

## Reflections on the Medieval and Early Modern Insular Identities

S. E. Fyodorov, F. E. Levin

**For citation:** Fyodorov S. E., Levin F. E. Reflections on the Medieval and Early Modern Insular Identities. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2020, vol. 65, issue 4, pp. 1336–1351. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2020.420>

The article reflects on the monograph by Sparky Booker *Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland: The English and the Irish of the four obedient shires* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2018) which offers a revised perspective on the issue of assimilation and acculturation in late medieval Ireland on the basis of the material of the four obedient shires: Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare. The scholar presents a complex and multi-faceted image of interethnic interplay in the region distinguishing between cultural and legal dimensions. She demonstrates that cultural practices were not the main resource of identity in the late medieval Ireland in which political allegiance and descent were prioritized. She highlights two aspects: the discursive level and the level of everyday interaction. Despite the obvious merits of the book, the material presented there requires more theoretical consideration of the issue of medieval identities. The authors of the article argue that the situation of interethnic interplay in the four obedient shires described by Booker could have been suitable for the emergence of *consensual identity*. Having coined this term, the authors define it as the type of identity which originates in the situation of interethnic interplay; entails intercultural switching; and has supragentile character, i.e., not insisting on common descent. The discourse of consensual identity did not emerge in the four shires during the period under consideration because of the absence of common subjecthood of the English and the Irish as well as prevalence of gentilism but its full potential was realized during the Early Stuarts.

---

Sergey E. Fyodorov — Dr. Sci. (History), Professor, St. Petersburg State University, 7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; [s.fedorov@spbu.ru](mailto:s.fedorov@spbu.ru)

Сергей Егорович Федоров — д-р ист. наук, проф., Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; [s.fedorov@spbu.ru](mailto:s.fedorov@spbu.ru)

Feliks E. Levin — PhD (History), Senior Lecturer, National Research University Higher School of Economics, 17, ul. Promyshlennaya, St. Petersburg, 198099, Russian Federation; [flevin@hse.ru](mailto:flevin@hse.ru)

Феликс Евгеньевич Левин — канд. ист. наук, ст. преп., Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики», Российская Федерация, 198099, Санкт-Петербург, ул. Промышленная, 17; [flevin@hse.ru](mailto:flevin@hse.ru)

The article was prepared with the financial support of Saint Petersburg State University (project ID 43924388 “Extending the boundaries of identity: F. Cluver and his edition of Tacitus’s *Germania*”), and within the framework of the Academic Fund Program at HSE University in 2020 (grant № 20-04-032 “Languages for describing the Other in early modern Europe: social contexts and repertoires of interpretation”).

Статья подготовлена при финансовой поддержке Санкт-Петербургского университета (проект ID 43924388 «Раздвигая границы идентичности: Ф. Клувер и его редакция “Германии” Тацита») и гранта № 20-04-032 «Языки описания другого в Европе раннего Нового времени: социальные контексты и репертуары интерпретации» в рамках программы «Научный фонд Национального исследовательского университета “Высшая школа экономики” (НИУ ВШЭ)» в 2020 г.

© St. Petersburg State University, 2020

*Keywords:* Ireland, four obedient shires, medieval identity, ethnicity, assimilation, acculturation, consensual identity.

## Рассуждения об инсулярных идентичностях Средних веков и раннего Нового времени

С. Е. Федоров, Ф. Е. Левин

**Для цитирования:** *Fedorov S. E., Levin F. E. Reflections on the Medieval and Early Modern Insular Identities // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. История. 2020. Т. 65. Вып. 4. С. 1336–1351. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2020.420>*

Настоящая статья представляет анализ монографии Спарки Букер (Booker S. *Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland: The English and the Irish of the four obedient shires* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018)), которая не только восполняет лакуны в историографии, но и предлагает обновленный взгляд на проблему ассимиляции и аккультурации в Ирландии в позднее Средневековье на примере лояльных английской короне регионов — Дублина, Мита, Лаута и Килдэра. В своей работе Букер исследует сферы средневековой жизни, в которых этничность имела значение, воссоздает сложную и объемную картину межэтнического взаимодействия в регионе, проводя различия между культурным и правовым измерениями. Она выделяет два одновременно функционирующих уровня. На дискурсивном уровне этничность играла значительную роль, выступая инструментом последовательного разграничения, легитимирующего исключительное положение англичан. На этом уровне ассимиляция ирландского населения была затруднена. С другой стороны, существовала гораздо более динамичная картина повседневного межэтнического взаимодействия, в котором границы между этническими группами оказывались не столь существенными. Несмотря на очевидные достоинства монографии, материал, исследуемый Букер, нуждается в большей теоретической рефлексии по поводу понимания и интерпретации средневековых идентичностей. Авторы статьи считают, что рассматриваемый в книге материал последовательно иллюстрирует ситуацию полиэтнического взаимодействия, которое, как известно, благоприятствует формированию того, что авторы определяют как *консентуальная идентичность*. Такая идентичность рождается в ситуации межэтнического взаимодействия, допускает межкультурное переклечение и имеет супрагентильную природу, не претендуя тем самым на императивность тезиса об общем происхождении. Отмечая, что дискурс консентуальной идентичности не сформировался в рассматриваемых Букер четырех графствах из-за отсутствия общего подданства англичан и ирландцев, а также доминировавшего гентилизма, авторы указывают на перспективность этой формы самосознания для эпохи Тюдоров и ранних Стюартов.

*Ключевые слова:* Ирландия, четыре лояльных графства, средневековая идентичность, этничность, ассимиляция, аккультурация, консентуальная идентичность.

The study into identity processes in late medieval Ireland has not lost its relevance in contemporary historiography<sup>1</sup>. The monograph by Sparky Booker, a lecturer at Queen's

<sup>1</sup> See: *Simms K. Bards and barons: the Anglo-Irish aristocracy and the native culture // Medieval frontier societies / eds R. Bartlett, A. MacKay. Oxford, 1992. P. 177–197; Frame R.: 1) 'Les Engleys Nées en Irlande': The English political identity in Medieval Ireland // Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. 1993. Vol. 3. P. 83–103; 2) Ireland after 1169: Barriers to acculturation on an "English edge" // Norman expansion: connections, continuities, and contacts / eds K. Stringer, A. Jotischky. Farnham, 2013. P. 115–141; Ellis S. G.: 1) More Irish than the Irish themselves? // History Ireland. 1999. Vol. 7(1). P. 22–26; 2) Citizenship*

University Belfast, addresses lacunae in the scholarship and presents a revised perspective on the issue of assimilation and acculturation in late medieval Ireland on the basis of the material of the four obedient shires: Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare.

The boundaries of late medieval ethnocultural and ethnopolitical landscape is a bone of contention among historians. Irish nationalist historiography for a long time had portrayed Ireland as divided between two mutually exclusive worlds — English, almost restricted by the Pale, and Gaelic — which differed in terms of political and cultural identities as well as legal practices. This division not only recreated the viewpoint from the English sources of the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries but also corresponded to the presentist agenda of Irish nationalist historiography: the alliance of Gaelic and Gaelicized lords<sup>2</sup> marked the process of formation of the unified Irish nation.

K. Nicholls, S. Duffy and K. Simms thought that cultural exchange in late medieval Ireland was not confined to any boundaries, and that the settler community was quite gaelicized<sup>3</sup>. J. Lydon and A. Cosgrove specified that this exchange turned colonists into “middle nation”, neither English nor Irish<sup>4</sup>. R. Frame and S. Ellis challenged this idea and emphasized that English identity in those times was political and legal, not cultural, so adoption of Irish cultural practices did not annihilate “Englishness” of the colonists<sup>5</sup>. S. Booker agrees with the third argument but attempts to clarify the extent and forms of gaelicization of English colonists within the four obedient shires, and anglicization of native population.

The author of the book adopts a discursive approach to ethnicity examining it as self-description, ascription and identification of the “other”. She believes that study into discourses describing intercultural interplay will shed light on the prevailing mechanisms of self-identification in late medieval society. The book is based on an extensive source base: narrative sources, documentation of local and administrative bodies, and onomastics. Another merit of S. Booker’s work is its scope: the scholar considers identity of a wider population not restricting her analysis to the elite.

It is necessary to emphasize the originality of Booker’s decision to study intercultural exchange within the four obedient shires. She argues that in the fifteenth century par-

---

and the state in Ireland: from medieval lordship to Early Modern kingdom // *Enfranchising Ireland? Identity, citizenship and state* / ed. by S. G. Ellis. Dublin, 2018. P. 19–31; *Nicholls K. W. Worlds apart? The Ellis two-nation theory on late medieval Ireland* // *History Ireland*. 1999. Vol. 7 (2). P. 22–26; *Muldoon J. Identity on the medieval Irish frontier: degenerate Englishmen, wild Irishmen, middle nations*. Gainesville, 2003; *Maginn C. Gaelic Ireland’s English frontiers in the late Middle Ages* // *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature. 2010. Vol. 110C. P. 173–190; *Smith B. Crisis and survival in late medieval Ireland. The English of Louth and their neighbors, 1330–1450*. Oxford, 2013.

<sup>2</sup> Such interpretation could be found in the works written both before and after Independence, for example: *Green A. S. Irish nationality*. New York, London, 1911. P. 77–157; *Watt J. A.: 1) The Church and the two nations in medieval Ireland*. Cambridge, 1970; 2) *Gaelic polity and cultural identity* // *A New history of Ireland*. Vol. II: *Medieval Ireland, 1169–1534* / ed. by A. Cosgrove. Oxford, 2008. P. 315–352.

<sup>3</sup> *Duffy P. The nature of the medieval frontier in Ireland* // *Studia Hibernica*. 1982/1983. Vol. 22/23. P. 21–38; *Nicholls K. W.: 1) Gaelic and gaelicized Ireland in the Middle ages*. Dublin, 1972; 2) *Worlds apart?*

<sup>4</sup> *Cosgrove A. Hiberniores ipsis Hibernis* // *Studies in Irish history presented to R. Dudley Edwards*. Dublin, 1979. P. 1–14; *Lydon J. F. The middle nation* // *The English in medieval Ireland*. *Proceedings of the first joint meeting of the Royal Irish Academy and the British Academy*, Dublin, 1982 / ed. by J. F. Lydon. Dublin, 1984. P. 1–26.

<sup>5</sup> *Frame R. ‘Les Engleys Néés en Irlande’*. P. 83–103; *Ellis S. G. More Irish than the Irish themselves?* P. 22–26.

liament sessions were held almost exclusively in this region, at which the parliamentary legislation was likely to have aimed<sup>6</sup>. By focusing on the four obedient shires, the author shifts the frontier from so called contact zone, where Anglo-Norman and Gaelic lords are thought to have coexisted, to the Pale, the bulwark of “Englishness”.

Booker’s book illustrates the spheres of medieval everyday life where ethnicity really mattered. The work consists of six parts in which Booker examines legal peculiarities of assimilation of the Irish in English shires; interaction between Irish and English in the ecclesiastical sphere; interethnic interplay in terms of marriage and fosterage; and transformation of the habits and language of Irish migrants, who resided in four obedient shires, as well as gaelicization of English settlers.

An extensive source base of Booker’s monograph involving parliament rolls, records, deeds, extents of land enables to examine intercultural exchange within the framework of the structures of everyday life and to evaluate the role of ethnicity in it<sup>7</sup>. Booker highlights that such markers of ethnicity as descent or name defined “imagined” boundaries not only between ethnic groups but also between those who could use English law, receive the land grants and get access to power, and those who could not.

In the first chapter, Booker demonstrates that the four shires were far more multicultural than they were considered before and were populated by a sufficient number of the Irish. There were several waves of migration into the four shires in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries. She asserts that later migrants were less anglicized than the earlier Irish freeholders who had lived there since the invasion and who bore anglicized names and Irish surnames without traditional patronymics *Ó*, *Uí*, and *iníon Uí*<sup>8</sup>. Booker makes a conclusion that Irish population was quite integrated in the social, economic and legal activities of the region — they had opportunities to become tenants, servants, clergymen, and tradesmen<sup>9</sup>. Furthermore, some of them pleaded in English courts, served as jurors and bailiffs<sup>10</sup>. On the basis of the records of land transactions, Booker makes a point about the rising social and economic status of the Irish in the four shires, which was a growing concern for the colonists<sup>11</sup>.

The second chapter is dedicated to legal peculiarities of assimilation of the Irish in English shires. Booker distinguishes between legal and cultural anglicization. The former was achieved by means of purchasing access to the English law which also allowed the petitioner to hold lands and possibly clerical and lay positions<sup>12</sup>. However, legal Anglicization did not entail cultural anglicization<sup>13</sup>, and the rising number of unanglicized Irish names and surnames in the records of the fifteenth century makes her think that newcomers in the fifteenth century were less culturally assimilated than descendants of those who had come to the region earlier, but it did not seriously hinder the integration of the

---

<sup>6</sup> Booker S. Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland: The English and the Irish of the four obedient shires. Cambridge, 2018. P. 42.

<sup>7</sup> At the same time Booker acknowledges that medieval identities were complex and flexible, and ethnic identity was one of many identities expressed in different contexts (see: Ibid. P. 8).

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. P. 46.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. P. 47.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. P. 47–82.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. P. 52, 60–65.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid. P. 68.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. P. 50.

former<sup>14</sup>. It means that there may have been a considerable infiltration of Gaelic culture in the four shires in this century.

However, the extent of inclusion of the Irish into the four shires should not be exaggerated. Access to law, land and power was denied to the aliens because of the prevalence of gentile concepts of ethnicity. Descent was the primary marker of ethnicity and was instrumental in identification and codification of the “other”. There were legal obstacles to integration in the four shires. In the later fourteenth — fifteenth century, denizenship<sup>15</sup> could only be individually purchased and could not be obtained automatically by the fact of birth on the territory of the four shires, by the fact of long-standing residence in the area or by marriage to an English colonist<sup>16</sup>. Moreover, English law was provided only to the direct heirs of the grantee, thus excluding extended lineages<sup>17</sup>.

Although the number of grants of the English law in the second half of the fifteenth century rose<sup>18</sup>, only the wealthiest of Irish population in the four shires, who comprised the minority of Irish community in the area<sup>19</sup>, could afford the procedure<sup>20</sup>. Furthermore, the position they could obtain in colonial society in the four shires was more modest than that of Irish urban families elsewhere in the colony<sup>21</sup>.

However, Booker shows that legal obstacles and restrictive categories were flexible, and were applied when it suited the interests of colonial community. It was possible to be admitted to the franchise without purchasing the grant to English law due to favouritism from council members and influential citizens<sup>22</sup>.

Nevertheless, Irish descent could be always politicized when the disputes about land-holding, access to court and civic position arose. Booker describes several legal cases<sup>23</sup> which demonstrate that neither acquisition of denizenship, nor anglicization of the surname turned Irish into English in the eyes of the colonists<sup>24</sup>. The case of John Lytill of the first half of the fifteenth century is indicative in this context: he had a prominent economic and social position in Dublin but was accused of Irish descent and almost deprived of all the lands he inherited from his wife, Eleanor Comyn<sup>25</sup>. Therefore, Booker endorses the thesis of Robin Frame who argued that full assimilation in colonial community was impossible<sup>26</sup>. Irishness could not be overcome in the society in which ethnicity was perceived genealogically — as an unchanged entity which is passed down from generation to generation<sup>27</sup> — so individuals with Irish ancestry could never feel secure.

It was the settler community who, resisting the incursion of the Irish into their territory, created barriers to maintain boundaries in order to secure their privileged position

---

<sup>14</sup> Booker S. Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland... P.58.

<sup>15</sup> Booker claims that the grants of the English law in Ireland were similar in form to grants of denizenship in England. (see: Ibid. P.69).

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. P.69.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. P.70.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. P.62–68, 94.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid. P.68–70.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid. P.83–84.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid. P.80.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid. P.85–94.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. P.93, 96.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid. P.85–86.

<sup>26</sup> Frame R. Ireland after 1169. P.115–141.

<sup>27</sup> Booker S. Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland... P.91.

in Ireland. For this purpose, they made efforts to record multiple names and aliases of the Irishmen who took English names so as not to forget Irishness of migrants<sup>28</sup>.

Yet Booker confirms that anti-Irish legislation and enactments were not always implemented, so in spite of all the obstacles the Irish participated in social and economic life regularly. Moreover, it is arguable to what extent they needed this full inclusion because the number of opportunities which were available without the grant of English law<sup>29</sup> was enough to take an active role in the economic life of the area<sup>30</sup>.

In the third chapter, Booker refutes a widespread historiographical viewpoint, according to which, ecclesiastical sphere in late medieval Ireland reproduced ethnic distinctions of the secular domain<sup>31</sup>. She demonstrates that the church was instead less inclined to ethnic discrimination, except for religious houses who resisted the Irish monks<sup>32</sup>. The church acted as a mediator in interethnic interaction and tried to reconcile English colonists with Gaelic lords in conflicting situations<sup>33</sup>. Intercultural exchange in the ecclesiastical sphere in the fifteenth century not only contributed to the acquisition of the English and Irish languages<sup>34</sup> but also to the adoption of the cults of Irish saints in the four shires<sup>35</sup>. Thus, Booker concludes that secular and ecclesiastical boundaries were not congruent.

In the fourth chapter, the author asserts that mixed marriages were widespread in the four shires in spite of the anti-Irish legislative prohibitions<sup>36</sup>. Furthermore, such marriages did not correspond to any social and gender patterns<sup>37</sup>. Booker emphasizes that statutes of Kilkenny and subsequent anti-Irish legislation were aimed at the four obedient shires rather than at entire island. It was the relationships between colonists and the Irish in this region that they were concerned with. In the eyes of colonial community, mixed marriages blurred ethnic boundaries, which were instrumental in defining the legal status, and undermined foundations of Englishness based on blood<sup>38</sup>. Mixed marriages could threaten a superior position of colonists since such marriages could have been used by the Irish as a means of integrating into colonial community and obtaining the same privileges.

The direct consequence of interethnic marriages could be either anglicization or gaelicization, which Booker reviews critically in the final two chapters. As far as gaeliciza-

---

<sup>28</sup> Booker S. Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland... P. 88.

<sup>29</sup> It is necessary to highlight that ecclesiastical courts and manorial courts were still open for Irish (see: *Ibid.* P. 66).

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* P. 72.

<sup>31</sup> This idea can be found in: *Watt J.A.* The Church and the two nations in medieval Ireland; *Jefferies H.A.* The Irish church and the Tudor reformations. Dublin, 2010. — Katharine Simms claims that differentiation in ecclesiastical sphere was based not on ethnic distinctions, but on the basis of the differences in organization of the church (see: *Simms K.* Frontiers in the Irish church — regional and cultural // *Colony and frontier in medieval Ireland: essays presented to J.F. Lydon / eds T.B. Barry, R. Frame, K. Simms.* London, 1995. P. 177–200).

<sup>32</sup> But even in some religious houses Irish monks rose to power (see: *Booker S.* Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland... P. 132–134).

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.* P. 130–131, 140.

<sup>34</sup> She indicates that papacy expected day-to-day interaction between priests and their parishioners (see: *Ibid.* P. 130).

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.* P. 137–140.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.* P. 148. — For instance, marriages between English and Irish were banned by the Statutes of Kilkenny of 1366 (see: *Statutes and ordinances, and acts of the Parliament of Ireland. King John to Henry V / ed. by H.F. Berry.* Dublin, 1907. P. 432–433).

<sup>37</sup> *Booker S.* Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland... P. 167–168.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.* P. 62–63, 176–177.

tion of English colonists in the late Middle ages is concerned, she thinks it is necessary to distinguish between the conceptual framework which describes certain phenomenon and the phenomenon itself. Booker states that there was nothing exclusively “Irish” in various hybrid practices such as organization of lineal family groups, coyne and livery, and other customs connected with the relationships between seigneur and vassal. These practices could be a form of frontier adaptation typical of frontier societies. English colonists could have adopted some Gaelic practices quite pragmatically but peculiarities of their lifestyle were classified as “Irish” and described by words taken from the Irish language<sup>39</sup>.

Booker maintains that some similarities between customs should not always be ascribed to cultural influence and postulates the necessity to reconsider gaelicization of English settlers<sup>40</sup>. She thinks that pragmatic observance of some Gaelic customs by colonists cannot be regarded as evidence of extensive gaelicization of the region.

The sixth chapter is dedicated to the issue of the usage of Irish in the four shires. Booker treats carefully the remarks of Tudor and early Stuart intellectuals about the distribution of the Irish language beyond Dublin. She not only hypothesizes, in line with her colleagues<sup>41</sup>, that the majority of colonists knew Irish (some of them were probably bilingual or had at least pidgin Irish) but also highlights that Irish population spoke English as well. Unlike the majority of historians and linguists, Booker attempts to specify the level of language acquisition, its distribution among different layers of the society and contexts of usage on the basis of her sources and makes a conclusion that English remained the preferred language of the majority in the four shires<sup>42</sup>.

The examination of onomastic material enables her to shed light on the influence of language on identity. English colonists adopted the same Irish nicknames as used by native population, which testifies to the fact that both groups shared the same linguistic environment<sup>43</sup>. Yet onomastic exchange was less common in Ireland than in Wales since settlers understood the social role of personal names and surnames and chose to maintain their “Englishness” in order to avoid possible problems with the access to English law. According to Booker, Irish material fits well into the Scottish, Welsh and English contexts and demonstrates that language was not central to ethnic identity, being inferior to descent as the main criterion of ethnicity<sup>44</sup>. Therefore, the English who spoke Irish in daily lives in the four shires did not lose their Englishness.

In her book, Booker presents a complex and multi-faceted image of interethnic interplay in the region distinguishing between cultural and legal dimensions. She demonstrates that cultural practices were not the main resource of identity in the late medieval Ireland in which political allegiance and descent were prioritized. She highlights two aspects: the

---

<sup>39</sup> Booker S. Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland... P.212.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid. P.178–211.

<sup>41</sup> Nicholls K. W. Worlds apart? P.23; Lydon J.F. Nation and race in medieval Ireland // Concepts of national identity in the middle ages / eds S. Forde, L. Johnson, A. V. Murray. Leeds, 1995. P.103–124; Carey V. Neither good English, nor good Irish: bilingualism and identity formation in sixteenth century Ireland // Political ideology in Ireland, 1541–1641 / ed. by H. Morgan. Dublin, 1999. P.51–61; Lennon C. Sixteenth Century Ireland: the incomplete conquest. Dublin, 2005. P.193; Bradshaw B. The Irish constitutional revolution of the sixteenth century. Cambridge, 1979. P.23, 25–26.

<sup>42</sup> Booker S. Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland... P.247.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid. P.240.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid. P.247. — Thus, Booker proves the correctness of A. Ruddick’s argument about the centrality of descent and place of birth for defining ethnicity (see: Ruddick A. English identity and political culture in the fourteenth century. Cambridge, 2013. P.155–166).

discursive level and the level of everyday interaction. On the discursive level, ethnicity played a significant role and was instrumental in maintaining distinctions which justified exclusive position of the English colonists. At this level, assimilation was virtually unattainable because of the impossibility of changing one's descent. The everyday level was more dynamic, and there the boundaries were not so crucial. At the same time, the stability of discourse prevented English colonists from full gaelicization and influenced incompleteness of acculturation in the region.

In spite of the relevance of Booker's work to the discussion of the day-to-day role of ethnicity in medieval Europe, her analysis of ambiguous and complex nature of identity might have been more sophisticated (and in this context we share C. Downham's critique of the book<sup>45</sup>).

For example, Booker's attempts to distinguish between codification of identity in administrative and legal documents and its possible actualization in the everyday life are not always consistent. In our opinion, the extent of anglicization of Gaelic population in the four shires has not been considered as carefully as the extent of gaelicization of English settlers. If one of the arguments of Booker's book is that descent, rather than culture or language, was central to the notions of ethnic identity in the four shires, is onomastic analysis enough to conclude about anglicization of Irish population in this region?

Anglicized names and surnames in the civic records could have been a means of adaptation of migrants to dominant rules of the game in the four shires. According to A. Ruddick, such practices can be found in the fourteenth-century England where anglicization of forenames by migrants was not a matter of conscious preference for English self-identification but a pragmatic invention of English ancestry for an English audience in order to obtain the same set of legal rights and privileges as English subjects possessed<sup>46</sup>. In this context, the question arises: if gaelicized English colonists were treated as English because of their blood, was there a necessity for Irishmen who managed to conceal their native ancestry to anglicize culturally?<sup>47</sup>

Furthermore, Booker could have concentrated more on social aspects of ethnicity which would have enabled her to look at English-Irish relations from another angle. Judging by her data, it may seem that the majority of migrants were of ignoble background<sup>48</sup>. It should have been examined in more details that the term "hibernicus" in the Middle Ages denoted not only "Irish" but also "unfree", which was emphasized in the cases against people with possible Irish ancestry, and that in the grants of English law grantees were liberated from "Irish servitude"<sup>49</sup>. Therefore, it is reasonable to consider anti-Irish legislation and litigations not only from the perspective of ethnic hostility, but also from the perspective of social exclusion. English colonial community did not treat Irish population as so-

---

<sup>45</sup> Downham C. Sparky Booker. Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland: The English and Irish of the Four Obedient Shires. Cambridge studies in medieval life and thought, 4<sup>th</sup> series, 109. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2018 // Journal of British Studies. 2019. Vol. 58, iss. 1. P. 180.

<sup>46</sup> Ruddick A. "Becoming English": nationality, terminology, and changing sides in the Late Middle Ages // Medieval Worlds. 2017. No. 5. P. 62–63.

<sup>47</sup> Irish migrants could possibly behave in the same way as Dutch immigrants in late medieval Great Yarmouth, who did not apply for denization because the opportunities open for them were enough for their commercial activity and who preserved their separate identity (see: Lambert B., Liddy C. D. The civic franchise and the regulation of aliens in Great Yarmouth, c. 1430 — c. 1490 // Resident Aliens in Later Medieval England / eds W. M. Ormrod, N. McDonald, C. Taylor. Turnhout, 2017. P. 139).

<sup>48</sup> Booker S. Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland... P. 48, 90.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid. P. 69, 90.

cially equal and tried to prevent socially inferior population from accessing land-holding, law and power<sup>50</sup>.

Even leaving the discussion of unfree status of Irish migrants outside the scope of research, it is necessary to explore the issue of resistance to integration of Irish population in the four shires from a social perspective: as a campaign of colonial community against outsiders, not because of their specific place of birth or ethnicity but because of the threat they posed to the inherent privileges, which were thought to be in exclusive possession of the colonists and were expected to be denied to others<sup>51</sup>.

Booker's book encourages the discussion of medieval identities which emerge as a result of ethnic interplay. She mentions that both Irish and English tried to find such an identity which could be acceptable in both communities<sup>52</sup> but does not elaborate on this idea.

In response to the material examined by Booker, C. Downham asked whether a person could have possibly been both English and Irish<sup>53</sup>. This is indeed noteworthy as, in our opinion, the situation when one could acquire such an identity which meant being English and Irish simultaneously deserves more scholarly attention. We would like to define such identity as *consensual identity*, a type of identity which originates in the situation of ethnic interplay, entails intercultural switching, and has supragentile character (serves as a superstructure over constituent ethnic identities).

We have coined the term consensual identity as a result of reflection on historiography on medieval identities<sup>54</sup>, on the one hand, and, on the other hand — on literature concerning the issues of assimilation and acculturation in the twentieth century<sup>55</sup>, which can be quite useful in the research into interethnic interplay in the Middle ages. This term

---

<sup>50</sup> At least it was advantageous for the settlers to insist on unfree status of the litigants.

<sup>51</sup> Similar processes can be found, for instance, in the fifteenth century in English towns, such as Greater Yarmouth (see: *Lambert B., Liddy C. D.* The civic franchise and the regulation of aliens in Great Yarmouth, c. 1430 — c. 1490. P. 138). What is more, corporate consciousness of English colonists in Ireland who were concerned with the protection of their rights developed in the same period. See: *Bradshaw B.*: 1) The Irish constitutional revolution of the sixteenth century. P. 3–31; 2) 'And so began the Irish nation': nationality, national consciousness and nationalism in pre-modern Ireland. Furnham, 2015. P. 57; *Cosgrove A.* Anglo-Ireland and the Yorkist cause, 1447–60 // *A new history of Ireland. Vol. II: Medieval Ireland, 1169–1534* / ed. by A. Cosgrove. Oxford, 2008. P. 565–568.

<sup>52</sup> *Booker S.* Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland... P. 89, 220.

<sup>53</sup> C. Downham also thinks that the possibility of maintaining English and Irish identity simultaneously deserves more detailed exploration. *Downham C.* Sparky Booker... P. 180.

<sup>54</sup> Particularly: *Ewig E.* Volkstum und Volksbewusstsein im Frankenreich des 7. Jahrhunderts. 2. Aufl. Darmstadt, 1969; *Wenskus R.* Stammesbildung und Verfassung. Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen gentes. Köln, Graz, 1961; *Kienast W.* Studien über die französischen Volksstämme des Frühmittelalter. Stuttgart, 1968; *Gschntzer F., Kozellek R., Schönemann B., Werner K. F.* Volk, nation, nationalism, masse // *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland* / hrsg. von O. Brunner, W. Conze, R. Koselleck. Bild 7. Stuttgart, 1992. S. 141–431; *Geary P.* Ethnic identity as a situational construct in the early middle ages // *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*. 1983. Bd. 113. S. 15–26; *Pohl W.* Conceptions of ethnicity in early medieval studies // *Archaeologia Polona*. 1991. Vol. 29. P. 39–49; *Reynolds S.* Kingdoms and communities in Western Europe, 900–1300. Oxford, 1997.

<sup>55</sup> First and foremost, we imply fourfold model of acculturation developed by John W. Berry. *Berry J. W.*: 1) Acculturation and adaptation in a new society // *International migration*. 1992. Vol. 30. P. 69–85, 2) Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation // *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 1997. Vol. 46. P. 5–34; *Gordon M. M.* Assimilation in American life: the role of race, religion, and national origins. New York, 1964; *Barth F.* Introduction // *Ethnic Groups and boundaries: the social organization of cultural difference* / ed. by F. Barth. Boston, 1969. P. 9–38; *Banton M.* Racial and ethnic competition. Cambridge, 1983; *Barkan R.* Race, religion, and nationality in American society: a model of ethnicity: from contact

helps to problematize the co-existence of different identities and the connection between power and acculturation<sup>56</sup>.

We would like to allude to K. F. Werner who has identified two forms of nation-building in the Middle ages: “primary”, which was based on one’s gens and its political consciousness, and “secondary”, which involved a lengthy process of fusion of two or more *gentes*<sup>57</sup>. According to him, the secondary form was characterized by its supragentile character<sup>58</sup>. The final result of this fusion was complete assimilation in which either both sides of intercultural interplay acquired a new “nation” abandoning their own origins, or one of the sides of intercultural interplay absorbed, to a certain extent, other ethnic communities<sup>59</sup>. It is with the secondary form that consensual identity should be associated.

Generally, it is argued that the secondary form was triggered by the processes of territorialization<sup>60</sup> when different *gentes* were connected with the ruler, and greater patria took priority over lesser patria, the place of one’s origins<sup>61</sup>. In the high Middle ages, this stage was accompanied by the discourse of *patria communis* (shared fatherland) which was equated to the territory of the realm<sup>62</sup>.

The discourse of territorialization was followed by the discourse of regentization<sup>63</sup>. During the process of regentization different ethnic communities united by the shared territory and cohabitation started reconsidering their background independently or by coercion, giving priority either to a shared experience, which stemmed from the long-standing cohabitation<sup>64</sup>, or to other schemes of common coexistence such as common language or history<sup>65</sup>.

The discourse of regentization can be perceived both as an independent phase in the process of formation of “new” identities and as one of the stages of acculturation in which the cultural pattern, which had been developed before, began to be perceived by the sides

---

to assimilation [with comment, with response] // *Journal of American Ethnic History*. 1995. Vol. 14, no. 2. P. 38–101.

<sup>56</sup> *Fyodorov S.*: 1) The identity processes in medieval Wales. Terminology, discourses, and context of bilingualism // *Dialog so Vremenem*. 2017. Vol. 61. P. 25–39; 2) The identity processes in medieval Wales. Terminology, discourses, and context of Bilingualism (Wēalas-based nomenclature) // *Dialog so Vremenem*. 2018. Vol. 62. P. 48–61.

<sup>57</sup> *Gschnitzer F., Kozellek R., Schönemann B., Werner K. F.* Volk, nation, nationalism, masse. S. 243–244.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.* S. 244.

<sup>59</sup> See: *Ewig E.* Volkstum und Volksbewusstsein...; *Gschnitzer F., Kozellek R., Schönemann B., Werner K. F.* Volk, nation, nationalism, masse. S. 217–219.

<sup>60</sup> The early contours of territorialization can be already found in the 7<sup>th</sup> c. (see: *Wenskus R.* Stammesbildung und Verfassung).

<sup>61</sup> *Gschnitzer F., Kozellek R., Schönemann B., Werner K. F.* Volk, nation, nationalism, masse. S. 217; *Reynolds S.* Kingdoms and communities in Western Europe, 900–1300. P. 256–302.

<sup>62</sup> *Gschnitzer F., Kozellek R., Schönemann B., Werner K. F.* Volk, nation, nationalism, masse. S. 224–231; *Post G.* Two notes on nationalism in the middle ages // *Traditio*. 1953. Vol. 9. P. 281–282; *Gueneé B.* État et nation en France au Moyen-Age // *Revue historique*. 1967. T. 237, fasc. 1. P. 24–30; *Ehlers J.* Kontinuität und Tradition als Grundlage mittelalterlicher Nationsbildung in Frankreich. Sigmaringen, 1983. S. 38–47; *Beaune C.* Naissance de la nation Française. Paris, 1985. P. 324.

<sup>63</sup> We would like to emphasize that unlike K. F. Werner who uses a groupist approach to ethnicity when we talk about territorialization and regentization we imply the transformation in the discursive processes.

<sup>64</sup> These new roots could be soon represented as “natural” and “primordial” (see: *Gschnitzer F., Kozellek R., Schönemann B., Werner K. F.* Volk, nation, nationalism, masse. S. 219).

<sup>65</sup> *Kienast W.* Studien über die französischen Volksstämme des Frühmittelalter; *Gschnitzer F., Kozellek R., Schönemann B., Werner K. F.* Volk, nation, nationalism, masse. S. 219.

of interethnic interplay either as primary and dominant, or as possible or exclusive. The variability of the aforementioned cultural pattern is defined by so called acculturation strategies. The orientation of these strategies depends on two variables:

1. The capacity of an ethnic group to regulate its cultural reproduction necessary for its persistence by means of maintenance of cultural differences. This regulation is always deliberate irrespective of the extent of its effectiveness. This capacity manifests itself to the fullest when an ethnic community finds itself in a situation of intercultural or cross-cultural communication<sup>66</sup>.
2. The attitude of an ethnic community towards contact per se. Each ethnic group is capable of structuring or modifying basic attitudes towards cultural contact or even towards probability of cultural exchange<sup>67</sup>.

Certain combinations of cultural reproduction and certain attitudes to cultural contact comprise different acculturation strategies. *Integration* can be perceived as a consciously constructed combination striking the balance between a positive pattern of cultural reproduction and an analogous model of cultural contact<sup>68</sup>. *Assimilation* combines a negative pattern of cultural self-reproduction and a positively organized pattern of cultural contact<sup>69</sup>. Conversely, *separation* emerges as a result of the model of a positive cultural self-reproduction and negative cultural contact<sup>70</sup>. Only *marginalization* represents a strategy of acculturation where negative model prevails, i.e. both cultural self-reproduction and positively arranged cultural contact will be rejected<sup>71</sup>.

In our opinion, the only possible option conducive to the formation of consensual identity was the model of integration since it enabled participants of the contact to retain different versions of actualization of their historical and cultural peculiarities. The absence of emphasis on a common descent illustrated consensual character of such an identity. Consensual identity was of supragentile character and actualized shared territory, culture and loyalty. At the same time, communities which acquired consensual identity remained culturally ambivalent and possessed the capacity for frequent intercultural switching. The choice of preference, which always depended on the combination of internal (emic) and external (etic) factors, was defined by both individual and collective experience.

We would like to highlight the necessity not to confuse dual identities with consensual identity. In the case of dual identity, its bearer had to choose between the two rejecting one or the other depending on the circumstances, whereas consensual identity enabled the person to retain both and to belong to both cultural worlds.

---

<sup>66</sup> Barth F. Introduction. P.24–37; Banton M. Racial and ethnic competition. P.153–164; Berry J. W. Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. P.9.

<sup>67</sup> Barth F. Introduction. P.18; Banton M. Racial and ethnic competition. P.153–164; Barkan R. Race, religion, and nationality in American society. P.50; Berry J. W. Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. P.9.

<sup>68</sup> Barkan R. Race, religion, and nationality in American society. P.48–49; Berry J. W. Acculturation and adaptation in a new society. P.72.

<sup>69</sup> Wirth L. The problem of minority groups // The science of man in the world crisis / ed. by R. Linton. New York, 1945. P.358; Barkan R. Race, religion, and nationality in American society. P.47–48; Berry J. W. Acculturation and adaptation in a new society. P.72.

<sup>70</sup> Gordon M. M. Assimilation in American life. P.235–239; Berry J. W. Acculturation and adaptation in a new society. P.72–73.

<sup>71</sup> Gordon M. M. Assimilation in American life. P.56–58; Berry J. W. Acculturation and adaptation in a new society. P.72–73.

From the medieval perspective, consensual identities were always oriented at the level of power relations since they were articulated by direct coercion or indirect coercion (the desire to adapt to certain circumstances)<sup>72</sup>. Consensual identity was of pre-modern nature because its acquisition was tantamount to loyalty to the sovereign: it was consensual as it implied consensus between a vassal and a seigneur.

Judging by the material examined by Booker, all of the four aforementioned acculturation strategies can be possibly identified in late medieval Ireland. Moreover, her book showcases that the processes explored in the historiography on medieval identities, perhaps, did not follow chronologically one another: acculturation could precede territorialization, and regentization could precede acculturation.

The situation of interethnic interplay described could have been suitable for the emergence of consensual identity in the four obedient shires, yet some of the circumstances hindered actualization of its discourse. Firstly, there were not enough institutional foundations for the formation of consensual identity in the four shires given the fact that law remained personal there, and Ireland did not undergo the process of territorialization. There was no common subjecthood in late medieval Ireland which could have created the prospect of consolidation of English and Irish population. The status of the Irish in the four shires was ill-defined. The English monarchs displayed considerable reluctance to confer English law to all Irish population living in the four shires, thus contributing to the maintenance of ethnic distinctions at the collective level.

Those Irish men who had received the grants of English law were not turned into English subjects, thus not acquiring a new identity in the eyes of English authority<sup>73</sup>. As regards the rest of the Irish population which could not afford to purchase English law, they even did not have to redefine their identity (if it existed) since ethnicity did not matter much in commercial activity.

Secondly, the prevailing mechanisms of self-identification did not enable articulation of consensual identity. The persistence of gentilism, i.e., genealogical connotations of ethnicity, in medieval Ireland inhibited opportunities for instrumentalization of discourse describing heterogeneous population of Ireland and the outcomes of cultural exchange. In both worlds, descent rather than culture was the main resource of identification. Acculturation was not treated as capable of changing nationality.

Yet it should be acknowledged that English identity in Ireland could have been possibly perceived as consensual since the Welsh, Scots, Lombards and Flemings were treated as English in medieval Ireland. In these contexts, being “English” either meant being a

---

<sup>72</sup> Gschnitzer F., Kozellek R., Schönemann B., Werner K. F. Volk, nation, nationalism, masse. S. 219.

<sup>73</sup> Booker S. Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland... P. 88. — In the documents such grantees turned into loyal liegemen of the King or obtained the King's peace. See: Patent Roll 49 Edward III no. 122, 261 // CIRCLE: A Calendar of Irish Chancery Letters c. 1244–1509 / ed. and trans. by R. Crooks. URL: <https://chancery.tcd.ie/roll/49-Edward-III/patent> (accessed: 14.03.2020); Patent Roll 9 Richard II no. 56 // Ibid. URL: <https://chancery.tcd.ie/roll/9-Richard-II/patent> (accessed: 14.03.2020); Patent Roll 31 Henry VI no. 4, 7, 8, 12 // Ibid. URL: <https://chancery.tcd.ie/roll/31-Henry-VI/patent> (accessed: 14.03.2020); Patent Roll 34 Henry VI no. 2 // Ibid. URL: <https://chancery.tcd.ie/roll/34-Henry-VI/patent> (accessed: 14.03.2020); An Act that if any Irish Enemy received to the King's Allegiance shall be found after to rob, spoil and destroy, the lege-people, it shall be lawful to every liege-man to do with him and his Goods, as to a Man that never was become liege // The statutes at large, passed in the Parliaments held in Ireland: from the third year of Edward the Second, A. D. 1310, to the twenty sixth year of George the Third, A. D. 1786 inclusive with marginal notes, and a complete index to the whole: in 13 vols. / eds J. G. Butler, F. Vesey. Vol. 1. Dublin, 1786. P. 7.

subject of the English king and living in Ireland for a long time without having any Irish roots, or arriving from the territories that were in the possession of the English king<sup>74</sup>. It is noteworthy that when Irish litigants claimed their English identity, they implied political loyalty to the English king and the tradition of residence on the four shires, but this concept of Englishness, as can be seen from legal disputes, was weak for exteriorization challenged by English colonists. Therefore, consensual potential of English identity was denied to Irish population.

In addition, it is also necessary to consider two distinct attitudes to cultural contact concerning anglicization and gaelicization. The predominantly negative attitude towards cultural contact on the discursive level manifested in law in the four shires acted against intercultural switching. Neither legal nor cultural anglicization of the Irish was officially welcome in this region. In this context, full assimilation followed by regentization and rejection of one's selfhood could have been the most desired outcome<sup>75</sup>. This practice was exemplified by the Irish people changing their ancestry.

The concepts of English and Irish identity being defined by blood in late medieval Ireland were mutually exclusive so the acquisition of English identity by the Irish presupposed the loss of native identity<sup>76</sup> and did not entail any switching per se. We may assume that in the absence of the discourse of consensual identity, which did not emphasize descent, a person could possess dual identities: claiming to be English in one situation, and Irish — in another. A possible choice in such situations could have been an invention of a new identity which was acceptable in both communities, but this identity was not formulated in late medieval Ireland.

Conversely, intercultural exchange between English colonists and Irish population which resulted in a certain gaelicization of the former was more flexible and guaranteed self-reproduction and reproduction of cultural contact. Gaelicized English colonists did not have to abandon their selfhood, remaining English in both contexts,<sup>77</sup> but they did not acquire a new identity either. The form of such interplay was even more suitable for the emergence of consensual identity but it was not legitimized by a specific discourse because of the dominance of gentilism and because of the absence of power at which it could be aimed since participants of this interplay did not insist on common subjecthood.

---

<sup>74</sup> Frame R. Barriers to acculturation on an "English edge". P. 120–121. — R. A. Griffiths has pointed out a paradox of subjecthood in the medieval English realm, according to which in the fourteenth century a Welshman enjoyed the rights and privileges of a king's subject in Ireland, whereas in Wales the same rights had been denied to the same person since at home the status of a Welshman was ill-defined (*Griffiths R. King and country: England and Wales in the fifteenth century*. London, 1991. P. 38).

<sup>75</sup> It was practically acknowledged in the statutes of 1465: An act that the Irishmen dwelling in the counties of Dublin, Myeth, C°, Uriel, and Kildare, shall go appareled like Englishmen, and wear their Beards after the English Maner, swear Allegiance, and take English Surname // The statutes at large... P. 29; An act that every Englishman and Irishman that dwelleth with Englishmen, and speaketh English, betwixt sixty and sixteen years, shall have an Englifh Bow and Arrows // *Ibid*.

<sup>76</sup> *Nicholls K. W. Worlds apart?* P. 23. — It means that although legally anglicized Irish population could maintain their cultural distinctiveness in theory, this peculiarity was not expressed in language. Therefore, it is very important to use emic perspective in the examination of identities in late medieval Ireland and not to assign cultural identity to the agents of interethnic interplay if cultural identity was not the main resource of identification.

<sup>77</sup> In the Irish language they were identified as *Gaill* (aliens) (see: *Nicholls K. W. Worlds apart?* P. 23).

Although there were early attempts to classify English colonists as “Irish” (“Éireannach”) in Irish literature, these attempts were sporadic<sup>78</sup>.

Real opportunities for articulation of consensual identity emerged only in the early modern time when both the Irish and the English became the subjects of the English crown (after 1541), and when Tudor and early Stuart monarchs recognized the importance of acculturation for overcoming distinctions, taming subjects and transforming their identities<sup>79</sup>.

## References

- Banton M. *Racial and ethnic competition*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983, 434 p.
- Barkan R. Race, religion, and nationality in American society: a model of ethnicity: from contact to assimilation [with comment, with response]. *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 1995, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 38–101.
- Barth F. Introduction. *Ethnic groups and boundaries: the social organization of cultural difference*. Ed. by F. Barth. Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1969, pp. 9–38.
- Beaune C. *Naissance de la nation Francaise*. Paris, Gallimard, 1985, 431 p.
- Berry J. W. Acculturation and adaptation in a new society, *International migration*, 1992, vol. 30, pp. 69–85.
- Berry J. W. Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 1997, vol. 46, pp. 5–34.
- Booker S. *Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland: the English and the Irish of the four obedient shires*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2018, 298 p.
- Braddick M. *State formation in early Modern England, c. 1550–1700*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004, 448 p.
- Bradshaw B. “And so began the Irish nation”: nationality, national consciousness and nationalism in pre-modern Ireland. *Furnham, Ashgate*, 2015, 318 p.
- Bradshaw B. *The Irish constitutional revolution of the sixteenth century*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979, 303 p.
- Bryson A. *From courtesy to civility: changing codes of conduct in early Modern England*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1998, 310 p.
- Carey V. Neither good English, nor good Irish: bilingualism and identity formation in sixteenth century Ireland. *Political ideology in Ireland, 1541–1641*. Ed. by H. Morgan. Dublin, Four Courts Press, 1999, pp. 45–61.
- Cosgrove A. Anglo-Ireland and the Yorkist cause, 1447–60. *A new history of Ireland. Vol. II: Medieval Ireland, 1169–1534*. Ed. by A. Cosgrove. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 558–569.
- Cosgrove A. Hiberniores ipsis Hibernis. *Studies in Irish history presented to R. Dudley Edwards*. Dublin, University College, 1979, pp. 1–14.
- Downham C. Sparky Booker. Cultural exchange and identity in late medieval Ireland: The English and Irish of the Four Obedient Shires. *Cambridge studies in medieval life and thought, 4<sup>th</sup> series*, 109. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2018. *Journal of British Studies*, 2019, vol. 58, iss. 1, pp. 179–181.
- Duffy P. The nature of the medieval frontier in Ireland. *Studia Hibernica*, 1982/1983, vol. 22/23, pp. 21–38.
- Ehlers J. *Kontinuität und Tradition als Grundlage mittelalterlicher Nationsbildung in Frankreich*. Sigmaringen, Thorbecke, 1983, S. 15–47.

<sup>78</sup> In the Irish language, autochthonous ethnonym for self-description with genealogical connotations was *Gaedheal* (Gael). The term *Éireannach* did not have this connotation and was rarely used for this purpose (Leerssen J. *Mere Irish & fíor-ghael: studies in the idea of Irish nationality, its development, and literary expression prior to the nineteenth century*. Amsterdam (Philadelphia), 1986. P. 190–200; Ó hUiginn R. *Éireannaigh, Fíor Éireann, Gaeil agus Gaill // Aon don éigse: essays marking Osborn Bergin's centenary lecture on bardic poetry* / eds C. Breatnach, M. Ní Úrdail. Dublin, 2015. P. 17–49).

<sup>79</sup> See Greenblatt S. *Renaissance self-fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago, 1980; Bryson A. *From courtesy to civility: changing codes of conduct in early Modern England*. Oxford, 1998; Braddick M. *State formation in early Modern England, c. 1550–1700*. Cambridge, 2004. P. 340–419.

- Ellis S. G. Citizenship and the state in Ireland: from medieval lordship to Early Modern kingdom. *Enfranchising Ireland? Identity, citizenship and state*. Ed. by S. G. Ellis. Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, 2018, pp. 19–31.
- Ellis S. G. More Irish than the Irish themselves? *History Ireland*, 1999, vol. 7(1), pp. 22–26.
- EWIG E. *Volkstum und Volksbewusstsein im Frankenreich des 7. Jahrhunderts*. 2 Aufl. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969, 268 S.
- Frame R. “Les Engleys Néés en Irlande”: The English political identity in Medieval Ireland. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 1993, vol. 3, pp. 83–103.
- Frame R. Ireland after 1169: Barriers to acculturation on an “English edge”. *Norman expansion: connections, continuities and contacts*. Eds K. Stringer, A. Jotischky. Farnham, Ashgate, 2013, pp. 115–141.
- Fyodorov S. The identity processes in medieval Wales. Terminology, discourses, and context of bilingualism. *Dialog so Vremenem*, 2017, vol. 61, pp. 25–39. (In Russian)
- Fyodorov S. The identity processes in medieval Wales. Terminology, discourses, and context of Bilingualism (Wēalas-based nomenclature). *Dialog so Vremenem*, 2018, vol. 62, pp. 48–61. (In Russian)
- Geary P. Ethnic identity as a situational construct in the early middle ages. *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 1983, Bd. 113, S. 15–26.
- Gordon M. M. *Assimilation in American life: the role of race, religion, and national origins*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1964, 276 p.
- Green A. S. *Irish nationality*. New York, Henry Holt and company, London, Williams and Norgate, 1911, 256 p.
- Greenblatt S. *Renaissance self-fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1980, 321 p.
- Griffiths R. *King and country: England and Wales in the fifteenth century*. London, Hambledon Press, 1991, 408 p.
- Gschntzer F., Kozellek R., Schönemann B., Werner K. F. Volk, nation, nationalism, masse. *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. Hrsg. von O. Brunner, W. Conze, R. Koselleck. Bd. 7. Stuttgart, Klein-Cotta, 1992, S. 141–431.
- Gueneé B. État et nation en France au Moyen-Age. *Revue historique*, 1967, t. 237, fasc. 1, pp. 17–30.
- Jefferies H. A. *The Irish church and the Tudor reformations*. Dublin, Four Courts Press, 2010, 302 p.
- Kienast W. *Studien über die französischen Volksstämme des Frühmittelalter*. Stuttgart, Anton Hierseman, 1968, 248 S.
- Lambert B., Liddy C. D. The civic franchise and the regulation of aliens in Great Yarmouth, c. 1430 — c. 1490. *Resident Aliens in Later Medieval England*. Eds W. M. Ormrod, N. McDonald, C. Taylor. Turnhout, Brepols, 2017, pp. 125–143.
- Leerssen J. *Mere Irish & fíor-ghael: studies in the idea of Irish nationality, its development, and literary expression prior to the nineteenth century*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publ. Co, 1986, 535 p.
- Lennon C. *Sixteenth-Century Ireland: the incomplete conquest*. Dublin, Gill & Macmillan, 2005, 401 p.
- Lydon J. F. Nation and race in medieval Ireland. *Concepts of national identity in the middle ages*. Eds S. Forde, L. Johnson, A. V. Murray. Leeds, University of Leeds, 1995, pp. 103–124.
- Lydon J. F. The middle nation. *The English in medieval Ireland. Proceedings of the first joint meeting of the Royal Irish Academy and the British Academy, Dublin, 1982*. Ed. by J. F. Lydon. Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, 1984, pp. 1–26.
- Maginn C. Gaelic Ireland’s English frontiers in the late Middle Ages. *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature*, 2010, vol. 110C, pp. 173–190.
- Muldoon J. *Identity on the medieval Irish frontier: degenerate Englishmen, wild Irishmen, middle nations*. Gainesville, University Press of Florida, 2003, 204 p.
- Nicholls K. W. *Gaelic and gaelicized Ireland in the Middle ages*. Dublin, Lilliput, 1972, 238 p.
- Nicholls K. W. Worlds apart? The Ellis two-nation theory on late medieval Ireland. *History Ireland*, 1999, vol. 7 (2), pp. 22–26.
- Ó hUiginn R. Éireannaigh, Fir Éireann, Gaeil agus Gaill. *Aon don éigse: essays marking Osborn Bergin’s centenary lecture on bardic poetry*. Eds C. Breatnach, M. Ní Úrdail. Dublin, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 2015, pp. 17–49.
- Pohl W. Conceptions of ethnicity in early medieval studies. *Archaeologia Polona*, 1991, vol. 29, pp. 39–49.

- Post G. Two notes on nationalism in the middle ages. *Traditio*, 1953, vol. 9, pp. 281–320.
- Reynolds S. *Kingdoms and communities in Western Europe, 900–1300*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1997, 387 p.
- Ruddick A. «Becoming English»: nationality, terminology, and changing sides in the Late Middle Ages. *Medieval Worlds*, 2017, no. 5, pp. 57–69.
- Ruddick A. *English identity and political culture in the fourteenth century*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013, 356 p.
- Simms K. Bards and barons: The Anglo-Irish aristocracy and the native culture. *Medieval frontier societies*. Eds R. Bartlett, A. MacKay. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992, pp. 177–197.
- Simms K. Frontiers in the Irish church — regional and cultural. *Colony and frontier in medieval Ireland: essays presented to J. F. Lydon*. Eds T. B. Barry, R. Frame, K. Simms. London, The Hambledon Press, 1995, pp. 177–200.
- Smith B. *Crisis and survival in late medieval Ireland. The English of Louth and their neighbors, 1330–1450*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013, 260 p.
- Watt J. A. Gaelic polity and cultural identity. *A New history of Ireland*. Vol. II: Medieval Ireland, 1169–1534. Ed. by A. Cosgrove. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 315–352.
- Watt J. A. *The Church and the two nations in medieval Ireland*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1970, 251 p.
- Wenskus R. *Stammesbildung und Verfassung. Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen gentes*. Köln, Graz, Böhlau Verlag, 1961, 656 S.
- Wirth L. The problem of minority groups. *The science of man in the world crisis*. Ed. by R. Linton. New York, Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. 347–372.

Статья поступила в редакцию 23 апреля 2020 г.

Рекомендована в печать 9 сентября 2020 г.

Received: April 23, 2020

Accepted: September 9, 2020