

# The Limits of Indemnity: The Earl of Derby, Sovereignty and Retribution at the Trial of William Christian, 1660–63

## I

On 2 January 1663, William Christian, one-time Governor and Receiver-General of the Isle of Man, went to his death on Hango Hill, ‘most penitently and ... curragiously’.<sup>1</sup> Having prayed, addressed the assembled crowd and refused the offer of a blindfold, his last view of the world was of a people and a political landscape made familiar to him throughout both his long public career and private life. The boundaries of his own estate of Ronaldsway ran right up to the foot of the hill, while the gates of his manor house were only a few hundred yards distant. Clearly visible to the west, were the towers of Castle Rushen, the centre of Manx government and home to the House of Keys, where before his fall he had collected tithes and administered justice. To the east, guarding the straits, lay the coastal fort of Derbyhaven, a potent symbol of the power of the Stanley family which he had at one time served, and had latterly come to oppose. His execution, ordered by Charles the 8th Earl of Derby, would therefore seem to have been staged as an unambiguous piece of political theatre. It served not only as a stark warning to any future rebellious subjects, but also as a grim testimony to the Earl’s ruthless commitment to the maintenance of his family’s dominant hold over the politics of the Isle and to his determination to resist any attempt at outside interference in his affairs.<sup>2</sup>

Unfortunately for the Earl, a death is far easier to order than to choreograph and, through the making of a ‘good end’, the myth of Illiam Dhône – ‘Brown haired William’ – the patriot martyred in the name of Manx liberty, soon became established throughout the Isle. Souvenirs were sought of him and tales of his deeds, which bore precious little relation to the historical record, were immortalised in folklore, popular song, and broadside ballads, as well as in the pages of romantic novels.<sup>3</sup> However if the appropriation of Christian as a nationalist hero, whose example and endeavour could henceforth be appealed to by islanders straining under the pressures of

proprietary government, was not already bad enough for the heirs of the House of Stanley, worse still was the fracturing of its relations with the Crown occasioned by this judicial murder and the long-term political marginalisation of the 8th Earl, and his descendants, which resulted from it. The reasons which led Charles Stanley, as a committed Royalist and fervent Anglican, to break with his king over the issue of Christian's death, and to pursue such a single-minded and disastrous course of action, will become clear only upon a closer examination of the Earl's career and of the tensions inherent in Manx politics, from the Interregnum through to the return of the monarchy.

The Restoration of May 1660 was initially welcomed right across the Isle of Man. The proclamation of Charles II as king was greeted, in each of the major towns in turn, with 'shouting, shooting of muskets and ordnance [*sic*], drinking of beer, [and] with great rejoicing'.<sup>4</sup> In this heady atmosphere it was comparatively easy for Charles, as the new Earl of Derby, to reassert the traditional rights of the House of Stanley as Lords of Man, even after an absence of some nine years. The administration of the Isle, under both Commonwealth and Protectorate governments, had left most of the pre-existing social structures intact and had allowed the local elites to continue largely unmolested in their offices, while Sir Thomas Fairfax had simply assumed the prerogatives of the Stanley Lords and had ruled largely according to their precedents.<sup>5</sup> In contrast to his return to his Lancashire estates, where he had to fight hard to impose his authority and to guarantee the election of his placemen, Earl Charles appeared to have inherited an extremely favourable set of circumstances on Man.<sup>6</sup> The Island was capable of supporting a large population through agriculture and fishing, while its strategic position, commanding the trade and invasion routes across the Irish Sea, ensured it a value and an importance that far exceeded its modest geographical size. Moreover the very fact that Man was remote, in the words of one contemporary, an island 'encompassed by the air and environed by the sea ... planted in the deep by the council of the Almighty', had ensured that it had retained a measure of independence and autonomy that was completely unthinkable on the mainland.<sup>7</sup> The rule of the Stanleys, first as 'kings' and later as lords of the Isle, enjoying sovereign powers but paying homage to the kings of England, had not resulted in political integration or in a concerted attempt to anglicize the culture and language of the indigenous people. The Manx language continued to function, largely unchallenged on the Island, as the primary means of communication in both business and recreation, while the expensive library of English and Latin texts brought over at Fairfax's command went unread in the confines of Castle Rushen.<sup>8</sup> However, if Gaelic culture remained deeply rooted in the popular consciousness, then Manx government retained many distinctive features which were overwhelmingly Scandinavian in origin. Foremost among these were the open-air assembly at Tynwald, convened to promulgate laws, the House of Keys, which acted as a

representative body, and a system of Deemsters, who administered local government and served as the equivalent of the English Justices of the Peace.<sup>9</sup> At the apex of this structure was the Lord of Man, whose position was held to be sacrosanct, on the grounds that ‘the government there ever was, and still is monarchical, for not any one in the Island hath any the least power to act anything of himself, by himself, but only the lord, and in his absence the governor of the Island who is his representative ... with so few instruments, all things are managed in this diminutive monarchy’.<sup>10</sup> With the political and religious opposition to his rule already broken, the Island’s militia firmly under his control and with the tacit support of the civil population taken for granted, the Earl of Derby should have begun his personal rule in an atmosphere of hope and reconciliation, and in the expectation of achieving the future prosperity and ‘good government’ of the Isle.<sup>11</sup> However, in reality this was to be very far from the case and the desire for vengeance for the death of the Earl’s father and public atonement for the sin of rebellion fundamentally tainted the government of Charles Stanley on Man, and ultimately scattered all his early advantages to dust.

After spending years in exile, a term in prison for the part he had played in Booth’s uprising, and having witnessed his father’s execution and the sequestration of his estates, Earl Charles showed no desire at all to overcome the feelings of bitterness and division generated by the civil war years. Whereas previous Stanley lords had attempted to enhance their status among the northern magnates by maintaining a balance between different factions, and religious groupings, the 8th Earl had no such qualms. Conceiving of himself as one of ‘God’s Viceregents on Earth’, he was prepared to confront opposition head-on and to act as a factional leader, championing the most strident and intolerant form of Cavalier politics and High Anglicanism.<sup>12</sup> As Lord Lieutenant of Lancashire, he pursued an uncompromising propaganda campaign against both Protestant and Roman Catholic dissenters, and purged the municipalities of radicals and Presbyterians in accordance with the most stringent interpretation of the provisions of the Corporation Act of 1662.<sup>13</sup> Moreover from the very moment of the Restoration, both he and his mother, the dowager Countess, Charlotte, embarked upon a campaign to win back their lost estates and to bring to trial all those who had a hand in the conviction and execution of the 7th Earl at Bolton, for his part in the failed Royalist risings of 1651.<sup>14</sup>

This campaign enjoyed considerable backing at the Court in Whitehall, where many returning exiles continued to view the sacrifices made by the House of Stanley as being among the finest acts of devotion to the monarchy witnessed during the entire course of the civil wars. Earl James appeared as an archetypal martyr for the Anglican faith, whose sufferings were compared – not least by his own son – to those of King Charles I, while stories of Countess Charlotte’s stout defence of her manor at Lathom made for reading which was not only ‘improving’ but also extremely exciting. As a result

of the sympathy generated for the plight of the Stanleys, the House of Lords pushed through a series of bills in the spring and summer of 1660 which aimed to restore to the Earl all the lands held by his family prior to 1642.<sup>15</sup> The passage of these bills, however, caused great alarm to Lord Chancellor Clarendon. He recognised that in summarily dispossessing the sitting tenants, many of whom had bought their properties quite legally in the years following on from the sequestrations, the legislation contravened both the spirit of the Declaration of Breda and the Act of Indemnity. Furthermore, in pauperising a section of the gentry who had not raised a hand against the Restoration of the Monarchy, the legislation could only prove divisive and serve to stir up a fresh cycle of hatreds and vendettas. Consequently, he prevailed upon Charles II to withhold his assent to the bills.<sup>16</sup> Even though a comprehensive plan for compensating both the tenants and Derby, who was offered the chance to buy back his properties from out of his still considerable fortune, was advanced, the Earl remained unsatisfied and railed against what he took to be the king's base ingratitude. As soon as the final verdict was delivered on the status of his 'lost' manors, in May 1662, Earl Charles removed himself from the Court and returned to Lancashire in order to nurse his private and public grievances.<sup>17</sup>

The king's apparent rejection of his services, and what he believed to have been an unwarranted infringement upon his rights as both courtier and landed magnate, touched him deeply and, thereafter, he shunned the politics of Whitehall. However despite his claims that he had retreated into private life, Derby maintained his hold on the governance of Lancashire and turned his attention increasingly towards the Isle of Man. The deaths of both his father and King Charles I upon the scaffold had served as defining moments in his political career, and appeared to cry out for similar forms of judicial retribution to be administered to those who had authorised them. As Lord of Man, Stanley was still able to conceive of his position as a wronged son, and sovereign heir, as being analagous with that of the King of England on his triumphant return. Unfortunately, while Charles II had exempted the Regicides by name from the Act of Indemnity and had had the satisfaction of exacting both actual vengeance – in the cases of men such as Thomas Harrison, John Okey and Hugh Peter – and posthumous retribution – in the cases of the corpses of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton and John Bradshaw – the Earl of Derby had had, under the terms of the same legislation, his own claims swept aside. Having failed, along with the Countess Charlotte, to bring to trial the army officers who had sat in court-martial upon his father, the Earl now embarked on a campaign of private vengeance, aimed at prosecuting all those who had taken up arms in opposition to his parents during the Manx rebellion of 1651.<sup>18</sup> This drastic and high risk course of action has been described as representing a policy of 'effectual defiance' towards central government, and the authority of King Charles II in particular.<sup>19</sup> Moreover in targeting the Manx for special treatment and retribution, the Earl could be guaranteed a

measure of success and a pretence of legality that would have been wholly absent anywhere else at this time in the British Isles.

Consequently, on 12 September 1662, Derby issued orders to his ‘Officers both Civill and Military’ in the Isle of Man to ‘forthwith upon sight ... proceed against William Christian of Rona[lds]way (sometimes recedent of my Island of Mann) for all his illegal actions and Rebellions at or before the yeare of our Lord one thousand sixe hundred fifty and one, or at any time since’.<sup>20</sup> From the beginning, therefore, it would appear that Christian was to be the Earl’s specific target. Indeed, the warrant for his arrest promised a pardon – issued by Derby in his capacity as Lord of Man, rather than by Charles II as king of England – to all Manxmen who ‘by reason of the iniquity of these late times may have been constrain’d to doe some things w[hi]ch may have rendered them ... liable to some inconveniencies in the severe eye of the Law’. The only group exempted from this pardon, and to whom clemency was not to be shown, were those who could be closely identified with the fallen governor. They were to be condemned and found ‘notoriously guilty with the Abovesaid William Christian’ as though they too were regicides.<sup>21</sup> This clear equation of the actions of one relatively obscure placeman and his colleagues with the most serious of all capital crimes, and the unequivocal presumption of Christian’s guilt, speaks of an enormous level of personal hatred held by Earl Charles for his former servant. This can only be accounted for by the thorough examination of the nature of the relationship between these two very different men, the conditions which led their careers to diverge so radically, and the circumstances which allowed their final legal confrontation to so thoroughly polarise Manx society.

## II

Branded as a ‘great rebel’, and quickly ‘clapt up ... to come upon trial for his life’, William Christian was, then as now, a difficult and problematical figure.<sup>22</sup> His early career had been spent in the loyal service of the Stanleys, avoiding any involvement in the abortive rebellion of his kinsman – Edward – in 1643 and acquiescing in the attempts of James Stanley, the 7th Earl, to impose a new system of land tenure upon the Manx.<sup>23</sup> Tenant farmers had traditionally been allowed to sell or bequeath their lands at will, holding them for their lord on the payment of a nominal fealty, or ‘straw rent’. However in addition to holding the monopoly on the grinding of corn and fishing rights, and the levying of taxes on all imports and exports, James Stanley had also laid claim to the ownership of all the land on the Island. This innovation, which limited tenancies to just twenty-one years or ‘three lives’, was bitterly resented and proved to be a major factor in the rebellions of both 1643 and 1651. Yet, despite the opposition of many of the leading islanders and members of his own family, it had been William Christian who had led

the way in accepting the new terms and conditions for the granting of an inheritance, following the grant of his father's estate at Ronaldsway.<sup>24</sup> Having thus come to the attention of the 7th Earl, he rose quickly in his service and was appointed Receiver-General of the Isle in 1648, distinguishing himself by his loyalty and diligence, and through his skilful deployment of his powerful network of family and friends in the service of his lord. When his master led an army into England three years later, Christian seemed to be the natural choice to command the hastily assembled militia forces, which were to be left behind to garrison the Isle, and to protect the person of the Countess Charlotte and her family.

However the total defeat of James Stanley's troops at the Battle of Wigan Lane, when allied to the arrival of a Parliamentary fleet off the Manx coast, caused Christian to rapidly reconsider his loyalties. Unlike the large majority of the senior officers employed in the Stanley household, he was an islander and, together with his nearest kinsmen, made it his business 'to move that their poor Island might be preserved from spoil, and the Inhabitants from undoing'.<sup>25</sup> Given that the best record of his life is to be gleaned from the proceedings of his trial and from fragmentary household and estate accounts, there is little reliable evidence to account for his sudden *volte face*. Certainly his earlier willingness to uphold the rights of Earl James to innovate in the agriculture of Man and to radically shift the balance between lord and tenant, emphatically in favour of the former, should act to dispel much of the nationalist rhetoric and elements of folklore which have attached themselves to his name on the Island today. With the Earl wholly absent, together with his best troops – who since the rising of 1643 had been employed to keep a significant section of the civil population down – and with the knowledge that both Scotland and Ireland had recently undergone bloody subjugation by the armies of the Commonwealth, it would seem safe to conclude that fear of social unrest, occasioned by widespread fighting and the free-quartering of troops, allied to a healthy dose of self-interest and an appreciation of the *realpolitik* were the crucial factors in forcing Christian's hand in the early autumn of 1651. By exchanging one set of masters for another, both he and his natural constituency of supporters, his close kinsmen and tenants, could hope to preserve their relatively advantageous positions within the society and governance of the Isle. Any dramatic change in the administration of Man set in place by a victorious Commonwealth government, which had had to fight hard to secure its conquest, or a sudden influx of English immigrants authorised from Whitehall and backed by the City of London, would have struck decisively at the powerbase of the extended Christian family and removed, perhaps forever, the property and indigenous institutions which they held dear. In this light, Christian's assumption of the mantle of rebellion was a fundamentally conservative action. He wished, quite naturally, to spare the Islanders bloodshed but equally prized the autonomy of Manx local government, over which he now held control. Fulfilling the role of intermediary

between the English officers of the expeditionary force, the traditional Anglo-Manx elites and the Gaelic speaking crofters and fishermen, Christian appears to have been aware that the opportunity to become the chief citizen and power-broker on the Isle had at last presented itself, without recourse to constitutional expedient, administrative innovation or even overt coercion.

His Ronaldsway home became the headquarters of the rebellion and fearing that the Countess might make separate terms with Parliament, by which the Manx might be sold 'for 2d. or 3d.' a head, he led the militia in a series of raids aimed at seizing the major strongholds on the Isle.<sup>26</sup> With their friends and neighbours among the garrisons, the outlying forts fell easily to the insurgents but the stone walls, and presence of professional soldiers, meant that the castles of Peel and Rushen held out until the actual landing and arrival of Commonwealth troops less than a fortnight later.<sup>27</sup>

His success in delivering up the Island, almost bloodlessly, to Parliament ensured that Christian retained his post as Receiver-General, as had been hoped, under the new titular lordship of Sir Thomas Fairfax. Furthermore in having successfully negotiated the terms of the surrender with Colonel Duckenfield, William Christian and his brother John had asked only that their countrymen 'might enjoy their lawes and liberties as formerly they had', thus preserving their own sinecures intact while firmly establishing their credentials with the new regime as the only knowledgeable, and well affected, advisors to hand on the largely unwritten constitution of the Island.<sup>28</sup> In attempting to settle a nominally republican administration upon a distant region, about which they knew precious little, it is little surprise that members of parliament soon came to rely upon the services of 'Dymster [John] Christian and his Bro[the]r [William] the Receiver, two of the ablest and honestest Gentlemen in the Island ... by whom they may receive a full and true account touching their Laws'.<sup>29</sup>

Having thoroughly refashioned himself as a useful instrument of the new powers at work in England, by 1656 William Christian had reached the apogee of his career. When Lord Fairfax appointed him as Governor of the Isle, he took up his post without first relinquishing his receivership, and continued to concentrate offices and sinecures in the hands of his closest friends and family. One early historian of the Manx nation was to bitterly remark that 'By policy they [ie. the Christians] are crept into the principal places of power, and they be seated round about the country, and in the heart of it; they are matched with the best families'.<sup>30</sup> Worse still, William was not averse to employing the same sweeping powers as the Stanleys in crushing dissent and all too quickly managed to alienate many of those who had followed him in the rebellion of 1651. James Banks was sentenced, in 1654, to have his ears clipped for 'having spoken scandalous and treasonable words against the Receiver and Deemster Christian', while Samsbury Radcliffe, another veteran of the rising, received the same sentence three years later for uttering 'many foul and scandalous words' against the Christian brothers.<sup>31</sup>

However, the fall of the little oligarchy put in place by William and John Christian was to come as suddenly, and quite as unexpectedly, as it had first arisen. It would appear that the trust displayed by the Commonwealth and Protectorate governments towards these 'honest' gentlemen was sorely misplaced, as in 1658 Lord Fairfax removed his governor on the grounds of financial mismanagement. His new appointee, James Chaloner, who was himself one of the actual Regicides, immediately launched an enquiry into the misappropriation of funds and in the following year issued an order for the seizure of William Christian's estate, on the grounds that he 'hath w[i]thdrawn himself out of the [Island] in a private manner, havinge neither the Consent of the Lord of the Isle, nor of myself ... [and] alsoe as hee the said late Receiv[e]r stood then upon his Accompts before mee by a spetiall Comission from his Lo[rds]hipp for divers Thousands of pounds, ffor which hee hath not yet given any accompt'.<sup>32</sup> Despite the attempts of Christian's son, George to intercede on his behalf and to produce some documentation of his expenses, it would appear as if the monies set aside from the sequestered bishopric of Sodor and Man for the establishment of four new grammar schools on the Isle had been diverted, and indeed either partly or fully appropriated, by William.<sup>33</sup> His flight from the Island and the arrest of his brother, John, for aiding in his escape, would seem to cast a long shadow over his claims to innocence and probity.<sup>34</sup>

Retiring to his estates on the Ribble estuary, which ironically looked across the river to the shattered ruins of Lathom House, William began almost immediately to plot his return to Manx politics. This time he chose to back the Army leaders and was heavily implicated in a failed coup against Governor Chaloner that was mounted in the winter of 1659, by disaffected republicans and soldiers. It is significant to note that five out of the ten leading citizens who were imprisoned by the rebels during the course of this abortive putsch were to take their seats in judgement upon Christian, just over three years later.<sup>35</sup> Thereafter we learn nothing of either William, his activities or movements until May 1660, when he hurried up to London in order 'to have a sight' of King Charles II on his entry into the City. It would seem that the Restoration of the Monarchy offered him a fresh opportunity to turn his coat, once again, and to effect a permanent return to office in his homeland. To this end, he sought out the 8th Earl of Derby, the son of his original patron, at Westminster and gave evidence to the ecclesiastical committee that Stanley had established in order to 'restore the collapsed and most deplorable estate and conditon of religion' in the Isle of Man, with the aim of ordering 'the settlings of religion and all ecclesiastical affayres as they were in my late father's tyme'.<sup>36</sup> Christian effectively abandoned his earlier dalliances with the baptists and other sectaries, and now sought to portray himself as a loyal son of the Church of England.<sup>37</sup> It is impossible to know whether his sudden display of contrition would have suitably impressed Earl Charles, let alone Dr Rutter and the other Anglican divines assembled there, for Christian was

prevented from taking any further part in the proceedings by his arrest for an outstanding debt of £20,000. This astronomical figure was probably the sum estimated by Chaloner to have been lost from the Manx exchequer during the period from 1658–59, and resulted in William being confined to the Fleet prison over the course of the next year.<sup>38</sup> When he finally did emerge and attempted to return to the Isle of Man, he found, probably to his total surprise, that he had become an object of hate for the authorities and for the Earl of Derby in particular.

Earl Charles had been raised at Castle Rushen, and it seems more than likely that he would have known William Christian from his childhood up until the time of his removal to England in the mid-1640s. However his difficult relationship with his parents and his total break with them over his marriage in 1650, which led to his disinheritance and his brief rapprochement with the government of the Commonwealth may well have led Christian to expect that his favour would be forthcoming. This might account for his appearance at Derby House in July 1660, and his determination to relaunch his flagging political career in the Isle of Man, during the winter months of 1662. Unfortunately we have no record of the Earl's reception of Christian at Westminster, and cannot precisely determine when he decided to break him. Certainly by the time of William's return to the Island, the Earl had committed himself 'to revenge a father's bloud', believing that Christian was not only a rebellious subject but also 'very instrumentall in the death' of James Stanley, the 7th Earl.<sup>39</sup>

This rationalisation for the initial proceedings against Christian has been largely ignored by previous historians, for it does not seem to bear any relation to his actual 'crimes'.<sup>40</sup> He had undoubtedly provided leadership in the rebellion of 1651, and could conceivably have been charged with the betrayal of the fortresses under his charge to Parliament, but in no strict sense of the word could he be held responsible for having played any part in the committal and eventual execution of the 7th Earl at Bolton. At the very time that James Stanley was fighting for his life, in early October 1651, William Christian had been busy laying the foundations for his rebellion on Man. Charles, who had helped to dress his father before his final walk to the scaffold, must have been aware of this. It seems fair to suggest, therefore, that Earl Charles – having already failed to bring the real authors of his father's death to justice – was now attempting to concentrate his desire for vengeance upon one, relatively minor and vulnerable, scapegoat whom he could actually reach. That he, himself, had sided with Parliament right up until his father's trial and that a reconciliation had only been possible at the very last moment, probably only served to intensify his feelings of hatred towards William Christian.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, his confrontation with the king and retirement from Court life had freed him of any of the normal constraints acting upon a great nobleman; henceforth he could push his remaining feudal prerogatives to their limits and demand that the 'most

---

heinous sinne' of rebellion 'ought to be purified by the blood of the most heinously guilty'.<sup>42</sup>

### III

In returning home, Christian had believed himself to be safe: covered by the terms of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion which promised that 'no crime whatsoever committed against his Majesty or his royal father shall hereafter rise in judgment or be brought in question against any of them to the least endamage of them, either in their lives, liberties, estates, or to prejudice their reputations'.<sup>43</sup> However in committing his prisoner to stand trial, Derby now significantly shifted his ground and re-activated a statute which had lain, largely dormant, on the Island's books since 1422. Written with the possibility of a Scottish invasion in mind, this legislation declared 'that whosoever riseth against the Lieutenant [governor] ... is a Traytor by our Law', on the grounds that they had acted in violation of 'the Lord's prerogatives'. Thus it was for treason against the Lords of Man, and not the kings of England, that William Christian was finally indicted on 13 November 1662.<sup>44</sup>

Even then, things did not work out quite as the Earl of Derby and his chief officials had planned. The arrest of a such a prominent figure had sent shock waves through the closely knit island community, and many of those who had taken part in the rebellion of 1651 were made fearful of losing their own lives and estates. In an attempt to defuse a potentially explosive situation, and to elicit sympathy for his own cause, Derby ordered a public notice to be read 'in English and Mankse' by the ministers of every church on the Island, for the 'better understanding' and 'satisfaction' of his people. Promising that the memory of 'the notorious revolution' would be 'clearlie oblitterated', he made it plain that a maximum number of five prosecutions would be made and that 'henceforth none in his Lo[rds]pps Island, shall be mollected ... for any thinge, they have done concerninge the rebellion or insurrection committed in the year 1651'.<sup>45</sup> The five exemptions to his clemency may well have been reserved with an eye to breaking the will of Christian's supporters who still sat in the House of Keys, and who were lobbying hard for his release.

At this point, the Earl could not take the loyalty of the twenty-four members of the House of Keys for granted. They had already rejected his original demand to condemn their prisoner summarily, without the need for a trial, and worried that Christian might still be acquitted, Derby now sought to curtail their influence in the proceedings. As a result he made provisions to pack the 'Grand Jury [with] ... one half Garrison Men', soldiers who would take their orders directly from him, without question and without the need to be answerable to the wider community.<sup>46</sup> Faced by a hostile court, Christian now threw his accusers into confusion by refusing to plead at the bar. This move has always been viewed as his gravest mistake, the one action which finally set

the seal upon his fate, but at the time he may well have believed that he had very good grounds for acting in the manner in which he did.<sup>47</sup> The death sentence had been rarely used on the Isle of Man for any offence other than sheep stealing, and in denying the authority of the court to try him Christian was following the precedent of his kinsman, Edward, after the failed rebellion of 1643. He too had refused to plead and a Manx jury, much to the fury of Lord James, had reduced his sentence from death to one of imprisonment.<sup>48</sup>

However Earl Charles and Henry Nowell, his Deputy-Governor and a former client of the Christians, moved quickly to retrieve the situation and to stamp out dissent. Seven members of the House of Keys, who had ignored their summonses to attend the trial or whose loyalty was suspect, were stripped of their offices and replaced by the Earl's appointees. At the same time, Nowell delivered his verdict that, in failing to offer a defence, Christian had forfeited his right to a trial and admitted to his guilt. He concluded that the prisoner 'ought not to obtayne ye same benefitt of tryall' as those who had acknowledged the authority of the court, and 'That any malefactor refusinge or denyenge the law ... [was] deemed to bee at ye Lord's mercy for body and goods at his hono[u]rs pleasure, [and] is to receive his doom and sentence for life or death as pleaseth the Gov[e]rn[o]r or Deputy Gov[e]rn[o]r'.<sup>49</sup>

Christian knew all too well that he could not expect mercy from the Earl and his servants, but still hoped that he might expect a measure of justice from a court sitting on the mainland. To this end he petitioned the King and Privy Council that he might 'be tryed by yo[u]r Malj[es]t[ie]s Lawes of England where he many years lived and hath an Estate ... as much as the said proceedings are without President and contrary to the Lawes within the said Island'.<sup>50</sup> However the rough nature of the Irish Sea in winter delayed the petition's arrival, and Derby, probably aware of its despatch, moved decisively to bring matters to a swift and bloody conclusion. Christian was duly convicted, his lands decreed forfeit, and sentenced to be hung drawn and quartered in a manner similar to that of the English Regicides. Only upon the 'earnest peticon of his wife and consideracon of her very disconsolate condition', was the punishment reduced to execution by firing squad.<sup>51</sup> No time was wasted in carrying out the sentence and Christian met his end on Hango Hill, just three days later, without having recourse to an appeal.

Sitting at Whitehall, the Privy Council deliberated over Christian's petition quite unaware of his death. Secretary Bennet concluded that there were solid grounds for 'Pardoning his offence' and, on 16 January 1663, King Charles signed an order for Derby to bring his prisoner up to London to be examined before the Council. There was reason to doubt the conviction 'upon pretence of Treason' and Christian was found to be 'legally capable of our grace and favour'.<sup>52</sup> Informed through Bennet of this worrying new development, Derby was unrepentant and defiant, dismissing the 'applications [made] to the King to evade the justice of that Island'.<sup>53</sup> The death of Christian, he argued was a private 'concerne of my owne', and had fallen outside the

bounds of English jurisdiction.<sup>54</sup> Whilst reminding the Secretary of State of the services performed by his family on behalf of the Crown, he also issued a veiled threat. He held his rights as the Lord of Man, over an independent fiefdom, and that 'his Majestie will be pleased not to take from me that w[hi]ch my Ancestors and I have enjoyed by the gift of our Gracious Kings'.<sup>55</sup> This rebuke, as might be imagined, did precious little to endear the Earl to his sovereign, and he was duly summoned to London in order to give a full account of his precipitate actions. Even then, Derby attempted to delay proceedings and claimed that his Manx officials could not join him in giving evidence before the Privy Council, as the seas were rough and had 'to be twice crossed'.<sup>56</sup>

For the next six months the two rival factions, representing the Earl of Derby and Christian's sons, respectively, petitioned and counter-petitioned the King and his Council for redress of their grievances. A propaganda war was waged on the streets of London, with the Earl having a broadsheet printed in order to vindicate his position. In this, and in depositions brought before the King, he argued that he ruled the Isle of Man as an independent sovereign, though owing homage to the king of England in the same manner as in former times had been offered 'to the Kings of Norway and Scotland'. Furthermore, he stated that the Act of Indemnity did not extend to the Isle of Man because, unlike Jersey and Guernsey, it had not been specifically mentioned by name. It soon became clear that the definition of Manx sovereignty was the key to the whole case. This was a particularly grey area, as the Crown had always allowed the Stanleys virtual autonomy on the Island in return for their continued loyalty and willingness to pay for the upkeep of its garrison, and coastal defences. However, there were already precedents for limiting the power of the Stanleys. William Blundell, one of their own partisans, had written in the 1640s that Man 'was always conveyned in letters-patents by the name of an island and not of a kingdom', while the Commonwealth government had chosen to regard it as being very much 'a part of England'.<sup>57</sup> More significantly, Charles II, as a new monarch whose hold on power had not as yet been firmly consolidated, could not afford to ignore Derby's challenge to his central authority. The Restoration had been accomplished in the spirit and promise of conciliation, and any successful attack upon the provisions of the Act of Indemnity would have opened the floodgates for scores of rival law suits, and lent an unacceptable degree of legitimacy to the settling of private vendettas. Furthermore, the King and Privy Council were keen to emphasise that the days of great feudal barons were past and to re-establish the power and authority of the Crown, over the regions. It is no surprise, therefore, to discover that they moved swiftly to halt Derby's attempts to intimidate witnesses and found heavily against him in their final judgement.<sup>58</sup>

In a humiliating and damning summation of the case, the Council delivered a series of verdicts which found against the Earl and his supporters on almost every count. The 'pretended Court of Justice' which had sat at Castle

Rushen was lambasted and although the Earl of Derby escaped punishment, five of his servants who had presided over the trial were held for further questioning. By way of contrast, three of William Christian's closest associates who had been awaiting trial on the Isle of Man were to be released from custody and fully compensated, while his confiscated estates were to be returned to his widow and sons.<sup>59</sup> Furthermore, in a damaging blow to the Earl's prestige it was decided 'That the Act of General Pardon and Indemnity did and ought to be understood to extend into the Isle of Man ... And that being a Publique General Act of Parliament it ought to have been taken notice of by the Judges in the Isle ... thereof His Majesty being deeply sensible of this great violation of His Act of General Pardon ... doth expect and require that all His subjects in all His Domains and Plantations shall enjoy the full benefit and advantage of the same'. Henceforth the Isle of Man, though not a 'Territory belonging to England', was to be considered as being under the Dominion of the Crown.<sup>60</sup>

In the future it would be impossible for the Earl of Derby to enforce such summary and arbitrary forms of justice in his courts, while his powers and independence of action in his own domains had been substantially curtailed. The printing and distribution of fresh copies of the Act of Indemnity, and of an account 'touching the illegal Proceedings in the Isle of Man against William Christian', were authorised by the Privy Council and stressed the fact that the interests of Derby were wholly subordinate to those of the Crown. The arrest of so many of his officials, even though they were never brought to trial, virtually dismantled Stanley government in the Isle while, in years to come, many islanders would turn to their bishop or king for justice, in an attempt to entirely circumvent the Earl's monopoly of power.<sup>61</sup> Although it would be a mistake to see the case of William Christian as marking a watershed in the fortunes of the Stanley Lords of Man, the events of the early 1660s severely restricted the 8th Earl of Derby's room for manoeuvre on the Island and reduced his later rule to little more than that of an absentee landlord. In incurring the displeasure of his sovereign, he had effectively limited his family's sphere of influence, removing them from the councils of state, and locating them firmly within the localised politics of the north-west of England. Moreover while disputes between the Stanleys and Christians simmered for another two generations, no other Manxman would go to his death simply to satisfy the blood-lust of his lord. In ignoring the need 'to bury all seeds of future discords', the 8th Earl of Derby had greatly diminished the standing of his family on both a national and a local level, proving beyond all measure of doubt that 'Revenge at least was awake if Justice slept' in his lands.<sup>62</sup>

## Notes

- 1 H. Bradley, 'William Christian', *Dictionary of National Biography* (London, Smith Elder & Company, 1887), X, 282; A. W. Moore, *A History of the Isle of Man* (London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1900, rpt. Surrey 1992), I, 380; A. W. Moore, *Manx Worthies* (Douglas, S.K. Broadbent & Company, 1901), p. 65.
- 2 C.W. Airne, *The Story of the Isle of Man* (Douglas, Norris Modern Press, 1964), II, 99; S. H. Beach, *The Yesterdays Behind the Door* (Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, 1956), Figs. 8–9 and p. 50; J. R. Dickinson, 'The Earl of Derby and the Isle of Man', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 141 (1991), 54; W. Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône and the Manx Rebellion, 1651: Records and Proceedings relating to the Case of William Christian of Ronaldsway* (Douglas, The Manx Society, 26, 1877), pp. xl, 35–40.
- 3 V. Allen, 'Manx Patriots – Who needs them?', *Inheritance: The Living Culture of Mann*, 1:1 (1998), 71–2; Anon, 'Patriot or Traitor?', *Isle of Man Weekly Times* (11 March 1933); Beach, *Yesterdays*, p. 51; Bradley, 'William Christian', p. 282; G. Broderick, 'Baase Illiam Dhône [The Death of Brown Haired William]', *Celtica*, 14 (1981), 105–11; A. M. Cubbon, 'The Cap of Illiam Dhône', *Journal of the Manx Museum*, 6 (1964), 217–18; J. G. Cumming, *The Great Stanley* (London, William Macintosh, 1867); Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. xxxix, 35–9; W. Scott, *Peveiril of the Peak* (London, Macmillan and Co., 1938).
- 4 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. xxxv.
- 5 Beach, *Yesterdays*, p. 44; J. R. Dickinson, *The Lordship of Man Under the Stanleys: Government and Economy in the Isle of Man, 1580–1704* (Manchester, The Chetham Society, 1996), pp. 19, 24, 41, 61; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. xxxiii; Moore, *History of the Isle of Man*, I, 272–4, 461; J. Wilson, *Fairfax: General of Parliament's Forces in the English Civil War* (New York, Franklin Watts, 1985), p. 168.
- 6 J. J. Bagley, *The Stanleys* (London, Sidgwick & Jackson, 1985), pp. 107–9, 111–15; B. Coward, 'The Social and Political Position of the Earls of Derby in Later Seventeenth-Century Lancashire' in J. I. Kermod and C. B. Phillips (eds), *Seventeenth-century Lancashire* (Liverpool, Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire 132, 1983), pp. 139–45.
- 7 W. Blundell, *A History of the Isle of Man, 1648–1656*, (ed.) W. Harrison, (Douglas, The Manx Society, 27, 1878), II, 36; Dickinson, *Lordship of Man*, pp. 10–11, 109–26, 140 n. 27, 193–208; F. R. Raines (ed.), 'History and Antiquities of the Isle of Man' in *The Stanley Papers: The Private Devotions and Miscellanies of James, Seventh Earl of Derby* (Manchester, The Chetham Society, 70, 1867), Part III, pp. 17–19.
- 8 Blundell, *History of the Isle of Man*, pp. 58–9, 84; T. E. Gibson (ed.), *A Cavalier's Note Book: Being the Notes, Anecdotes and Observations of William Blundell of Crosby, Lancashire* (London, Green & Company, 1880), pp. 301–2; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 46–7; Raines (ed.), 'History and Antiquities of the Isle of Man', p. 22.
- 9 Blundell, *History of the Isle of Man*, pp. 66–7, 69, 76–7
- 10 Blundell, *History of the Isle of Man*, p. 58.
- 11 P. W. Caine, 'The Second Episode on Illiam Dhône', *Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society Proceedings*, 4 (1932–42), 137–41; Coward, 'Earls of

- Derby', p. 140; B. Coward, *The Stanleys, Lords Stanley and the Earls of Derby, 1385–1672* (Manchester, The Chetham Society, 1983), p. 178; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. xxxv, 27; Moore, *History of the Isle of Man*, I, 375.
- 12 Bagley, *The Stanleys*, pp. 111–14; Coward, 'Earls of Derby', pp. 142–5; Coward, *The Stanleys*, pp. 179–82; P. Draper, *The House of Stanley* (Ormskirk, Privately printed, 1864), p. 251; R. Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658–67* (Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 142; J. Miller, *Charles II* (London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991), p. 64; C. Stanley, Earl of Derby, Lord of Man and the Isles, *The Protestant Religion is a Sure Foundation and Principle of a True Christian* (London, 1671), p. 2.
- 13 It is interesting to note that among the Roman Catholic families he persecuted, the Molyneuxs and the Tyldesleys had been among his father's most fervent supporters during the civil wars. The Earl's agents were to pursue a similarly uncompromising campaign against religious dissenters on the Isle of Man. W. C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism to 1660* (York, William Sessions, 1912, rpt. 1981), p. 225; Coward, *The Stanleys*, pp. 179–80; Coward, 'Earls of Derby', pp. 138–9, 141–4; C. Evans, *Friends in the Seventeenth Century* (Philadelphia, The Friends' Book Store, 1875), pp. 345–50; T. Hodgkin, 'Ruillick-ny-Quakeryn: Notes on the History of Friends in the Isle of Man', *Friends Quarterly Examiner* (Tenth Month, 1908), pp. 471–92; Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 153; P. Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661–1667* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 97, 189; C. Stanley, Earl of Derby, Lord of Man and the Isles, *A Dialogue Between Orthodoxe a Royalist, and Cacodaemon, one Popishly affected* (London, 1671), pp. 2–3, 29, 34, 37–8; Stanley, *Protestant Religion*, pp. 3–4, 7, 9; C. Stanley, Earl of Derby, Lord of Man and the Isles, *Truth-Triumphant: In a Dialogue Between a Papist and a Quaker* (London, 1671), pp. 47–9, 51, 53–5.
- 14 Bagley, *The Stanleys*, pp. 105, 107–10; Beach, *Yesterdays*, p. 49; Coward, *The Stanleys*, pp. 76–7, 178–9; Coward, 'Earls of Derby', pp. 139–41; Draper, *House of Stanley*, pp. 250, 252.
- 15 Bagley, *The Stanleys*, p. 107; Beach, *Yesterdays*, p. 49; Coward, *The Stanleys*, p. 76; E. Halsall, 'A Journal of the Siege of Lathom House' in L. Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* (London, George Bell and Sons, 1904), pp. 491–516; Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 142; Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, pp. 201–2.
- 16 Derby, ever afterwards, bore Clarendon a grudge and was instrumental in the moves from 1663 onwards to have him impeached. Bagley, *The Stanleys*, pp. 107–8; Beach, *Yesterdays*, p. 49; Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 163; Seaward, *Cavalier Parliament*, pp. 203, 213, 229.
- 17 Such was Stanley's anger at the king's actions that he had the following inscription cut into his house at Knowsley: 'Charles II refused to accept a Bill passed unanimously by both Houses of Parliament for restoring to the family the estates lost by [James Stanley, the 7th Earl's] loyalty to him'; Bagley, *The Stanleys*, pp. 108–9; Coward, *The Stanleys*, pp. 76–8.
- 18 Bradshaw, the civilian judge, would have stood trial for his life as a regicide had he not died in October, 1659. The other officers were exempted from prosecution under the provisions of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. Bagley, *The*

- Stanleys*, p. 112; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. xxxv, 1–2, 46–7; Stanley, *A Dialogue Between Orthodox ... and Cacodaemon*, pp. 2, 32, 34, 39–41; Stanley, *Protestant Religion*, pp. 3–4, 10–11, 16.
- 19 Beach, *Yesterdays*, p. 49.
- 20 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 1–2.
- 21 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 2.
- 22 Bagley, *The Stanleys*, p. 110; G. D. Kinley, ‘Illiam Dhône’s Petition to the King in Council and its aftermath: Some new light’, *Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 7 (1970–72), 576.
- 23 Dickinson, ‘Earl of Derby’, pp. 42–5; Moore, *History of the Isle of Man*, I, 241–4, 266; Raines (ed.), ‘History and Antiquities of the Isle of Man’, pp. 10–11, 30–3 & 40–1.
- 24 W. Mackenzie (ed.), *Legislation by three of the thirteen Stanleys, Kings of Man* (Douglas, The Manx Society III, 1860), pp. 103–18; Moore, *History of the Isle of Man*, I, 266, II, 874–81; Raines (ed.), ‘History and Antiquities of the Isle of Man’, pp. 37–8.
- 25 Blundell, *History of the Isle of Man*, p. 60; *Mercurius Politicus* (6–13 November 1651), quoted in Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 66; D. Robertson, *A Tour through the Isle of Man, 1794* (rpt. Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, Frank Graham, 1970), p. 214.
- 26 Despite the survival of several mementoes and relics relating to William Christian, precious few personal letters or reflective works from his own hand have come down to us. In the absence of a contemporary biography, he is probably best known today through the eighteenth-century Manx ballad ‘Baase Illiam Dhône’, while William Harrison’s collection of trial transcripts and documentary sources for the 1651 rebellion remains unsurpassed as the seminal account of Christian’s life and career. Broderick, ‘Baase Illiam Dhône’, pp. 108–11; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 4–8.
- 27 Dickinson, ‘Earl of Derby’, p. 69; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 8, 15, 21; *Mercurius Politicus* quoted in Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 66, 72–4.
- 28 Blundell, *History of the Isle of Man*, pp. 84, 87; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 6.
- 29 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 79.
- 30 Peck’s *Desiderata Curiosa* (London, 1779), cited by Scott, *Peeveril of the Peak*, pp. xxxvi–xxxvii.
- 31 Caine, ‘Second Episode on Illiam Dhône’, p. 142.
- 32 J. Chaloner, ‘Governor Chaloner “Ceizes” Illiam Dhône’s Estates’, *Manx Museum Journal*, 2 (1934), 170.
- 33 Caine, ‘Second Episode on Illiam Dhône’, p. 141; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. xxxiv–xxxv.
- 34 Chaloner, ‘Governor Chaloner’, p. 170; Moore, *Manx Worthies*, p. 65.
- 35 Caine, ‘Second Episode on Illiam Dhône’, pp. 138–41.
- 36 Beach, *Yesterdays*, p. 48; Caine, ‘Second Episode on Illiam Dhône’, p. 143; Moore, *History of the Isle of Man*, I, 376.
- 37 Caine, ‘Second Episode on Illiam Dhône’, p. 140; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 35–9.
- 38 Caine suggests that the charges brought against Christian for debt were politically motivated. Citing Christian’s ownership of open-cast coalmines, near his estate at

- Sparth in Lancashire, he claims that 'it was possible for him to incur liabilities which would be unexplainable by his circumstances in the Isle of Man'. However, to have made a £20,000 loss on an investment of £900, in the space of just 17 years, would suggest gross financial incompetence. Moreover, there would appear to be no record of writs being issued against him in Lancashire and he appeared to be more than happy to retire to his manor there, in late 1662. Caine, 'Second Episode on Illiam Dhône', p. 141; Chaloner, 'Governor Chaloner', p. 170; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. xxxvii, 43; Moore, *History of the Isle of Man*, I, 376.
- 39 F. Espinasse, *Lancashire Worthies* (London, Simpkin Marshal and Company, 1874), pp. 193, 200–1; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 1.
- 40 Bagley, *The Stanleys*, p. 110; Broderick, 'Baase Illiam Dhône', pp. 106–7; Coward, 'Earls of Derby', p. 140; Kinley, 'Illiam Dhône's Petition', pp. 576–7; Moore, *History of the Isle of Man*, I, 376–7.
- 41 Espinasse, *Lancashire Worthies*, p. 168; F. S. Hampson, *An Interesting History of the Execution of James Stanley, Seventh Earl of Derby* (Bolton, Privately printed, 1914), pp. 8–9, 12–13; Raines (ed.), *The Stanley Papers*, Part I, pp. cci–ccviii. Part II, pp. ccix–ccx, cccxxxiv–ccclxi, ccclxxvii–ccclxxxvi; G. R. Smith & M. Toynbee, *Leaders of the Civil Wars* (Kineton, The Roundwood Press, 1977), pp. 45–6; G. de Witt, *The Lady of Lathom; being the Life and Original Letters of Charlotte de la Tremoille* (London, Smith Elder & Company, 1869), pp. 174–94, 208.
- 42 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 1.
- 43 A. Browning (ed.), *English Historical Documents. Volume VIII, 1660–1714* (London, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1966), p. 164.
- 44 Espinasse, *Lancashire Worthies*, p. 201; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. xxxvi.
- 45 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 2–4.
- 46 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 27.
- 47 Bagley, *The Stanleys*, p. 110; Beach, *Yesterdays*, pp. 49–50; Bradley, 'William Christian', p. 281; Broderick, 'Baase Illiam Dhône', p. 107; Coward, *The Stanleys*, p. 141.
- 48 Beach, *Yesterdays*, p. 35; Dickinson, 'Earl of Derby', pp. 45–8; Moore, *History of the Isle of Man*, I, 242, 259–63; Raines (ed.), 'History and Antiquities', pp. 40–1.
- 49 The actions of Derby and Nowell may well have been accompanied by a concerted campaign of witness intimidation. Caine, 'Second Episode on Illiam Dhône', p. 136; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. xxvi, 32–3, 36; Moore, *History of the Isle of Man*, I, 378.
- 50 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 43; Kinley, 'Illiam Dhône's Petition', p. 580.
- 51 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 34.
- 52 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 42–43; Kinley, 'Illiam Dhône's Petition', p. 577.
- 53 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 44.
- 54 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 44–5.
- 55 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 45.
- 56 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 50. 8
- 57 Blundell, *History of the Isle of Man*, p. 37; E. Coke, *The First Part of the Institutes of the Lawes of England* (London, 1633), pp. 9, 74, 390–2; M. A. E. Green (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1670: With Addenda, 1660 to 1670* (London, The Stationery Office, 1895), X, 687–8.

- 58 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 51–53; Kinley, ‘Illiam Dhône’s Petition’, pp. 580, 582–5.
- 59 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 54–7; Kinley, ‘Illiam Dhône’s Petition’, pp. 581, 588.
- 60 Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, p. 55; Kinley, ‘Illiam Dhône’s Petition’, pp. 587, 589.
- 61 Bagley, *The Stanleys*, p. 111; Harrison (ed.), *Illiam Dhône*, pp. 58–9.
- 62 Dickinson, *Lordship of Man*, p. 24 n. 52; Browning (ed.), *English Historical Documents*, p. 164; Scott, *Peveril of the Peak*, p. 828.

**Address for correspondence**

Dr John Callow, Department of History, University of Lancaster, Lancaster LA1 4YG, UK, e-mail: [j.callow@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:j.callow@lancaster.ac.uk)