"Dip Napkins in His Sacred Blood": Mourning as Catholic Resistance in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*

Sélima Lejri
University of Tunis

In his *True, Sincere and Modest Defense of English Catholics* (1584), Cardinal William Allen protests against Lord Burghley, William Cecil's pamphlet "The execution of justice" (1583). For the Jesuit, who in a previous work celebrates the "glorious martyrdom" of twelve reverend priests who led the Counter-Reformation in England,[1] the official stance of Queen Elizabeth's principal minister aims at undermining Catholic martyrology and harboring state paranoia against the Catholics' treason: "They went about by divers proclamations, libels, and speeches, first to make the people believe that all Catholics, and especially Jesuits and such priests and scholars as were brought up in the Seminaries or Colleges out of the Realm, were traitors."[2] Allen's contestation of the accusation showcases how slippery and blurred the semantics of faith and the dynamics of persecution in England were, especially after the Protestants appropriated the martyrological discourse by making John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (1563), also known as *The Book of Martyrs*, made into an official reference alongside the Bible in Anglican churches under Queen Elizabeth I.[3] Traitors in the eyes of the political authorities and the reformed church, martyrs in the eyes of their co-religionists and the compassionate watchers of their executions, the Jesuits were subjected to oppositional views and paradoxical testimonial accounts, while their activities and executions called for divergent interpretations. This situation

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 21, 71-84
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

made the legal authorities fail to rally unanimous approval against the persecuted or to ensure that people's support would not shift grounds, despite the host of tough legislations they passed during that period.[4] Furthermore, this tense environment generated ambivalent feelings with regard the recently suppressed ritualized practices of collective mourning and remembrance of the dead, and, paradoxically, reinforced the need for relic-making among the English Catholics. Amidst this religious strife and along the actual sites of execution in England, the Elizabethan stage dramatized spectacles of violence, torture and suffering characterized by what French anthropologist René Girard terms mimetic rivalry that results in sacrificial crisis or failure of sacrificial ritual.[5] It is in light of this anthropological perspective and against the background of "the Reformation martyrdom crisis"[6] in Early Modern England that this study examines Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, a tragedy that foregrounds the contemporary debate over the identity of the scapegoat, and particularly over the performative rituals of mourning. The first two parts analyze the differing commemorations of Caesar's murder by the two contending camps among the Romans. The inconclusiveness of these polarized perceptions calls for speculation, in the last part, on the significance of Caesar's ghost in the context of disputed performances of mourning.

1. Caesar as Traitor:

From the outset, *Julius Caesar* illustrates a latent division among the Romans, with a group of merry-making workers on the one hand, ready to celebrate Caesar's triumphal return from Munda, and two infuriated tribunes on the other, who view the occasion as a mournful one, inviting tears and lament over Pompey's kin whom Caesar has defeated (1.1.1-76).[7] Cassius, the mastermind of the plot against Rome's foremost general, is aware not only of this endemic rift among the citizens, but also of Brutus's ambivalent feelings towards Caesar, who is, at the same time, his close friend, "a role model" he wishes to imitate, and "an insurmountable obstacle" that stands in his political path.[8] Hence, Cassius seizes the opportunity of a resonant public cheer wherewith the plebians "choose Caesar for their king" (1.2.79) to create a sense of mimetic rivalry in Brutus, a staunch defender of republicanism who utterly despises autocracy. Cassius urges Brutus to topple the scale of the pro-monarchists and comforts him about the allegiance he already enjoys among "many of the best in Rome" who hold him as far worthier than Caesar (1.2.59). Later, at night, he throws at Brutus's window letters he forges "in several hands," "as if they came from several citizens" (1.2.315-316), in order to further instill in him the illusory belief that the number of the adherents to their anti-Caesarian camp has grown, thus making their claim to the legitimacy of the murder more substantial. The mechanism that Cassius sets at work and that Brutus very soon adopts is one that underlies all communities. René Girard calls it "mimetic rivalry" or "acquisitive mimesis" which, he explains, "divides by leading two or more individuals to converge on one and the same object with a view to appropriating it."[9] Brutus now seeks to rally unanimous approval for his labelling of Caesar as traitor to the Republic, making him bear sole responsibility for "the time's abuse" and "high-sighted tyranny" (II.1. 115, 117). He claims that the dispute over Caesar's nature will transform mimesis from acquisitive to "antagonistic," whereby "the entire community will find itself unified against a single individual;" hence the community *and* the victim play a beneficent role in bringing about the resolution of the conflict.[10] Brutus therefore designs the murder of Caesar as a pre-emptive sacrifice that would be purgative and salvational for his country. He invests Caesar with the role of a scapegoat or *pharmakos*, which, by definition, has the dual nature of the sacred or *sacer*: Evil and cursed if he remains alive in the community, beneficent and blessed once he is symbolically expelled from it.[11]

After the assassination of Caesar, the Republicans vie with the Pro-Caesar monarchists for control of commemorative practices. Oscillating like the recusants' in Post-Reformation England between martyrdom and treason, Caesar's identity is subjected to rival understandings. Indeed, as they bathe their arms up to the elbow in Caesar's oozing wounds, Brutus and his co-conspirators congratulate themselves on the decisive social import and prospect of their performative gesture, proclaiming that they have initiated a sacrificial ritual that will, "ages hence," be repeatedly carried out "in states unknown and accents yet unborn" (3.1.112). Confident that they have channeled violence in and outside Rome, they proleptically fantasize a pacifying social custom enacted by mockmurderers and in which Ceasar will bleed only "in sport," hence symbolically, probably through a sacrificial animal (3.1.114). Eager to control Rome's collective memory and to steer public opinion towards the upholding of the Republican tradition, the executioners forge a national sign by which the signified, Caesar's blood on their weapons, has for signifiers "Peace, Freedom and Liberty" (3.1.109-110). Caesar's death is turned into a synecdoche by which "Tyranny is dead" (3.1.78) and the commemoration of the event is shaped into a festive celebration thanks to which Caesar's executioners believe they will henceforth be dubbed "the men who gave this country liberty" (3.1.118). Just as he rejects the designations "butchers" and "murderers" for himself and his partners (2.1.165, 179), Brutus prescriptively frames the funeral ceremony with censorship, warning Antony: "You shall not in your funeral speech blame us / But speak all good you can devise of Caesar" (3.1.245-46). As he presses to have the murder officially received as a purgative sacrifice (2.1.165, 179) in which violence is "purifying and pacifying,"[12] Brutus promises to honor Caesar's corpse and to perform "all true rites and lawful ceremonies" due to him (3.1.241). This seemingly paradoxical treatment of the victim fits within the logic of the scapegoating mechanism as expounded by Girard: The death of the sacrificial victim or of its surrogate generates the rebirth of the community "in a new or renewed cultural order" and helps to sustain its unity.[13]

This interpretation of the murder is resisted and challenged by the pro-Caesar faction that reverses the tide by deflecting the accusation of treason onto the executioners and by rehabilitating the victim at the centre of a mourning ritual. Caesar is no longer the seed of malevolence which, once extracted and expelled from the community, turns into a benevolent and propitiatory talisman. He is still a sacrificial victim, but one that is perceived and presented as the target, not the source of evil. Now Caesar's scapegoating appears to be that of an innocent martyr who rids the community of its own ills by absorbing them. Furthermore, the second commemoration carried out by Antony mirrors the ambivalent feelings that the official framework of Reformation England generated regarding the elimination of the Catholic rites of mourning, on the one hand, and the execution of Catholic dissidents, on the other.

2. Caesar as martyr

By displacing the object of remembrance from the self-proclaimed "sacrificers" (2.1.165) to the sacrificed Caesar, Antony establishes what Tobias Döring terms in his analysis of women's laments in Shakespeare's *Richard III*, "a counter-memory."[14] The performance of mourning Antony enforces has Catholic undertones in Post-Reformation England. England now championed inward over communal devotional practices, and witnessed the dissolution of chantries and the banning of religious ceremonies for the dead, like funeral processions, dirges and intercessory prayers.[15] In this context, Antony's funeral oration is ostentatiously performative as it relies not only on rhetoric, but also on visual signifiers, from location to props, to facial expressions.[16] The forum, which is a secular location, becomes a virtual or alternative religious space that offers a compensation for the suppressed ritual of mourning. This open area, along with the stage that represents it, functions like the heterotopias that are, in one of Michel Foucault's definitions of the concept, "counter-sites" in which "the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted."[17] Although he claims that he comes "to bury Caesar, not to praise him" (3.2.75), Antony weaves his funeral oration around the figure of his deceased friend, summoning up his glorious past, his generous gifts and his virtuous deeds. He also gives precedence to the corpse by bidding the "poor poor dumb mouths," Caesar's wounds, to speak for him (3.2.218). Under King Edward VI, the Second Book of Common Prayer omitted the prayers for the dead, making such a practice, in the words of the Protestant reformer Thomas Becon, "vain, superfluous and unprofitable."[18] Commenting on this significant shift, historian Eamon Duffy argues that the dead: "could neither be spoken to, nor even about," and adds that "the oddest feature of the 1552 burial rite is the disappearance of the corpse from it."[19] Furthermore, with "eyes [that] are red as fire with weeping" (3.2.116), Antony elicits in the commoners what Richard II calls "the external manners of lament."[20] But before he succeeds in making them shed their "gracious drops" (3.2.192), he challenges them into expressing their love and grief, asking "What cause withholds you then to mourn for him" (3.2.104)? Antony's exhortation looks back to the aesthetics and in particular to "the physiologies of mourning" that the Protestants in Post-Reformation England strove to regulate.[21] The medieval representations of the Virgin's and the Magdalene's "excessive" mourning over the crucified Jesus Christ came under attack, and the wailing for the dead, associated with "the time of popery" in one of Hugh Latimer's sermons, was submitted to measure.[22]

The subversive burial rite takes on further performative accents when Antony descends from the pulpit where he is supposed, at Brutus's behest, to deliver a formal speech, and asks the crowd to "make a ring about the corpse of Caesar" (3.2.158). Then, like a stage director, he orchestrates a play-within-the play, in which the corpse and the mantle are chief props of a "piteous spectacle" (3.2.196) as one of the horrified watchers exclaims. As he ostentatiously displays Caesar's bloodied mantle and body "marred as you see with traitors" (3.2.195), Antony turns them into sacred relics and objects of veneration, bringing audience compassion to a higher pitch.[23] Just before his assassination, Caesar too finds the image of his sanctified body appealing in Decius's interpretation of Calphurnia's dream. Appearing like a statue that offers "reviving blood" (2.2.88) to sustain and save the people, his body bears striking similarities to that of the "lactating Christ" in late medieval Christian allegory.[24] Caesar finds equal satisfaction in the image of tokens of remembrance the Romans keep from his body to serve as "tinctures, stains, relics and cognizance" (2.2.89). This image of Caesar as idol and martyr is yet again projected by Antony who, in his funeral oration, presses for a ritualistic performance in which the commoners "kiss dead Caesar's wounds, / And dip their napkins in his sacred blood, / Yea, beg a hair of him for memory" (3.2.133-135). If Caesar's executioners self-complacently assert that they shall be remembered by future generations as Rome's benefactors each time their "lofty scene [is] acted over" (3.1.112), Antony calls for a rival commemoration whereby Caesar's remains are preserved and bequeathed "as a rich legacy / Unto [the Romans'] issue" (3.2.137-138).

The iconographical construction of Caesar as martyr exposed to public gaze and the intimacy created by interaction with his mutilated body, resonate with the dispute over the legitimacy of claims to martyrdom across the confessional spectrum in Shakespeare's time. While the over one hundred graphic accounts of the Marian martyrs in *Foxe's Acts and Monuments* enjoyed great popularity and were enforced as the official documents on martyrology, the persecuted recusants, keen on imitating Christ's suffering, offered a rival martyrology by defining their fatal ends as staged crucifixions and offering their tortured bodies and blood and bones—future relics—as "didactic and inspirational tools against Protestantism."[25] Antony's staging of a "piteous spectacle" (3.2.196) with Caesar's mantle and body recalls the last words on the scaffold of the most prominent figure of the Counter-Reformation, Edmund Campion, who quotes St Paul: "We are made spectacle unto God, unto his angels and unto men."[26] Likewise, Antony's call for the watchers to collect Caesar's blood and body remnants as a treasured memory testifies to "the visual and even tactile interaction" between recusants and their martyrs, a feature that Robyn Malo underlines as prominent in Post-Reformation England, in comparison with the pilgrims' practices during the Middle Ages.[27]

In the context of Post-Reformation England where religious idolatry and the veneration of the saints and their relics had been decried as popish, "salvage of [these] grisly remains" during burial rites, especially those of eminent recusants, "had become an act of collective resistance."[28] Hence, the authorities demanded that the drawn-and-quartered bodies of Catholic dissidents be quickly removed or burned and their clothes dispersed so as to prevent the crowd from gathering body remnants and garments, or saturating handkerchiefs with blood.[29] The 1584 collection titled *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Trophea* ("The Victories of the Anglican Church") evidences the authorities' attempts to curtail Catholic performances of mourning. One of Cavalieri's wood engravings in this collection traces the whole sequence of the execution at Tyburn in 1581 of three priests, Edmund Campion, Alexander Briant and Ralph Sherwin. The last stage shows a corpse being sunk in a burning furnace. The intention behind this device was to preclude any attempt from the crowd to rush towards the corpse in hope to snatch a body part or dip handkerchiefs in its blood.[30]

In *Julius Caesar*, the two representations of the assassinated general as martyr testify to the demise of relic-worship and collection in Post-Reformation England: The first is a "dream," "a vision" interpreted by Decius, in which "great Rome shall suck / Reviving blood" from Caesar and "great men *shall* press / For tinctures, stains, relics, and cognizance" (2.2.83-89 emphasis added). The second is a wish Antony spells out, hoping the Romans, after hearing Caesar's generous legacy in his will, "*would* go and kiss dead Caesar's wounds, / And dip their napkins in his sacred blood, / Yea, beg a hair of him for memory" (3.2.133-135 emphasis added). Thus, in both instances, it is rhetoric that replaces the actual performance of relic gathering, and fills in the void of the incarnational aesthetics of the Catholic tradition.

3. "Caesar's Spirit": Sacrificial Crisis

None of the Roman attendees of Antony's funeral ceremony gets a relic from Caesar's mantle or body. Instead, they rush in the streets to "fire all the traitors' houses," and to "pluck down forms, windows, anything" (3.2.246, 250). Hence, the murderers' and Antony's intended rituals are both disrupted. They devolve into what Girard terms sacrificial crisis. This social phenomenon, he explains, indicates "the disappearance of the difference between impure violence and purifying violence." In this case, "reciprocal violence spreads throughout the community."[31] The degeneration of the religious burial into a civil war is already foreshadowed by Antony's first shock at the sight of the "bleeding piece of earth" (3.1.254). Indeed, his emotions slip from grief to resentment and he confesses to a servant who sheds tears with him: "Here is a mourning Rome, a dangerous Rome" (3.1.288). He thereupon dresses a secretive political rebellion in the trappings of a funeral oration and as soon as the plebeians disperse bent on wreaking havoc, he cynically observes: "Now let it work. Mischief, thou art afoot" (3.2.251). Through his powerful rhetoric in his address of the commoners, he proves to be a "Jesuitical Machiavel", a commonplace label used for Catholic activists in Elizabethan England who were, in Protestant J. Hull's description, "well practised in Machiavel, turning religion into pollicie."[32] After having whetted his audience against Caesar's murderers, he tactically hides behind disclaimers:

> [L]et me not stir you up
> To such a sudden flood of mutiny …
> For I have neither wit nor words nor worth,

> Action nor utterance nor the power of speech,
> To stir men's blood. (3.2.203-204, 214-216 emphasis added)

These political intentions he defends himself against resonate with the official accusation that the 1585 Act against Jesuits and Seminarists leveled at the priests who "have of years come or been sent … to *stir* up and move sedition, rebellion, and open hostility within the same her highness's realms and dominions, to the great endangering of the safety of her most royal person, and to the utter ruin, desolation, and overthrow of the whole realm." These priests were proclaimed traitors and accused of "high treason" by the same act.[33]

Dramatically, though, the civil war lies beyond Antony's manipulation of the crowd. Caesar's defender acts like Apollo's Pythia, ventriloquizing the victim's wounds which "like dumb mouths do ope their ruby lips / To beg the voice and utterance of my tongue" (3.1.260-261). The prophecy announces that Caesar's spirit will be released from the mutilated body, and will be "ranging for revenge" (3.1.270), empowered by the Greek goddess of mischief and ruin, "[With] Ate by his side come hot from Hell" (3.1.271). This spirit, which later on takes the demonized form of a ghost, functions as more than a simple "post-mortem memorial."[34] Indeed, Caesar's ghost appears not only to claim due remembrance and completion of "maimed rites," but to torment the living and demand reparation for death just like Hamlet's father whose double injunction calls hearers to "remember me" and also "revenge his foul and most unnatural murder."[35] Although unsubstantial and fickle, the ghost's overwhelming presence shapes and directs the action of the second half of the play. It presides over "domestic fury and fierce civil strife" (3.1.263), and effects retaliation by "turn[ing] [the murderers'] swords / In [their] own proper entrails" as Brutus acknowledges in his moment of recognition (5.3.95-96). Thus, Caesar's revenge operates as a sacrificial crisis that reopens the cycle of violence and invalidates both commemorations: the executioners' festive one, and the pro-Caesarians' mournful one.

Furthermore, with its destructive energy, Caesar's ghost supports the suppression of the performances of mourning in that it absorbs the diabolical function that the Protestants attributed to the relics their confessional enemies venerated. Indeed, early modern reformers, and especially demonologists like William

Perkins and Samuel Harsnett discredited the belief in the efficacy of relics and in their allegedly propitiatory and miraculous powers, and flouted their use in healing therapies and exorcist rites, condemning these as demonic and witchcraft-related practices. They also established a link between the salvage of the Catholics' remains on execution sites and the collection of body parts in nocturnal witches' Sabbaths.[36]

Thus, Caesar's ghost functions as a visual and secular manifestation of suppressed beliefs that the Reformation expunged. It recalls the deprivation of the Catholics, who are forbidden their rites of mourning and, by enforcing due remembrance, it relocates purgatory in the mental landscape of the spectator.[37] Reflecting on the role of the spectral figure in Elizabethan drama, Thomas Rist argues that "[t]he ghosts of revenge tragedy repeatedly fear being forgotten, reflecting the anxiety of Catholics and religious waverers that without due memorial the dead in purgatory would languish in torment."[38] If the gathering of Caesar's remnants is aborted, the remembrance of his martyrdom is enforced by his ubiquitous spirit that hangs over both his allies and his enemies.

Conclusion

In one of his confident assertions, Caesar represents himself like the mythical Medusa: "When they shall see the face of Caesar, they are vanished" (2.2.11-12). But, while Medusa's killing power is annihilated once her head is cut off, Caesar's disembodied presence after his death is formidably powerful. Before Brutus's petrified eyes, it is a "monstrous apparition," "some god, some angel, or some devil, / That mak'st [his] blood cold, and [his] hair to stare" (4.3.275-278). Antony's prophecy is at work: Caesar's ghost functions like Ate seeking revenge. Arguing that, in revenge tragedies, "the demise of the cult of the relic had ushered in the cult of the fragment," Margaret Owens suggests that the "severed body parts […] represent a nightmarish return of the suppressed ritual forms, including the veneration of relics."[39] So do the ghosts that invest the early modern stage. As Tobias Döring explains, in Elizabethan tragedies, the representation of the unappeased spirits of the dead, like Caesar's, resonates with the topical issue of the executed Counter-Reformation priests, and the resilience of Catholic mourning rituals.[40] More than their relics, it was the ghosts of the martyrs that the authorities dreaded. Like Caesar whose assassination breeds an unsuspected number of pro-monarchists in an otherwise Republican country, and leads to mutiny and civil war, Edmund Campion, the "Hydra" or "dragon" as he was described by Elizabeth's Regius Professor at Oxford, not only remained alive in the memory of his friends and sympathizers, but he also bred "a harvest of new men," i.e., new converts to the Old Faith.[41] Ghosts of the past thus prove to be, like relics in Alexandra Walsham's phrase, "an absent presence" that haunts Shakespeare's England and stage.[42]

Notes

1. William Allen, *A Briefe Historie of the Glorious Martyrdom of Twelve Reverend Priests, Father Edmond Campion and his Companions*, in *Unpublished Documents Relating to the English Martyrs*, ed. J. H. Pollen. S.J., London: Burns and Oates, 1908. For other examples of martyr literature, see Thomas M. McCoog, "'The Flower of Oxford': The Role of Edmund Campion in Early Recusant Polemics," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 24, no. 4 (Winter, 1993): 899-913; Alexandra Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (London and New York: Routledge, 2016), 262.

2. Baron William Cecil Burghley *The Execution of Justice in England, London*, 1583; William Allen, *A True, Sincere and Modest Defence of English Catholics*, ed. Robert M. Kingdon (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965), 79. On the reception of William Allen's pamphlet by Elizabeth's government as "A false, seditious, & Immodest offense," see Cyndia Susan Clegg, "Justice and Press Censorship in Book V of Spenser's 'Faerie Queene,'" *Studies in Philology* 95, no. 3 (Summer, 1998): 243.

3. See Jessie Childs, *God's Traitors: Terror & Faith in Elizabethan England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 19.

4. See Alice Dailey, "Making Edmund Campion: Treason, Martyrdom, and the Structure of Transcendence," *Religion & Literature* 38, no. 3 (Autumn, 2006): 74; David K. Anderson, *Martyrs and Players in Early Modern England. Tragedy, Religion and Violence on Stage* (London and New York: Routledge, 2016), 85-86. On the legislations passed against the Catholics under Elizabeth I, see John Coffey, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England,1558-1689* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 86-87.

5. For a parallelism between the scaffold of execution in Shakespeare's England and the scaffold of revenge tragedy, see John D. Staines, "Radical Pity: Responding to Spectacles of Violence in *King Lear*," ed. James Robert Allard, Mathew R. Martin, *Staging Pains, 1580-1800: Violence and Trauma in British Theater* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), 76-77; David K. Anderson, *Martyrs and Players*, 9.

6. Anderson, *Martyrs and Players*, 85. For an overview of "martyrological controversies" in 16th and 17th century England, see Susannah Brietz Monta,

Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1-5.

7. All references to Shakespeare's play are from William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, The Arden Shakespeare, ed. David Daniell (London: Thomas Nelson, 1998).

8. René Girard, "Collective Violence and Sacrifice in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*," *Salmagundi* 88-89 (Fall 1990- Winter 1991): 399.

9. René Girard, *Things Hidden Since the Foundation of the World*, trans. Stephen Bann and Michael Metteer (1978, republished New York: Continuum, 2003), 26.

10. Girard, *Things Hidden*, 26.

11. See René Girard, *Violence and the Sacred*, trans. Patrick Gregory (London: The Athlone Press, 1988; London & New York: Continuum, 2005), 61, 271-279.

12. Girard, *Violence*, 61.

13. Girard, *Violence*, 269-270.

14. Tobias Döring, *Performances of Mourning in Shakespearean Theatre and Early Modern Culture* (London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 54.

15. On inwardness in post-Reformation grief, see Patricia Phillippy, *Women, Death and Literature in Post-Reformation England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 9. On the dissolution of the Chantries, see Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England. 1400-1580* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), 139-141, 364-375, 454; Ethan H. Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 235-270. On Shakespeare's personal witnessing of the religious practices during his time, with a particular focus on his son's death in light of burial rites, see Stephen Greenblatt, *Will in the World. How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare* (London: The Bodley Head, 2014), 311-313.

16. Catholicism and Protestantism have been perceived as, respectively, "the religion of the eye" and "the religion of the ear." See Beatrice Groves, *Texts and Traditions: Religion in Shakespeare 1592–1604* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), 55, 59. See also Wietse de Boer and Christine Göttler eds., *Religion and the Senses in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2013), 178.

17. Michel Foucault, *Of Other Spaces, Heterotopias*, trans. Jay Miskowiec, *Diacritics* 16, no. 1 (1986): 24.

18. Thomas Becon, "The Displaying of the Popish Mass," (1555) in *Prayers and Other Pieces of Thomas Becon*, ed. John Aye (Cambridge University Press, 1844), 277.

19. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, 474-475.

20. William Shakespeare, *King Richard II*, The Arden Shakespeare, ed. Peter Ure (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), 4.1.296.

21. See Döring, *Performances of Mourning*, Chapter 3: "The Physiologies of Mourning," 110-148.

22. Hugh Latimer, "Sermon on the Gospel of the Twenty-Fourth Sunday at Trinity," (1485) in *The Sermons of the Right Reverend Father in God, and Constant Martyr of Jesus Christ, Hugh Latimer, sometime Bishop of Worcester. Volume 2* (London: Printed for James Duncan, 1824), 212. On other sermons

calling for moderate mourning, see Thomas Rist, *Revenge Tragedy and the Drama of Commemoration in Reforming England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), 19-21. On the Protestant attacks on the Mater Dolorosa figure and rituals of mourning, see Katherine Goodland, "Inverting the Pietà in Shakespeare's King Lear," in *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama*, ed. Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins (London and New York: Routledge, 2016), 47-74.

23. Naomi Conn Leibler views Antony as a peddler who turns Caesar's body into "a collection of relics." "'Thou bleeding piece of earth': The Ritual Ground of *Julius Caesar*," *Julius Caesar*, ed. Richard Wilson (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 138.

24. Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* (Ithaca and New York: Cornell University Press, 1993), 107.

25. Robyn Malo, "Intimate Devotion: Recusant Martyrs and the Making of Relics in Post-Reformation England," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 44, no. 3 (2014): 539. On the iconographical importance of Foxe's document, see O.T. Hargrave, "Bloody Mary's Victims: The Iconography of John Foxe's Book of Martyrs," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 51, no. 1 (March 1982): 7-21. On the recusants' *imitatio Christi*, with a particular focus on Edmund Campion, see Marianne Dircksen, "Martyrological Themes and the Revival of Catholic Identity in Robert Persons' *De Persecutione Anglicana*," S.A. Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies 29 (2019): 102-104.

26. On Campion's scaffold-speech with an analysis of the word "spectacle" as related to martyrdom, see Alison Shell, "'We Are Made a Spectacle': Campion's Dramas," *The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits. Essays in the Celebration of the First Centenary of Campion Hall, Oxford* (1896-1996) ed. Thomas M. McCoog S.J. (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1996), 112-113.

27. Robyn Malo, "Intimate Devotion," 533.

28. Richard Wilson, *Secret Shakespeare. Studies in Theatre, Religion and Resistance* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2004), 190.

29. See Wilson, *Secret Shakespeare*, 189-192; Patrick Gray, "Caesar as comic antichrist: Shakespeare's Julius Caesar and the medieval stage giant," *Comparative Drama* 50, no. 1 (2016): 14.

30. For a reproduction of Cavalieri's engraving, see Todd P. Olson, "Pitiful Relics: Caravaggio's Martyrdom of St. Matthew," *Representations* 77, no. 1 (2002): 124. Despite the authorities' precautions, a few relics of the three martyrs were rescued, like Campion's thumb and rope, and a piece of bone from Sherwin's body. See Wilson, *Secret Shakespeare*, 191; Jacqueline Adrienne Pedder, "Saints and Relics During the English Reformation of the Early Modern Period 1558-1625: "How Far Did This Catholic Belief Continue/Change from Medieval England?" University of Huddersfield, 2018, http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/34706/, 64-66.

31. Girard, *Violence*, 51.

32. J. Hull, *The Unmasking of the Politique Atheist* (1602). Quoted in Daniel Stempel, "The Silence of Iago," PMLA 84, no. 2 (March 1969): 253.

33. Quoted in Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunder ed., *Documents of the Christian Church* (1943, republished Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 257-258. Emphasis added.

34. Rist, *Revenge Tragedy*, 14.

35. William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare, ed. Philip Edwards (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 5, 1, 186; 1.5.91; 1.5, 25.

36. See Wilson, *Secret Shakespeare*, 189-192.

37. Mark Rose argues that ghosts and spirits are magical substitutions for the belief in the real presence of God. See "Conjuring Caesar: Ceremony, History, and Authority in 1599," *English Literary Renaissance* 19, no. 3 (1989): 298.

38. Rist, *Revenge Tragedy*, 14.

39. Margaret E. Owens, *Stages of Dismemberment: The Fragmented Body in Late Medieval and Early Modern Drama* (Newark: University of Delaware Press), 206.

40. See Döring, *Performances of Mourning*, 154.

41. Quoted in Döring, *Performances of Mourning*, 154. See also Gerard Kilroy, *Edmund Campion: A Scholarly Life* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 384-385.

42. Alexandra Walsham, "Relics, writing, and memory in the English Counter Reformation: Thomas Maxfield and his afterlives," *British Catholic History* 34, no. 1 (2018): 78, https://doi.org/10.1017/bch.2018.3.