formation is related to the need to be a member of an 'in-group' and the consequent rejection of out-groups. They tell us too that these attitudes are established in childhood and by education or propaganda within the family. They also indicate that once such attitudes are established in a child there will be hostility to other 'out-groups'. You can, therefore, expect the anti-Scot, to be anti-French, and anti-American as well. They also suggest that an early experience of an unpleasant kind can create or

intensify an ethnic or national prejudice. Boswell once asked Johnson if he could trace the origins of his antipathy to the Scots. Johnson replied that he could not, which was probably a truthful answer, although he must have realised that the prejudice was later intensified when he formed his mature ideas on Church and government. Boswell even investigated the possibility of an early experience of an unpleasant kind. When Johnson told him of the brutality of his schoolmaster, Hunter, Boswell said: 'Hunter is a Scotch name. So it would seem this master who beat you so severely was a Scotchman. I can now account for your prejudice against the Scotch.'²⁶ Johnson ruined the theory by pointing out that Hunter was not, in fact, a Scot. One can still speculate, of course, that Johnson may have been frightened in his Lichfield childhood by a hairy Highlander who had ventured too far south during the '15 Rebellion! One could more seriously suggest that the rioting in Staffordshire at this time about the Jacobite cause, to say nothing of his father's latent Jacobite sympathies, may have cast Presbyterian Scots as 'bogeymen' in the young child's mind.

The second part of this paper concerns the ways in which Johnson's emotional conflicts about the Scots affected *The Journey to the Western Isles*. It should be noticed that I assume here that there was a conflict between Johnson's prejudices on one side and his desire to make significant reflections and truthful observations on the sights and national manners he had seen in Scotland on the other. In her introduction to the Yale edition Miss Lascelles points out that Johnson's letters to Mrs. Thrale, as well as Boswell's journals and papers, give

us unusual opportunities to view the *Journey* from other angles than that offered to us by the *Journey* itself and show how Johnson's capacity for reflection and generalisation, so clearly displayed in the *Journey*, give that version of the travels a richness of texture in the thought which Boswell's more factual narrative lacks.²⁷ One other advantage this multi-faceted view gives is that we can often have two Johnsonian statements and a Boswellian commentary on the same place or incident which allow us to observe Johnson's effort to be polite and dispassionate in his public version. Thus 'Kinghorn, a mean town . . . Kirkaldie, a very long town meanly built, and Cowpar which I could not see because it was night,' (Thrale letters) become in the *Journey* 'Kinghorn, Kirkcaldy and Cowpar, places not unlike the small or straggling market towns in those parts of England where commerce and manufactures have not yet produced opulence'. The 'dirty and despicable Dundee' of the letters becomes in the *Journey* 'Dundee, where I remember nothing remarkable'.²⁸ When Johnson describes the rigours of crossing Skye to reach Corrichtachan in the *Journey*, his tone is one of measured objectivity; when he describes the same thing to Mrs. Thrale, he grumbles that it 'affords only all the possible transpositions of bog, rock and rivulet.'²⁹ Such examples can be multiplied. The *Journey* very often adopts an explanatory tone, for example, about signs of primitive conditions, beggars, barefoot children and dirty floors, suitable to the *persona* of the non-prejudiced philosophic traveller. It was probably Boswell's consciousness of this effort on Johnson's part to sustain this role which explains his 'utter astonishment' at the way the *Journey* had been 'misapprehended, even to rancour, by many

of my countrymen.'³⁰ Johnson's general tone seems to me to be characteristic of a man who is deliberately and conscientiously trying to be fair; he is on his best behaviour. He starts off with a graciously turned compliment to Boswell, his *Scottish* fellow-traveller; he praises the roads, 'neither rough nor dirty', the agreeable absence of tollgates, the civility of the professors at St. Andrews; 'the elegance of lettered hospitality' and all this comes from a man who once told Boswell, in a conversation with Wilkes, that he had taken him to visit Lichfield to see what civilisation was really like for in Scotland he lived with savages.³¹ Johnson's efforts to sustain this tone of kindly objectivity predictably breaks down at the signs of the ruins of St. Andrews Cathedral. The reformers are 'ruffians', their religious beliefs 'sullen scrupulousness', and their fervour 'epidemical enthusiasm'. At the sight of a ruined cathedral, a neglected church, or the island of Iona, Johnson's choice of words loses much of the judiciousness and benevolence it otherwise has. Dislike of the excesses of the Protestant reformation is a perfectly rational dislike, but in Johnson, it emotionally extends itself into unbalance. The positive side of Calvinism is ignored in utterances like 'the malignant influence of Calvinism has blasted ceremony and decency together.'³² One would have liked him to mourn the iconoclasm of presbyterian bigotry without implying barbarian wantonness. On the other hand Johnson's accounts of the barren and beautiful mountainous wastes which make up the Highlands and Islands of Scotland are carefully and judiciously done. Scott and others have noted Johnson's frequent statements of his belief that the Highlands could be improved by plantations of forests and

orchards and attribute much of the improvement of thirty to forty years later to his influence. 'His remarks concerning the poverty and barrenness of the country tended to produce these subsequent exertions which have done much to remedy the causes of reproach.'³³ Johnson comments practically on deficiencies that in his view could be put to rights with effort and labour. The emphasis that Johnson lays on the apparent sloth of the Highlanders, their preference for pleasure and indolence over labour has led one Johnsonian critic, Miss Durkee, to suggest that Johnson's stress on these aspects of Highland behaviour is closely associated with Johnson's life-long struggle, so clearly indicated in his *Prayers and Meditations*, with his own spiritual imperfections, his own indolences, folly, and love of sensual pleasure which torture him in his prayers and private thoughts from the age of twenty-nine right down to his last years. She says, 'May it not be that this identification, conscious or unconscious, of his own life with the barrenness of Scotland is the determining factor in Johnson's 'prejudice' against the nation.'³⁴ I do not know about *determining factor* but I think she is certainly right in suggesting that the melancholic piety of these parts of the *Journey* are strongly reminiscent of his personal meditations. I would like tentatively to suggest that Johnson's innermost fears and apprehensions about his failure to live up to the standards of excellence and achievement which he believed he owed to God may have caused him to transfer some of his own hated traits to the Scots by the psychological process called 'projection' i.e. the tendency to attribute to a group we dislike motives and traits that are, in fact our own. In

its more obvious forms projection is used by an individual as a means to lessen inner conflict by ascribing, to another person or group, emotions, motives and behaviour which actually belong to the person who projects them. The attractions of this suggestion may be more specious than real. Projection is commonly used to resolve inner conflicts by people who have little power of self-analysis or self-insight, and one might well object that this is *not* true of Johnson. Recent scholarship has suggested that he had extraordinary psychological insights on the nature of frustration, and the complex nature of human motivation. The ability to apply these insights to the characters and problems of others, however, does not necessarily mean that Johnson understood himself and it remains noteworthy that the kinds of flaws in personality that Johnson finds in the Highland Scots resemble those that he saw in himself.

Some kind of analysis of the counter-prejudice which revealed itself in the Scots by their reaction to Johnson's *Journey* would require another paper. It may be sufficient to quote part of a response, more measured and restrained than some of the appalling, violent denunciations of Johnson's personality and motivations which appeared in print after the publication of the *Journey*.³⁵ Sir William Forbes wrote to the Hon. John Forbes of Pitsligo in February, 1775: 'I have likewise used the freedom to send Johnson's Tour through the Highlands which has just come from London, and is much the subject of conversation here at the present. I hope it may amuse you and Mrs. Forbes. The Doctor is a man of very eminent merit in many respects but he is subject to inveterate prejudices, which indeed are very conspicuous in many places in this

publication: he is likewise very blind and very deaf: owing to all which it is not surprising that he should fall into many mistakes, but it may very reasonably be asked why the Dr. under all these disadvantages, should have undertaken to describe a country of which, at the best, he could know but little, from barely riding through it.'³⁶ Modern readers can only be glad he did. The critical debate on the nature of the merits of the *Journey* continues. Patrick O'Flaherty has recently contended that Johnsonian critics like Greene, Tracy and Schwartz have exaggerated the picture of Johnson 'as a dynamic thinker, breaking new ground in intellectual history, capable, even at a late age, of rejecting his own settled opinions, welcoming the challenge of new experience, and emerging with new and startling insights.'³⁷ O'Flaherty asks the question "Did those experiences (in Scotland) cause any major rethinking of Johnson's previously held views about Scotland and primitive life in general, or did they merely serve to confirm and reinforce already formulated attitudes?" O'Flaherty's answer to this question is a resounding *yes*, and he finds everywhere in the *Journey* condescension and hostility towards Scotland and its people arising out of Johnson's anti-Scot prejudices. He concludes: 'In the *Journey* he is revealed as a thinker whose opinions about men and society were established, once and for all, as a static, not a dynamic thinker, as a pontificator upon the world, not an explorer of experience. His mind was so firmly made up, his views so hard and settled, that not even the raw evidence of primitive Scotland could provoke a rethinking of his preconceptions and biases.'³⁸ I tend to agree with Sherbo³⁹ that O'Flaherty's is a selective reading which

deals with the *positive* side of Johnson's account of Scotland by ignoring it or slanting it. Neither O'Flaherty's paper or Sherbo's defence of Johnson make any attempt to analyse the nature of group prejudice, and to what extent Johnson's anti-Scot prejudice produced that conflict between his deep-rooted emotional attitudes and his equally strong desire to write rationally and philosophically about his Scottish experiences. It is precisely this conflict - a conflict between emotion and reason - that makes the *Journey* such a characteristic and absorbing book.

Footnotes

¹Thomas Campbell, *Diary of a visit to England in 1775*, ed. J. L. Clifford (Cambridge University Press, 1947), p. 76.

²Boswell's version of the story in his Journal for 14 April is quoted by Clifford in his notes, p. 130.

³James Boswell, *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1887), iv, 53.

⁴Samuel Johnson, *The Rambler*, ed. W. J. Bate and A. B. Strauss (Yale, 1969), p. 151. (Yale Edition of *The Works*, Vol. IV)

⁵Karl Brunner, "Did Dr. Johnson hate Scotland and the Scottish?" *English Studies*, XXX (Oct. 1949), 184-90.

⁶Samuel Johnson, *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*, ed. M. Lascelles (Yale, 1971), p. 119. (Yale Edition of *The Works*, Vol. IX)

⁷Most of the comments by Johnson on the Scots are to be found in the *Journey* and *Boswell's Life*, and others elsewhere can be tracked down with the aid of the admirable indices to the Hill-Powell edition. I have tried to make my choice of illustrations as fair as is compatible with a necessarily selective process.

⁸James L. Clifford and Donald J. Greene, *Samuel Johnson: A survey and bibliography of critical studies* (Minneapolis, 1970). Section 21 gives the best guide to the miscellaneous writing about the *Journey* up to 1968.

⁹Gordon W. Allport, *The nature of prejudice* (Boston, 1954), p. 9. I would like to express my indebtedness to this admirable study in clarifying my thinking on the nature of group prejudice. The debt is pervasive throughout the whole paper.

¹⁰John Wain, ed. *Fanny Burney's Diary* (London, 1961), p. 70.

¹¹James Boswell, *Journal of a tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson, LL.D.*, ed. R. W. Chapman (London, 1924) O.S.A. reprint, 1948, p. 173.

¹²*Fanny Burney's Diary*, ed. Wain, p. 70. Miss Burney comments that Johnson said this with a 'droll' look.

¹³*Ibid.*, p. 243.

¹⁴*Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, p. 415.

¹⁵See Boswell's *Life*, ed. G. B. Hill, v. 382-3.

¹⁶*Journey*, p. 28.

¹⁷*Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, p. 240.

¹⁸George Birkbeck Hill, *Johnsonian Miscellanies* (Oxford, 1897), ii, 223.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, i, 458 and ii, 365. Tyers ruins his case by asserting in the same sketch that Johnson was skilled at causistry. ii, 366.

²⁰Campbell, *Diary of a visit to England in 1775*, p. 49; p. 114.

²¹E. C. Mossner, *The Life of David Hume* (Austin, 1954), p. 438; p. 586.

²²Boswell's *Life*, iv, 98.

²³I owe the story to J. L. Clifford's note in his edition of Campbell's *Diary of a visit to England in 1775*, p. 130.

²⁴*Fanny Burney's Diary*, p. 80.

²⁵*Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, p. 172.

²⁶*Boswell's Life*, ii, 146-7.

²⁷*A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*, intro. xiii-xiv.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 4; p. 11.

²⁹*Letters of Samuel Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1892), p. 254.

³⁰*Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, p. 173.

³¹*Boswell's Life*, iii, 77. Boswell insists that Johnson and Wilkes were amusing themselves persevering 'in the old jokes', but humour does not make this story and the other in this passage any less prejudiced.

³²*Journey*, p. 65.

³³Sir Walter Scott, *Lives of the Novelists*, ed. A. Dobson (London, 1906), p. 158. (OUP's *The World's Classics* edition)

³⁴Elizabeth Durkee, "The barren years: a further consideration of Johnson's prejudice against Scotland," *Journal of the Rutgers University Library*, XXVII (1963), 1-18.

³⁵The fullest list of these for the period 1749 to 1784 can be found in Miss McGuffie's "Samuel Johnson and the hostile press" (Diss. Columbia University, 1961).

³⁶NLS MSS, 3112, f. 25.

³⁷Patrick O'Flaherty, "Johnson in the Hebrides: philosopher becalmed," *Studies in Burke and His Time*, XIII(1), 1986-2001.

³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 2001.

³⁹Arthur Sherbo, "Some animadversions on Patrick O'Flaherty's Journey to the Western Islands," *Studies in Burke and his Time*, XIII(2), 2119-2127. Sherbo's observation on Mrs. Thrale's use of the word *hatred* to describe Johnson's attitude towards the Scots ignores the fact that Johnson used the word himself in this context on at least one occasion.