Article

Cahiers Élisabéthains

Cahiers Élisabéthains: A Journal of English Renaissance Studies
2016, Vol. 89(1) 27–44

DOI: 10.1177/0184767815627761
cae.sagepub.com
SAGE

Popular politics in *2 Henry VI*: Everyday forms of resistance and hidden transcripts

In-Hwan Doh
Keimyung University

Abstract
This essay aims to re-evaluate popular politics in *2 Henry VI* by adopting James Scott's concepts of *hidden transcripts* and *everyday forms of resistance* as its critical methodology. Shakespearean popular politics is invested not only in the scenes punctuated by the high moment of Cade's rebellion but also in the scenes which register less spectacular forms of resistance, such as the three scenes concerning petitioners, protesters and pirates. Moreover, Scott's hidden transcripts invite us to reconstruct the Cade scenes so obviously distorted by Elizabethan censorship and to look for the people's grievances concealed beneath the surface of their disfigured portraits.

Keywords
Popular politics, hidden transcripts, public transcripts, political agency, manipulation, negotiation

Résumé
Cet article cherche à réévaluer la politique populaire dans *2 Henri VI* en s'appuyant sur une méthodologie fondée sur les concepts de *transcriptions cachées* et de *formes quotidiennes de résistance* élaborés par James Scott. Chez Shakespeare la politique populaire est investie dans des scènes où culmine le grand moment de la révolte de Cade, ainsi que dans celles dépeignant des formes de résistance moins spectaculaires, telles que les trois scènes centrées sur des pétitionnaires, des protestataires et des pirates. La notion de transcriptions cachées invite aussi à reconstruire les scènes centrées sur Cade,

Corresponding author:
In-Hwan Doh, The College of Liberal Arts, Keimyung University, Room 106, Osan Kwan, 1095 Dalgubeol-daero, Dalseo-Gu, Daegu 42601, Republic of Korea.
Email: inhwandoh@yahoo.co.uk

assurément déformées par la censure élisabéthaine, pour y percevoir les souffrances du peuple cachées sous des portraits défigurés.

Mots clés
Politique populaire, transcriptions cachées, transcriptions publiques, action politique, manipulation, négociation

New perspectives in social history

Generally, previous studies of Shakespeare's popular politics have been limited to analyses of exceptional moments: namely, mass protests and large-scale riots in which those normally rendered silent are seen to cry with rebellious voices. By doing so, they have created an incomplete picture of popular politics. In the ordinary situation of an oppressive regime, the subordinate people do not stage crowd actions openly, which would put them at a high risk of retribution. Rather, they express their grievances in inarticulate and everyday forms of resistance which may seem politically unremarkable. Reassessing early modern popular politics, John Walter argues, '"ordinary people" could influence the exercise of power in ways that were less spectacular, but more continuous, than is suggested by the current historiographical emphasis on the crowd'.[1] Supporting Walter's argument, Steve Hindle maintains that '[c]rowds engaged in direct action only as the very last resort' in the highly pressured situation wherein their governing elites had ignored grievances they had previously 'expressed in grumbling, in appealing and in petitioning'.[2]

In addition, whilst searching for popular voices in crowd actions, previous scholarship has been frequently restricted to a so-called *manipulation theory*, a hypothesis that explains how the commoners are helplessly manipulated into crowd actions by political elites who compete for royal sovereignty. However, recent social history suggests that it is difficult to adopt manipulation theory as an effective description of early modern popular politics.[3] Historians argue that what looks like commoners' respectful behaviours towards their superiors, which the previous concept of ideology discarded as a subjugated consciousness, should be re-evaluated.[4] This new perspective enables us to advance a positive interpretation of the people's political agency which is normally concealed beneath their public show of deference and loyalty to their superiors.

These recent developments in social history derive their momentum by and large from the studies of James Scott whose anthropology has crucially inspired social historians. Scott's *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* offers a convincing critique of the static concept of hegemony, which has been deployed by Gramsci's followers including Althusser, Miliband, Poulantzas and Marcuse. Scott argues, 'in making long overdue room for the analysis of ideological domination per se, many of Gramsci's successors have, it seems to me, substituted a kind of ideological determinism for the material determinism'.[5] Based on his fieldwork of class relations in Malaysian villages, he constructs a cogent argument for the political agency of the subordinate class: 'the concept of hegemony ignores the extent to which most subordinate classes are

able, on the basis of their daily material experience, to penetrate and demystify the prevailing ideology'.[6] This critique of static hegemony invites us to appreciate interdependent relations between dominant and subordinate groups.

Another innovation in social history stimulated by Scott is its recognition of what he calls hidden transcripts of the oppressed. In *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, Scott uses the term *public transcripts* to describe 'the open interaction between subordinates and those who dominate',[7] and the term *hidden transcripts* 'to characterize discourse that takes place "offstage," beyond direct observation by powerholders'.[8] In doing so, he stresses reciprocal relations between those who have power and those who do not, focusing on the strategies and tools subordinates employ to avoid exploitation, oppression and threats to their subsistence. In public, the oppressed accept powerholders' domination, but they always question it offstage. In order to identify hidden transcripts covered by apparent domination and subordination, therefore, careful attention has to be paid to what lies beneath the surface of evident, public and pragmatic behaviour.

Based on Scott's anthropological studies, social historians have proposed what might be termed *negotiation theory*, replacing the previous *manipulation theory*. Michael Braddick and John Walter argue that power relations between dominant and subordinate groups were a complex process of negotiation through which authority was tempered and subordination mitigated.[9] Along with the reconsideration of the manipulation theory, there has been a significant re-examination of the so-called *deference hypothesis* whereby the poor were supposed to act in obedience to their governing elites' paternalism. Hindle argues that:

> relations of paternalism and deference were perforce not only *reciprocal* but *conditional*, and both patricians and plebs were only too aware that the tradition of riots – the widely recognized 'custom of disobedience' – might contain within itself an element of tacit negotiation.[10]

That is, relations between elites and commoners were dynamically modulated by both downward influence and upward pressure.

In early modern England, obviously, the commoners were yet to constitute the Marxist concept of a class with a nationwide political consciousness, but they were not passive recipients of governing elites' hegemonic rule. The commoners were capable of exercising political agency by appropriating public transcripts. In this respect, revisionist historians' accounts of social relations leave much room for rectification.[11] They regard the common people by and large as being unilaterally bound by hierarchical links and passively manipulated. Following this logic, they attribute crowd actions to a power struggle within elite groups. However, crowd actions were generally autonomous and defensive events in which commoners appealed for moral economy and paternalist policy to resolve their specific grievances such as enclosure, price hikes and food shortage.[12]

In his theatrical career, Shakespeare wrote three insurgency plays which directly involve crowd actions: *2 Henry VI* (*c*. 1592), *Julius Caesar* (1599) and *Coriolanus* (1608). Produced about a decade apart, these three plays not only touch on the feverish

instability of the early modern economy but they also divergently interpret the political agency of the commoners. This essay focuses on *2 Henry VI* and argues that Jack Cade's rebellion is not an isolated incident concerning popular politics. For this argument, I will use recent critical developments in social history regarding everyday forms of resistance. And I seek to demonstrate that Shakespeare's investment in popular politics is apparent not only in the scenes punctuated by high moments of Cade's rebellion but also in the scenes prior to his rebellion which register the people's less conspicuous modes of resistance such as appeals and petitions. In regard to the cause of the rebellion, the play seems to endorse manipulation theory when York says he will instigate Cade's commotion in order to further his own claim for the crown. However, the play presents the commoners' accumulated grievances as a cause for Cade's rebellion, and in the scenes prior to his rebellion, the commoners build up their actions gradually from low-keyed petition to clamorous protest. That is, the play provides us with ample evidence to interpret Cade's rebellion as an inevitable resort to the popular power which has been repeatedly dismissed in its previous stages of routine resistance.

In dealing with the commoners' grievances, the play couples them with a paternal figure who commands their love and respect. Taking issue with *deference hypothesis*, I attempt to show that the commoners' negotiating power is apparent in the scenes where their show of deference is reciprocally linked with governing elites' fulfilment of moral duty. On the other hand, as for direct crowd actions which result from failed reciprocity between the commoners and the governing elites, the play disfigures the commoners as did most public transcripts of the time and stages them as violent, brutish, absurd, ludicrous and megalomaniac. In line with the recent concept of hidden transcripts in social history, I will keep a critical distance from those apparent disfigurations. To overcome the representational distortion, I will carry out a tripartite dialogue between chronicle source, dramatic reformulation and critical appraisal. By doing so, I will demonstrate that the commoners are less disorderly and more politically conscious than previously assumed.

Petition, protest and rebellion in *2 Henry VI*

In its appreciation of Shakespeare's popular politics, critical history of the play has generally disregarded the popular scenes which precede the Cade scenes. Instead, it has focused on the analysis of the playwright's depiction of rebellion and considered the dramatic staging of the rebels' violence as evidence of his anti-populist attitudes. Irving Ribner's critique is typical of conservative accounts of Shakespeare's popular politics: 'The principal rebel … is Richard of York, but to display the horrors of rebellion Shakespeare uses chiefly Jack Cade and his followers', whose disorder is 'the very antithesis of God's plan'.[13] Even in the era of radical criticism such as new historicism and cultural materialism, the viewpoint has not changed all that much. Walter Cohen admits that Shakespeare represents Cade's rebellion in a 'more subtle' way than the anonymous playwright of *Jack Straw*, but he argues that 'the result is not qualitatively different' from that of *Jack Straw* which depicts the peasants' rebellion 'in the serene confidence that it will be contemptuously dismissed'.[14] Endorsing the majority view that

Shakespeare was an anti-populist playwright, Richard Wilson also looks upon his representation of Cade as 'a revealing example of Tudor historiography, an instance of the brazen manipulation of records practiced to buttress the regime'.[15]

As far as the Cade scenes are concerned, it seems almost impossible to reinstate an affirmative appreciation of Shakespeare's popular politics. Rather than focus on those scenes, therefore, I will consider the popular scenes that precede them in which the commoners use the more moderate weapons of the weak and their voices employ a less vociferous tone. Indeed, I contend that Shakespeare's sympathy with popular politics is registered not so much in the representation of Cade's rebellion as in the dramatization of the people's less conspicuous resistance: namely, the petitioners' scene (1.3), the protesters' scene (3.2) and the Kentish pirates' scene (4.1).

In Act 1 Scene 3, a scene with no equivalent in the chronicle sources, Shakespeare presents three petitioners on the stage. This scene is the starting point of his investment in popular politics. In early modern England, petition was a customary right of commoners, as is suggested by Margaret's question: 'My Lord of Suffolk, say, is this the guise, / Is this the fashions in the court of England?' (1.3.37–8).[16] Considering the early modern people's esteem of deep-seated customs, petitioning might well have formed an important weapon of popular resistance. According to Walter, this was 'a more formal weapon' than 'the appeal', which might have been made by an individual or a large group,[17] and it arose from governing elites' negligence in redressing commoners' grievances which had been previously expressed in informal modes of resistance such as 'grumbling' and 'cursing'.[18]

The petitioners in the scene file a humble form of supplication, but they are not exempted from dangers. In particular, their petitions are involved in explosive political issues of the time. The first petitioner takes issue with ecclesiastical abuses, protesting 'against John Goodman, my lord cardinal's man, for keeping my house and lands and wife and all from me' (1.3.15–17). The second petitioner appeals against agrarian enclosure, a volatile issue which frequently exploded into popular revolts. The third petitioner touches on dynastic dispute, one of the leitmotifs of the play, by alleging that his master said 'the Duke of York was rightful heir to the crown' (1.3.24).

Of the three petitions, Suffolk takes only the third one forward and uses it for his own political purpose. York is one of Suffolk's contestants in the ongoing power struggle. During the dispute over the regency of France, Suffolk summons the petitioner in order to prevent York from being appointed for the position. Then the court hears contradictory allegations made by the accuser and the accused. These opposing testimonies between the two simple commoners echo the conflicting accusations between the warring courtiers. In the name of justice, Gloucester commits the armourer and his apprentice to a 'single combat' (1.3.203). Interestingly, the combat scene shows that each combatant rallies supporters who align themselves according to their social ranks. That is, masters 'drink to' their fellow-master, whilst apprentices 'drink to' their colleague who will '[f]ight for credit of the prentices' (2.3.59, 66, 67–8). The combat between the master and his servant thus takes on a disquieting tone of class conflict. This tone presages the Cade scenes in which 'handicraftsmen' and 'labouring men' wage a sort of class war against '[a]ll scholars, lawyers, courtiers, gentlemen' (4.2.8, 12; 4.3.36). The outcome of

the combat also serves as a dramatic precursor to the following popular scenes. That is, the servant's killing of his master foreshadows the Kentish pirates' scene in which Suffolk is killed by his former servant. Moreover, the absurdity concerning the servant's victory, which he owes to his master's drunkenness, anticipates the topsy-turvydom of the whole hierarchical system in the Cade scenes.

In terms of popular politics, the second petition is more remarkable. Right from the start, it suggests a collective action in which all the townsmen are determined to express their grievances. In particular, Suffolk finds himself implicated: 'What's here! [*Reads*] "Against the Duke of Suffolk, for enclosing the commons of Melford"' (1.3.19–20). Encountering Suffolk's indignation, the petitioner says sheepishly, 'Alas, Sir, I am but a poor petitioner of our whole township' (1.3.21–2). In spite of his meekness, he indicates that Suffolk's enclosure has caused widespread grievances among the commoners of Melford. And he suggests that the commoners may have congregated to present a petition after more routine forms of resistance such as grumbling and cursing failed to achieve anything. Moreover, Shakespeare seems to raise the issue of enclosure deliberately by transforming the chronicle sources. In Hall's chronicle, Suffolk's oppression of the poor is indicated,[19] but there is no mention of enclosure.

The petition scene is brief, but its implication is significant. The scene deftly uses the issue of enclosure to cast Suffolk as the enemy of the people, whilst suggesting Gloucester is their friend. Initially, the petitioners wanted to present their supplications to Gloucester, but they mistook Suffolk for him. Consequently, they are intercepted by Suffolk and his paramour Margaret. As the storyline develops, it becomes obvious that Gloucester is the only magistrate on whom the commoners can rely. In contrast, Suffolk is not only the enemy of the people but also a typical example of corrupt politicians, 'whose filth and dirt / Troubles the silver spring where England drinks' (4.1.71–2). By contrasting the two courtiers, the petition scene invites the audience to sympathize with the commoners' perception of who is their friend and who is their enemy. In addition, it shows that the people at this stage take on moderate forms of resistance and do not yet engage in violent protests.

Before Cade appears on the stage, the play presents two more 'thoroughly populist scenes'.[20] One is Act 3 Scene 2 in which the townspeople of Bury St. Edmunds launch mass protest, demanding Suffolk's banishment, and the other is Act 4 Scene 1 where Kentish pirates execute Suffolk. In these two scenes, the people's actions are contrasted with those in Act 1 Scene 3. The petitioners' actions remain within both moral and legal bounds, but the people's actions in these scenes transgress the law. Only in moral terms can they be legitimate. In other words, they begin to engage in violent actions, but they are still supporters of the monarchical commonwealth, acting for the 'care of your most royal person' (3.2.254).

In its preparation for the mass protest scene, the play carefully establishes Gloucester as an exemplary statesman by reiterating the phrase, 'Good Duke' (1.1.156, 159, 190; 2.2.74; 3.2.123, 183, 248). He has frequently 'watched the night . . . in studying good for England' and 'would not tax the needy commons' (3.1.110–1, 116). In contrast, Suffolk is portrayed as a Machiavellian intriguer engaged in an anti-Gloucester faction with Queen Margaret, Cardinal Beaufort and the Duke of York. In the parliamentary scene

immediately before the mass protest, Suffolk's faction arrests Gloucester and accuses him of various offences. However, the charges are so blatantly fabricated that even the conspirators themselves admit they lack solid evidence: 'we have but trivial argument, / More than mistrust, that shows him worthy death' (3.1.241–2). Unable to execute him 'by course of law' (3.1.237), they plot to assassinate him by resorting to their own arbitrary force.

As they plan to murder Gloucester, Suffolk rightly worries that 'The commons [will] haply rise to save his life' (3.1.240). Indeed, when the news of his death becomes public, 'The commons, like an angry hive of bees / That want their leader, scatter up and down / And care not who they sting in his revenge' (3.2.125–7). In this situation, Salisbury appeals to the King as a temporary spokesman of the people: 'Dread lord, the commons send you word by me, / Unless Lord Suffolk straight be done to death / Or banishèd fair England's territories, / They will by violence tear him from your palace' (3.2.243–6). That is, the people overwhelm the King with the threat of violence. It is an obvious transgression of legal bounds, but the dramatic situation ensures the moral legitimacy of the people's power. From the petition scene to the mass protest, Suffolk's evil has been exacerbated not only in his political misconduct but also in his moral degeneracy. After all, this scene signals that power *de jure* still remains in the hands of the courtiers but that power de facto has been transferred to the people.

Gloucester's murder and the subsequent mass protest invite us to consider how popular deference to a paternalistic figure operated in early modern politics. In a normal situation, political stability was maintained by subordinates' deference to governing elites. But it did not mean that the subordinates were politically subjugated. Their respect was rather conditional upon their customary expectations of paternalistic policies. Reciprocally, governing elites derived authority from their successful performance of a range of moral duties such as fatherhood, gentility and godliness.[21] That is, within everyday forms of power relations, tugs of war operated continuously between dominant and subordinate groups. In this respect, the commoners' protest immediately following Gloucester's death attests to their political agency which has been hitherto concealed beneath their pragmatic deference to the governing elite.

In Act 4 Scene 1, Shakespeare makes a more direct presentation of the people's power. Off the coast of Kent, Suffolk and his followers are captured by a crew of pirates. Some of the pirates are willing to release their captives for ransom, but one of them, Walter Whitmore, is not interested in demanding a ransom for Suffolk, whom he holds captive. Instead, he swears vindictively, 'I lost mine eye in laying the prize aboard, / [*To Suffolk*] And therefore, to revenge it, shalt thou die' (4.1.25–6). At this stage, his vindictiveness is nothing more than personal revenge since Suffolk is in disguise. Immediately after this, however, the scene expands his personal grudge into the people's general animosity against the public enemy. In order to save his life, Suffolk takes off his disguise and announces himself, 'thy prisoner is a prince, / The Duke of Suffolk, William de la Pole' (4.1.44–5). But this bombastic announcement brings forth a contrary effect and causes him to face the pirates' collective wrath. Recognizing him as Suffolk, the Lieutenant of the pirates joins Whitmore and delivers a vehement indictment:

> By devilish policy art thou grown great,
> And, like ambitious Sulla, overgorged
> With gobbets of thy mother's bleeding heart.
> By thee Anjou and Maine were sold to France. (4.1.83–6)

This remark seems to echo Gloucester's indignation in the opening scene in which he bewails the loss of Anjou and Maine,[22] and it thus suggests that the commoners are astutely aware of state politics.

What is more remarkable is that Shakespeare transforms the chronicle sources and thereby heightens the people's political agency. According to Holinshed, Suffolk is captured and beheaded by unnamed sailors who are employed by the Duke of Exeter, Constable of the Tower of London.[23] However, Shakespeare 'turns these servants of Exeter into an independent crew of pirates' and describes their execution of Suffolk as the people's autonomous action.[24] With this alteration, he not only emphasizes the people's political awareness but aligns it with the previous popular scenes in which the commoners petitioned (1.3) and protested against Suffolk (3.2). In this respect, the scene bears witness to the way that the people's grudges against Suffolk have gradually evolved, and it thus underlines the moral legitimacy of the people's power.

On the other hand, the scene can be seen as a popular version of courtly politics. As mentioned above, the pirates' grudges against Suffolk correspond to Gloucester's indignation against him. Furthermore, Suffolk is killed as a result of the people's summary justice, just as Gloucester is summarily executed. When Suffolk says to the pirates undauntedly, 'I charge thee waft me safely cross the Channel', Whitmore mimics his words derisively, 'I must waft thee to thy death' (4.1.114, 116). That is, the scene underlines correspondences between courtly and popular politics by making the people imitate their common enemy.

Furthermore, the scene eerily anticipates the Cade scenes. Whilst cursing Suffolk, the Lieutenant imagines his head mounted on a pole: 'thou that smilest at good Duke Humphrey's death / Against the senseless winds shalt grin in vain, / Who in contempt shall hiss at thee again' (4.1.76–8). In a gruesome scene, Cade orders his followers to strike off the heads of Lord Say and his son-in-law, to 'bring them both upon two poles hither', and to make 'them kiss one another' (4.7.95–6, 112). As Roger Warren argues, the pirates' bitterness about Suffolk's abuses of government and the brutality of his decapitation 'anticipate the way in which Jack Cade and his followers … express their grievances over misgovernment which then become the reason, or the excuse, for acts of extreme violence'.[25] In spite of this anticipation, however, the people's power at this stage does not yet aim at a radical reformation of the state as a whole. It is still restricted to the redress of particular grievances and locally contained in the provinces.

In his dramatization of Cade's rebellion, Shakespeare adopts the 1450 Kentish incident as his main source. In addition, he conflates several other incidents of popular insurgency: namely, Jack Straw's revolt of 1381 in which rebellious peasants killed lawyers, destroyed the Savoy and the Inns of Court and burned the records of the realm and London Bridge; John Lincoln's Evil May Day of 1517 in which London apprentices wreaked xenophobic violence particularly against French foreigners; and Robert Kett's

1549 rebellion in which the sumptuary signs of the gentry were one of the targets of the attacks by the protesters who camped at Mousehold Heath. Along with these conflations, Shakespeare enriches the Cade scenes with contemporary events such as London cloth-workers' disturbances in the early 1590s.[26]

As a result of this conflated depiction, the Cade scenes make it more complicated to resolve controversies over Shakespeare's attitudes towards popular politics. Does Shakespeare invite sympathy for the common people, or does he treat them with contempt? Does he employ Cade's voice to express the economic grievances of commoners in the 1590s, or does he offer up an ignominious portrait of Cade in order to discredit popular politics?

When Shakespeare's Cade is compared to Cade in the chronicle sources, it is difficult to deny that Shakespeare portrays him in a much darker way. For example, Hall depicts him as '[a] certayn youngman of a goodely stature, and pregnaunt wit',[27] but Shakespeare disfigures him into a barbaric demagogue who agitates his followers to '[k]ill and knock down! Throw them into Thames' (4.8.1–2). In Hall, Cade is 'a subtill capitayn', 'sober in communication, wyse in disputing',[28] but in Shakespeare, Cade is a vulgar and brutish ringleader who abolishes public legislation to impose his own arbitrary rule: 'my mouth shall be the parliament of England' (4.7.11–12). Hall's Cade is 'prohibityng to all men, Murder, Rape, or Robbery',[29] but Shakespeare's Cade is willing to revive the notorious feudal *droit de seigneur*: 'there shall not a maid be married, but she shall pay me her maiden-head ere they have it' (4.7.104–6). Indeed, Shakespeare's Cade is so demonized that his claims for social justice are likely to fall on deaf ears.

In terms of popular politics, a more serious problem arises in that Shakespeare seems to obliterate the autonomy of popular voices and align them with manipulation theory. For example, Cade's rebellion is presented as a side effect of a power struggle among the courtiers. In Act 3 Scene 1, York reveals his intention to employ Cade as his stalking horse in his Machiavellian drive to seize the crown: 'I have seduced a headstrong Kentishman, / John Cade of Ashford, / To make commotion, as full well he can, / Under the title of John Mortimer' (3.1.356–9). Cade in turn pretends to be a son of 'Mortimer', a claimant to the throne through the York line (4.2.31). It is certain that in connecting the Kentish popular commotion with York's royal claim Shakespeare follows the chronicle sources: 'Those that fauoured the duke of Yorke, and wished the crowne vpon his head ... procured a commotion in Kent'.[30] Nevertheless, it should be noted that Shakespeare does not simply follow this circumstantial connection but amplifies it by establishing a personal link between York and Cade. Cade is thereby utterly deprived of his independent autonomy as a popular leader and relegated to a tool of the royal claimant who will use the army levied against Ireland to fulfil his own political ambition. Obviously, this manipulated aspect of Cade's rebellion goes against social historians' assessment of early modern popular politics. According to Roger Manning, crowd actions occurred because of the poor people's subsistence crisis, and it was very unusual for them to raise a rebellion because they were manipulated by ruling elites.[31]

Furthermore, Shakespeare's Cade disrupts the normative relationship between the King and his subjects. Cade's political agenda is remarkably different from that of the commoners in the previous scenes. In Act 3 Scene 2, the commoners make a commotion

to protect the King from the treasonous councillor: 'they will guard you, whe'r you will or no / From such fell serpents as false Suffolk is' (265–6). In Act 4 Scene 1, the Kentish commoners kill Suffolk, accusing him of having mismanaged the King's marriage: 'wedded be thou to the hags of hell / For daring to affy a mighty lord / Unto the daughter of a worthless king' (79–81). Above all, in the chronicle sources, Cade makes it clear that his uprising is not directed against the King. He sends the King 'an humble supplicacion, with louyng woordes' which confirms that his insurrection is only 'against diuers of his counsail, louers of them selfes, and oppressers of the pore comonaltie'.[32] These descriptions do not contradict social historians' arguments for royal paternalism and popular deference as the normative order of early modern England.[33] However, in transforming the chronicle sources, Shakespeare portrays Cade as a treasonous villain who calls the incumbent King 'usurper openly' and announces blatantly, 'king I will be' (4.4.30; 4.2.58). Thus, it is difficult to rule out the suspicion that the playwright disfigures Cade deliberately in keeping with 'Tudor propaganda'.[34]

In evaluating Shakespeare's disfiguration of Cade, however, we should be reminded that most early modern plays are, in a sense, public transcripts which resulted from negotiations between public censors and commercial companies. In the case of *2 Henry VI*, we have no evidence regarding censorial negotiation, but indirectly, we can get a glimpse of it from the manuscript play, *Sir Thomas More*. In the first leaf of the manuscript of the play, we find Edmund Tilney's injunction, 'Leave out the insurrection wholly and the cause thereof'.[35] Consequently, we see significant changes carried out in the original manuscript.

For example, John Lincoln in the original text (OT) is a rational leader of the Ill May Day, who has 'long time winked at these vile enormities with mighty impatience' (OT: 1.62–3).[36] He cautiously prepares for a mass demonstration by prevailing on Doctor Beal to publish his bill which will call forth 'compassion over the poor people' (OT: 1.79–80). He decides what actions he will take after discussion with his fellow protesters. In particular, the OT presents a moving dramatization of his execution. That is, he faces his death as courageously as Thomas More. And he dies a hero's death for popular legitimacy, just as More dies a martyr to his religious conscience. However, the revised text demotes him to a ridiculous demagogue: 'Peace, hear me! He that will not see a red herring at a Harry groat, butter at eleven pence a pound, meal at nine shillings a bushel and beef a four nobles a stone, list to me' (Addition II D: 6.123–5).[37] His speech sounds very much like Cade's: 'There shall be in England seven halfpenny loaves sold for a penny, the three-hooped pot shall have ten hoops, and I will make it felony to drink small beer' (4.2.54–6). Their speeches might allude to commoners' economic grievances over massive price hikes in the 1590s, but they cannot help giving the impression that their causes are trivial and both are transformed into farcical clowns.

In particular, Ralph Betts is remarkable in the revised text. His role was obviously added after Tilney's injunction. In the OT, he is neither named nor assigned a speaking part: he is simply one of the mute stage-fillers. In the revision, however, he is not only named but also given the role of the clown who utters ludicrous asides to discredit the voices of the protesters. In Lincoln's execution scene, Hand B diligently interpolates distinctive additions between the original lines and gives Ralph opportunities to blurt out

farcical remarks in order to smear every solemn speech of the protesters. For example, when Doll Williamson extols Lincoln's heroic death, 'Thou lived'st a good fellow, and died'st an honest man', Ralph waters it down with a mocking joke, 'Would I were so far on my journey. The first stretch is the worst, methinks' (OT: 7.638; interpolation beside 7.638–41).

As a result, Ralph in the revised text of *More* bears a striking similarity to Dick, Smith, and Holland in *2 Henry VI*, who also speak asides in order to ridicule Cade. When Cade asserts, 'Therefore am I of an honourable house', Dick scoffs, 'Ay, by my faith, the field is honourable; and there was he born under a hedge, for his father had never a house but the cage' (4.2.40, 41–3). Throughout the protest scenes of both plays, the contaminating effects of these clown figures are at once persistent and widespread. In theatre terminology, their utterances are termed *asides*, but they are powerful enough to stigmatize central characters. In particular, when clown figures standing on the edge of the stage deliver their speech directly to the audience, they achieve the dramatic effect of replacing the centrepiece of the stage with the periphery by inducing the audience to strike a close affinity with them.

Inevitably, the similarity between the two plays invites us to suppose that hidden transcripts lie beneath the surface of the ludicrous distortion of Cade. Indeed, when we remove the farcical surface and reconstruct hidden transcripts imaginatively, we can see that the Cade scenes are powerfully charged with early modern commoners' discontents and aspirations. Touching a flashpoint of popular grumblings about enclosure, Cade declares, 'all the realm shall be in common; and in Cheapside shall my palfrey go to grass' (4.2.56–7). This remark reminds us of the petitioner's grumbling about Suffolk's enclosure (1.3.19–20). Furthermore, out of Cade's mouth issues a radical critique of contemporary social inequality. He promises, 'There shall be no money, all shall eat and drink on my score; and I will apparel them all in one livery that they may agree like brothers' (4.2.60–2). As Jean Howard argues, Cade suggests an alternative model of egalitarian society which is 'much more radically utopian' than the 'hierarchical paternalism' and moral economy which the Duke of Gloucester represented earlier in the play.[38]

Populist democracy, referred to repeatedly in the Cade scenes, has a long tradition. The rebels emphasize the value of labour by contrasting it with the idleness of the nobility. Holland says, 'The nobility think scorn to go in leather aprons' (4.2.9). And he refers to Scripture: 'it is said ''Labour in thy vocation'': which is as much to say as let the magistrates be labouring men; and therefore should we be magistrates' (4.2.11–13). This populist radicalism traces its tradition at least as far back as Jack Straw's revolt in 1381. In the anonymous play, *Jack Straw*, Parson Ball summarizes the popular dream in a catchphrase, 'when *Adam* delved and *Eve* span / Who was then a Gentleman?' (1.1.62–3).[39] According to the catchphrase, the first community on earth was the egalitarian utopia which did not know the distinction of rank based on the division of labour.

In Cade's aspiration for egalitarian community, it is remarkable that his damning critique of early modern society is directed specifically against literacy. This critique is another feature the play shares with *Jack Straw*. Holinshed's Cade does not display any animosity towards literacy, but Shakespeare's Cade repeatedly condemns the practices

of reading, writing and printing. Cade commits his first violence by killing the Clerk of Chartham 'with his pen and inkhorn about his neck' (4.2.89–90). Later, he orders his followers to 'burn all the records of the realm' (4.7.10–11). His vandalism reaches its climax in the execution of Lord Say. Incriminating Lord Say with several offences, he identifies Say's educational career as the foremost crime: 'Thou hast most traitorously corrupted the youth of the realm in erecting a grammar school' (4.7.25–7).

The rebels' vandalism against literacy is frequently regarded as one of the distinctive features of the play, testifying to their wilful ignorance and mindless violence against civil society. For example, Richard Wilson argues, the rebels' violence shows their 'long orgy of scatological clowning, arson and homicide fuelled by an infantile hatred of literacy and law'.[40] However, as Thomas Cartelli argues, the rebels' reaction is less derived from wilful ignorance than from the discriminatory role that literacy played in dividing early modern society into dispossessed commoners and possessing elites.[41]

David Cressy gives historical evidence that helps us reconstruct hidden transcripts which lie beneath Cade's animosity towards literacy. In his kangaroo court, Cade examines the Clerk of Chartham: 'Dost thou use to write thy name? Or hast thou a mark to thyself?' (4.2.84–5). Cressy notes that 'the ability or inability to write a signature' was a distinctive measurement of literacy in early modern England,[42] and he demonstrates 'an overwhelming correspondence between social and occupational status and the ability to sign one's name'.[43]

Considering literacy as the key dividing line of society, Cade's violence against it amounts to class war, in which the literate few who 'have been so well brought up that [they] can write [their] name' are put into confrontation with the illiterate mass who make their 'mark' and communicate 'like an honest plain-dealing man' (4.2.86–7, 85). From Cade's viewpoint, the egalitarian state of commonwealth is collapsed into a discriminatory society by the unsettling effect of literacy. Thus, in his animosity to literacy, he would 'kill all the lawyers' because they 'call poor men before them about matters they were not able to answer' (4.2.63; 4.7.33–4).

Along with vandalism to literacy, another remarkable feature of the Cade scenes is the rebels' animosity towards sumptuous clothes. This feature is also Shakespeare's independent depiction. In Hall and Holinshed, the rebels do not show specific interest in clothes. In contrast, right at the start of the rebellion scenes of Shakespeare, Bevis compares Cade's reformation to re-dressing: 'Jack Cade the clothier means to dress the commonwealth, and turn it, and set a new nap upon it' (4.2.4–5). Encountering Stafford and his brother who lead the royal army, Cade taunts them as 'these silken-coated slaves' (4.2.107). At the height of the rebels' violence, it is also the 'foot-cloth' of Lord Say's horse which sparks Cade's antipathy: 'thou ought'st not to let thy horse wear a cloak when honester men than thou go in their hose and doublets' (4.7.38, 40–1).

Obviously, this animosity to the gentry's clothes would reveal the hidden transcript which lay beneath contemporary sumptuary laws, that is to say, the sartorial regulations which reinforced social hierarchies by preventing commoners from imitating aristocrats' clothes. Additionally, James Holstun finds that Robert Kett's campmen in their 1549 rebellion 'repeatedly attacked the sumptuary signs of class: plucking off the clothing of Norwich's deputy mayor, mocking the coat of Northumberland's herald as ''but some

pieces of popish copes sewed together"'.[44] Along with sumptuary laws, Holstun's findings invite us to understand why Shakespeare's Cade shows a bitter animosity towards costly clothes.

On the other hand, the rebels' interest in clothes might be related to the 1590s cloth-workers' disturbances. In the period between the latter half of the fifteenth century and the first half of the sixteenth century, the woollen cloth industry was in the vanguard of capitalist development and economic proliferation in England, and it accelerated enclosure for the expansion of sheep pasture. However, in the latter half of the sixteenth century, the textile boom collapsed because the export market was blocked by religious wars in continental Europe. Alan Dyer argues that 'in 1569–73 with the deterioration in Anglo-Spanish relations and more generally in the 1590s when much of Europe was convulsed in warfare', the English cloth industry was directly hit and plunged into slump.[45]

In particular, London in the 1590s was besieged with accumulated hardships which included devastating plague, repeated harvest failures, massive price inflation and heavy taxation to finance the war in Ireland and the Low Countries. According to the price index compiled by Phelps Brown and Sheila Hopkins, the cost of a composite basket of consumables in southern England soared by 685 percent between 1500 and 1600, whilst real wages plummeted to 29 percent of their original value during the same period.[46] And Ian Archer notes that 'plague stalked the city in 1592–93' with a record of '10,675 plague deaths' in the second year alone, which amounted to '14.3 per cent of the population'.[47] Based on these accumulated plights, Archer argues that 'this was clearly the worst decade sixteenth-century Londoners experienced'.[48] Consequently, during this age of crisis, London underwent numerous outbreaks of apprentices' riots, including cloth-workers' disturbances.[49]

Wilson places the Cade scenes in a micro-historical context. According to him, Shakespeare's depiction of the Cade scenes is a response to apprentices' riots in the summer of 1592 in which a group of Southwark feltmakers clashed with the guards of the Marshalsea prison.[50] Wilson finds the evidence of this topical connection in the characterization of the rebels: 'The 1450 rising had been an agrarian *jacquerie*, like that of 1381, but Shakespeare changed the occupations of the rioters'.[51] Indeed, the rioters in the play are not presented as country peasants but urban artisans such as weavers and shearers, and above all, Cade is 'the clothier' who 'means to dress the commonwealth' (4.2.4–5).

Hidden transcripts and history from below

From the 1970s onwards, what is called *history from below* has made a great impact on the development of social history.[52,53] History from below found that the early modern period was an age of immense social mobility whereby the rich and the poor were increasingly polarized.[54] It also found that various kinds of disproportion and discrimination occurred along the principal line drawn between those of gentle and non-gentle status.[55] And it argued that if 'as much as 95%' of the population was below the gentry,[56] then we should give due attention to the situation of poor subordinates. In other words, if

we are restricted to the advancement of the gentry whilst overlooking the decline of the poor majority, we cannot but produce what Foucault calls 'subjugated knowledge', that is, 'those blocs of historical knowledge which were present but disguised within the body of functionalist and systematising theory'.[57]

Rediscovering the unequal society in which most of the poor were rendered invisible by their illiteracy, history from below 'began to challenge an earlier social history which too often allowed the comments of literate elites on their inferiors to masquerade as a history of society' and recognized that 'the normative nature of much social comment' was 'more prescription than description'.[58] However, by constructing popular politics with spectacular incidents such as riot and rebellion, history from below produced 'what we might label a "stepping-stone" history, in which periods of subordination are punctuated by moments of agency, and a popular politics is seen as spasmodic and reactive'.[59]

When this stepping-stone history is applied to *2 Henry VI*, the Cade scenes are treated as 'a little play of its own, a miniature inset',[60] and popular scenes prior to them are easily disregarded. Scott's concept of everyday forms of resistance enables us to overcome this limited view by inviting us to situate spectacular episodes of crowd action in a broader vista of popular politics. Crowd action originates as a small-scale expression of grievances such as appealing and petitioning, and in accumulated hardships, it could explode into riot and rebellion. Accordingly, the petitions in Act 1 Scene 3, the mass protest in Act 3 Scene 2 and the Kentish crew's violence in Act 4 Scene 1, all show the commoners' psychological development in a series of worsening situations, which lead eventually to Cade's rebellion. In this respect, the three scenes can be perceived as building materials which construct the stepping-stone incident of Cade's rebellion and thereby ensure that we should see the Cade scenes as more than 'a little play of its own, a miniature inset'.

Earlier social historians, particularly revisionist historians, tended to reduce commoners as an inarticulate and pre-political mass by aligning the elite/popular dichotomy with a top-down model. When we view the play from this top-down perspective, we are liable to interpret relations between Gloucester and the commoners as unilaterally bound by the paternal figure and thereby disregard the commoners' political awareness. By acknowledging the commoners' negotiating agency, Scott invites us to re-evaluate this deference hypothesis. Behind public transcripts of compliance and deference lies the commoners' subtle political consciousness. Thus, we should beware of overemphasizing the downward direction of influence when we interpret this deference to a paternal figure. In this respect, the three popular scenes prior to Cade's rebellion do not so much register Gloucester's paternalism but rather testify to the commoners' surveillance of governing elites.

Moreover, when we evaluate Cade's rebellion according to the top-down model, we may be tempted to regard it as a political incident manipulated by York in his contest for sovereign power, and we thereby implicitly discredit the people's political agency. Scott's concept of hidden transcripts enables us to overcome this restrictive evaluation. The play is a public transcript in that it went through the public censor's intervention. Seen from this perspective, the Cade scenes reveal what might be concealed beneath the surface of the rebels' violence and barbarism. That is, we can reconstruct from the scenes

the early modern people's economic grievances caused by enclosure, their animosity against literacy which operated as a class discriminator, London cloth-workers' subsistence crisis in the 1590s, and more generally, their aspiration for an egalitarian utopia whose tradition dates back to time immemorial.

Finally, Scott's theory of hidden transcripts invites us to reconsider Shakespeare's attitudes towards the populace. Based on the analysis of the Cade scenes, critics have produced wildly divergent arguments regarding Shakespeare's attitudes.[61] For example, Wilson argues that Shakespeare's farcical depiction of Cade's rebellion shows his 'scorn of popular culture and identification with an establishment'.[62] However, Annabel Patterson disapproves of these accounts of Shakespeare's conservatism by arguing that 'there is nothing in *Henry VI, Part 2*, read carefully, that can justify its use as the court of last appeal in a claim for Shakespeare's conservatism'.[63] In response, Wilson counters Patterson by contending that 'her vision of the Bard as a Jeffersonian democrat' is the projection of her own politics onto Shakespeare.[64] In the midst of critics' Sisyphean efforts to identify Shakespeare's attitudes, I do not wish to contribute to the controversies by adding my own conjectural argument. Instead, I wish to point out that, given Elizabethan censorial policies, the play should be viewed as a public transcript which cannot be regarded as a transparent representation of the playwright's attitudes. In this respect, the similarity between the revised text of *More* and *2 Henry VI* reminds us that our judgement of Shakespeare's popular politics relies inevitably on our imaginary reconstruction of hidden transcripts.

Acknowledgements

This article is both aided and improved by the invaluable input of a host of readers. My thanks to Eoin Price, Paul Hamilton, Peter J. Smith, Janice Valls-Russell and the anonymous reviewers of *Cahiers Élisabéthains*.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. John Walter, *Crowds and Popular Politics in Early Modern England* (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2006), 200.
2. Steve Hindle, 'Crime and Popular Protest', in Barry Coward (ed.), *A Companion to Stuart Britain* (Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 138.
3. Social history stands in contrast to political history. It focuses on social structures and processes rather than parliamentary and court politics. Influenced by the French *Annales School*, it has become a major branch of English history since the 1960s. In particular, social history of early modern England made great strides at a time of intensive controversies over the significance of

the Civil War, in which Marxists such as Christopher Hill and Brian Manning and other progressivists such as Lawrence Stone and R. H. Tawney were pitched against the empiricist school of revisionists such as Geoffrey R. Elton and Conrad Russell who emphasized short-term and high political factors rather than ideology, economic causation and long-term consequences.

4. Michael J. Braddick and John Walter, 'Introduction. Grids of Power: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Early Modern Society', in Michael J. Braddick and John Walter (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001), 5–10.
5. James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1985), 317.
6. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak* . . . , 317.
7. James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1990), 2.
8. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance* . . . , 4.
9. Braddick and Walter, 'Introduction . . . ', 14–6.
10. Hindle, Crime and Popular Protest, 139.
11. Revisionist historians propounded the manipulation theory in the 1970s, in objection to the previous orthodox historiography wherein Samuel Rawson Gardiner interpreted the Civil War as a crucial step in the structural change of English society from a traditional *feudal* formation to a modern *capitalist* one. The revisionists interpreted the Civil War as an accidental war resulting from local factionalism by emphasizing the downward dictation of ruling elites. Representatives of the revisionists include Alan Everitt, Conrad Russell, John Morill, Mark Kishlansky, Kevin Sharpe and Steve Rappaport.
12. Walter, *Crowds and Popular Politics* . . . , 16–22.
13. Irving Ribner, *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare* (London, Routledge, 1965), 108.
14. Walter Cohen, *Drama of a Nation: Public Theater in Renaissance England and Spain* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1985), 228, 227.
15. Richard Wilson, *Will Power: Essays on Shakespearean Authority* (New York, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993), 27.
16. All quotations of the play are from Michael Hattaway (ed.), *The Second Part of King Henry VI* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991).
17. Walter, *Crowds and Popular Politics* . . . , 208, 204.
18. Walter, *Crowds and Popular Politics* . . . , 200, 203.
19. Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle: Containing the History of England, during the Reign of Henry the Fourth, and the Succeeding Monarchs, to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth* (London, J. Johnston et al., 1809), 212.
20. James Holstun, 'Damned Commotion: Riot and Rebellion in Shakespeare's Histories', in Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard (eds), *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works: The Histories* (Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 205.
21. John Walter and Keith Wrightson, 'Dearth and the Social Order in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 71 (1976), 22–3.
22. Roger Warren, Introduction, in Roger Warren (ed.), *Henry VI, Part Two* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003), 50.
23. Raphael Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, vol. 3, 1587 edition (London, J. Johnson et al., 1808), 220. For Hall's account, see *Hall's Chronicle* . . . , 219.
24. Holstun, 'Damned Commotion . . . ', 203.

25. Warren, 'Introduction . . . ', 51.
26. In addition to contemporary cloth-workers' disturbances, some critics find connections between the Hacket rising in 1591 and Shakespeare's Cade. For details, see Christ Fitter, *Radical Shakespeare: Politics and Stagecraft in the Early Career* (London, Routledge, 2012), 54–80.
27. Hall, *Hall's Chronicle* . . . , 220.
28. Hall, *Hall's Chronicle* . . . , 220, 221.
29. Hall, *Hall's Chronicle* . . . , 221.
30. Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles* . . . , 220. For Hall's account, see *Hall's Chronicle* . . . , 220.
31. Roger B. Manning, *Village Revolts: Social Protest and Popular Disturbances in England, 1509–1640* (Oxford, Clarendon, 1988), 1–6.
32. Hall, *Hall's Chronicle* . . . , 220. For Holinshed's account, see *Holinshed's Chronicles* . . . , 221.
33. For the nexus between social protest and normative order in the early modern period, see Hindle, 'Crime and Popular Protest', 136–42.
34. Wilson, *Will Power* . . . , 29.
35. This famous injunction is found in the margin opposite to the original text's lines 1–19. All indications of the play are from W. W. Greg (ed.), *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*, by Anthony Munday et al., printed for the Malone Society (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1911), but in modernization, I follow John Jowett (ed.), *Sir Thomas More* (New York, Methuen, 2011).
36. Greg divides *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore* into two separate sections: one Original Text and six Additions.
37. Addition II D is the abbreviation of 'Addition II Hand D'. Greg finds that each section of the play's manuscript is transcribed by a different hand, that is, the Original Text by Hand S; Addition I by Hand A; Addition II by Hands B, C and D; Addition III by Hand C; Addition IV by Hand C and E; Addition V by Hand C; and Addition VI by Hand B. Scholars have identified Hand S as Anthony Munday, Hand A as Henry Chettle, Hand B as Thomas Heywood, Hand C as the theatre scribe and annotator, Hand D as William Shakespeare and Hand E as Thomas Dekker.
38. Jean E. Howard, Introduction, in Stephen Greenblatt et al. (eds), *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition* (New York, Norton, 1997), 208.
39. Quotations are from Stephen Longstaffe (ed.), *A Critical Edition of the Life and Death of Jack Straw* (Lewiston, Edwin Mellen, 2002).
40. Wilson, *Will Power* . . . , 27.
41. Thomas Cartelli, 'Jack Cade in the Garden: Class Consciousness and Class Conflict in *2 Henry VI*', in Richard Burt and John Michael Archer (eds), *Enclosure Acts: Sexuality, Property, and Culture in Early Modern England* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1994), 59.
42. David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1980), 53.
43. Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order* . . . , 137.
44. Holstun, 'Damned Commotion . . . ', 202.
45. Alan Dyer, 'The Urban Economy', in Robert Tittler and Norman Jones (eds), *A Companion to Tudor Britain* (Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 341.
46. Henry Phelps Brown and Sheila V. Hopkins, *A Perspective of Wages and Prices* (London, Methuen, 1981), 29.
47. Ian Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991), 9.

48. Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability* . . . , 11.
49. Manning, *Village Revolts* . . . , 207–10.
50. Wilson, *Will Power* . . . , 35.
51. Wilson, *Will Power* . . . , 31.
52. History from below grew out of the English Marxism of the Communist Party Historians' Group, loosely brought together around *History Workshop Journal* in the 1970s, when the journal *Past and Present* lost its explicit political focus. History from below asks historians to describe the lives, ideas and experiences of those who lie below dominant historical narratives. Thus, it focuses on hegemony and subordination and attempts to valorize resistance. However, it had difficulty in securing a foothold during the last 30 years in which revisionist historians emphasized detailed attention to sources and documents and promoted a literal interpretation of them. But it has begun to revitalize its momentum since the global financial crisis in 2008, which served as a wake-up call for historians to pay attention to the problem of various disparities between the rich and the poor.
53. Braddick and Walter, 'Introduction . . . ', 2.
54. For social mobility and polarization, see Lawrence Stone, 'Social Mobility in England, 1500–1700', *Past and Present*, 33 (1966), 16–55. For the polarization of society, see Keith Wrightson, *English Society 1580–1680* (New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1982), 140–2.
55. Wrightson, *English Society* . . . , 23.
56. Stone, 'Social Mobility in England . . . ', 20.
57. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. and trans. Colin Gordon et al. (New York, Pantheon Books, 1980), 82.
58. Braddick and Walter, 'Introduction . . . ', 2.
59. Walter, *Crowds and Popular Politics* . . . , 216.
60. François Laroque, 'The Jack Cade Scenes Reconsidered: Popular Rebellion, Utopia, or Carnival?' in Tetsuo Kishi, Roger Pringle, and Stanley Wells (eds), *Shakespeare and Cultural Traditions: The Selected Proceedings of the International Shakespeare Association World Congress, Tokyo, 1991* (Newark, University of Delaware Press, 1994), 76.
61. For a recent survey of divergent critical viewpoints concerning Shakespeare's attitudes, see Chris Fitter, '"Mock Not Flesh and Blood / With Solemn Reverence": Recovering Radical Shakespeare', *Literature Compass*, 9:6 (2012), 420–30.
62. Richard Wilson, '"A Mingled Yarn": Shakespeare and the Cloth Workers', *Literature and History*, 12 (1986), 169.
63. Annabel Patterson, *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice* (Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 1989), 51.
64. Wilson, *Will Power* . . . , 17.

Author biography

In-Hwan Doh is an assistant professor of English at Keimyung University, South Korea. His research focuses mainly on Shakespeare and early modern drama. His recent publications include 'Numismatic Languages and Credit Relations in *Henry IV*', *Shakespeare Review*, 50 (2014); and 'Gypsyism as a Cultural Discourse on Otherness in *The Spanish Gypsy*', *JCERL*, 22 (2013).