



Memoir on Hugh Miller (1802–1856) by his son Hugh Miller (1850–1896) in  
*Calotypes by D. O. Hill and R. Adamson: illustrating an early stage in the  
development of photography. Selected from his collection by Andrew Elliot , 1928*  
Transcribed and annotated by Michael A Taylor 2017  
<http://repository.nms.ac.uk/1606>

Deposited on: 31 May 2016

NMS Repository – Research publications by staff of the National Museums Scotland

<http://repository.nms.ac.uk/>

**Memoir on Hugh Miller (1802–1856) by his son Hugh Miller (1850–1896) in *Calotypes* [...] (1928)**

Transcribed and annotated by Michael A. Taylor, with the kind permission of Henry McKenzie Johnston CB on behalf of the Miller family; and with the kind assistance of Becky Howell and colleagues (Scottish National Portrait Gallery) and technical assistance from Richard C. Harley, December 2017. Transcript is verbatim except for converting the asterisks, etc., used to indicate the original footnotes into numbers. Modern comments [in square brackets] have also been added, especially to indicate original pagination identify some references and allusions.

[MILLER, H., the younger], as 'H.M.', 1928. Hugh Miller, pp. 13–18 and photographic carbon print in HILL, D. O. and ADAMSON, R., 1928. *Calotypes by D. O. Hill and R. Adamson: illustrating an early stage in the development of photography. Selected from his collection by Andrew Elliot.* Printed for private circulation, Edinburgh.

[original text begins: page 13]

HUGH MILLER.

HUGH MILLER, man of letters and geologist, was born at Cromarty, 10th October 1802. On his father's side he came of a long line of seafaring men, who for more than a hundred years had found their graves in the ocean. His father was a man of great strength, courage, and moral steadfastness, and rose in the world; but he was lost in the Moray Firth, with his trading sloop and all hands, when Hugh was but five years old. The father's best legacy to the son was Saxon force of intellect and strength of purpose; from his mother he inherited a strong dash of Celtic blood, that had flowed, two generations before, in the veins of Donald Roy, a sage and seer long remembered in Ross-shire. She was a woman of picturesque and, in some respects, powerful mind, but deeply coloured with the superstitions of the place and time. Her two brothers – thoughtful, observant, book-loving men – were the best guides of her son's boyhood. Hugh learned his first letters from the shop signboards when scarcely out of his nurse's arms, but his schooling made no great progress. He read greedily, but not in his school-books. The wrong end of his exercise-books generally evinced more right sense in rhyme and prose than ever found its way into the other. Yet in the open school of Nature he was a delighted and infinitely assiduous student. He became a keen

and incessant observer, a collector of shells and stones; and his native Cromarty, with its wide bay, its cave-hollowed rocks, its natural history without, and its quaint human history within, was a fit nursery for his genius. In the village school he was incorrigibly truant and careless; and after a violent personal encounter with the dominie, he summarily left it, revenging himself on his antagonist ere night in verse quite pointed enough to sting. He had in truth become a wild, intractable lad. He formed his chosen companions into a gang of youthful rovers and orchard robbers; but even these he infected with his own insatiable love of reading and rhyming. At his wildest he was the editor and supporter of a boyish "Village Observer." The necessity for labour won him from these ways. He was apprenticed to a stone-mason at seventeen, settled into mental sobriety and an absolute purity of life that was spotless from first to last, became an excellent workman, and found a manly pride in standing by his unwritten indentures in circumstances that would have warranted him in breaking them. It had ere this become a law of his nature that whatever occupied his hands should engage also his mind; and seeing ripple marks on the quarry-bed, "the necessity that had made him a quarrier taught him also to be a geologist."<sup>1</sup> His mind had taken a scientific cast even before he knew it. His first science, in fact, had been child-science.

Miller pursued his mason's craft in barrack or bothy, in different parts of the highlands and lowlands of Scotland; sometimes in towns, oftener among scenes of nature, but always ceaselessly cultivating his powers, – observing, studying, reflecting, and writing, – and amassing within a faultless memory stores of knowledge of books and men, of contemporary history, and of the strata of society. Few men have so thoroughly developed their own brain-power. He became a correct versifier and a writer of vigorous prose. Meanwhile his strengthening moral nature slowly gravitated towards Christianity, which, at twenty-five, after some years of examination and thought, became the great determining principle in his life; remaining [page 14 begins] throughout, in its truths and manifestations, not less assured for him than the certainties of science. His merits gradually became known. He formed the acquaintance of persons of refinement and literary taste, among whom were Dr Carruthers of the *Inverness Courier*, and his own eloquent parish minister, Stewart of Cromarty. In 1829 he published *Poems written in the Leisure Hours of a Journeyman Mason*, a volume that drew the eyes of not a few able critics – among them Leigh Hunt –

---

<sup>1</sup> [Paraphrased from p. 148, Miller, H. 1854. *My schools and schoolmasters; or, the story of my education*. Johnstone and Hunter, Edinburgh.]

northwards to Cromarty. His poems, however, are prevailingly sombre and heavy; they lack the flow of rhythm and the expressiveness that mark the prose he was as yet keeping at home; and Miller wisely abandoned poetry. *Letters on the Herring Fishery*, reprinted from the *Inverness Courier* by his friend Carruthers, furnished a better sample of his powers. His science had scarcely yet fruited, but with him ordinary observation had all its accuracy, and we find in these letters much that afterwards made him the illustrator of Geology – great powers of presentment and a delicate poetic colouring.

At thirty-two his reputation in his native town brought him an accountantship in its branch bank. In the same year he married Lydia Falconer Fraser, after an almost idyllic courtship. His love for this lady, herself endowed with much feminine brilliancy of intellect, was like a dividing firmament between a life of intellectual acquirement which, though strenuous, was often dreamy, and a life of ceaseless fruition. His first lasting mark in literature was *Scenes and Legends of the North of Scotland*, – a work which dealt with the traditions of his native Cromarty. A mind that was to find its most congenial occupation in producing graphic *restorations* of geological scenery and old-world life had, naturally enough, looked round first upon the antiquities of its native village. But in one of the chapters of the book – *The Antiquary of the World* – he appeared as something *more* than the antiquary of a village. His scientific aptitudes had found a field and expression. He was visited by Malcolmson and Fleming. He led them over fossil fish beds of the Old Red Sandstone which he had been quietly examining for years. He was brought into correspondence with Murchison and Agassiz; and with but little aid from without, amassed the materials for his work on *The Old Red Sandstone*. Meanwhile, he was still labouring at the uncongenial bank desk.

There was something dearer to him, however, than literature, science, or even home. Since 1834 (it was now 1839) he had been an intensely interested spectator of the attempts of the Church of Scotland to neutralise the unhappy effects of Patronage. He deemed it full time that the people should reclaim the right of free election and unquestioned rejection of pastors which had been provided for them by John Knox, and confirmed, as they had thought, by the Articles of Union and a subsequent Act of Security, and yet, after all, had been quietly taken from them by an Act of the time of Queen Anne, and was still unwisely withheld. In May 1839 it was decided in the House of Lords that the rights of Patronage were “inconsistent with the exercise of any volition on the

part of the people, however expressed.”<sup>2</sup> Hugh Miller at once took the measure of the situation. Parliament – Whigs and Tories alike, – the Civil Court, – the Patrons, – all were hostile to the Church's claims. The only hope of an ecclesiastical Reform Bill for Scotland lay in the Scottish people; and feeling and seeing that they were as yet indifferent to the question, he set himself to do what he could to bring the people up to the Church's assistance. His *Letter to Lord Brougham* is a “noble,”<sup>3</sup> effective, and unanswerable composition, not technically disputing his Lordship's law, but occupying the whole breadth of the historical ground, and the inalienable popular rights. It was closely followed by a kindred pamphlet on *The Whiggism of the Old School*; and in January 1840 Hugh Miller was brought to Edinburgh by the leaders of the party of *non-intrusion* as editor of the *Witness* newspaper. He accepted the post with strange diffidence in his own powers. Once at the editorial desk, however, he found himself – at least for the time – in his right place. There was not at first even a reporter to be had for the paper. With but one ally, Hugh Miller had to stand [page 15 begins] against the whole newspaper press of the kingdom. But the *Witness* soon became identified with one voice and one man, and so rapidly did it rise in circulation that within a few years it could dispute precedence with the foremost Scottish newspaper. The efforts to inform and arouse the people met with signal success. Signatures to non-intrusion petitions increased five-fold. Already at the general election of 1841 all candidates (with but one exception) were advocating some popular modification of Patronage. In 1843 two-thirds of the membership deserted a church whose spiritual powers the Civil Courts seemed to have appropriated; and then followed the crowning successes – contributions for immediate purposes twenty times greater than had ever before been raised voluntarily in Scotland, and the efficient founding of the Free Church. A secession of clergy would have been but a protest: this disruption of both ministers and people was little less than a revolution. Whether the press or the platform was foremost in producing the awakening that led to it is vain to ask. Hugh Miller's writings worked in Scotland as a living power, and he now stands, beside Chalmers, as one of the historical figures of the Scottish Disruption – an event whose issues are held to have justified Lord Cockburn's estimate of it as the “greatest event in Scotland since 1745, if not since the Union.”<sup>4</sup> Often did

---

<sup>2</sup> Lord Chancellor Cottenham, House of Lords, May 3rd.

<sup>3</sup> Chalmers [Rev. Professor Thomas Chalmers (1780 - 1847), theologian and a leader of the Free Church of Scotland.

<sup>4</sup> *Life of Lord Jeffrey*, vol. 1, p. 387 [= Paraphrased from Cockburn, H. T. 1852. *Life*

Chalmers speak of Miller as the greatest of Scotsmen since the death of Scott.

The abstract question of spiritual independence Hugh Miller comparatively seldom touched. He may have felt that a question which men like Norman Macleod could honestly misunderstand was scarcely suited for the watchword of a great reform. He had at first held that the clergy were bound by sacred obligations neither to yield to civil control, nor to desert the church, and but for the "scandalous ignorance" – the epithet is that of Macaulay's biographer<sup>5</sup> – of the government, regardless of the voice of the people, and "smiling at the idea of clergymen renouncing livings,"<sup>6</sup> secession might have been avoided.

In the Free Church – its career all before it, Miller beheld the materials, and a unique opportunity, for the realisation of his ideal national church – a church that, reared alongside the Establishment (which he at that time held, with Chalmers, to be a "moral nullity"), should, without self-aggrandisement, but by pure moral force, overshadow and absorb it. "The church of the future," he insisted, "must be missionary not political." It was with great sorrow that he saw his church, after the death of Chalmers, and under the manipulation, as he thought, of her more active leaders, abandoning the vantage ground of her high and unique claim, and ranging herself on the common dissenting level.

Science was now his relaxation and holiday work. In 1840, chapters on *The Old Red Sandstone, or New Walks in an Old Field* appeared serially in the *Witness*, and were republished in 1841, with remarkable figures of "Old Red" fishes from his own pencil. By this work geologists were delighted and astonished.<sup>7</sup> Their dry science was laboriously making its way, but none too quickly; they gladly hailed this new worker and brilliant illustrator, and at once accorded to the Old Red Sandstone as a formation an importance scarcely before recognised. His technical ichthyology was based on Agassiz's contemporary researches among the fishes of the "Old Red," but it contained important improvements, and the

---

of Lord Jeffrey with a selection from his correspondence. Black, Edinburgh]

<sup>5</sup> [Vol. 2, p. 178 in Trevelyan, G. O. 1876. *The life and letters of Lord Macaulay* [...]. Longman, Green & Co., London.]

<sup>6</sup> [Vol. 1, p. 390, Cockburn 1852 as fn. 4 above.]

<sup>7</sup> Buckland [William Buckland (1784–1856), Reader in geology at the University of Oxford. A partly inaccurate paraphrase of his comments on Miller's 1840 *Witness* articles on fossil fishes at the time of the British Association meeting of 1840, quoted by the publisher of Miller's 1841 book *The Old Red Sandstone* [...], which was based in part on those articles].

best part of the work was founded entirely on original observation. "The more I study the fishes of the 'Old Red,'" wrote Professor Huxley twenty years afterwards, "the more I am struck with the patience and sagacity manifested in Hugh Miller's researches, and by the natural insight which in his case seems to have supplied the place of special anatomical knowledge."<sup>8</sup> Common sense, insight, and sheer love of labour gave him a grasp of the scientific method in *palaeontology*; his powerful imagination, again, delighted in pictorial restorations of ancient physical geographies, and he thus instinctively realised, so far as in his time was possible, the chief end of *geology*. His power of scientific illustration probably remains unrivalled. "In the correct and simple beauty of calm thought, even Miller," as Lord Cockburn truly says, "falls short [page 16 begins] of Playfair."<sup>9</sup> In point and incisiveness he is surpassed by Professor Huxley; in graceful directness of diction by Archibald Geikie;<sup>10</sup> and in beauty of style perhaps by Henry Drummond.<sup>11</sup> But for vividness, picturesqueness, and above all, in lucid and glowing illustration, nicely adjusted both to the thing illustrated and the thing illustrating, he seems to stand alone.

In 1845, broken down in health by excessive labour, he visited England, and his *First Impressions of England and its People* appeared in 1846. In 1847 he published *Footprints of the Creator, or the Asterolepis of Stromness*, being a reply to the *Vestiges of Creation*, a work now disparaged even by evolutionists.<sup>12</sup> It was received in its time as a valued accession both to Christian apologetics and to palaeontology. Agassiz affixed his scientific *imprimatur* to the American edition

---

<sup>8</sup> [Untraced; assumed to be a letter direct to the author, or the Miller family, from Thomas H. Huxley (1825–1895).]

<sup>9</sup> [p. 359, Cockburn, H. C. 1856. *Memorials of his time*. Black, Edinburgh. Henry Cockburn (1779–1854), Scots barrister, judge and historian.]

<sup>10</sup> [Perhaps Geikie, A. 1882. *Geological sketches at home and abroad*. Macmillan, London. But it could refer to earlier articles in periodicals, such as, indeed, those collected in that volume. Archibald Geikie (1835–1924) was the younger Miller's superior in the Geological Survey.]

<sup>11</sup> [Probably the first major book by Henry Drummond, though it could possibly refer to earlier articles in periodicals: Drummond, H. 1883. *Natural law in the spiritual world*. Hodder and Stoughton, London. Henry Drummond (1851–1897), geologist, writer on theology, soon to be professor at the Free Church College in Glasgow, and later the Free Church's main exponent of Darwinian evolution.]

<sup>12</sup> See Huxley, article *Evolution*, *Encyclopaedia Britannica* ['Evolution in biology', 9<sup>th</sup> edition of 1878, vol. VIII, pp. 744–751].

in the form of a memoir of the writer. Many of the fossils described in this volume he owed to the labours of his devoted friend Robert Dick of Thurso.

With Agassiz and Edward Forbes, Hugh Miller believed in creation by a method not now in operation. To a mind devoutly looking for a resurrection, or *re-creation*, still future, this view of the beginning of things could present no difficulty. He, therefore, upheld the *miracle* of creation versus the *law* of development, and set himself to prove that the earliest fossils, and more especially the fishes of the "Old Red," were as advanced of their kind as those that have lived since, or that live now. Recent science discards much that he founded upon. His *Asterolepis* is a gigantic *Cocosteus*; its jaws and scales are those of *Glyptolepis*;<sup>13</sup> it is more insisted upon that though the earlier Placoids and Ganoids range high as fishes, they also descend low; and the discovery of intermediate links between fishes and reptiles, reptiles and birds, and among the fossil horses,<sup>14</sup> gives a different complexion to much of the general palaeontologic evidence. But his chief problem, the persistence of types, – types, for instance, such as that of the new-found scorpions of Silurian times,<sup>15</sup> – remains an unsolved problem still; and his declaration that the doctrine of development is irreconcilable with the Christian doctrines of the Fall, the Mediation, and the Redemption, if it be untrue, has yet to be proved so.

In 1852 Miller published his autobiography, *My Schools and Schoolmasters*, a work that bids fair to retain perennial freshness in English literature. His next volume received its final corrections on the last day of his life.

The *Testimony of the Rocks*, like his controversial work the *Footprints*, mainly deals with the borderland between science and religion. On the determinateness of the borderland, therefore, depends the permanent value which the future will accord to the work. Miller set aside, as was quite necessary, Chalmers's earlier view, that the chaos of Genesis separated between the

---

<sup>13</sup> [Perhaps from an address by Ramsay Traquair (1840–1912), Keeper of Natural History at the Edinburgh Museum of Science and Art: Traquair, R. H. 1880. *Proceedings of the Royal Physical Society of Edinburgh* **5**, 137–161.]

<sup>14</sup> [Those 'intermediate links' were particularly topical in the later 1870s, e. g. Huxley, T. H. 1880. On the application of the laws of evolution to the arrangement of the vertebrata and more particularly of the Mammalia. *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* **for 1880**, 649–661; Bowler, P.J. 1996. *Life's splendid drama. Evolutionary biology and the reconstruction of life's ancestry, 1860–1940*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.]

<sup>15</sup> [Known since 1859, e. g. *Slimonia stylops* Salter, 1859.]

creation of the past and the creation of the present. He took the six days of creation as synonymous with six periods, and sublimed them into representative *visions* of the progress of creation. Except for his idea, indeed, that the seventh day is the Sabbath of Redemption, – God resting *now*, we might for *period* substitute the developmental idea of *stage*. His view of the geologic progress may be summed up in one of his own sentences. “The long ascending line from dead matter to man,” he says “has been a progress God-ward; not an asymptotical progress,<sup>16</sup> but destined from the beginning to furnish a point of union; and occupying that point, as true God and true Man, we recognise the Adorable Monarch of all the future.” The *Testimony of the Rocks* has exerted an influence that latterly seems to have become curiously dissociated from any necessary acceptance of its views. It sustained, in Scotland at least, the calm confidence inspired by Chalmers, that geology and Scripture are not in conflict. The atmosphere to this day has remained comparatively clear; science, religion, and the progress of both, have benefited thereby. “Rightly understood,” says Miller, speaking of Genesis, “I know not a single truth that militates against the minutest or least prominent of its details.” The declaration has had its weight. [page 17 begins]

All Hugh Miller’s works, except the *Footprints* and the *Testimony*, were first given to the readers of the *Witness* in its columns. They represent only a fraction of his work. His leading articles were elaborated with the same unstinted expenditure of thought, workmanship, and ornament as his books. He retained his old mason habit of leaving every piece of building as good as he could make it. Many of his “leaders” attained a longevity very unusual with productions of their class; some of them went into pamphlets at the time, some others were republished after his death. Five years after it started, the *Witness* became the joint property of himself and his business partner, Robert Fairly. On vital questions, both public and internal, its sentiments diverged from the guiding majorities of the Free Church. In politics Miller called himself an “old Whig,” – he was in reality an Independent Liberal – “Whig in principle, Tory in feeling,” as he had long before described himself. He held aloof both from “*Edinburgh Review Whigs*” and “*Blackwood Magazine Tories*,” not deeming it the duty of private persons to swell political parties, and holding especially, that “right and wrong are words of much more emphatic meaning than Whig and Tory.” His aim was to inform men’s minds, not to influence their votes. But his influence was too strong not to be worth securing, and for years he stood, like a

---

<sup>16</sup> Progress along approaching lines without a meeting point.

rock in the tideway, between the swirl of Parliament House Whigs and the undercurrent of Free Church committees. More and more as time went on, Hugh Miller, in the words of the *Scotsman*, “gave dignity and character to the newspaper press of Scotland.”<sup>17</sup> And it was a wholesome thing for the Scotland of his time that on public questions of principle one of the strongest of Scottish heads was so scrupulously pondering and so independently judging.

What might be termed his newspaper-teaching was marked by individuality and clear-sightedness. In government he would fain have seen better reflected the collective Christianity of the country – a proposal that seems still to bring an inexplicable smile upon Whig faces. For the better-being of Scotland he would have gladly seen more self-government. It would have prevented the disruption, he said, and many a ruinous delay besides. In education he held with the national, not the sectarian, and favoured no narrow restriction of subjects; and in *Thoughts on the Education Question* (1850) outlined a scheme now substantially law.<sup>18</sup> Better than his contemporaries he knew the power of the masses; he had an almost excessive fear that the gap between lower and upper classes might be so widened that the one class should rush in upon the other with the violence of revolution. He therefore advocated, besides education, a moderate extension of the franchise, the abolition of entail, and the curtailment of the game laws, which he emphatically termed the “crime-making” laws. He exposed and denounced the Sutherlandshire *clearings*, and the subsequent intolerant refusal of sites to the Free Church, but he countenanced no vision of *clearing* the proprietors. His quite realisable ideal, for Highlands and Lowlands alike, was a numerous peasantry, facilities for peasant-proprietorship, and a regulated emigration. He long foresaw the repeal of the Corn Laws to be inevitable; the tenant’s true policy, he urged, was to move, not for protection, but for good terms from landlords and compensation for improvements. Of the evils of the bothy system and the defects of labourer’s houses he spoke from an experience of which every item lay preserved in his memory. To Chartism he was hostile, but more to its method than its claim. Strikes he discouraged. He accepted a poor-law for Scotland with sorrow as necessary, – thanks to the inefficiency of the old church-administration of relief. Each poorhouse he would have had to aim at being self-supporting by division of the pauper-workers into

---

<sup>17</sup> [Paraphrased from Anon. 1856. Death of Hugh Miller. *Scotsman* 27 December 1856, p. 3.]

<sup>18</sup> [Presumably a reference to the *Education (Scotland) Act 1872*, which brought in compulsory state-supported education.]

“raiment producers” and “sustenance producers.” The “stalk of carle-hemp”<sup>19</sup> in Hugh Miller was undoubtedly his Puritanism, though he found no difficulty in reconciling his own love of Puritanism, of science, and of Burns. Subjects such as Puseyism, Maynooth, and Sunday railway-traffic, seemed always to lay it bare. In Puseyism he saw only an “inclined slide” into Popery; in Episcopacy, the creeping on to Scottish soil of a tide that would cover her dearest landmarks. He held that Protestantism is inwoven with the constitution, and that in all countries Popery is adverse to [page 18 begins] order and progress. His remedy for Ireland was to educate and Protestantise, and the grant to Maynooth he would gladly have seen converted into a grant to science.

In public questions he sometimes bore a part that engendered heat and even flame. A man of peace, he had yet formidable elements as a man of war. He was laboriously fair to the arguments of an antagonist; little regardful of mere personalities; he corrected a few mistakes or misrepresentations calmly enough; but anything having the semblance of persistent indignity to truth aroused his wrath; extreme diffidence was exchanged for exultation in the fight; and he was apt to strike too hard and fight too long. Tenacity was one of his supreme qualities, but it was the cause also of almost his only mistakes. Tenacity in controversy made him the too-rugged combatant he sometimes was; tenacity to his class, added to an extreme modesty, kept him from the friendship of such men as Jeffrey, Cockburn, and Argyll; tenacity to his post made him hold by his Free Church editorship when his best work for his church was done; and tenacity in labour brought him to his too early death. For he was, as Dr John Brown has said of him, an “inexorable taskmaster” of his own energies.<sup>20</sup> No power seemed sufficient to take him from work till it was done. As early as 1846, when he was writing his *First Impressions of England*, his friend Makgill Crichton went in distress from friend to friend, saying “Miller is killing himself, working *always* up yonder. Can *no* one get him out?” It was the nature of the man. Youth and strength, when he had them, grew haggard and lax at such times. The seeds of the “stone-mason’s disease” had been sown in his constitution long before,

---

<sup>19</sup> [carle-hemp = the sex of the hemp plant with the coarser and stronger stalk, then thought to be male (but in fact female). Hence the Scots expression ‘stalk o carle-hemp’, tough fibre, element of firmness, as when describing a stubborn boy. Compare Robert Burns, ‘Come, firm Resolve, take thou the van, /Thou stalk o carle-hemp in man!’ in his poem ‘Epistle to Dr. Blacklock’.]

<sup>20</sup> [p. 217 in Brown, J. 1862. *Horae subsecivae*. Edmonston and Douglas, Edinburgh. John Brown (1810–1882), Scots physician and essayist.]

and a frame weakened by repeated attacks of inflammation of the lungs, was no fit tenement for his intense mind to work in. One of the chapters in his last volume was written in the very height of one of these recurring fevers. Day after day the servants heard him rising from his night-long labours only when they were beginning their morning work. He retained the leverage and poise of his intellect, but its fulcrum was wearing through; and on the night of the 23rd December 1856 it suddenly gave way, and he died by his own hand.

“There is no likeness of Hugh Miller,” said an eminent geologist to us recently, “that adequately conveys the immense strength and mass of his face.” Perhaps this early *Calotype* of D. O. Hill's, though not very distinct in its lineaments, and certainly too ag[g]ressive in its expression, is more suggestive of *strength* than any other likeness that exists. But there was much in his face besides. He had a large, calm, grey eye, which could wax very brilliant; his smile lit up the ruggedness of his features; his voice was surprisingly soft. Quiet in society, loving much to be alone, and counting himself a working man to the end, there was a certain stateliness in his bearing to which even the word *grandeur* has been applied. Burns must have deemed “the pride of worth” not only pardonable but honourable; Hugh Miller would not have denied that he possessed it.

H. M.