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FIRST LECTURE

Since becoming minister of Dunbar I have often reproached myself for not knowing all that can be known about the last Earl of Dunbar, who died in the year 1611 and was buried in our Parish Church, and whose monument is the chief object of historical interest which our Parish Church contains. During the last month or two I have tried to make myself acquainted with the Earl’s life and times, and I propose giving you the outcome of my research in three lectures. To Scots people the whole life of the man is of interest, but Scottish Church people may find a special interest in him, as he played a very prominent part in shaping or misshaping the government of our Church in the first years of the seventeenth century.

His life lay at the end of the sixteenth and at the beginning of the seventeenth centuries, three hundred years ago, during the reign of James VI. of Scotland, who also became James I. of England in the year 1603. He would be a boy of ten or so when Mary, Queen of Scots, was shocking the people of Scotland by bringing herself under the suspicion of being a party to the murder of her husband, Darnley; and by afterwards marrying the infamous Bothwell, who was supposed to be Darnley’s murderer. She was shortly afterwards imprisoned in Loch Leven Castle and forced to abdicate the throne. But she escaped some months later, and with her supporters tried to win back her throne at the battle of Langside in the year 1568. She failed, and was then
imprisoned in England for nineteen years, at the end of which period she was beheaded, and that closed one of the most tragic and romantic lives that the history of the world contains.

At the battle of Langside in 1568 one who commanded a body of horse against the ill-fated Queen Mary was Sir Alexander Home of Manderston, and that gentleman was the father of our last Earl of Dunbar, whose sculptured figure we see every Sunday kneeling on his monument.

The father, Sir Alexander Home of Manderston, had been married to Jean or Janet Home, daughter of George Home of Spott in the year 1552. The subject of our lecture was the third child of that marriage; he was called George, after his grandfather at Spott, and we can guess the year of his birth to have been 1556 or 1557. His childhood was therefore passed in the stirring times of the Reformation and in the days of John Knox's activity. We do not hear anything of him as a boy; we only begin to hear of George Home when he is about twenty-six years of age. He was brought to the Court of the Scottish King when about that age by a relative, Alexander, 6th Lord Home, who was then a fairly prominent personage at Court. The King, James VI., had been king since he was a year old; he was now about sixteen, and was still under regents. George Home would be ten years older than the King. The Scottish nobles were divided into two parties; there was the Lennox party and there was the Gowrie party. The Lennox party was then in power. But the Gowrie party in 1582 kidnapped the King in what was called the Raid of Ruthven, and he was in their hands until he escaped from them a year later. After his escape, everybody who was suspected of taking part in the Raid of Ruthven or of approving of it was proclaimed a traitor. Our young courtier, George Home, designated then as George Home of Primroknow, was accused by Home of Wedderburn of having held communication with the Ruthven raiders; but on March 18, 1584–85, he was acquitted and declared innocent of the accusation. Shortly afterwards the King's confidence in him was conclusively manifested by his being appointed a Gentleman of the Bedchamber.

Then in 1589 an event took place which would greatly interest all the King's courtiers. It was the King's marriage. A marriage had been arranged between the King, now twenty-three years of age, and Anne, daughter of the King of Denmark. She was to have come to Scotland to be married, but contrary winds had interfered with her voyage. James became impatient, and set out with a retinue of his nobles, 300 of them, to meet her. George Home of Primroknow, the future Earl of Dunbar, was one of that merry crowd. The storm-stayed bride was found at a place called Upsal in Norway, and the marriage took place there on November 24. The King had taken a Scots minister with him, his own chaplain, the Rev. David Lindsay, who has the honour of being the only Presbyterian minister who ever married a royal couple. The marriage party proceeded from Norway to Denmark, and there a merry winter was spent at the Danish Court. On May 1, 1590, the King and Queen and their company arrived at Leith; on Sunday, May 7, the Queen was crowned in the church of Holyrood Abbey; and on the 24th the King and Queen were kirked in St. Giles' Cathedral, where, at the end of the service, the King stood up and confessed that, by reason of his youth, he had somewhat mismanaged State affairs, but now he had seen more of the world, was married, and would be more staid.

George Home of Primroknow was probably married himself about this time. His wife was a daughter of Gordon of Gight and a granddaughter of Cardinal Beaton. Seven months after his return from Denmark with the King and Queen, on November 4, 1590, George Home received the honour of Knighthood, and was then designated Sir George Home of Primroknow. He would then be about thirty-four years of age, and signs of the King's
in order to get himself in, Sir George Home "did quietly shoot out William Keith," Earl Marischal, from that office. That is the first suggestion which we find in the contemporary records that Sir George Home was a self-seeking, ambitious man, not too scrupulous about the means by which he raised himself. However, one has to take all those suggestions with a great grain of salt and with a very great charity, for at that time there were so many parties in Scotland and so much suspicion and jealousy that the best of men were often very wrongfully malignured.

In that same year, 1597, Home, on July 31, was appointed one of the Companions to the Lord High Treasurer; and when the Lord High Treasurer, the Master of Elphinstoun, resigned in September, Home became Lord High Treasurer in his place. On the monument in the Parish Church he is described as Lord High Treasurer of Scotland.

In the same year, 1601, he was the Provost of Dunbar.

Then came the memorable year 1603, when the King of Scotland became also King of England, and the Crowns were united. Queen Elizabeth died on March 24; and on Sunday, April 3, in St. Giles', at the close of the service, King James made a farewell speech to the congregation. During that week he journeyed to London, and along with him went our Dunbar provost, Sir George Home of Spott. Faster than ever now, honours and lands were showered upon him. Whenever he reached London he was appointed one of the English Privy Council. On June 1 he received a grant as Keeper of the Great Wardrobe for life. That appointment would likely cause a good deal of feeling among the English nobles, that it was given to a Scotsman; but Sir George Home had already been Keeper of the King's Wardrobe in Scotland for two years, and there was some reason for his serving his royal master in England in the same capacity.

In the autumn of that memorable year, 1603, on September 27, Home received more lands, the manor
and the castle of Norham, with the fishing on the river Tweed. And on December 12 there is another royal charter, giving him the custody and captaincy of the Castle of St. Andrews. He had, besides, charters of other lands.

In 1604 he ceased to be known as Sir George Home of Spott, for on July 7 he was created an English peer of the realm with the title of Baron Home of Berwick. That is one of the titles appearing in the inscription on the monument. In the charter of his peerage he was given the privilege of nominating any kinsman or relation to bear and transmit to his heirs the title of Baron of Berwick; but he never exercised that power.

But an English peerage was not all. A year later, on July 3, 1605, he was created Earl of Dunbar in the Scottish peerage, and for the remaining six years of his life he was known by that title. Historians of the time refer to him briefly as Dunbar. In July of 1606 he got a confirmation of all the lands which had previously been granted to him; they were all incorporated and combined into a free earldom, lordship of Parliament, and barony of Dunbar.

From this time till his death, six years later, Dunbar was undoubtedly the most prominent and the most influential Scotsman in England. He seems to have played little or no part in English politics; his work lay in the King's household and in the control of the State affairs of Scotland. Along with Lord Chancellor Dunferrmline, he shared the chief management of Scottish affairs, being generally retained by the King in England as his chief Scottish adviser, and despatched to Scotland as the King's special representative when matters of importance were under consideration.

Now we come to the point in the Earl of Dunbar's history where he came into violent conflict with the ministers of the Church of Scotland. Forty years had passed since the Reformation and the establishment of Presbyterian government in the Church. The Scottish ministers were proud of their system in which each minister had exactly the same position: no one was over any other; no one was under any other. All of them submitted to the authority of the General Assembly, which was practically their own authority, the combined voice of all the ministers of the Church. It seemed a perfectly democratic, a perfectly Christian system. But King James did not like it, for there was no place for him in it; he had very little power over the Church under Presbyterian government. Again and again before he went to England he suggested that it would be far better if ministers were not all equal, if some had greater power and higher responsibilities than others, if some were bishops or superintendents over the others. Human vanity enabled him to find ministers to agree with him: a few were ambitious or wished to enjoy the royal favour, and consented to the King's Episcopal proposals. The King knew that he could get the Church into his power if he could get the Church to accept bishops. He would appoint them: they could not well oppose the King who had raised them to their high estate, and would see that the ministers under them would obey the King's behests. Episcopacy was James' scheme to make himself head of the Church as well as head of the State. He did make some headway. He held out the bait of a seat in Parliament for the bishops; he demonstrated the benefit which would come to the Church through its having representatives in Parliament. And to the bait the Church partially fell a victim. Bishops were appointed. The Earl of Dunbar was James' right-hand man in all this Episcopal project. Sometimes it has been thought that it was his policy more than the King's. If not primarily responsible for initiating the King's ecclesiastical policy in Scotland, he carried out that policy with strenuous zeal and devotion, contriving, nevertheless, with great dexterity to partly mask his exact aims. He professed to act towards the Presbyterians as their mediator with the King in modifying
and softening the rigour of his proposals, and succeeded to some extent in persuading them that his mediation was not ineffectual.

After James went to England he became more determined than ever to see the Scottish Church thoroughly Episcopal. He gave as his reason now that he wished to see England and Scotland uniform in Church government. However, Episcopacy would not flourish in Scotland. James' bishops were there, but the ministers would not recognise their authority. They insisted on having their General Assembly every year. James forbade them to meet. In July 1605 some nineteen ministers assembled at Aberdeen in defiance of the King's prohibition. Six of them were taken and imprisoned in Blackness Castle near Linlithgow. And there, on January 10, 1606, the Earl of Dunbar came from London to be present at their trial and to act as the assessor at this famous Linlithgow court. Everything was done by the Earl of Dunbar that could be done to win a verdict for the King against the six ministers. He brought plenty of money with him to purchase a verdict. The evidence which might have told in the ministers' favour was suppressed or was not elicited. Every quibble, every quirk was resorted to. The main question of their accusation was shelved, and an attempt was made to get them sentenced on a technical point. Dunbar had carefully selected the fifteen jurymen, gentlemen who would incline to the King's side or could be bought over to the King's side. Five of them were Homes, relatives of the Earl of Dunbar. All day long the trial went on. The jury retired and deliberated, but even in that packed jury there were six who would not hear a word said against the ministers. Sir John Livingstone of Dunipace was one of those six, and he declared that the ministers were not only innocent of treason, but maintained that they were honest ministers, faithful servants of Christ, and good subjects of the King. Of the nine who were willing to sentence the ministers, five were Homes:

Sir John Home of North Berwick, Sir Patrick Home of Polwarth, Sir George Home of Broxmouth, George Home of the Deans, and Alexander Home of Renton. The jury could not agree. The Earl of Dunbar, finding that he could not get unanimity among the jurymen, next visited the ministers in the room where they were awaiting the verdict, and tried to get them to plead guilty. He promised them the King's pardon if only they would admit that they had done wrong; but they remained firm. And the Earl had to be content with a verdict against the ministers by a mere majority in the jury of nine against six. Still it was the verdict of a Scottish court, no matter how basely it had been gained, and it established the law that it was high treason for any minister of the Church to dispute the authority of the King and the Privy Council in religious matters. The verdict practically placed the King as the chief authority in the Church of Scotland. It was the initial step in the establishment of Episcopacy in Scotland.

The Earl of Dunbar was now called to another troubled scene, not this time in connection with the Church. Two months after the Linlithgow trial (March 4, 1606) the Privy Council of Scotland petitioned the King and Council of England to appoint the Earl of Dunbar as the single Commissioner of the Borders for both England and Scotland. There was much thieving and reiving by Englishmen and Scotsmen on the Borders, and the English Commissioner had no right to apprehend Scots thieves who escaped back to the Scottish side, and the Scots Commissioner had no jurisdiction over English thieves who stole in Scotland and got over the boundary into England without being caught. But one Commissioner could deal with the situation more successfully. The recommendation was acted upon. During 1606 Dunbar held two justiciary courts, and he condemned and caused to be hanged ''over one hundred and forty of the nimblest and most powerful thieves in all the Borders.''' His measure was drastic, but entirely successful. In
December of that year, 1606, the principal Border towns were enjoined by the Council of Scotland to aid the Earl of Dunbar with all their power in delivering over to him every person who was known to live by Border thieving and reiving.

The year 1606 was a hard year for the Earl of Dunbar in Scotland. And he found the ministers of the Kirk much more difficult to overcome than the Border raiders. The only way of getting the iniquitous verdict of Linlithgow made less glaring was to go on further with the Episcopal scheme and get Episcopacy more firmly established. One hardly knows what to make of Dunbar. Neither he nor the King's advocate seemed to enjoy the Linlithgow trial. After the trial the advocate wrote to the King telling the infamous methods he had to employ to procure the condemnation of the ministers, and expressing a devout wish that the King would give him no more such work to do. And the Earl of Dunbar professed to an outstanding Scottish divine that to himself personally the whole business was painful, that he would give £1000 to see the King satisfied without injury to the Kirk or to the honest men imprisoned in Blackness. It is difficult to make up one's mind whether Dunbar was the willing servant of the King or merely the King's obliged slave.

The Scottish Parliament was summoned to meet at Perth on July 9, 1606. It was nicknamed the Red Parliament, because the nobles and bishops attended it clothed in their scarlet robes of office. The two archbishops and nine bishops were present. Dunbar had the whole direction of the arrangements, and succeeded in passing the two important ecclesiastical articles, the first declaring the King to be supreme over all persons and causes, the second restoring the Estate of Bishops. It is amusing to know that it was this Red Parliament of Perth, engineered by Dunbar, which granted him confirmation of all the lands and honours which had previously been presented to him.

Our next view of the Earl of Dunbar is in London. It is still 1606, the month of September. King James is still bent on winning the Scots ministers over to Episcopacy. He has summoned eight ministers to London, opponents of Episcopacy: Andrew and James Melville are two of the eight. Along with them he has summoned five of the Scottish bishops. He is going to make those thirteen ill-assorted Scotsmen mix with English bishops and listen to English bishops preaching and lecturing on the superiority of Episcopacy to Presbyterianism. The Earl of Dunbar had arranged for this visit to London when he was in Scotland in the summer. The Melvilles and the others had felt inclined to refuse to come to Hampton Court, but the Earl had talked them over. When they arrived in London the Earl made a point of keeping out of their way. He even declined to grant them a private conference with himself. But he showed them the greatest kindness indirectly, sending each of them 500 merks (about £30 of our money) for their expenses, and using every other means to induce them to alter their attitude towards Episcopacy. Melville's Diary of this London visit is very interesting and very amusing reading. He tells how the King received them at Hampton Court, still chewing the last mouthful of his dinner; how he joked with them and complimented one of them on his long beard; how next day they had to listen to a long lecture by the Bishop of Lincoln on the supremacy of bishops; how the next day following the King himself harangued them; how next the Bishop of Rochester lectured them and the Bishop of Chichester and the Dean of Christ's Church. Then Andrew Melville threw fat in the fire altogether by composing a satirical Latin epigram on the whole proceedings, and was censured by the Archbishop of Canterbury. But Melville spoke up, and for his defence of himself and his friends and his Presbyterian Church was clapped into prison in the Tower of London for three years, at the end of which time he was banished to the Continent, whither the six
ministers tried in that mockery of a trial at Linlithgow had been banished before him. The other Melville, James, was not allowed to return to Scotland, but was restricted to Newcastle and afterwards to Berwick. The other six of the eight were permitted to return to Scotland, but restrictions were also placed upon their freedom.

So far James and his faithful servant the Earl of Dunbar had got bishops in Scotland, but they had not succeeded in getting the ministers of Scotland to love, honour, and obey their bishops.

It is quite possible that the King and his henchman, Dunbar, were convinced in all sincerity that the government of the Church by bishops was a better form of government than by presbyteries. Both systems are good: both systems have their defects. To say that the one is right and the other wrong, to say that the one is Biblical and the other non-Biblical, to say that the one government is ordained by God and the other merely of man's making is utter prejudice, bigotry, and absurdity. If James and Dunbar thought Episcopacy to be really God's and Christ's way of ruling a Church, they might have adopted more godly and more Christ-like methods of commending it to the Scottish people.

SECOND LECTURE

The Earl of Dunbar's activity in the year 1606 had been untiring. We saw him at Linlithgow in January working hard to get the six imprisoned ministers sentenced for treason and banished from the country. We saw him in spring holding courts for trying Border raiders and reivers, and getting one hundred and forty of them hanged; it did not matter much whether the trial preceded or succeeded the execution. Then we saw him in July controlling the Scottish Parliament at Perth and getting the Estate of Bishops established in the Church of Scotland. Next, in the autumn, we saw him in London, working the "unseen hand" to induce the eight Scottish ministers to alter their determined attitude against Episcopacy.

At the end of November 1606 he was back in Scotland, and from Edinburgh was issuing orders to presbyteries to send certain ministers to a Conference or Convention to be held at Linlithgow on December 10. Only some of the presbyteries were asked to send delegates, and the choice of delegates was not left to the presbyteries; the names of the ministers to be sent were given in each summons. The presbyteries called were mostly northern presbyteries, and the bishops had supplied Dunbar with the names of those who would assent to all the King's proposals or who could be bought over to consent. It was known that Dunbar had 40,000 merks to be distributed amongst the most needy and clamorous of the ministry in order to facilitate the business of the Convention.

The Convention met on December 10. There were
thirty-three noblemen and one hundred and thirty ministers present. The Earl of Dunbar did not speak much: he had taught others their lessons and he only required to sit and pull the wires. The chief business of the Convention was said to be the need of suppressing any remainders of Roman Catholicism which existed in Scotland. That, of course, delighted the Presbyterian ministers greatly; they enjoyed nothing better than hunting out the Roman Catholics in their parishes. Then Dunbar, in the King’s name, presented proposals for providing more adequate stipends for the ministers—another very popular move. But the real business was to launch the proposal that moderators of presbyteries should not be elected by rotation every six months, but that each presbytery should have one of their number as a permanent moderator, to be chosen by the King and paid 100 merks annually by the King. This was a clever scheme to get a minister in each presbytery exalted over his brethren, dependent on the King, and therefore sworn to carry out all the King’s wishes. The Linlithgow Convention weekly swallowed this project, washed down as it was by Dunbar’s 40,000 merks. At the end of the third day of the Convention at Linlithgow the Earl of Dunbar had obtained all he wanted, and he thanked the Convention, in the King’s name, and desired the ministers to pray for the King and to make known to their brethren and people, so soon as they went home, what good was done at that Convention. The minutes of the Convention were sent to London; there they were very considerably altered, then printed and circulated throughout Scotland. The whole scheme of permanent moderators was represented as having been passed at Linlithgow, and a moderator for each presbytery was named.

The Earl of Dunbar remained in Edinburgh over Christmas. The celebration of Christmas had been regarded in Scotland since the Reformation as utter Papistry; and on this Christmas, 1606, the Earl of Dunbar somewhat scandalised the godly by the great solemnity with which he kept the day.

Throughout the presbyteries of the Church in 1607 there was great strife about the permanent moderators. A few accepted the King’s proposal. Many object to the principle of elevating one minister over others. Many did not object to the principle, but objected to the special minister whom the King had named as moderator. The Presbytery of Haddington did not accept the moderator chosen for them; the Presbytery of Dunbar obeyed the King. In the autumn of that year, 1607, Lord Roxburgh, as the King’s Commissioner, attended the meeting of the Synod of Merse and Teviotdale, and urged the presbyteries within the synod to accept the permanent moderators whom the King had chosen. The Presbyteries of Melrose, Jedburgh, Kelso, Duns, and Chirnside refused. The Earl of Dunbar, travelling from London, arrived in Berwick just at the time, and was determined to make an example of some of those unruly ministers. He had the ministers of Maxton and Foulden arrested, taken to Edinburgh, and then sent to prison in Blackness Castle. But they were liberated after forty-eight hours, and bound over not to move beyond the boundaries of their respective parishes. The Earl of Dunbar was sensible enough to see, in spite of his desire to get the King’s wishes carried out, that the ministers who were accepting office as constant moderators and bishops were really the scum of the ministry, men for the most part corrupt, and that the worst men were really being put up to rule over the best. Of course he had tried hard to win over the best men to accept Episcopacy, but had not succeeded. If he was to prosecute the King’s purpose, he had to be content with the worst ministers in the Church for his officials. Between the ministers and the King, Dunbar’s position was not a very enviable one.

Throughout the close of the year 1607 and the beginning of the year 1608 the discontent continued. The
bishops took care to increase the stipends of those ministers who acknowledged their authority and to starve out those who would not submit. They began making visitations of the parishes within their diocese; the ministers who would not accept their visitation were warned that the consequences would be serious. At last the King announced that a meeting of General Assembly would be held.

Before he left England to attend this General Assembly the Earl of Dunbar, on May 20, 1608, was installed at Windsor as a Knight of the Garter. If you look at the left shoulder of the Earl’s figure on the monument in the Church, you will see there the badge of the Order of the Garter.

The Earl came to Scotland in the end of June, and in the end of July the Assembly met at Linlithgow. Months before the Assembly met it had been rumoured throughout Scotland that the Earl of Dunbar was coming down to next Assembly with some English doctors of divinity and a great number of old and new-made earls to overthrow the discipline and government of the Kirk with one blow. It was also rumoured that the Earl had £14,000 sterling with which to pay for conversions to Episcopacy. Certainly the English divines came down to Scotland with the Earl; they were Doctor Abbot, Doctor Higgins, and Doctor Maxy, one of the King’s chaplains. Those clergymen had orders from the King that they were to persuade the Scots “that there was no substantial difference in religion between the two realms, but only in things indifferent concerning government and ceremonies, and they were to let it be known that it was the King’s will that England should stand as he found it and Scotland as he left it.” But those gentlemen found the Scottish ministers so ready to argue every point, that they were driven from the tolerant position stated in their commission to reveal themselves as very intolerant Episcopalian. Their mission did less than no good. It was said that they were very well paid by the King for their tour in Scotland.

The Assembly opened at Linlithgow on July 26. The Earl of Dunbar took his seat as the King’s Deputy, Lord High Commissioner. He had brought with him plenty of earls, lords, barons, and gentlemen, sent for by the King, who voted solid every time and left the ministers always in the minority. At the opening diet of Assembly a moderator was to be appointed; five ministers were nominated by the ministers, but the Bishop of Orkney was nominated by the King’s party, and he was easily elected.

The Earl of Dunbar acted very cautiously. He knew that public feeling in Scotland was running very high, and he thought it advisable to do nothing which would fan that discontent into open rebellion. Consequently most of the Assembly’s time was taken up dealing with Roman Catholics, the Marquis of Huntly, the Earl of Angus, the Earl of Errol, and Lord Semphill. Those men were ordered to worship at their respective parish churches in the Protestant faith. If they still refused, the presbyteries were to take action against them, and if they still remained Roman Catholic the Earl of Dunbar warned them that after forty days the civil sword would strike without mercy. Then resolutions were passed against Jesuits and priests, against pilgrimages to chapels and holy wells, regarding the searching of merchant vessels for Popish books, and regarding the removal of Roman Catholics from public offices. There were still, and from the Reformation there had been, many parishes without a minister; in some synods there were still about thirty vacant parishes. Steps were taken to induce men into the ministry and to provide them with stipends. The ministers presented a petition asking that the exiled ministers should be brought back to Scotland, and the Earl promised that he would intercede with the King for the restoration of all except those who had been banished for treason. On July 29, after four days’ sitting, the Assembly dissolved.

Nothing had been done by definite resolution to
further establish the bishops in their authority, but the fact that no voice was raised against Episcopacy gave the system a greatly increased hold. The bishops were to have the sole power of fixing and altering the ministers’ stipends, and that gave them a great influence over their brethren. Men with wives and families to maintain had to be careful not to offend their bishop.

The Earl of Dunbar came from the Linlithgow Assembly to Edinburgh, and in a fortnight everybody was talking about him in another connection. On August 22, 1608, he was present at the execution of a notary called George Sprot, and took a suspiciously keen interest in the hanging of the unfortunate man. Eight years before, in August 1600, there had taken place the mysterious Gowrie House incident. There were many sides to the story and there were two chief sides. On the one hand, King James averred that he was decoyed from Falkland Palace to Gowrie House in Perth, and that there the Ruthvens attempted to murder him, but he escaped. On the other hand, it was thought that James had a grudge against the Ruthvens, and that the Gowrie House incident was plotted by himself to get an excuse for putting the Ruthvens out of the way. The King and his friends did everything possible to prove that the King’s story was the true one. And many people who would not believe the King’s story and maintained that the other story was true had to flee the country or were got out of the way. Eight years had passed, and this notary in Eyemouth, George Sprot, who was factor for Coldingham and Fast Castle and other places in the district, was heard to say that he knew all about the Gowrie Conspiracy, that he had in his possession letters which had passed between the Earl of Gowrie and Logan of Restalrig, the Laird of Fast Castle. He was reported to the authorities and apprehended. He was made to produce the letters. After a time he confessed that he had forged the letters and imitated Logan’s handwriting. Logan was two years dead. He had from 1600 onwards sold every foot of land he possessed. The Earl of Dunbar had bought some of it, but was still owing Logan 33,000 merks of the purchase-money when Logan died. When this man Sprot was examined in Edinburgh in July and August 1608, the Earl of Dunbar took care to be present. He exerted himself especially to obtain from Sprot a confession of his connection with the Gowrie Conspiracy. He may have done all this just to please King James, but the public seemed to think that Sprot knew more than the King and the Earl wished the public to know, and that therefore it was very necessary for their reputations to get Sprot out of the way. The man was hanged and the Earl of Dunbar was present at the execution, and the presence of so important a person at so unimportant an execution caused much adverse comment, "it being surmised," writes the historian Calderwood, "that it was only to give a sign when Sprot’s scaffold speech should be interrupted and when he should be cast over the ladder." In the next year Logan, though three years dead, was declared a traitor and his property forfeited, and Dunbar never paid the 33,000 merks owing to him. After one wades through all the evidence about the Gowrie Conspiracy and its sequels, one can only shut the door of the mind upon it with the exclamation: "All men are liars!"

The Earl of Dunbar also shows up badly in the trial of Lord Balmerino in March 1609. This Lord Balmerino was still adhering to the Roman Catholic Church and was often taking part in Popish plots. He had obtained by false pretences and by forgery the King’s signature and the King’s seal to a document which was being sent from Britain to the Pope. Before the English Privy Council, Balmerino had made a confession of his guilt, but he was

---

1 On December 21 of the year 1608 the Earl received a charter of the lands of Broommouth in this parish. Six or seven weeks later, February 6, 1609, he was appointed one of the Commissioners of the jees, and about the same time was chosen a member of the new Scottish Privy Council of thirty-five members, which was reconstituted in the following year.
Scottish peer and had to be tried in Scotland. The
confession made by him before the English Privy Council
could not be produced as evidence against him in a
Scottish court. The Earl of Dunbar undertook to induce
him to plead guilty. This he accomplished by promising
that if Balmerino would only confess, he would neither
lose his life nor his estates. Probably Dunbar was
authorised by the King to make the promise, and did so
in good faith. But Balmerino, who had been left to
expect that his confession would completely clear him,
was sentenced to death as a traitor, to be beheaded,
quartered, and dismembered, and the parts of his body
to be set up in public places. The sentence was not to
be immediately carried out, so he was taken to Falkland
and imprisoned, where he fell into great dejection of
spirits, broken-hearted. The King thereupon allowed
him to walk abroad a mile beyond his prison, but in spite
deu return to fresh air he soon died. In his diary
he sets down that he followed the Earl of Dunbar’s direc-
tion in every point, trusting in his promise: so he died
the victim of a broken promise.

In the month following Balmerino’s trial we find the
Earl of Dunbar at Berwick-on-Tweed. And as he had
scandalised the citizens of Edinburgh by his keeping of
Christmas Day in 1606, so now we have the Presbyterians
of Berwick deeply incensed at his observation of St.
George’s Day (April 23) 1609. The day fell on a Sunday.
He made a solemn feast with great pomp and ceremony,
and as one of the Knights of the Garter, he was that day
served by lords, knights, barons, and gentlemen of good
rank.

From Berwick the Earl journeyed northwards to Fife,
to Falkland Palace, where the Commission of General
Assembly was to meet on May 4 and 5. It was a very
quiet meeting; all opposing parties seem to have agreed
to differ. The Earl of Dunbar acted as the King’s Com-
missioner, and certainly gained the good will of those over
whom he presided. They agreed to keep a strict watch
for any Roman Catholic strangers from foreign parts
who might appear in Scotland, and report them to the
Earl of Dunbar, “or such other of his Highness’ Council,
whom they know zealous of God’s Truth.” The ministers
further promised “to strive in all things that God may
have glory and that the King may have satisfaction and
contentment in all things.”

In the next month after the Falkland Conference the
Scottish Parliament met in Edinburgh on June 24, 1609.
This Parliament conferred on the Scottish bishops all
the judicial power in spiritual and ecclesiastical causes
that had been enjoyed by presbyteries and synods
and general assemblies since the Reforma-
tion, and which had been possessed by the bishops of the old Roman
Catholic period. And the Court of Session was authorised
to grant letters of horning to the bishops to enable them
to enforce the execution of their sentences. All those
things were just paving the way for what followed in a
few months, namely, the setting up of two courts of High
Commission, one in the Archbishopric of St. Andrews,
and the other in the Archbishopric of Glasgow. The Earl
of Dunfermline, Lord High Chancellor of Scotland, and
the Earl of Dunbar, Lord High Treasurer, were members
both of the St. Andrews and the Glasgow courts. Those
two Church courts of High Commission had high powers.
They could call any man before them whom they were
pleased to think scandalous in life or erroneous in re-
ligion; they could impose any fine; they could imprison
for any period; they could depose any minister; they
could pronounce sentence of excommunication against
any subject of the kingdom. They were bound in all
they did by nothing but their own discretion. Their
sentence was final; no one could appeal against any of
their findings. They were courts of utter despotism; and
their work made bishops and Episcopal methods more
and more hateful in Scotland.

In the summer of 1609 the Earl of Dunbar continued
his drastic measures on the Borders against the cattle-
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stealers of the marches. At the end of July he held a Justiciary Court at Dumfries, and several of the Border thieves were executed. His appointment as sole Commissioner for the Borders had been thoroughly successful, his joint authority in Scotland and England being the first effectual means of quelling the old feuds and rooting out the old habits of plunder.

You must not think that the Earl of Dunbar was not well rewarded for his excellent services on the Borders. He did not go there without seeing lands that were worth his having. On January 25, 1610, he had a charter of the lands of Smalholm in the county of Dumfries and other lands, with the hereditary keepership of the Castle of Lochmaben, and the office of Steward of Annandale, all which were incorporated into the free barony of Lochmaben.

A few days later he got the keepership of the Palace of Holyrood House. Previous to that he had been constituted "sole and full Intromitter of His Majesty's revenues and casualties, and regulator of the entire revenues of Scotland" in order to avoid the abuses occasioned by a multiplicity of offices. By this time he was not only Lord High Chancellor of Scotland, but he was almost Lord High Everything Else.

We have now reached the closing year of his life. In April of 1610 we come across him at Newcastle, travelling northward to Scotland. You may recall that of the two Melvilles, two of the eight Scots ministers who were taken to London to be converted to Episcopacy, Andrew was imprisoned in the Tower and then banished, James was sent to Newcastle and not allowed to move outside the walls of that city. Often when the Earl of Dunbar passed through Newcastle, the Rev. James Melville besought him to be allowed to return to Scotland. The Earl always put him off. James Melville lived in great hope, not only that he would get back to Scotland, but also that the Scottish Episcopacy would soon be abandoned. He seems to have thought that it was only an experiment,
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When the Earl of Dunbar arrived in Edinburgh on May 24, 1620, he had to begin at once to issue the King's missives calling a General Assembly to meet at Glasgow on June 8. The Church of Scotland had always held that it had the right of appointing meetings of General Assembly, but the King refused to admit that right; he and he only was to say when and where and why a General Assembly of the Church would take place.

Then you all understand how members of a General Assembly are chosen. Each presbytery sends so many ministers and so many elders, and certain burgh towns also send a representative. But this Glasgow Assembly was not to be made up in that way. In every summons issued by the King to presbyteries on this occasion the names of the ministers whom they were to appoint were given. Those names had been given by the bishops to the Earl of Dunbar as ministers who would not be likely to oppose anything that the King wished the Assembly to pass. Of all the ministers in Scotland, a little over a hundred were in this way invited to attend.

Constitutionally, only ministers and elders can be members of General Assembly; often noblemen and barons are members, but they are there because they are elders. However, to this Glasgow Assembly of 1620 the King summoned thirteen noblemen and forty barons, not because they were elders, but because they were noblemen and barons. That was done to ensure a majority for the King.

For three days before the Assembly met the Earl of Dunbar gathered around him a small committee of the bishops and barons and ministers; and in committee he taught them all that was to be said and done. Everything was to be settled in committee, and no discussion was to be allowed in the General Assembly. What the committee decided would be formally submitted to the Assembly, and it would have to be approved. When the Church historians call this Assembly a "muzzled" Assembly, you can see that the name was not inappropriate.

On Friday, June 8, the Assembly met, and the first day was observed as a fast. The historian Calderwood says it was very like the fast held in Samaria before Ahab stole Naboth's vineyard, because the King was on the point of stealing Presbyterianism from the Church of Scotland. In the early morning Spottiswood, Archbishop of Glasgow, preached; his argument ran that Presbyterianism was perhaps good enough during the confusion of the Reformation, but now a better system, namely, Episcopacy, was needed. At 10 o'clock the Bishop of Orkney preached on the lawfulness of Episcopacy; it was the oldest form of Church government; it was the most common; it was the most lasting.

Then the moderator was chosen: Spottiswood, Archbishop of Glasgow. It is amusing how Calderwood, the historian of the time, insists upon calling him the parish minister of Calder, and then adds, "stiled Archbishop of Glasgow." There were five ministers bold enough even in that muzzled Assembly to vote against his appointment to the moderator's chair.

In the afternoon it was an English divine who preached. The Earl of Dunbar had brought from England with him three reverend doctors: Dr. Hampton, Dr. Mirrton, and Dr. Hutson. Big, burly Calderwood says that in the afternoon it was the little chaplain, Doctor Hutson, who preached; and he supported the idea of different grades among the ministers, for had not Christ taught His apostles in different grades: some at His head, some at His bosom, some at His feet. No doubt Dr. Hutson had
better arguments than that, but his opponents would enjoy recalling the lamest and most puerile argument. I am sure the thirteen noblemen and the forty barons felt that they had put in a very hard and exhausting day listening to three long, dry, stodgy sermons.

On Saturday morning, in committee, the Earl of Dunbar, as Lord High Commissioner, presented the King's letter and had it read twice. The King expressed his great concern for the peace and welfare of the Kirk in Scotland, spoke of himself as God's Lieutenant, regarding himself as bound to see the Church put in proper order. He lets the ministers know that they will not go away empty-handed if they do as he desires, for he has asked the Earl of Dunbar to take special notice of everyone's affection and forwardness in the service, so that they may be acknowledged and remembered thereafter, as any fit occasion for their good shall occur. The committee met at 7 A.M. and the General Assembly at 9. The King's letter was read. One minister, Mr. Peter Primrose, got up to protest against the King's method of settling the government of the Church, but he had no sooner begun to speak than the moderator, "smelling his intention," as Calderwood writes, interrupted him, and said the Assembly must proceed to dinner. And then he historian adds: "Primrose and his associates were so wrought upon, partly by threatening, partly by flattery and fair words, that there was no more din of a protestation." Besides, the Earl of Dunbar had taken the precaution of having the King's guard at hand, ready to arrest such as would oppose the proceedings of the Assembly.

In the afternoon the committee met at 2 o'clock and the Assembly at 3. Eleven articles or resolutions, all cut and dry from the committee, were read and passed without discussion. The articles were all interesting, and were all in favour of the King and the bishops:

7. Only the King could call a General Assembly together.

2. Synods should meet twice a year; nobody but the bishop should preside at synod meetings.

3. The bishop must approve of every sentence of excommunication and absolution before it is pronounced.

4. The bishop would choose a minister for a vacant parish.

5. The bishop would be the person to depose a minister, if deposition was necessary.

6. Every minister at his admission should swear obedience to the King and to the bishop.

7. The bishops were to visit all parishes in their diocese or send substitutes.

8. The ministers of a presbytery were to meet weekly as usual for doctrinal exercise, but the bishop or his deputy would always be present as moderator.

9. The bishops were to be under the authority of the General Assembly.

10. No one could be a bishop till he was forty years of age and had been ten years a minister.

XI. Any minister speaking in the pulpit against the General Assembly and its findings would be deposed; any minister speaking against Episcopacy would be similarly punished.

June 10 was Sunday and no business was done, but the English divine, Doctor Hampton, preached to the Assembly in the forenoon, proving that synods and presbyteries were most iniquitous institutions. In the afternoon the third English divine, Doctor Mirrton, had his opportunity, and he gave a defence of bishops and Episcopal rule. On Monday forenoon, June 11, the Earl of Dunbar told the Assembly that the King wished him to proclaim at the Cross of Glasgow that there was to be no such thing as a presbytery meeting. The King hated the word presbytery, and the word was to be abolished. "The ministers of the presbytery" were to be styled "the ministers within the bounds." When the ministers of the presbytery came together weekly for
their doctrinal exercise, they were to be called “the Brethren of the Exercise.” It all sounds very thorough and very German—that officious thoroughness which lacks insight and lacks humour. The members of the Assembly persuaded the Earl of Dunbar to “ca’ canny”; the noblemen especially besought him to postpone the abolition of presbyteries till he had a further audience with the King; the Earl allowed himself to be swayed by the nobles and barons, and the proclamation to discharge the presbyteries was meanwhile withdrawn.

The Marquis of Huntly, an excommunicated Papist, was dealt with; he confessed that he was now Protestant, and it was agreed to restore him to the Church.

On the Monday afternoon the Assembly approved of the Committee’s arrangements for the supplying of parishes still vacant and for the payment of ministers’ stipends. The Assembly was closed that afternoon with the singing of Psalm cxxxiii.:

Behold, how good a thing it is, and how becoming well,
Together such as brethren are in unity to dwell!

There are some amusing reflections about the Glasgow Assembly of 1650. The Bishop of Orkney brought a goodly number of ministers down with him from the north—men who had their expenses paid and more—to vote on the side of King and bishops. It was not the last time that the “Highland Host” has been brought south, at other people’s expense, to record a vote in the General Assembly. A good deal of money was distributed among the members of the Glasgow Assembly. Those on the King’s side took care to explain that all the money distributed to members was for payment of travelling and boarding expenses during the Assembly. Another explanation given was that the permanent moderators of presbyteries had not before received their £100 Scots, as arranged, and that they were paid during the Glasgow Assembly. The Rev. John Balfour, from the Presbytery of Kelso, heard that money was going freely, and he presented himself before the Earl of Dunbar’s cashier for his share; but he was told that there was none for him, for he voted on the wrong side.

The minister of Cockburnspath, Rev. John Lauder, came too late for his dole, and all that was left was £10 Scots less 40 pennies; but he was content to take the ten pounds less forty pennies. Some of the ministers, like the Rev. Michael Cranston of Cramond, got the promise of augmentations to their stipends. One got a pension from the King, another got a bishopric.

All the historians, both on the Episcopal and Presbyterian sides, agree that it was the Earl of Dunbar who was the moving spirit of the Glasgow Assembly of 1650. One of his enemies says: “Through his dexterous management, aided by the expenditure of a considerable sum of money in bribes, the alteration of the forms and method of Church government practically amounted to the entire superseding of Presbyterianism by Episcopacy.” One of his friends, Archbishop Spottiswood of Glasgow, who was Moderator at the Glasgow Assembly when the Earl was Lord High Commissioner, writes appreciatively thus: “The Earl of Dunbar was a man of deep wit, few words, and in His Majesty’s service no less faithful than fortunate; the most difficult affairs he compassed without any noise, and never returned when he was employed without the work performed that he was sent to do.” It is very easy to be denunciatory and talk of the Earl’s methods being corrupt and unscrupulous; but we must take into account the facts that he was working for a King who was called the “wisest fool in Christendom,” and that there were ministers in Scotland who were corrupt enough and unscrupulous enough to accept the Earl’s bribes and to aid and abet him in his methods.

At the time of the Glasgow Assembly the Rev. Andrew Melville was still a prisoner in the Tower of London; he had been, you remember, one of the eight Scots ministers taken to London four years before to be won over
to Episcopacy; he had been refractory, and was put under arrest in the Tower. When all the doings of the Glasgow Assembly reached Andrew Melville, he became prophetic and foretold the doom of the Earl of Dunbar. James Colville, a Scottish gentleman, visited him in the Tower and told all that had passed at Glasgow. Melville became so pensive and melancholy that he would not speak for a long time; then at length he broke forth in these words: "That man (meaning the Earl of Dunbar) that hath overthrown that Kirk, and the liberties of Christ's Kingdom there, shall never have that grace to set his foot in that Kingdom again." Popular tradition has it that it came to pass, as Melville had foretold, and the Earl never set foot in Scotland after he returned to England from the Glasgow Assembly. I have not been able to find any record of his being in Scotland in the autumn of 1610.

In November of that year three of the Scots bishops—Spottiswood, Archbishop of Glasgow; Lamb, Bishop of Brechin; Hamilton, Bishop of Galloway—went to London to be consecrated by English bishops; but there is no mention of the Earl of Dunbar showing them any attention or hospitality during their visit.

The year 1611 opened. The Earl of Dunbar had some interesting events to look forward to. His second daughter, Elizabeth, was to be married, with magnificent solemnisation, early in the year to Theophilus Howard, Lord de Walden, afterwards second Earl of Suffolk. And at Berwick-on-Tweed he had been building what was described as "a sumptuous and glorious palace," which was to be finished and opened by a great "house-heating" on Saint George's Day, April 23, 1611. But he died before either of those events could be celebrated, on Wednesday, January 29, 1611. His death was very sudden, and the suspicion was current that he had been poisoned. Why he should have been poisoned or how it was done or who did it are all unknown. Another

Scots nobleman, Lord Kinloss, who had been appointed by the King as Lord of the Rolls when he went to England, died suddenly and mysteriously shortly before. It was evidently conjectured that there was a grudge against Scotsmen who were too great favourites or too good servants of the King.

The Earl of Dunbar's death produced profound emotion in Scotland. "It was," writes one, "as if a great tree had suddenly fallen, and men stood gazing at the wide ruptures that had been left by its roots." The Presbyterian party at once called it a "judgement." The Episcopalian party saw it as a calamity; the hand that had exalted them was powerless. Perhaps there would be changes and they might fare badly. The Chancellor of Scotland, with some of the Privy Council, as well as bishops and others, took journey to London to look after their interests. But before the Chancellor went to London he was ordered by the King to go to Holyrood and Berwick and take inventory of all the Earl of Dunbar's movables, so great were the Earl's possessions and properties.

The Presbyterian historians crowed loudly over poor Dunbar's death. They spoke of him being pulled down from the height of his honour. His palace at Berwick, almost ready for occupation at his death, gave them scope to compare his fate with that of the accursed man who would try to rebuild the walls of Jericho. And one rejoiced to record that "none of his posterity enjoyeth a foot's breadth of land this day of all that he acquired in Scotland." ¹

Though the Earl died on January 29, his funeral did not take place till April. The body was embalmed. A solemn funeral ceremony was performed in Westminster in April, after which the body was placed in a coffin of lead, sent to Scotland to be buried in the Church of

¹ The Earl left two daughters—the elder, Anne, who had been married to Sir James Home of Coldingknowes; the younger, Elizabeth, whose marriage to Lord Howard de Walden was postponed till the year after her father's death.
Dunbar, where it lies to this day, under the floor, midway between the baptismal font and the pulpit.

When the Earl's monument, which is still the distinguishing feature of our Church, was placed over the tomb we can only guess. It is not likely that it was erected after 1688, when the Church of Scotland became fixedly Presbyterian. Neither is it likely to have been erected during Cromwell's ascendency, between 1649 and 1660, when Episcopacy was quite under the cloud. It depends largely on whom we consider likely to have erected the monument. The Earl was fond of magnificence and ceremonial; probably he had arranged for his last resting-place being graced by a finely sculptured monument. If it was the King who raised the monument over his faithful servant's tomb, it might have been done before 1625, the year of James' death. Throughout this neighbourhood, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, there were many Homes: the minister of Dunbar from 1582 to 1601 was a Home, half-brother to Sir George Home of Broxmouth; he was succeeded by a Home. The first of those two Homes did not die in 1601; he demitted the charge and lived for twenty-two years afterwards, being known as the "Parson of Dunbar." It may have been the Home family which reared the monument. The Latin motto, high up on the monument, ""Rex ditt, deus beat," means "The King enriches: it is God who blesses." That motto seems to me to echo the feelings of the Home family, grateful to the King for the honours and wealth showered by the King upon the favoured member of their family, yet conscious that the blessing of God was of more value than the King's riches. I am inclined to think that the monument was erected sometime between the Earl's death in 1611 and 1649.

The church inside which it was erected was the Pre-Reformation Church of Dunbar. That church was repaired and renovated in 1779, but not rebuilt; it was re-roofed, ceiled, newly floored, and part of the east end partitioned off. Very probably the part which was partitioned off was the part which contained the Earl's monument. From 1779 to 1829 the monument was in a little room or chapel by itself in the east gable of the church. When the present church was built in 1819-1821 the monument was left standing in its place as well as the piece of gable into which it was built. When the church was being built the Duke of Roxburghe in 1820 contributed £100 for the repair of the monument; and the repair was done by a sculptor, Mr. St. George. When the apse was added to the church in 1895 the monument was carefully removed stone by stone and rebuilt in its present position in the north aisle. Great interest was taken in the repair of the monument at that time, and the Marquess of Bute gave £100 towards its restoration.

The earliest description of the monument which I have seen is given by an English gentleman travelling in Scotland in 1760; he saw it in Dunbar Church on September 23 in that year.

George Miller, who wrote a poem in 1819 on the demolition of the old church, speaks of it, calling on the masons who are pulling down the old walls to be careful of it:

Spare, mason! spare that splendid monument
That points the ashes of illustrious Home,
Else will each mailed warrior start to life,
And with his stony gauntlet strike you down.
Yes! thou shalt spare that honour'd sepulchre
And it will stand a princely ornament
To grace the new-born church that phoenix-like
Will spring forth from the ashes of its sire.

In a footnote he adds, "Thanks to the good taste of the heritors, the monument will form an ornament within the modern fabric."

As a work of art it is considered one of the finest monuments in Britain. The late Mr. Eustace Balfour of Whittingehame was greatly interested in it; and from his widow, Lady Frances Balfour, I have heard some of his opinions about it. It is Italian workmanship, having
been originally wrought and put up by Italians in the seventeenth century. Lady Frances thinks it was removed to its present position in 1895 by Italian workmen, but some of you may remember more particularly about that. Lady Frances also tells me that the late Rev. Robert Buchanan of this parish was fond of quoting Dean Stanley's opinion, that the Dunbar monument was finer than any monument in Westminster Abbey. It is good that we should know that our Church contains so priceless a work of art.

The monument itself is 12 feet long and 26 feet high. The lower part is of different coloured marbles, shaped like a sarcophagus or stone coffin. On the top of this the life-size figure of the Earl kneels, in the attitude of prayer, on an embroidered cushion, in front of which stands a book-rest, with an open book of devotion upon it. The Earl wears the robes of a Knight of the Garter; the badge of that distinguished order is seen on the cloak at his left shoulder; the garter of knighthood is on his left leg. The posture of the figure is very uncommon; most monuments represent the body recumbent in the attitude of death. On each side are caryatides of men in armour, i.e. men in armour represented as pillars supporting the sculptured work above. Round the feet of the mail-clad figure on the right are a sword, a halberd, a helmet, a mace, and other things. At the feet of the mailed figure on the left are gauntlets, lion's head, battle-axe, and other weapons. Immediately above the man-in-armour on the right stands the Roman goddess, Minerva, representing Wisdom, with her owl perched on her left arm. This figure, no doubt, is a tribute to the Earl as a wise counsellor of the King. Above the man-in-armour on the left stands the Roman goddess, Justitia, representing Justice, with the scales of Justice in her left hand and a drawn dagger in her right hand. In that we see commemorated the Earl's firm dealing of justice on the Scottish and English borders. Above the Earl's head is a cupola, adorned with Time's hour-glass and Death's scythe and other emblems. The inscription is written in gilt letters on a black marble tablet in this cupola, and reads as follows:

Here lyeth the body of the Right Honble, George, Earl of Dunbar, Baron Howme of Barwick, Lord Heigh Tresser of Scotland, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, and one of His Matte. most honble, privie Counsell, whose depeart this life the xxxix day of Januuary, MDCCX.

When the inscription was renewed in 1895, a mistake was made and 1610 was written instead of 1611.

Above the cupola, in marble bas-relief, are two angelic figures facing each other: the one on the left is Fame, with the scull of fame in her right hand and with the trumpet of fame in her left hand, raised to her lips to sound the Earl's name abroad. The angelic figure on the right is that of Peace, with the olive branch in her right hand and a crown of laurel in her right, poised above the head of the kneeling Earl.

Then we come to the top of the monument. On right and left are two shields bearing coats-of-arms. The left shield, above the figure of Justice, shows the Home coat-of-armes, a lion rampant within a border studded with eight roses. The right shield, above the figure of Minerva, displays three parrots (in the language of heraldry, three papings or vert, beaked and membered gules), which is the arms of the family of Pepide of Dunglass. Right at the top, between those two side shields, is a great mass of heraldry. In the centre of it there is a shield encircled with the Garter of the Order of the Garter. The shield has five coats-of-armes: (1) a lion rampant for the family of Home; (2) the three parrots for the family of Pepide of Dunglass; (3) three escutcheons for the family of Home of Broxmouth; (4) a lion rampant for the family of Home (same as (1)); (5) a lion rampant within a border studded with eight roses.
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Above this shield is a crest—a lion rampant with a crown. Supporting the shield on each side are two sculptured lions, the left one crowned, with a tree behind them, and a helmet on the tree. Under this great heraldic piece runs the motto,

Rex ditat, Deus beat.
The King enriches: God blesses.

In conclusion I may add that if all goes well, it may be possible for me after the war to go more fully and carefully into the subject, and to expand those three lectures into a modest book on the last Earl of Dunbar.\(^1\) He was certainly a great figure in the history of his time; and I would advise you all in thinking of him to put the same bridle upon your judgment as I have done myself. I have tried to find out the facts of his life, but have avoided passing any sentence upon him. We are three hundred years later in the world than he was; and in three hundred years the standard of judgment is heightened, and there is perhaps injustice in measuring a seventeenth-century person by a twentieth-century standard.

Sometimes I wonder if this magnificent monument of the Earl of Dunbar had been placed in our church as a kind of memorial to mark the triumph of Episcopacy over Presbytery. If so, how the turn of Fortune's wheel has defeated the intention and doomed the pioneer of Episcopacy to kneel in immortal marble for over two hundred and thirty years in our very Presbyterian church! The best reflection which we can draw from the splendid monument is this—that History has shown us many excellent men who wrangled about Church matters in very un-Christian ways and in a very un-Christ-like spirit, and it may enable us to remember that not Episcopalianism and not Presbyterianism are the main things: the main thing is Christianity itself.

\(^1\) The writer did not live to carry out this intention. Immediately after the conclusion of this third lecture, on the evening of February 10, 1918, Mr. Kirk left for France, where he had already spent two years as Chaplain to the Forces. A month and a half later, on March 27, he was dangerously wounded, and on April 1 he passed away.