

Lazarela GARIBOVIĆ*

INTERVIEW: PROFESSOR DR COLEMAN DENNEHY

Dr Coleman Dennehy is a legal historian who has taught at Maynooth, UCD, and University College London. He has also held visiting appointments at the Max Planck Institute for European Legal History in Frankfurt and the University of Vienna. Dr. Coleman Dennehy's research focuses on the history of early modern Ireland and England, particularly the Restoration period, as well as the history of law, crime and punishment, parliament and political representation, and administrative systems. His work also extends to contemporary criminology and hermeneutics. He is also a lecturer at the Department of Humanities at the Dundalk Institute of Technology. He currently serves as Director of Publications for the International Commission for the History of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions and is a Fellow of both the Royal Historical Society and the Society of Antiquaries of London.

Known for his refined style and wide-ranging interests, Coleman Dennehy is the author and editor of several influential works on early modern Irish history, legal history, and political institutions. His recent publications include *The Irish Parliament, 1613–1689: The Evolution of a Colonial Institution* (2019) and *Law and Revolution in Seventeenth-Century Ireland* (2020). He has also co-edited *Sir Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington, and His World: Restoration Court, Politics and Diplomacy* (2021), while his forthcoming books include *Crime and Punishment in Early Modern Ireland: Developing a Colonial Institution* and *Earl of Cork & Burlington Diaries, 1650–73*.

Dr Coleman Dennehy held a lecture entitled “*Considering the attrition rate in Irish criminal justice trials: why were so few executed in an*

* Second-year undergraduate law student at the University of Belgrade Faculty of Law, lazarela.garibovic@gmail.com

early modern common law country?” at the Faculty of Law, University of Belgrade on January 23, 2026. This opportunity was used to conduct this interview.

Lazarela Garibović: *Good afternoon, Professor Dennehy. I am very glad to have you as my guest, and thank you for being here today.*

Professor Dr Coleman Dennehy: Thanks for having me!

L.G: *I would like to start with the story about your education and academic path since you have a very impressive biography. So, could you share a bit about your academic journey and what inspired you to specialize both in law and history? It would be interesting to hear what your education looked like back then.*

C.D: I grew up in the southwest of Ireland in a place called Kerry. I just went to a local elementary school, and most schools in Ireland tend to have a religious input, and it was quite interesting that my school was, actually, named after Saint Oliver Plunkett, who is someone I study. Later on in the 17th century, he was a martyr who died; he was executed in England during the very early 1680s. My primary education was pretty standard and pretty happy. When I was twelve years old, my father's job moved from the southwest of Ireland to the east coast, to the capital, Dublin, so I moved up. I began secondary school, which in Ireland you begin at about the age of twelve. Again, that was just a local school called 'Community School'; it was a very good school looking back on it. They taught everything, from very practical subjects like woodwork, metalwork, engineering, and also lots of academic subjects. I enjoyed school. I am not sure if I was good at it because I didn't fail my final exams, but I didn't do well enough to attend university in the course that I wanted. It's because I chose some subjects like chemistry, which I was not very good at. I've taken German, which I found okay. So when I repeated my exams, I dropped chemistry and took up what was "called 'Home Economics'", which was a subject at the time that people generally said was a subject for girls because it was cooking and things like that, but I loved it, and I still love cooking. I did okay in that test, and on the second attempt I got into university. I suppose, in terms of my academic interests and school, I always loved history. I think my father liked history a lot, so when we were young we'd talk a bit about history and we visited history sites. We had cousins who lived in England, so we went on holiday once in London and went to a place called „The Imperial War Museum“, which is a very prominent museum in London, and it was just superior to any museum we'd had in Ireland. It had airplanes hanging from the ceiling and tanks you could get into. When you're an eight-year-old boy, that's very cool, and it's still kind

of cool, I suppose. I loved military history, history of 20th-century conflict and stuff like that. I always had an interest in history, and I was generally good at history, but my exam results were never that spectacular in history in high school. So, I was good; I could talk, I could engage with the teacher. It was frequently the case that I felt that I had a grasp on certain things that other people in class wouldn't have done. I think he recognized that he was a very good teacher actually; a guy called Tony Brady and a previous teacher called Dennis Finn were also excellent. Writing history in the way the examiners wanted me to write wasn't something I was particularly good at, but I suppose I was determined from that point to study history. I first entered university in 1996. In the Irish system, when you go to study arts or humanities as they might be called, the vast majority of our students will take two subjects. The way it worked at University College Dublin, where I was studying, was you start taking three subjects, and then you usually drop one of them. I started taking a history course, which was always the first one, English, because I found I was good at it and I enjoyed it reasonably well, and it works well with history because we write a lot in history in Ireland, and then also Celtic civilization, which is a little bit more niche. Ireland is, you know, a Celtic country and it's a very prominent part of its identity. We spent a lot of time just looking at Celtic history, archaeology, early history of Ireland, by which I mean the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th centuries, and then some things on early Celtic literature, mythology, that sort of thing. At the end of my first year, I did reasonably well at my first-year exams in University cause I think it's approached differently to the way high school history is. So I found out I was kind of getting into my groove in university in ways that maybe I didn't in secondary school. From there I had an opportunity to take history just by itself, not with another subject. It was kind of a little niche group of people studying history by itself, and it was a very good, vigorous education because it was purely in history.

L.G: It's a very fascinating story; it is reasonable to conclude that history holds immense value.

C.D: One of the values of doing history with other subjects was something highlighted by a man called John Henry Newman, who has just recently been made a Catholic saint. He was an English scholar who converted to Catholicism and came to Dublin to set up the University in the mid-19th century. Among the things he valued was a wide spread of education. I think the University that I studied at, University College Dublin, still provides that. Very happy memories of that University. When it comes to the syllabus, we teach things like classics and archaeology quite separately from history. So, history in Ireland generally starts around the

mid-5th century when Christianity begins to emerge. The official arrival of Christianity was with Saint Patrick in the year 432 AD. We know that there are Christians in Ireland before this point, but from around the mid-5th century, Christianity takes off. It's not necessarily the case that Christianity means we have history all of a sudden, but it does emerge in Ireland that we have written sources beginning to emerge because the Irish people, they have forms of writing called "Ogham languages" that actually provides for useful legal markers of property in very early sense but it also allows us to get an emergence of very early forms of vernacular literature outside of Roman or Greek. The history syllabus spreads roughly half-Irish history and roughly half elsewhere. There were some very good scholars from Europe working in the University at the time in France and in Italy. I was particularly interested in early modern history, but then in the early days I was just thinking I may become a secondary school teacher. I didn't really have ambitions towards academia, but once I got into University I really started to enjoy it. When I started to study history by myself, I was essentially getting a double hit of history each semester, which was great. I covered lots of areas: medieval, very modern, faraway places from Ireland, a lot of Irish history as well.

L.G: On that note, could you explain how the history programme was structured at your university?

C. D: We have a three-year history degree, and we have to write a dissertation – a special study where we would actually undertake some real research, read real documents either in print form or potentially in manuscript form as well. I was searching around for a topic and was taught in second year by a man called James Maguire, who is a brilliant historian. In many ways, he facilitated a lot of other people's great work because he had edited a lot of important journals, and in particular he was an editor of a huge project called "The Dictionary of Irish Biography" which is a biography entry of anyone important in Irish history. It was a huge project that took a huge part of his career. James had a knack; several people had commented on finding the right topic for the right student, and it's not the talent that every supervisor has, but he had it, I think, in abundance. He had a good sense of what you thrive in. I initially went to him. I've been studying 17th and 18th century Protestant culture in Ireland as a module and I just read some random book about church courts which in Ireland most of the things that had been the part of Canon law had switched over to the secular state but one thing that had been left behind were essentially common morality issues and I was kind of interested in this cause there's always interesting stories. So that link between court and law, but also things like marriage, family, sexuality, gender, all of those sorts of things I

was curious about. Looking back, I think the sources were difficult; a lot of materials in Latin, and I didn't have Latin. He kind of skilfully managed to manoeuvre me from wanting to do Church courts. He said to me: „Parliamentary history is, actually, really interesting these days; there are a lot of interesting things happening, have you thought about studying the Irish parliament?” So, I walked into his office saying: „I want to study Church courts” and I walked out saying: „I want to study Parliament”. I wrote a dissertation on issues surrounding the kind of anxiety around land settlement law in the mid-1660s in Ireland, and I enjoyed it. When I finished the degree, I went back to him and said: „I'd like to study post-graduate work and I'd like to do it with you”, and he kindly accepted me as a student of his. It was a two-year research master's degree. It was just in the Parliament that sat between the years 1661 and 1666. James was, which I probably didn't realise at the time, but his supervisor studied at Cambridge and his PhD supervisor was Geoffrey Elton, who wrote mostly English history, mostly Parliamentary history. His own personal history is, actually, Central European. After all, he left the Czech Republic because he was Jewish and he ended up in England. He was a very good historian and had a very strong personality. His work on procedure is really interesting in Parliamentary history. From here, I suppose, I went from being a historian working primarily in Parliament in my own head to then becoming instead a historian who was working on legal procedure. In Ireland, I don't know if it's the same in the Balkans, but the Parliament is also the Supreme Court. The House of Lords, the Upper House of Parliament, is also the Supreme Court. They hear a huge number of cases, but not only are they creating law through legislation, but they're also judging law through cases that come before the Court. The House of Lords, which is made of hereditary aristocrats, is not lawyers by any means, but they sit as both judge and jury in a lot of these cases. Parliaments are a really interesting form, I think, to study legal history because it allows us to talk about law in lots of ways. After my master's, I stayed at University College Dublin, and I took a long time to do my PhD, far longer than I would appreciate a student of mine doing now. Mine took about eight or nine years. Standards at the time were, officially, three, but most people did it in maybe three and a half years. I was working in between, and I published a decent amount of material during the course of my PhD. So my excuse is that I was busy doing other things when I should have been doing my PhD, but I firmly believe that a long PhD can be a brilliant way to do a PhD. If we rush it sometimes, particularly when people receive funding to do a PhD, there's an urge from the funding body to ensure that the work is completed in three years. Sometimes a project takes longer. You can't always find a good dissertation that's writeable in three years.

I always say: „slow-cooked stew tastes much better than fast cooking”. It is the same, sometimes, with research. Sometimes you have to give extra time to really understand what’s going on.

L. G: What was the central theme of your PhD?

C. D: The PhD I worked on then was on Irish parliaments generally in the 17th century, but I was concentrating exclusively on the legal functions of Parliament. I was not interested in Parliamentary politics; I wasn’t necessarily interested in any of the people who sat in Parliament; I wasn’t interested in the biographies of members. I was literally interested in how the Houses and Parliament generally work. It’s a bicameral parliament in Ireland, so there’s the House of Commons, which represents the town and the gentry class of the rural areas, and then the House of Lords, which represents the aristocracy and also the bishops. I was really interested in the sort of administrative and legal history of Parliament – how it works, how bills are processed through the House and how Houses interact with each other? People have ambitions within their House, and we often talk about the rise of the House of Commons taking over from the aristocracy and how they interact then with the royal personality in Dublin. The King doesn’t live in Dublin; he’s always in London because Ireland, for the most part, is part of the English royal system at this point, but there is a representative who lives and resides in Dublin. My supervisor at that point was a fellow called John McCafferty. I am still friendly with my supervisors. Lots of people fall out with supervisors; it’s not uncommon. I was very lucky with both of mine. He wrote a lot of religious history, but he was strong on politics and law as well. You are always going to be influenced by your supervisor just like a child influenced by parents. I was very lucky in terms of all the supervisors. John was excellent because he knew I had done a considerable amount of research already working with a previous supervisor, so he was willing to let me off the lead, so to speak, and so I could go and study and read what I wanted. He didn’t pursue me too much, but when I came to him with issues he was always very quick to react. When I finished the PhD, it was about two years after the economic crash in 2008, so not a good time to be emerging into the world, looking for employment, especially in such a niche area. I had been doing work with another company, plus I was studying. That company had collapsed, and I got a payment as a goodbye. I was bored, and I had nothing else to do, but I was always curious about the law, so I decided then to engage in a master’s of Laws also at University College Dublin, particularly in criminology. To me, criminology is essentially looking at things like sociology and psychology and even economics. It was taught within the law school at UCD. We studied the practical application of how

the law works and the human consequences of people who are victims of crime or offenders of crime, and then how the administration of a system works with things like prisons and parole and stuff like that – I just found that absolutely fascinating. I did something very different, even though it sounds more like legal history than studying criminology within the law context; that doesn't sound too radical, but I left the early modern period behind. I started studying things like prostitution and how the law is created around these things. Essentially, it can be a very private issue because nobody wants the State interfering in their private life, even though it sometimes does in things like abortion and contraception and things like that. There was a feeling within Ireland at the time, and I think the law that was created around the criminalisation of large parts of that industry. I don't think it necessarily worked well since then, but the research I was doing felt quite relevant at the time, more so, maybe, than legal history because it was something that was actually happening. So, I was a criminologist doing sort of investigations into the sociology of sex work. It was very useful to think about law from an entirely different perspective. You see things from a very different perspective, and it's really healthy, I think, for academics. You pick up different skills and different insights from different branches of academia, so what I am trying to do now is to gather all of these different strands and try to become a better academic, taking all of the best ideas from criminology, from law, from history and things like that.

I am currently working on a very practical master's in education. I don't know if it's the same in Serbia, but one of the things about academia is that we gather all of these clever people into buildings, into universities; primarily, it's about teaching young people, but we never actually learn how to teach well. After that, if time allows, at some point I'd probably like to study theology because it brings me another insight into ideas about how these things work.

L. G: Yes, it's all about another perspective, and I see some similarities with our educational system, which leads us to my next question. In which exact moment did you know that you made the right choice when it comes to your career? You have been influenced by some important people at the time; therefore, I would like to know about that exact moment.

C. D: It's a tricky one actually because when I finished my PhD, the employment prospects were not good. I finished my studies in criminology; I was very lucky to be awarded a Marie Curie Skłodowska award by the European Research Council, and that was a chance to go to London for two years and to spend another few years back in Ireland, all paid by the European Research Council. I published a lot. I had a lot of time to

research different projects, but even after that, again, the nature of employment in the academic sector, and I think it's the same across Europe, is that we produce more postgraduates than we do jobs available in academia. Postgraduate at anything is a brilliant training itself I would say, but I always say to students „I would like to have come and study postgraduate with me. I think it's a brilliant way to help develop people and critical thinking. There are never guarantees of employment“, so in the practical sense until I got a permanent job I was never sure that I had taken the right decision to study. Aside from the practicalities of having employment and being able to pay rent, I think that I was always confident that I was doing the right thing for me, purely from a sort of personal and intellectual development kind of perspective. I always kind of felt that my research was interesting to me, so therefore I consider it to be interesting, that I was engaged with it, that I enjoyed doing it, and I suppose we often wonder whether it contributes anything to the academy generally because we become so wrapped up in our personal sort of projects. If it's the only thing you are studying, you're constantly thinking „this is the centre of the world“ because for me in the next two years it is and it's all I am thinking about. Sometimes it is important to step back and say „is this important, is this contributing something useful?“. Sometimes studies are undertaken, and articles are written, sometimes even books are written, and it's fair to ask, „does this actually help? Does this make our intellectual horizon any brighter?“ When I was studying in London, there was a senior professor in our department called Margo Finn, who worked on 17th-century India. Somebody has done a paper on some random aspect of the past, and she legitimately would ask „So what? Why is this relevant? Why is this special?“, „Why is this worth spending a year or two of your time?“. Sometimes you see random studies that are conducted, which disappear; they don't really make any impact. In Ireland, when I was going to college, military history was not popular at all, and now two or three of the prominent universities have centres for military history. I think sometimes in legal history and parliamentary history things come in and out of fashion. When I was doing parliamentary history, to a point it seemed like it was not particularly fashionable because I was studying an institution, not people; I was studying systems of administrative control and governments and things like that. I was purposely trying to keep people out of my history, even though these systems obviously are staffed by people and are created by people, but ultimately I wasn't studying people; I was studying a system. A long way of coming back to the original question is, practically, I was never sure that I've made a good decision to study history as a PhD, although now I am very happy with it. Intellectually, I suppose I was always overconfident, or maybe in this place confident, that my work

was useful or helpful. I know these other historians who take the same approach that I do, and I think we're all fairly assured that our work is useful. We think it contributes, but only time will tell.

L. G: Exactly. So, as you said, you didn't focus on people; you primarily researched institutions, but the interdisciplinary path naturally opened some political questions, and I would like to know what drew you specifically, in that context, to study especially parliamentary and representative institutions, and during that time did you have any person that you found influential at the time?

C. D: Do you mean someone from the 17th century or a historian that I was reading?

L. G: Someone from your research period.

C. D: I suppose I will go back to starting my master's studies. That's where I started first looking at Parliament. The dissertation that I wrote was sort of half on parliamentary politics, and the other half was on how Parliament works. My supervisor, at the time, said: „A lot of people who study politics in the 17th century, they kind of understand how politics works, but they don't always understand how the institutions of the state work“. Sometimes there can be confusion between what people assume is a political manifestation of political intrigue or political disruption, and what can in fact be a normal administrative piece of work. If you don't understand the administrative side of the institution, you may not understand aspects of politics. So we can help political historians by explaining how things like courts and parliaments work and by creating a better understanding of the past. That's the kind of material I was sort of looking at. As I said, there had been a few historians, people like Geoffrey Elton or Michael Graves, who had been doing very interesting work on those practical sides of Parliament, and Elizabeth Read Foster, who wrote a brilliant book on the House of Lords, and I enjoyed approaching that from that sort of perspective. Is there any historical figure that I find interesting? There are a few. The Speaker of the Irish House of Commons went on a very peculiar sort of political journey, and he's not a very likeable sort of a figure. First, Ireland is in the midst of a colonial project. The Gaelic Irish, the kind of what we might call the original inhabitants of Ireland, were invaded in the 9th century by Viking invaders. Later on, in the 12th century, by Norman invaders basically coming from England, maybe originally from France. Then, in the 16th and 17th centuries, by more English colonisers or planters, who are distinctly Protestant as opposed to the population of Ireland. In the 17th century, you had this kind of battle for supremacy for people who would control local and national govern-

ment. People who control the Irish parliament – it's exclusively Catholic in the mid-16th century, but by 1613 the lower House of Commons has got a Protestant majority. By 1661 it's entirely Protestant, one hundred per cent. A few decades later, Parliament was exclusively Protestant as a result. Parliament could be used there as a way of seeing the colonial project in action. That's essentially what colonisation is, in some ways: the replacement of elites. We know other things like the replacement of religion, which is attempted but never completed because most of Ireland remains Catholic today. Then, things like language and the term „civilization“. I am sure it's the same in the Balkans, as people come from different corners of the area, whatever it's from Turkey, from the North, from the East – they have different ideas of what a civilization is. This can be based on the language you speak, the way that you worship, the way that you dress. So this character in the House of Commons, for instance, is a figure who is a colonizer, and he has just got a very interesting history in how he's involved and how he becomes the Speaker of the House of Commons, which is a prominent political position, even though he is not necessarily popular with many other people. There's another figure, who again is not a very nice man, a judge in the 17th century. His name is Jerome Alexander; he was actually disbarred from practice in England. He was kicked out of the profession because he had been forging documents, which, for a lawyer, is as bad as it gets. Absolutely *persona non grata* in England. This, to my mind, says everything that's of interest in the colonial project. So, if you are unpopular in England and you've been thrown out of your legal profession – you are disgraced. Then, he comes to Ireland, and within a few years he is made a judge. He believes in harsh punishment a lot of the time, so he is known as a hanging judge. One of the most interesting things is that we have his will, which we don't always have. He leaves his books to Trinity College Dublin, and he leaves some money for the poor protestants of Dublin, which is not typical at the time. He leaves everything to his daughters under one condition – that they don't marry anybody from Ireland, protestant or catholic. So, when he comes to Ireland, he is a judge, but he hates the Irish and everybody from Ireland, whether they're protestant or catholic. He is almost like a cartoon character; he's like a bad guy in a film. I find him interesting because I suppose he is different. After all, he doesn't conform to what everybody else is doing in society. He's not a nice person; I wouldn't want him to be my friend, but he is interesting to read.

L. G: Yes, *he's not an ordinary person. So, as we can see, societies and legal systems are quite different, and from there comes my next question. What insights can studying crime and punishment overall provide into our knowledge about the structure and values of past societies?*

C. D: I think it's brilliant; I think it's so useful to look at. I mean you can study the values of societies and ideas of societies through a number of ways – through religion, through economics and many other sorts of things. The very valuable aspect of crime, I suppose, is that it's a study of society in individuals' reactions to events experienced at their most stressful. The moment in your life if you're a victim or if you're a perpetrator of a very serious crime, for example a murder, you will never forget that. Also, it shows humans at, I suppose, the moment of their worst crisis. Whether it's the 21st or 17th century, it's the same. The reactions to those harms that have been done to them tell us a lot. The talk that I am going to be giving later on today will be looking at a system of criminal justice that allows for very high levels of execution. We break down a law in Ireland, as in the common law system generally, with three categories of law. On the top we have treason – offences against the State, offences against the King, killing a diplomat, killing a monarch or somebody very important. It's a very serious crime with a very serious punishment. On the bottom level we have what might be called misdemeanours, which are relatively lighter crimes with relatively lighter punishments, which could be a corporal punishment, for example some sort of damage to the body, to the ears or the nose or simply just a fine or even simply humiliation. In between are felonies; almost all have death as the sentence. Relatively speaking, crimes against property and stuff like that. The law allows for huge numbers of criminals to be executed. The records suggest, as far as I can see at least, that levels of people being killed are actually relatively small. We have a PowerPoint for the talk which shows some results from trials. What I'm saying is while the State and the law provide for harshness, society prefers not to be so harsh because a lot of the time the jury will not find guilty, or sometimes they'll say: „This person is guilty and the threshold for what they stole is twelve pence.“ If it's above the value of twelve pence, it's death, and if it's below twelve pence they'll say it's just imprisonment or a fine. In one case, a man stole a silver cup which was worth thirty shillings, which is way more than a twelve-pence threshold. In that case they say: „He is guilty of theft, but we don't believe that silver cup is worth thirty shillings; we believe it's worth eleven pence.“ So literally just below the threshold for the death sentence. So what they're saying is he is a criminal, he's guilty of a crime, we think he should be punished, but we don't want a death sentence. That to me is a perfect calculation of a society as a whole that rejects the ultimate sanction of death in a lot of cases. So I'll be asking questions tonight like „What does it tell us about our society?“ Our society is violent. It's much more violent than today. You always hear people today who watch too much news saying: „Oh, society is becoming so violent.“ Then I pull my historical records, and I

say: „Well, hang on a second.“ In Ireland, on average in recent years, you might have a murder homicide rate of maybe fifty-five/sixty people. During Covid it dropped down to twenty, but when my grandmothers' grandmother was around in the 1880s the homicide rate was maybe a hundred and twenty-seven a year. Even though people are looking with nostalgia to the past as a nice time, where we didn't have much money, but everybody was happy, I think probably they weren't, and everybody felt safe. People use a phrase like: „You could leave your door unlocked back in the day.“ I don't think that's true at all: by the way, the murder rate was way higher. In the 17th century, it was way higher again, I think. Lots of people died in violent circumstances in the 17th century. The State was very violent; we had martial law in Ireland when there was no war. That means that military officers could execute people legally with no jury trial and the circumstances of such. During war, people think maybe that's acceptable because martial law and military laws are important to keep order when the courts can't function normally. In Ireland, the war stopped – military law continued for the next forty years in the early 17th century. In the 19th century, people, maybe in Germany or France or England, are saying: „We're civilizing people in Africa, and we are making them European – we're bringing our values, our religion and we are teaching people to dress nicely.“ The same sort of thing has been said in Ireland in the 17th century. The English are going to civilize the Irish, but the big irony about it is that in order to civilize people they're going to act in a very barbaric fashion. So the death rate, the killings, the violence, all of that sort of thing had the English acting in a barbarous manner. So the really interesting thing for me when I study criminal justice outside of the States' violence is when the community becomes involved because in Ireland we have a jury system – twelve people from the locality who reject State violence. They say: „We have the power to kill, but we're not going to use it.“ That to me is a really interesting point. In one case, a woman kills her husband, and then she claims that she is pregnant. She claims what's called the benefit of the belly. A jury comes into a courtroom; it's a jury of women, and they have her inspected. They say: „Yes, she is pregnant and because she's pregnant she can't be executed.“ In another case, a woman is having an affair with another man, and the two of them kill her husband, and that should be a case where society wants to see vengeance. So for me it's not just about crime and what the law says the punishment is or how the court works. The interesting thing about studying crime is that it's a window on society. I used to be a legal historian, and now I am a social historian because I am interested in how gender works with crime, how class works with crime, and how regional areas work with crime – how do rural people react to criminal activity vs how do urban people? Think about how people live in

very rural areas because the forces of the State aren't around as much. In the city centre, CCTV cameras are everywhere, and there's a much greater chance that we'll see people fighting. For me it's a useful window on Irish society in the 17th century, looking through crime but particularly something like how the lower levels of Irish society work because they don't write things in documents. It's easy to write the history of what we used to call „a great man“ but to look at what, for today, we would use a phrase like „working class“ or people from lower levels of society, women, homeless people. How does Irish society change in relation to people who move around? People who scare everybody in the town because they're outsiders, who travel in and away for a time and don't feel like they belong. So it's just really interesting to look at somebody at that level of society. Particularly things like homeless people, the Vagabond law, stopping movements of people, and criminalizing poverty. Also fear of things like diseases, fear of young men who are not married off and so represent a potential chaos within the society – it's a really interesting window into how society sees these people. Sometimes the criminal justice system allows us to see these things.

L. G: And speaking of that sentence as a very important category in criminal law that divides past societies from present societies, since today we don't have many systems with death sentences, but overall it is a question that's related to international law. So, what insights can studying crime and parliamentary law tell us and make us better understand the social development of both historical and contemporary societies? Because cancelling the death penalty is also a result of developing law. I would like to know your opinion.

C. D: It's a very interesting point. Personally speaking, I am not in favour of the death penalty; I think most people probably aren't. Occasionally, I can speak only from Irish experience; traditionally in the 20th century, by the 1950s and early 1960s, we stopped the death penalty. We did not have a huge number of cases. A colleague of mine, Lynsey Black, did a brilliant book on women and the death penalty in Ireland, where we have about twenty women who are convicted. I think Irish society, now, is happy that we don't have a death sentence. Traditionally, after the 1950s and 1960s, the only people that could be sentenced to death were those guilty of what today we would call „treason“ or, in Ireland, offences against the State. For example, the sentence for killing a policeman in Ireland, if I am not mistaken, is about forty years. You are not just attacking the policeman, you are attacking the State as well. You will occasionally hear people say: „Maybe we should have the death sentence for killing a policeman.“ But I think it's a good thing that societies moved past the

death sentence, obviously. I also think we need to be careful not to be too smug or too self-congratulatory about the States' criminal justice system because the death sentence is not a good thing. We make mistakes, but I don't think it's civilized to kill other people even when they've done terrible things, and many people have done terrible things. At the same time, putting people into a prison for a very long time isn't always a perfect system either. I don't have a better system to replace it with. These people are far cleverer than you and me, who have thought about this for a very long time and haven't come up with a better system either. Sometimes the system of incarceration doesn't produce good results. Longer sentences – where politicians want to show just how angry they are to get votes, obviously and they just keep on increasing the sentences. Instead of having a war on crime, maybe we might consider having a war on poverty or a war on educational standards or a war on an inclusive society that doesn't create and push people to the margins. It's not necessarily purely about the law. We still don't have a perfect criminal justice system, and it still needs huge thinking. It doesn't necessarily need a huge investment because you can help the issues around crime in a cheaper manner. What we used to call the „Celtic Tiger“ before the Economic crash, I am not perfectly sure of these figures, but I seem to remember that the cost of incarceration of a person in an Irish prison was about €96.000 a year, probably more now. The cost of sending somebody to the most expensive private school in Ireland is about €22.000 a year, so that's five times more expensive to send somebody to a prison than it is to send them to the most expensive school. If you invest in things like breakfast clubs in school or things that create an inclusive society where children feel valued, they don't engage in crime and later on you save much more money. You need to consider that our society still has a long way to go. I think European society, generally, needs to think about those sorts of things. There's a lot of progressive stuff going on across Europe; some countries are better than others. Some of them have improvements to make, but nobody in my mind has a perfect situation.

L. G: What do you think the international criminal law system lacks the most? Speaking in general, not about any specific country, since we can agree that there are things that could be done better. Do you have any specific thing in mind?

C. D: I've done a couple of modules as a student on international criminal law, but it seems that it's increasingly sort of out of date. I suppose one of the things to keep in mind, right now, about international criminal law is probably under severe pressure as a system. Things like people threatening to take over other countries like Greenland, and things going on in the

Middle East. I am not an international criminal lawyer, but I did study it a little bit as a student. I wouldn't have a huge amount to say on it, but I suppose one of the most interesting things and the very obvious point is that the system of international criminal law in terms of bringing perpetrators to justice seems to be under severe pressure. Americans, for example, were so strong in creating things like international criminal courts, then don't engage with them themselves, don't make their own politicians or soldiers appear before courts, and it's unlikely that they ever will be sort of prosecuted. I say „unlikely“ for political reasons. It's always a political form of justice at some point. Even just this week, things like what's going on in the Middle East, what's going on in Eastern Europe, what's going on with places like Greenland. Those things suggest that the international criminal law system is under severe pressure. To a point, realistically, it always had political elements to it. Common law systems, like the one that I come from, have had law developing over such a long period of time, hundreds of years. You could argue that a common law developed and reacted to a society that accepted it. If you take what is maybe a Western tradition of international criminal law and plant it on the world and say: „Everybody has to obey this now.“ I think overall ideas behind it are good, but the way the law is actually played out doesn't always see satisfactory results for everybody in terms of philosophy of justice.

*L. G: Exactly, I just wanted to make a full story on the topic, and thank you very much for expressing your opinion. So now I would go back to your current career since you have been appointed as **Director of Publications for the International Commission for the History of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions**, and previously you have served as **Co-Editor of Parlements, États & Représentation**. As well as **Fellow of the Irish Legal History Society**. Therefore, I would like to know how these experiences have shaped your perspective on the historical legal system and, of course, in terms of your research?*

*C. D: I think they've been a huge benefit to me – I really enjoyed interaction. I suppose whilst there is ultimately academics' temptation to disappear into your studies and never leave. Occasionally give a lecture to someone and retreat in. We work mostly by ourselves; occasionally you'll have collaborative projects but not that often. For me, there was great value in interacting with both the *International Commission for the History of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions* and also the *Irish Legal History Society*, as they gave you contact with other scholars. Most of the people in the Irish Legal History Society are either from Ireland or working in Ireland. We've got a lovely mix of academic historians, academic lawyers, legal practitioners and also judges – which is not always common in legal*

history societies in other parts of the world. Access to people with very different perspectives, the people who work in the law, within the universities and the legal systems... It's a brilliant way to talk, listen, and read what people are working on. For me, just that chance to interact, to listen and to learn from other people is like travelling; you need to go and see other places to really appreciate the world around you. The Parliamentary History Commission for me is brilliant because we always work on the same topic – parliamentary history for the most part. First of all, we meet once a year, usually in early September for a conference. I hosted one in Dublin over ten years ago. We visited Spain, Norway, the Czech Republic, Austria, France... I'd love to come to Serbia sometime. I don't know if anyone would take it upon themselves to organize one, but I think it would be a brilliant occasion. We usually visit Parliaments; we might visit courts as well. We are usually hosted at the university. It's a good way to learn how academia can be done. So we need to be aware that even simple words, which we think we know and understand, can have very different meanings, but also just understanding what words like representation mean. In Ireland, we have a system called proportional representation for elections, and people in Ireland, both academics and the public generally, have a lot of confidence in that system. They think it's a good system because it allows for representation of minorities, and it's a system that we know, we're comfortable with, and we like it. Go to somewhere like England where they have some uses of proportional representation in some of their regional parliaments, but in the main parliament of Westminster, they have a first-past-the-post system, which isn't really as representative as it could be, but it's one that the English are comfortable with because they've been using it for centuries, and they like it – and that's fine. I'm not saying it's a bad system per se, but they wouldn't like proportional representation because it's not their system, and they've thought about bringing it in and they've rejected the idea of it. So it's very interesting for someone like me to go to lots of different countries to see how different systems work, to appreciate that other systems work well, that maybe it wouldn't work well in Ireland, but it works well in Serbia. So the contact that I have with other people, the ability to visit other places and to really get in under the skin, if you understand the phrase, to get under the skin of a different system of representation, to understand maybe how politics works, how the institutions work, just to visit the physical buildings. I'm writing a piece at the moment on parliamentary history for a book. It's a co--authored piece. It tells us a lot about COVID times. When I started writing the piece, I'd never met the other two historians I was working with. We met online; that's it. I'd never physically met them in person. But we started writing this chapter together for a book. It's part of a much bigger project. So we're

looking at architecture. We're looking at space in a room. How does, for instance, in the English Parliament, traditionally, it's based on an old chapel, St. Stephen's Chapel in Westminster. So in the Latin Christian tradition, I know here in St. Sava's, it's a big, wide open space, but in English churches, it's a long, narrow space, and if you look even at the House of Commons today in England, if you've ever seen it on TV, it's like a corridor. So it's a long, narrow space. Whereas in Ireland, in our House of Commons in the 18th century, we had a large octagonal space, eight sides – more like a circle. So looking at those spaces can be very useful. How is the decoration? What kind of colour is on the furniture? For instance, in Ireland, we rarely have the monarch in our parliament because they don't reside in Ireland, but they do sometimes put up a picture, a portrait of the monarch. So you have to pay respect to the picture or to the coat of arms. The symbolism of things like that can be very interesting. In Ireland, for instance, they've got a gallery on the top of the House of Commons, and there's a very famous picture by a guy called Wheatley of the Irish House of Commons. At the top, it's full of women. Now, traditionally, women didn't appear in parliament in Ireland until 1918. That's not to say that they're not politically aware. It's not to say that they're not politically active. It's not to say that they don't understand politics, or that they're not involved in politics, or that some of them don't have very strong and robust opinions on politics or what's going on. We can see from that painting, and we have documentary evidence otherwise, to show that they're heavily involved, consuming politics. They're observing the chamber. I often wonder if there's ever interaction with some politicians. We have a phrase called „playing to the gallery“, trying to impress the people up in the gallery. It's very interesting to know things like that, and you can learn a lot by looking at the differences and the similarities. So when you go abroad, when you interact with scholars from other parts of the world, you gain from their experience. It's a learning experience. For me, being involved in international organizations or organizations where I'm interacting with different professionals, it's the only good thing that comes out of it, I think.

L. G: Yes, there's always a space to improve your knowledge, which leads us to my next question. Your career has also been marked by teaching across Europe. You have taught in several countries and at many universities across Europe. So how have these experiences shaped your approach to research and teaching within your main fields of interest?

C. D: I've taught in a number of Irish universities, and again, like I was just saying about being involved with different organizations, seeing how different institutions work, and mostly Irish universities work more or less in the same manner. It depends on the size sometimes. I suppose

the nature of my work in several different Irish universities is a reflection of the academic job market as much as it is my happiness to travel around and work in different places. Generally speaking, it's been very good. When I was teaching in Maynooth, which is a historic university to the west of Dublin, that was founded in 1795 as a reaction to things like the French Revolution, because a lot of Irish clerical students, students who wanted to become priests, had been travelling to the continent and the English government think where they had been particularly hostile towards Catholics in seminaries in the 17th century, by the 18th century, they say: "Hang on, Catholic clergy could represent a bastion of conservatism within Ireland, anti—republicanism", so they fund a university. And so that's working as one of the biggest seminaries in the Western world. By the 19th century, Ireland was exporting priests all over the world. And when they took in secular students in the 20th century, and by the time I was teaching there, the university had largely been secularized with the exception of, I think, philosophy, theology, and sacred music. So there are still priest students, and then there are lots of regular secular students, we might call them. So occasionally I'd be teaching students; occasionally priests who were studying history would come into my lectures. So it was a very interesting interaction to have young men, 19, 20 years old, studying history, and I'll be teaching maybe early modern history, which inevitably means I'm teaching religious history. So the diversity of the student body for me is brilliant. I love it. Ireland was largely, let's say, fairly monocultural for most of the 20th century. But then, for instance, in the early 21st century, we had a lot of people from parts of Eastern Europe, including the Balkans. That brings diversity, and it's interesting to listen to them and to their experiences and things. And lots of people say, for example, from the Far East or from Western Africa, which again is bringing different experiences, different ideas. That diversity of the student body is really interesting to me. When I went abroad then, I worked at University College London for two years, and I taught for a time at the University of Vienna after that. Two very different universities. At the University of Vienna, I always found Vienna a kind of fairly conservative sort of city, and the student body, the lawyers, I think, reasonably, seemed to be a little bit more conservative. I don't mean that in a bad way. It's not a negative. It just seemed a little bit different from what I was used to in Ireland. Just the kind of thing that people would dress up for on a Sunday, for example, whereas in Ireland, they tend not to. So it was really interesting teaching. I taught medieval English legal history in Vienna. The students were quite interested, even though they didn't necessarily study a huge amount of common law tradition. They knew a little bit about it, but they were enthusiastic. We used to teach three-hour lectures there. So my teaching

responsibility was that module, and I taught three hours on a Wednesday morning, 9 to 12, and that was exhausting as a teacher because you're performing when you're teaching. It's almost like coming off the stage in a theatre. You're kind of buzzing a little bit after a lecture, but it's a long three hours, so it's exhausting in many aspects, and you need to be mentally really kind of ready for it. The University of Vienna is very big. The law school is very big. They have a department of legal history that has maybe six or eight academics plus postgraduate students. They also have a department, I think, of ancient lawyers. So they've got two that are concerned with the history of law, whereas most Irish universities might have one or two lawyers who are interested in history. So in Ireland, there's a specific genre that must be taught in the university. Some universities, I think, actually don't teach any legal history, or not much anyway. So in the end, it was very good that they have ring-fenced legal history in a specific area, and that's its whole department. It's a big law school. You've got a big law school here as well, compared to the two others in Ireland that I've worked in. So that's a very interesting way to organize a department that can guarantee the idea of teaching legal history. My colleague, Professor Nina, was telling me that legal history is a first-year subject here. It's an obligatory subject. So in Ireland, it's generally third or fourth year, where if somebody's interested, they will take it, but it's not obligatory anymore. And so that's really interesting to learn about. It's been really interesting to take on that. When I went to London and when I was in London, it was like living in Disneyland for historians, because the location of University College London is in the heart of the academic district of the city. So the University is not too far from King's College London. It's very close to both the British Library, which is one of the UK's legal deposit libraries and was, I think, about a 10- or 15-minute walk from my office, and also the Institute of Historical Research, which is a kind of umbrella organization that welcomes historians from universities across the UK and beyond. At the Institute of Historical Research, there were always seminars every evening. You can go online and watch some of them. They have maybe 20 or 30 different seminar series, and they meet once every two weeks. So on a Monday, there may be four seminars, and on a Tuesday, another four. There was always something to see, and it was interesting just to have access to the seminars. Now, I know we can go online and watch seminars, but there's something lovely about being in the room, and there's a social aspect afterwards. Everybody goes for a drink afterwards, maybe. Sometimes that's just fun, but you learn a lot. You make contacts with people. I have published four significant books during my time as an academic, and I have others in the pipeline. They all began life—maybe I shouldn't say this out loud—in the pub. You're having a drink with some-

body, and you kind of say, “God, isn’t it weird that nobody’s ever written a book on this?” Then, two days later, you get a text saying, “Why don’t we write a book on this?” So we did, as collaborative projects with colleagues. So the ability to meet people, to talk to people, to listen to people, either in a formal academic environment, but then the informal, what happens afterwards, to my mind, is part of the process as well. Because sometimes when you’re relaxed, and you can be more informal, you can ask people questions, you can say what you’re thinking, maybe that we don’t always, because we don’t always like to speak up in a classroom. I was an undergraduate once in Ireland; our students are notoriously quiet in the classrooms; they may not ask many questions in the classroom, but afterwards they may have very strong ideas. And maybe it’s the same here. And so it’s a great way: that informal seminar afterwards, which relocates maybe to a cafe or a bar, allows people to interact. And sometimes it can be very productive. And so it’s the same with getting involved with the Parliamentary History Commission. The social side of us allows people to interact, and it’s very healthy, I think.

L. G: The connections are very important. Speaking of your lecture today, here at the faculty, at Forum Romanum focuses on the attrition rate in Irish criminal justice trials and why the executions were relatively rare in an early modern common law country. How does this research reshape our, as an audience, understanding of the early modern criminal justice system?

C. D: I suppose I used the word „attrition“, and this is coming off an article that I’ve written. It’s not yet published; I’m hoping it will be published in the coming months. The editor asked me: „Are we sure about attrition, that word?“ It’s kind of got two meanings, I suppose. Attrition rate, in part, is around the number of people being killed, the conventional understanding of the word attrition. But also in some criminology circles, we use the word attrition rate around cases. So particularly in cases, my lecture this evening isn’t specifically about rates of sexual assault, but in Ireland in cases, because there’s a very high attrition rate in those cases where a case may start or a complaint is made, but it doesn’t come to fruition for a whole host of reasons, it’s something specific to those sorts of crimes because the success of the cases is never, the percentages are very low for conviction. So that word attrition is used both in the sense of executing criminals in the 17th century, but also the number of trials that fail. That word attrition is around the trial, also. So, to talk tonight is going to set up a premise that Ireland is a colonised country; I don’t think I’m going to go to the argument with that, although sometimes in the modern world people find it difficult to use the word colonising around one European country with another European country. But the Balkans, I’m sure you’ve

used it; I don't know if you do, but it certainly could be used in those contexts with people invading from other parts. Certainly in Ireland, we use it as well. Colonised country, the forcing of one legal tradition onto another, that a kind of a distinctive indigenous Irish legal system, which is a sophisticated system, in the 17th century is put out and the English system is essentially placed on, along with other issues around religion and societal norms generally, around dress and language and things like that. I'll bring out a legal book that has a long list of punishments, and it's death, death, death, death, death, huge amounts of crimes, yet the practical application of the law in Irish society, which is a mixture of Irish people, indigenous Irish people, English people and also Scottish people that ultimately all of those societies tend to reject the death sentence. Now, people are executed on some occasions, but most of the time, when it's possible, they are not. So what I'll be asking the question is, traditionally, I would normally teach that a successful legal system is one whereby the people consent to the law; that if the community doesn't buy into the legal system, it won't work very well. So they have to accept judgments for property, or society generally has to accept punishments for individuals. And if the punishment is seen as too harsh, society won't accept it. And that criminal law, like all other forms of law, where society generally can agree, this is good behavior, we accept it; this is poor behavior, we won't accept this. So the people who steal and murder and are violent and things like that must be rejected, and they must be punished for the transgressions of what is normative behavior. And this idea of normative behavior is really important because what's normal to an Irish person may not be considered normal to an English person. What's considered good and decent behavior to one class of society may not be considered good and decent behavior to another. So to a point, you need consensus in society as to what is good or bad behavior. But in a colonizing society, it's very hard to find consensus because English people will say one thing is civilising, Irish people may consider something else to be civilised behavior. So the paper is trying to understand where Ireland is at this moment, when law is being enforced onto the majority of the population, which essentially is a foreign law to an extent; how do they adapt to that law, and does Irish society as a whole accept it? And to my mind, the execution rate might suggest that in this instance, they don't accept it. Because there's an Irish tradition of their indigenous law system. It's largely a system of what we would call in the common law system – „torts“. I don't know if you use the terminology in the legal system here in Serbia. A tort is essentially when you sue somebody for harm that's been done to you. So if somebody crashes into your car, you may have to go to court to get recompense to pay for the damage to the car. The Irish system works the same way in that if somebody does

you harm, you get a payment as a result. The legal system was comprehensive across Ireland in the early Middle Ages. And what that means is that the state doesn't punish people in the way it does in the common law system. What happens is you essentially bring your case before judges, and they award compensation. Now, I'm not necessarily saying that's a good system or a bad system, because in the modern age, I think we'd all be horrified if you could just compensate somebody after you killed their father or compensate somebody if you commit a crime against somebody. But the positive of the system is that we don't execute people who commit crimes in that Brehon law system in Ireland. For the most part, there's no corporal or capital punishment -- it's all fine, it's all financial. So it takes the violence out of the system for the most part, but it does replace it just with money. And if you're wealthy, you can essentially buy out of a punishment. So it's, like I say, it wouldn't work in today's society because what's so civilized about a system that executes everybody? From the perspective that to say that that represents civilized behavior, because as we were saying earlier, death sentences are not considered a civilized way to progress anymore.

L. G: We can say that there is something that's common for both the common law system and the European system, even though they are completely different. My last question, personally my favourite, since most of our students are pursuing criminal law and commercial law after finishing their studies, and as you said, legal history isn't always obligatory. In Serbia it is, but speaking generally... So my question is what advice would you give to young law students on why engaging with legal history is important for their careers and also in their lives as professionals?

C. D: I can't say specifically how, particularly in Serbia where obviously I'm not an expert in Serbian law, you can make a successful career in the law, obviously, without having perfect knowledge of legal history. I know that people who study legal history bring a certain sort of roundness to their knowledge of the law to really understand where, I would say this with history in general, to understand where we are, we need to know where we've come from, and we need to have an understanding of how society develops. I would always say to my students, this sounds terribly arrogant, but I would say to students that historians, and I include legal historians in this number, have 20/20 vision because we've already seen everything that's happened. There's nothing that hasn't happened in the past that isn't happening today. So to understand the world around us-- the politics of Russia or America or China or everywhere else-- we've studied all the things that have happened in the past; we can't say we're surprised by things that are happening today. Because the human past is

so complete in so many ways. And so from a legal history perspective, when you're zooming in on the law, we can see how the law has developed over longer periods of time. So we can see the big trends that are emerging. And so if you want to understand the law now, and particularly the law as it's developing into the immediate future, legal history can give you a sense of having a little bit of, it's kind of like the ability to look into a crystal ball and to see how things are developing. And so just to have a greater understanding and not be surprised by developments in today's world, because we've seen those trends and we have an understanding. I know that sounds a bit abstract, but I do think there's a practical benefit for us to understand; to really understand the law, I think you need to understand where it's coming from.

L. G: Absolutely, that's why, here at the faculty, we study legal history as an obligatory subject. I wanted to hear an answer because I think that legal history should be more popular and it's sometimes kind of underrated.

C. D: In Ireland in recent years, we've seen surges of popularity. It's something; I think it's the course that used to be seen as a sort of a free hit in that in a lot of law schools, you have obligatory modules on, you know, contract law, European law, criminal law, constitutional law, all of the things that you have to have to go into the profession in law. And then you get some interesting things that you can study if you like, but we've increasingly seen numbers rising in legal history. And the fact that a lot of the significant sort of academic lawyers and significant academic practitioners are very interested in the law. We've got a number of very senior judges in Ireland who are active legal historians. They write legal history. They're not just coming along to listen politely to the paper and have a coffee afterwards. They are actually writing books on legal history. It's fascinating. And sometimes they have time because cases are held off at this time to spare, and they write a little bit of history. But we've got great support from the, particularly the senior judges within the profession, who are not just attending our meetings out of a sense of, you know, some sort of sense of professional obligation. I think they are actually fundamentally very interested in legal history. So I think that's a lesson for everybody that if the senior academics and the senior legal professionals are engaging in legal history, I think it's something that we all should be.

L. G: I have one more question that now came to my mind as we were speaking. Aside from your job, in your free time, do you have any area of history that you like to read about? For example, Roman law or something similar?

C. D: I'm reading a lot; from my reading at the moment, I'm reading a lot of theology at the moment. Right now, I'm reading a recently pub-

lished book on organized religion and sexuality by a guy called Diarmuid McCullough, who's a professor of church history in Oxford or Cambridge, and he writes in a lovely style; it's very readable. You know, I think the real test of a great historical writer is somebody who's a really sharp academic and knows all the little details, but can actually write in a way that's easily read by people who are not professional historians or not professional lawyers. So, I think that book is good for that reason, in that it's very easy to consume. So, I found myself reading a lot of early church history, kind of first-, second-, third-, fourth-century histories of the church, you know, in these two places like Greece and modern-day Turkey and places like that, and it's quite interesting. I've also been, I mean, I read around things like church courts; it's not sometimes teaching just legal history, I suppose, really. What else have I been reading recently? I've read a book recently on the history of jokes, which I found very, very interesting. It's, again, just fun, but I often find, particularly if I'm teaching a double lecture, if I'm teaching a two-hour lecture, I give little spaces in my teaching. So, the theory of teaching is that students have a certain limited space in their head for concentration; they zone out. So, if you break up your class, and increasingly, because we're always on phones and iPads, our concentration is even less. So, I break up my teaching sometimes with little stories, little vignettes, mostly about history, but sometimes if I'm teaching an intense topic, I'll just take a tiny break and say, 'interesting story about, in relation to what I've just said, did you know blah blah blah blah blah,' and it just gives the students a little rest. And then, so, it might be just 30 seconds, and then we go back into the lecture. So, sometimes when you're broadly read, if you can find things, like I said, something about the history of jokes, there was a guy in England who wrote a history of farting, which I found fascinating, and it's funny, and it's interesting, and it's a social convention, and there's a whole lot around societal expectations around what is good behavior, and something that can seem very vulgar, and maybe even saying it, it makes me vulgar in the process, but it's a very important, it's like, you know, 100 years ago, people would not write on the history of sex, and now everybody writes the history of sex. People who have no interest in the history of gender— everybody writes about the history of gender now, you know. And so, I suppose reading about the past, a comprehensive look into areas that have traditionally been considered vulgar or inappropriate or things like that, I find interesting. That's why I was interested in those church courts originally, because they dealt with people who misbehaved, and it's probably also why I found working on the criminology of law relating to prostitution as interesting, because, again, it's people who reject normal behavior, civilized behavior. But then again, as I say, the criminal law is always about people who are transgressing norms.

But in fact, we're all criminals. Who can say they're not a criminal? We've all broken the law. For most of us, it's only small things, thankfully. Most of us aren't murderers, but nobody can say they're not criminals, I think. So it's all about us, to a point, you know?

L. G: I didn't think about it in that way. What an interesting perspective. Thank you very much for your answers. Once again, it was my pleasure to have you here.

C. D: Thank you for having me!

L. G: I am sure that our readers and viewers will have an opportunity to learn a lot from you since we talked about many interesting themes. So thank you for being our guest.

C. D: Thank you very much!

Рад приспео / Paper received: 10. 3. 2026.

Прихваћен за објављивање / Accepted for publication: 2. 4. 2026.