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recent work on mourning, memory, and commemoration in early modern England dwells on survivors’ grief and the various strategies by which the living manage their painful longing for those who have died by sustaining and performing their connection with them. What about less tender feelings? The living also feared the dead and strove to placate them and keep them at bay. As Peter Marshall observes, “The impulse to assist the dead is not incompatible with a desire to propitiate them and guard against their precipitate return.” Until 1828, for instance, suicides were given burials that now sound disturbingly like those given to vampires in horror movies. As Michael MacDonald and Terence Murphy explain:

The night following the inquest, officials of the parish, the churchwardens and their helpers, carried the corpse to a crossroads and threw it naked into a pit. A wooden stake was hammered through the body, pinioning it in the grave, and the hole was filled in. No prayers for the dead were repeated; the minister did not attend.

Such a burial suggests not just horror at the sin and crime of suicide, but fear of the “unruly,” “restless,” “dangerous dead” who, if not rooted in the grave, might haunt the survivors. Many practices associated with Catholicism had as their goal separating the dead from the living definitively; they worked to lay a ghost not to evoke it (as a seance might do). Although some writers claimed that ghosts had been a clerical delusion and disappeared with the Reformation, ghosts seem to have persisted as a post-Reformation problem because the dead and the claims they might make on the living continued to be a problem. Changing burial practices—sewing the corpse into a shroud, rolling it into a wooden coffin—suggest growing distaste for the corpse and a desire to confine it. These bodies, however carefully packaged, were everywhere in early modern cities: inside the walls of the city, inside the
walls of churches. Perhaps this is why the displacement of the dead that accompanied the dissolution of the monasteries provoked surprisingly little opposition, and even some displays of rage and ruthlessness, as remains disinterred, intermingled, and dumped remains. Requiring appeasement or provoking rage and desecration, the fearsome departed lingered on, not quite dead enough.

In this chapter I will argue that Catholicism was the undead of post-Reformation English culture. I will draw on the connection between Catholicism and the feminine in the early modern imagination, and the insights of feminism, to interrogate the complex responses this status as “undead” provoked in contemporaries and still provokes among scholars of the period. If the ghost is often called a revenant—“one who returns from the dead” (a term critics of Hamlet especially like)—then perhaps the presence of Catholicism in the plays might more properly be called, as widows were, a “relic”—“a survivor, the remains, remnant or residue” (OED). The relic activates what Steven Mullaney identifies in Hamlet’s response to his mother’s sexual vitality as “mourning before the fact, over a vitality that one wants to be or imagines or finally produces as past and dead...a response to what should be dead but isn’t.” The relic is often also, as in Mullaney’s example, feminized, since the woman who outlives her husband is still identified in relation to him as his leavings. In the two conceptually linked cases, of Catholicism and the widow, the remains pose “the problem of the leftover” Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt discuss with regard to Eucharistic controversies. This is a problem simultaneously material and imaginary.

The vanishing Catholic?

What I mean by Catholicism here is not a coherent theology but rather a cultural phenomenon, an eclectic ensemble of objects, images, stories, practices, and beliefs that might be drawn on indiscriminately and a field of projection for a range of anxieties about difference and, more alarmingly, identity. The association between Catholicism and the undead operates at two levels. First, Catholic belief is invested in a two-way traffic between living and dead, body and spirit, manifested in the real presence of Christ in the chewed and digested Eucharist, relics of saints and martyrs, a reverence for images and objects as part of worship, the imagined vitality and power of stones and bones. Because of these components of Catholic belief, both John Bale and Pierre Viret, a Swiss reformer, described Catholicism as “necrolatry” or worship of the dead. An accretion of leftovers, Catholicism is also the undead of European history. Latin is, according to Thomas Hobbes, “but the Ghost of the Old Romane Language” and thus appropriate to a pope who is “the Ghost of the deceased Romane Empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof.” Catholicism haunts the cultural imaginary of early modern England as the supposedly superseded and defeated that yet keeps adapting and re-conceiving itself in uncanny and disturbing, rather than welcome, ways.

As many scholars are now demonstrating, a neat division between pre- and post-Reformation, Protestant and Catholic, misconceives how gradual and uneven the Reformation was and how it confused rather than clarified relations between self and other, past and present, at least at first. While confessional identity may have achieved some stability at the extremes, most people occupied what Arthur Marotti has called the “muddled middle.” Ritual objects were sometimes melted down or burned, but often simply redistributed and assigned new places or functions wherein they often retained a vaguely magical significance. As Anthony Milton points out, Catholics worshipped in the same spaces in which Catholics once did, and these spaces were only gradually and unevenly stripped of their ornamentation. Beliefs and practices were even more lingering because less tangible, surviving in the compromise of the Elizabethan settlement, in the eclecticism and wavering that characterized many people’s faith and worship, and in the adaptability and survival of Catholicism itself.

By thinking about Catholicism in these terms, as a vibrant if sometimes disturbing presence in post-Reformation England, I want to trouble the presumed nostalgia for Catholicism that now challenges the once widespread presumption that Shakespeare’s England was and ought to be unambivalently Protestant. My concern, then, is as much with how early modernists talk about Catholicism as it is with early modern people’s own attitudes. Some scholars locate fond nostalgia in those who resisted the Reformation from the start. Eamon Duffy, for instance, describes a reluctant populace clinging to the accoutrements and affect of the old faith. Others locate nostalgia or longing in those who understood themselves to be “reformed,” but who nonetheless missed certain practices or beliefs. Keith Thomas argues, with regard to exorcism and other protections against bewitchment and possession, that with the Reformation “all the old mechanical protections were dismissed as empty symbols, lacking any efficacy in themselves.” As a consequence, “it is not surprising that many old Catholic formulae retained their value in times of emergency for Protestants who found themselves disarmed in the face of the old enemy.” Michael Neill and Stephen Greenblatt have drawn our attention to how Protestants might have responded to changes in doctrine that withdrew means of intervening to help the dead in Purgatory and therefore left the living helpless against the dead’s demands and reproaches. But if Catholicism was associated with lost resources for appeasing demons and the dead and protecting one’s self against occult forces, it was also associated with the very uncanny forces to be feared. While I find it persuasive that some people might have clung to officially discredited beliefs and longed for lost rituals, I also believe that such longing requires faith not only in lost beliefs and practices but in the fact
that they are indeed “lost.” If, as Greenblatt argues, “Purgatory...enabled the dead to be not completely dead,” then this might be disturbing as well as reassuring. Longing for the dead requires a confident sense that they really are dead, securely buried, and unlikely to reanimate.

Like staking the corpse of the suicide, locating, binding, and burying a body helps to insure that the dead will not come back. We can see the importance of this in James I’s careful management of his own accession. As Jennifer Woodward shows, there was some ambiguity regarding where sovereignty resided in the month between Elizabeth’s death and James’s arrival in London. Although James claimed that “at the very moment of the expiring of the king reigning, the nearest and lawful heir ent’reth his place,” he did not enter the city until Elizabeth had been interred. In the meantime, her bewigged and brightly painted effigy represented the body royal. James did not assume that role himself until his subjects could visit Elizabeth’s tomb and reassure themselves that the queen was dead—long live the king. Since Catholicism had no sepulcher, no rituals could mark the conclusion of its reign or the smooth transition into a new era. Perhaps the need to witness the reduction to ashes of some symbolic representative of Catholicism helps to explain the popularity of pope burning processions later in the seventeenth century.

Imagining early modern responses to a resurrected Catholicism, or a female ghost, is a thought experiment in the limits on longing to speak with the dead. In this chapter, I will link two specters—undead Catholicism and undead women—because these alarming prospects were intertwined in the early modern period. As I have argued elsewhere, Catholicism was associated with actual women, such as the Stuart kings’ wives and mistresses, and with men who were viewed as effeminized by their celibacy or exclusion from public life. The religion was also associated with the Virgin Mary and a large cast of female saints and martyrs who dominated stories and visual representations. More generally the Church itself was figured as the Whore of Babylon, and the association of the Church with disorderly women was condensed into the figure of Pope Joan, who was depicted as historical rather than apocryphal, and representative rather than exceptional. Remembering what we know about the complexity of early modern gender constructions should alert us to the complex responses a feminized Catholicism would express and provoke. Like the feminine, Catholicism was associated with horror and longing, with rot and ornament, with anger and compassion. It was therefore more beautiful and desirable, less troublesome and ambiguous, if absolutely dead.

As has been widely observed, in Shakespeare’s tragedies it is often easier to love dead women. Desdemona, whose loquacity, appetite, and love of company provoked her husband’s suspicion as much as his desire, becomes an object of his affection again when she is first asleep “smooth as monumental alabaster,” and then dead. “cold, cold, my girl, / Even like thy chastity” (5.2.282–3). As Othello pledges, “I will kill thee and love thee after,” Hamlet is finally able to express his love for Ophelia in the past tense and in the presence of her corpse. Antony articulates preference for the dead particularly bluntly in Antony and Cleopatra. Learning of Fulvia’s death, he remarks, “she’s good being gone; The hand could pluck her back that shoved her on” (I.2.115–16). Of course, Antony has no intention of plucking her back, since she is only good in so far as she is gone.

In these tragic plots, the hero must reject or even kill the heroine so as to mourn her wholeheartedly; mourning requires the certainty that the woman, threatening when vigorous, is irredeemably extinct. What happens when the story is told at the national level, and when a group rather than an individual must be killed first and loved later? Perhaps it will be useful here to look at a well-documented sequence of events in which a nation removed a group of its inhabitants and then lamented their passing. Consider, for instance, the stories about and sightings of the supposedly ‘last’ Indian in the United States in the nineteenth century. Many of those who drew attention as the last members of various tribes were old, childless women. This European fantasy is one of burying, not of being haunted, of valuing what is about to be utterly and reassuringly gone and one’s own power both to obliterate and to remember. As Jill Lepore puts it, “For Indians’ role in American history (even as wartime enemies) to be cherished, romanticized, and fetishized, Indians themselves must exist only in the past, mute memorials, silent as a rock.” Stripped of their lands and autonomy, Native Americans “have vanished into the minds of those who have dispossessed them.”

There have been successful genocidal programs, and the relationship of European settlers to Native Americans can be seen as one such. Yet, as Jean O’Brien and other scholars have shown, when Indians or other groups “vanish,” this usually means that they have, in fact, intermarried and blended in. The “vanishing” or “last” Indian depends on a fantasy of racial purity—of both self and other—that can be preserved by erasing and then mourning the other. Historians of Native Americans have redirected questioning from “what happened to the Indians” to “who or what is an Indian?” How does the practice, meaning, and location of such an identification shift so that it becomes less localized, less visible, but perhaps, thereby, more pervasive? These are also good questions to ask about Catholicism. What about Catholic survival?

Attempting to imagine what it might have been like had there been sightings of and stories about the “last Catholic” in England makes it easier to understand a grave problem at the heart of Catholic identity in the post-Reformation period: Catholics were everywhere, could be anyone, and were very difficult to spot. Although Catholicism was sometimes associated with foreignness, it could not consistently be construed as a stable, visible, and incontrovertible racial or ethnic identity because most
people's ancestors were Catholics; penal laws emphasized conduct rather than lineage and therefore the possibility of avoiding penalties by acting, if not believing, differently; and people constantly converted back and forth. Although they were in the minority in post-Reformation England, Catholics were in the majority in powerful countries like Spain and France. The constant intermixtures that fueled and were redressed in the fantasy of the "last Indian" defined Catholicism. The last Catholic was just too much to hope for.

The earliest and most influential new historicist essays often made such comparisons, drawing on Clifford Geertz’s interpretation of a Balinese cockfight, for instance, in order to shed light on the Renaissance court. Such comparisons have long been an important part of feminist work as well, sometimes provoking the critique that too many feminist projects are transhistorical and therefore ahistorical. The limitations of such approaches have been anotomized in detail. Yet the assumption that we might learn from comparing widely various times and places invigorated early new historicism, as well as ground-breaking work in postcolonial, feminist, and queer studies of early modern English culture. Some of that wit and energy has been lost in the recent turn to the local, with its sharp focus on a particular place, time, and body of evidence. An unexamined juxtaposition cannot speak for itself, of course. Nor should we ignore crucial differences between the cultural moments we compare. In this case, for instance, I am not arguing that Catholics were the "natives" of post-Reformation England—although such a claim is useful provocative. Furthermore, at least one contemporary made precisely this analogy. In New Shreds of the Old Snare (1624), John Gee’s follow-up to The Foot Out of the Snare, his enormously popular exposé of Catholic corruption, he argues that both Indians and Catholics trade what they hold most dear for "rattle-baby toys."

Why do we laugh at the barbarous Indians for imparting to us their richest commodities in exchange for glass, beads, penry whittles, copper rings, &c? But the Popes Benediction, or any the least touch of Sainting Miracle-mongering fiction is able to infuse the highest worth into the basest baggadly New-nothing to hang upon the sleeve of admiring adoring ghostly Children of the Jesuites. How doth his Holines exercise and conjure Beads of wood, of stone, of Corall, and of all other stuffe, making besorted Ignaro’s belieue they have more power against sinne, the Devill, and Hell; whereas alas all is but cheating, and to gull them of their money. 29

Interestingly, the connection between Indians (whatever group Gee so identifies) and Catholics also creates a parallel between those who exchange glass and beads for the Indians' "richest commodities" and the pope, who trades fictions for faith and "new-nothings" for salvation itself. Indians and Catholics are similarly barbarous and gullible. But the laughing cheats who prey on them are disturbingly similar, too. Gee’s text suggests that there is early modern precedent for the connection I am exploring between Indians and Catholics.

In my analysis here, however, I am less interested in proving the early modern existence of this association than in making the methodological suggestion that considering the status of the Indian in nineteenth-century American culture—as it is now understood in revisionist historical accounts that interrogate both the assumption that Indians vanished and the professions of grief thereupon—helps us to see how a sequence of emotions characteristic of Shakespeare’s tragic heroes—displacing and then mourning—might also operate at a larger cultural level. The grief that is now of interest to scholars followed after dissolving the monasteries, stripping the altars, fining and jailing recusants, executing priests. I draw attention to how violence precedes mourning, in national histories and in tragic plots, as a reminder that we should scrutinize the conditions that enable sorrow and approach expressions of grief critically as well as empathetically.

Several influential recent studies of lingering attachments to the Catholic past have focused on the ways in which the official rejection of Purgatory stripped survivors of the capacity to assist and appease the dead. In such accounts, the claims of the past are figured as ghosts, demanding a redress that it is not clear their survivors can offer. Ghosts are thus ambiguous figures for a transitional period—welcome, fascinating, horrifying. Similarly, Bergland argues that the Indians who were stripped of their lands and lives so as to be installed in the “national uncanny” of nineteenth-century America were imagined as ghosts, consigned to the past yet still demanding attention in the present, perhaps even cursing the future. In two very different contexts, then, guilt toward the dispossessed was explored through ghost stories. But how does gender operate in the post-Reformation stories? In the heterosexual plot writ large in ghost stories about Catholics and Indians the character who is more lovable when dead is a woman. What stories were told about women who returned from the dead? How do undead women figure in recent studies of death and grief in the early modern period?

Looking for female ghosts

Apparently, the desire to speak with the dead, then and now, focuses on some and not others. Extending his oft-cited claim that he wishes to speak with the dead to everyone in early modern England, Greenblatt argues that "Though the return of a dead person arouses terror, the collective impulse is not to flee from and not even simply to ward off the weird apparition, but rather to approach and find out what it is and what it wants." For Greenblatt the ghosts themselves have no choice but to make their demands for "they fear they are being forgotten." 30 In the many texts Greenblatt addresses in
his book *Hamlet in Purgatory*, those who long to return from the dead, or to interact with those who do, are usually men. Why would that be?

A few female ghosts do turn up in Greenblatt’s magisterial study. In Middle English versions of *Trental of St. Gregory*, which Greenblatt describes as “one of the foundational stories of Purgatory,” a pope is haunted by his mother who had “committed lechery as a young woman and had murdered her child.” Since shame had prevented her from admitting her sin in life, she confesses to her son, who then prays for her and releases her from both Purgatory and hideous ugliness (129). In Thomas More’s *The Supplication of Souls*, according to Greenblatt, More “characteristically does not imagine dead wives looking on at their husbands’(146)“ lookings in horror” at their remarriage, and shrieking to make themselves heard” (204). When More does imagine “dead wives speaking out” it is “not to lament their surviving husband’s pleasures but to regret their own past delight in gorgeous clothing, jewels, and cosmetics” (148). Thus, whether the wife or the husband returns, what is to be lamented is the wife’s conduct. Female ghosts are driven by their sexual guilt, not by a sense of grievance; they seek to confess rather than accuse or demand. The only other female ghost in the book is a con, in John Gee’s description of a Jesuit ruse that presented “impressionable” young women with the apparition of a woman in white who advises them that they can avoid the torments of Purgatory she suffers only if they are “unnified” (255). Interestingly, the Jesuits’ deceptive theatricality is figured in a female apparition of the sort we see so rarely on the stage. Given Greenblatt’s convincing claim that Shakespeare’s “ghosts are figures who exist in and as theater, figures in whom it is possible to believe precisely because they appear and speak only onstage” (195), it is telling that, despite the associations of theatricality and the feminine, ghosts are so rarely women in Shakespeare’s plays and in early modern culture more generally.

Refutations of belief in Purgatory dwell on one female ghost who is conspicuous in her absence: St. Augustine’s mother, Monica. In his *An Exposition of the Catenlike Faith*, Gertrude Babington wonders why love does not compel all the dead to return, “since we must needs grant, that if of themselves they could, sure they would be often with us, they being not now deprived of love, and become cruel.” Babington turns to St. Augustine as his authority: “For surely, saith he [Augustine], my deare mother Monica, who in her life time followed me over the Sea and land, would never thus long have bene from me if there had bene any such walking of dead spirits as is talked of.” In *Shield of Our Safetie* (1581), Anderson also appeals to Augustine’s argument from absence: “Augustine saith that if the soules of the dead could walke wyth men on earth, his godly mother Monica, who travayled from sea to lande to be with him, would never nowe after her death be absent from him. No truely the soules of dead men cannot walk in this worlde.” Both Babington and Anderson seem to assume that the dead retain their own desires and affections—they are not now cruel—but cannot enact them. Augustine assumes that if his mother could return she would; surely her love would tether her to her son. There is something disturbing, then, in an epitaph such as this one for Elizabeth Leigh, who died in 1619: “What friends, what children, what blest Marriage, / Dead I forgette.” In death as in life, mothers and wives cannot win. It is disturbing to imagine that they might bittely forget the attachments through which they once defined themselves; it is disturbing to imagine that they might: *not leave one alone*.

Other studies turn up only a few more female ghosts. Keith Thomas cites a Star Chamber case of 1613 in which one Southwark woman called another “a hag” whose “ghost doth continually haunt her and her husband that they cannot thrive,” as well as popular accounts in 1679 of a midwife who returned to confess the murder of two illegitimate children. In addition, Thomas asserts that “many stories related to widowers, haunted by their wives for breaking their promise not to marry again, or for neglecting the children of their first marriage.” His source is Thomas Nashe’s *The Terrors of the Night* (1594): “A number of men there be yet living, who have been haunted by their wives after their death, about forswearing themselves, and undoing their children, of whom they promised to be carefull fathers: whereof I gather no reason but this, that women are borne to torment a man both alive and dead.” That last sentence suggests Nashe’s snide perspective on such stories, which, for him, provide mundane rather than supernatural evidence of the ways in which women are woes to men. Nashe positions these ghostly wives after a story of hogs who pursue a man’s coach from London to his country house and before accounts of those pursued by weasels, rats, squirrels, and hares, which he dismisses as “the exploiters and stratagems of witches” and an “old wives’ tale of devills and urchins” that must be withstood by those stout of heart. Nashe thus links three kinds of female pests: wives (living and dead), witches, and old wives’ tales.

In his sweeping study of changing beliefs about the dead, Peter Marshall recounts a story of a woman who haunted her husband and his children because her spouse broke his promise to bury her in the churchyard. He also tells the story of how the specter of a young woman haunted the household of Sir Thomas Wise, appearing first in the maids’ bedchamber and then at the foot of Wise’s own bed. A minister advised Wise that it must be a bad rather than a good spirit because the latter did not appear in woman’s form. Finally, Marshall discusses sightings of “Old Mother Leakey” who purportedly returned in fulfillment of her threat to her daughter-in-law that she would do so. Laura Gowing assesses a fascinating case in which a woman’s ghost repeatedly visits her female servant.
modern texts and archives, trying to dig up a few more female ghosts to include or celebrate. I assume that other scholars do not grossly underrepresent female ghosts. Therefore, the feminist project in this case is not to recover female ghosts but rather to observe how few there are and to inquire why that might be the case. If, as Marshall claims, “in numerous accounts, purgatory was designated an ‘old wives’ tale,’ an example of gendered (and generationed) discourse designed to stress its marginality and redundancy” then the old wives’ tales of demanding, familiar revenants include surprisingly few old wives. There is a dearth of female ghosts both before and after the Reformation, in continental Europe as well as in England. Jean-Claude Schmitt asserts that female ghosts were rare in the medieval period, despite the fact that men’s and women’s souls were considered equally valuable and as many women died untimely deaths as did men. Schmitt links the emphasis on female relict and male revenant to inheritance practices that invested men with the orderly and uninterrupted succession of goods and power, and to widows’ ambivalence about their status as survivors. Nancy Caciola concurs that female revenants were “rare among the individual, hostile variety of the undead,” perhaps because of women’s “relatively tenuous connections with violence: women did not lead the kinds of lives, nor die the kinds of death, associated with the evil undead.” Both Schmitt and Caciola link the gendering of ghosts to the gendering of investments in the world, to men’s monopoly over property, power, violent action, and efficacy, a monopoly that, it was imagined, would be hard to surrender.

Female ghosts are even rarer on the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century stage than they were in recorded sightings. When they turn up, they tend to be silent. In Joshua Cooke’s *How to Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad*, a man imagines that the ghost of his dead wife haunts him; he suddenly blurts her name in the middle of his own speech but her apparition says nothing. In *The Witch of Edmonton*, bigamist Frank Thorney murders his second wife; despite the fact that she seems content to die if it suits him, and forgives him as she dies, she appears silently at his bedside later in the play. In *The Sequestred Maiden’s Tragedy*, a Lady kills herself rather than consent to marry a tyrant. He then steals her dead body, threatening to have his way with her now that she can no longer resist. Her apparition appears before her tomb to announce to her true love, Govianus, that she has been abducted and to spur him on to rescuing her corpse. While the Lady, like other ghosts, has a demand, she only lays claim to her own body, insisting that, even after death, it matters. Govianus then employs her dead body (painted with poison) to kill the tyrant. The Lady thus appears in the play as a living woman, a speaking ghost, and a manipulable, desirable, but lethal corpse. Fletcher’s *The Woman’s Prize* imagines a Petruchio who hides “his breeches out of fear” that the ghost of his first wife (Katharine, in *The Taming of the Shrew*) “should walk and wear ‘em yet” (1.1.35–6). Sadly, this bellicose, cross-dressed ghost does not make an appearance.

The last acts of two tragedies with female protagonists are haunted by a thwarted desire for their return. Mariam, Queen of Jewry, and the Duchess of Mal斐 both die by the end of Act IV. The final act of both tragedies is devoted to lamentation. The first part of Elizabeth Cary’s *The Tragedie of Mariam* revolves around responses to Herod’s supposed death and anxiety “Should Herod’s body leave the sepulchre / And entertain the seved ghost again” (2.1.81–2). It turns out that Herod’s little-lamented death was a rumor. If Herod returns from the dead, why can’t Mariam? Even before Herod has Mariam executed, he imagines that she might be revisable. Discussing how to kill her with his sister, Salome, Herod remarks that if he cannot live without the sight of Mariam, once dead, Salome will “find the means to make her breathe again” (4.7.31). Upon hearing Mariam is dead, Herod immediately wishes she had not died (5.1.115), addresses her “pure unsotted ghost” to ask pardon (1.1.82), and denies that she’s really dead: “But sure she is not dead, you did but jest, / To put me in perplexity a while” (5.1.135–6).

The Nuntius assures him that if she appears it will be “attired in robe of heaven” (1.2.203). Before she dies, Mariam herself tells the Nuntius, “By three days hence if it wishes could revive, / I know himself would make me oft alive” (5.1.77–8). Herod does wish her back again, but his wishes cannot make it so. Her head has been severed from her body. Although she is more loveable once dead and Herod longs for her, she has nothing more to say to him.

The Duchess of Mal斐 famously claims that she is flesh and blood, not the statue kneeling at her husband’s tomb. But when her brothers kill her she is not given even this substantial commemoration; she lingers as an echo in the ruined abbey, where, we are left to suppose, her body has been unceremoniously stashed. After she is murdered, the Cardinal makes up a story about the ghost of an old, murdered woman to explain Ferdinand’s madness (5.2.90); Bosola says “the Duchess / Haunts me” (5.2.264–5). But she returns only as admonitory fragments of her husband’s speech. She has no body and is not the origin of meaning. Her voice does not accuse or explain. In all these examples from the drama, dead wives appear or threaten to appear, or their husbands long for their return, but they either fail to materialize or, when they do, refrain from reproaching, menacing, or intervening. All these appearances leave open the perplexing question of what dead women want.

Ann Jones and Peter Stallybrass directly address the gendering of stage ghosts, querying why, while there was “a wave of female ghosts in narrative poetry” in the 1590s, there are so few on the stage. They argue that the ghosts of the stage “are materially and legally entitled . . . Most sage ghosts have active stakes in inheritance, which is both about the ownership of the future and about the control of memory. Most of these ghosts are the revenants of men and of aristocratic men at that. . . . They return to claim a future that they ‘properly’ own and that has been taken away
from them.”43 Jones and Stallybrass argue that women were not understood to have the same sense of entitlement and therefore would not have the same claim to sympathy and redress for the loss of property, power, and even life.

In Shakespeare’s plays, the women who are dead have often completed their most important task, which is to give birth and die, or at the very least to die, and so have no unfinished business. Nor do the plots need them to explain important back stories or to embody how the past impinges on the present. In an influential article, Mary Beth Rose draws our attention to the elimination of mothers from Shakespeare’s plots: “Since the mother would remove one from what is conceived as the world of action—the public, socialized world—the best mother is a dead or absent mother.”44 Other female characters, too, contribute to the plot precisely by dying—not at the end but in the middle. Look at it this way: how often do male characters advance the plot by seeming or pretending to be dead, as Juliet, Hero, Hermione, and to a lesser extent, Imogen, do?45 Why is it so often female characters who aid resolution by dragging themselves into a coma or turning to stone?

Hermione’s ghosts

Although there is not a ghostly mother in Shakespeare’s plays to rival the ghost of Hamlet’s father, The Winter’s Tale comes closest to imagining an undead mother. In the figure of Hermione and her ghostly refractions, the gendering of ghosts and the gendering of Catholicism conjoin. Tellingly, the play fractures the undead mother into three very different apparitions, and minimizes or displaces her rage in each manifestation. The three apparitions of Hermione all occur after her supposed death in Act III, scene ii. In the very next scene, Antigonus describes a dream in which Hermione appears to him. Antigonus, of course, has not heard the news that Hermione is dead, yet he introduces his description of his dream by remarking, “I have heard, but not believed, the spirits o’ th’ dead / May walk again.”46 He closes by concluding that, however “superstitiously,” he will believe in and follow the instructions of this apparition as that of the dead Hermione. In between, he describes a figure “in pure white robes / Like very sanctity,” bending its head from side to side, bowing three times, gasping, and weeping. When this specter finally finds words, she announces this as the place in which her baby should be abandoned, names the infant (a name that rather magically sticks, despite the fact that the only person to whom it is communicated dies), and pronounces the cost that Antigonus will pay as the “thrower-out” of her “poor babe”: he will never see his own wife again. While she issues commands regarding the treatment of her child and makes a prediction about Antigonus’s fate, she does not defend her innocence or express rage at her treatment; indeed, Antigonus seems to believe in Hermione’s guilt more at this point than he had earlier, concluding that he is to leave the baby in Bohemia “upon the earth of its right father,” i.e., Polixenes. The apparition does not attempt to intervene to prevent the baby’s abandonment.

As has been much discussed, Antigonus’s dream announces the play’s movement out of tragedy and into comedy, out of the past and into the future. The Old Shepherd’s remark that “Thou met’st with things dying, / With things new-born” (3.3.112–13) refers not only to the juxtaposition of Antigonus’s gnawed remains and the abandoned infant, but to Hermione’s body just after childbirth, which straddles death and birth. Indeed, Hermione’s phantom body seems to linger in this post-partum purgatory for years. Rose and Eggert both argue that the play announces loss as the condition of its own possibility; what is lost is the queen mother’s youth and sexuality. When Hermione returns at the end of the play, she is less queenly and authoritative, less openly, fecundly sexual. She also lacks the vengeful power the Catholic tradition invests in the figure of the queen mother. The play occludes three layers of feminized rage—the retaliations of the spurned wife, the humiliated queen, and the avenging mother of heaven and earth.

The disturbing possibility of Hermione’s return is again addressed in Act V, in a scene that reminds us that Paulina has been talking to Leontes for sixteen years, amplifying his regret, and restraining him from remarriage. In response to a discussion of Hermione as irreplaceable, Leontes curiously imagines that her ghost would return to haunt him should he remarry.

No more such wives: therefore, no wife: one worse,
And better us’d, would make her sainted spirit
Again possess her corpse, and on this stage,
(Were we offenders now) appear soul-vex’d,
And begin, “Why to me?”

(5.1.56–60)

Such a return is obviously to be feared, not desired. Paulina and Leontes then engage in a duet of horror. Paulina points out that such a “sainted spirit” would have “just cause” to haunt her husband, and Leontes imagines that the ghost “would incense me / To murder her I married” (5.1.61–2). Leontes here places himself in a revenge tragedy, where ghosts require redress, yet, despite the feverishness of his fantasy, does not imagine that what the ghost of Hermione might want is revenge against him rather than against his second wife. This fantasy is not about the past—Hermione’s grievances against her husband for slandering and jailing her, for breaking her son’s heart, for exposing her infant. Just as the play displaces punishment for the abandonment of Perdita from Leontes and onto Antigonus and the ship’s crew, Leontes never imagines that he might be the target of his wife’s ghost’s
murcrous rage. When Paulina then inhabits the perspective of Hermione's ghost, she says

Were I the ghost that walked I'd bid you mark
Her eye, and tell me for what dult part in't
You chose her. Then I'd shriek that your ears
Should rift to hear me: and the words that follow'd
Should be, "Remember mine."

(5.1.63–7)

At this point, Leontes and Paulina share a fantasy that what would concern Hermione most is being replaced as Leontes' wife. Paulina promises him only such a second wife "As, walk'd your first queen's ghost, it should take joy / To see her in your arms" (5.1.80–1). Obviously, this emphasis serves Paulina's project of preventing Leontes from committing bigamy. What interests me most here is the contrast between the cry of Hamlet's father's ghost to "remember me"—which, as critics such as Michael Neill have pointed out, emerges as a more important and more challenging demand than "revenge me"—and "remember mine" that is "my eyes." Greenblatt remarks that "there is nothing notably Catholic or purgatorial about this vision," yet links it to Thomas More's depiction of dead husbands who shriek at the wives who have forgotten and replaced them.47 It is crucial, I think, that Hermione does not actually shriek at anyone but is instead imagined doing so in a conditional future; and is a wife and not a husband. These differences suggest how disturbing the figure of a vengeful wife might be. Here, Leontes and Paulina invent that specter to keep Leontes suspended in limbo. Yet even this disciplinary fantasy stops short of imagining a wife who calls for the remembrance of her dead children rather than her eyes and who demands revenge.

Throughout, the play evokes revenge only to refuse it: when he first accuses and arrests her, Hermione warns Leontes "how will this grieve you / When you shall come to clearer knowledge, that / You thus have publish'd me!" (2.1.96–8). In her trial, she wishes that her father, the Emperor of Russia, were alive and a witness, seeing her misery "yet with eyes / Of pity, not revenge" (3.2.122–3). It is Paulina who undertakes to imagine that vengeance might be called for: "The Queen, the Queen, / The sweetest, dearest creature's dead:
And vengeance for 't / Not dropped down yet" (3.2.200–2). The vengeance Paulina exacts requires Hermione's apparent death, a death that Leontes at first desires and then that Paulina persistently asserts. From Act II to Act V, Hermione is constantly imagined as dead. The prospect of killing a wife is presented in The Winter's Tale as a wish—"Say that she were gone, / Given to the fire, a moiety of my rest / Might come to me again" (2.3.7–9); as a false report that Paulina circulates and emphasizes, referring to Hermione as "she you killed" and provoking Leontes' concurrence and annoyance

"Killed! / She I killed! I did so: but thou strik'st me / Sorely, to say I did" (5.1.16–18); as Leontes' probable response to a second wife; and finally as an imminent danger when, in the last scene of reunion, Paulina urges Leontes to take Hermione's hand: "Do not shun her / Until you see her die again; for then / You kill her double" (5.3.105–7). Killing his wife occurs so often at the level of Leontes' dream that her second death is evoked even at the moment of her apparent resurrection. For, with Paulina presiding, Hermione is asserted to be dead in order to emerge as the undead. Paulina envisions a future that could resolve these conflicts as one in which the dead walk: she says it is as likely that Leontes' lost child should be found as for Antigonus "to break his grave / And come again to me" (5.1.42–3); she responds to the praise of Perdita by invoking Hermione whose grave must "give way to what's seen now" (5.1.97–8).

Whatever the mysterious processes by which Paulina and Hermione conspire to keep the queen outside Leontes' awareness and the play's staged action, Hermione seems to die in Act III. As many critics have pointed out, up to this point Shakespeare closely follows his source, Robert Greene's prose fiction, Pandosto (1595). Hermione's resurrection is not in the source and might be an "afterthought."48 If so, then Hermione "is" dead until the idea of reanimating her changes the course of the story. In Pandosto the queen's death is decisive; "her vital spirits were so stopped that she fell down presently dead, and could be never revived."49 The king has his wife embalmed, and entombs her and her son in a sepulcher that he then visits once a day. In Greene's tale, there is no redemption for the king, even though the child who was lost is found. In The Winter's Tale Leontes proposes that the queen and her son be buried in a single grave, asks to be brought to see their dead bodies, and plans to visit "the chapel where they lie" daily (3.2.238–9). This raises the question of whether Hermione is really dead and buried, and then resurrected. As Leontes asks at the end of the play, "how, is to be question'd, for I saw her, / As I thought, dead; and have in vain said many / A prayer upon her grave" (5.3.139–41).

The play's mater ex machina ending hints at the uncanny possibility that Hermione is the undead. Several critics have associated her statue with a funerary monument or tomb sculpture, suggesting that a commemorative icon comes to life.50 Imagined in this way, her reanimation combines the miraculous with the horrifying. Whereas most critics dwell on the former, Kenneth Gross is willing to explore the darker possibilities. For Leontes "the dead likeness' of the queen is perhaps easier to dwell on than the thought of her literal return." Gross describes the statue and the play's ending as "haunted by . . . fantasies of return" allied with revenge and "intimations of a tragic economy that the play is eager to renounce." Gross argues that for both Camillo and Polixenes, "the statue-Hermione is not just a question mark but something taboo, and their words suggest a hovering suspicion that this moment of recovery cannot banish the thought of revenge," that, in other
words, the animated statue is the vengeful ghost of the dangerous dead. Critics who emphasize the play's Catholic resonances tend to play down such doubts and fears so as to celebrate grace and forgiveness. But the miraculous and vengeful need not be antithetical. Probing the Catholic associations in this final scene might lead us not only to forgiveness and redemption, but also to the anxieties about the uncanny that the play evokes in order to suppress and to the menace that is displaced from this female ghost.

In *The Comedy of Errors* the lost mother, presumed dead, becomes an abbess; in *Pericles* she puts on a "vestal livery" and is called a nun. Hermione, too, has complex Catholic associations after she is supposedly dead. Several critics have helped to position her statue within a Catholic culture of reverence for female figures. The way is prepared when a servant praises Perdita as a creature who "would she begin a sect, might quench the zeal / Of all professors else; make proselytes / Of who she but bid follow" (5.1.107–9). Paulina responds, "How? Not women!" and the servant says, "Women will love her that she is a woman / More worth than any man; men, that she is / The rarest of all women" (5.1.110–12). But it will be Hermione, not Perdita, who has female acolytes and is adored as the rarest of all women. Perdita herself longs to kneel before her statue. Perdita's embarrassment about this desire accurs its need for apology—even in a play in which a Delphic Oracle figures importantly—from a post-Reformation iconophobia.

And give me leave,
And do not say 'tis superstition, that
I kneel, and then implore her blessing, Lady,
Dear queen, that ended when I but began,
Give me that hand of yours to kiss.

(5.3.42–6)

As both queen and mother, and object of devotion, Hermione certainly does resemble the Virgin Mary: "It is requir'd / You do awake your faith" (II.54–5). Yet if we link Hermione to the Virgin, as many critics have done, we might also notice that the play leaves something out. The Virgin is a powerful figure as well as an accessible one; believers attributed to her the power to intercede on their behalf with her son and also to intervene directly, even violently, in the world. While Hermione does not seem to be vengeful, the Virgin Mary was often viewed as being so. One treatise defending Marian devotion warns that blasphemy towards Mary is "dangerously imprudent" since those who neglect or dishonor the Virgin fall into "poverty, misery, and disreputation, and confusion" and "come, after lives led in extreme obscurity of mind and misery, to end wretchedly in despyare." Nor is Mary's vengeance always deferred and indirect. The Virgin also physically injures those who damage her image. Justus Lipsius' (1547–1606) much translated and discussed account of miracles attributed to the Virgin includes among its many miraculous rescues, resurrections, and rewards various instances in which the Virgin takes revenge against blasphemers and iconoclasts. A man who knocks off her statue's nose has his own nose shot off on the battlefield; Lipsius confides that "it was undoubtedly directed by the B. Virgin." Another who threatens to place the statue in a bonfire has his jaw shot off. "This was the Fortune of those that came to fight against the City of Hale, that is against the B. Virgin." This Virgin is as vengeful as the Ghost of Hamlet's father, but she can exact revenge herself.

A lively debate in England over the miracles of Our Lady of Hale focuses on just this vengeful aspect of the Virgin's intercessions. In 1613, John Floyd, a prolific and passionate Catholic apologist, repeats Lipsius' stories of revenge against iconoclasts and argues that surely Lipsius could not have claimed that named persons in recent memory had lost noses if they manifestly had not. Sir Edward Hoby, who frequently clashed with Floyd, scoffs that accounts such as Lipsius' depict the Virgin as a "hard-hearted Saint" and that if images are so vengeful (and powerful), how did it come to pass "when Popish Idols were suppressed in England, that no man lost his nose, nor received any harme, though many such woorden Ladies then lost their heads?" For Hoby, Catholics present a Virgin who is too much like other women: splenetic, irrational, and bossy. Thus Hoby mobilizes misogyny as a resource for discounting the claims made for the Virgin's power. While anti-Catholic polemics such as Hoby ridicule the idea of a vengeful virgin, Mary's staunchest admirers defend her rage as justified and recount her mutilation or murder of her opponents with reverence and gratitude.

In contrast, the Hermione who is an animated statue, like the Hermione who appears to Antigonus in a dream, or even the "soul vest" stage walker who is fantasized by Leontes and Paulina, is not angry at her husband, not seeking revenge. Indeed, Leontes recognizes his wife in just these terms: "thou art she / In thy not chiding" (5.3.25–6). If the resurrection scene at the end of *The Winter's Tale* has Catholic as well as pagan resonances, then the evocation of Catholic belief is curiously partial and defanged. This Hermione may withhold her speech from her husband, but she does not shoot his nose off.

Hermione might be seen as a figure for the "Vanishing" Catholic, whose disappearance is a wish and whose return can be celebrated only if it serves to freeze the threat of an animate, powerful, and vengeful Catholicism into its most innocuous manifestation: the silent, loving, wrinkled mother. While the recent critical emphasis on Purgatory invites us to imagine a vanished Catholicism that longs to be remembered, I have hoped here to activate associations with women, revenge, and the undead in order to suggest how disturbing the specter of a clamorous and punitive Catholicism might be. This is a specter from which the stage turns away.

In this chapter, I have linked two questions: how is Catholicism—as cultural phenomenon more than as theology— itself a specter haunting post-Reformation England, feared and evaded rather than warmly remembered,
precisely because it was not quite dead? And why are there so few female ghosts in Shakespeare’s plays? The constellation of Catholic associations around the figure of Hermione illuminates the conjunction I have been suggesting. As I have argued, Catholicism was disturbingly vigorous rather than lamentably moribund. For centuries after the Reformation, it remained as vaguely defined and as undead as ever, going in and out of fashion, crucial to myths of nation-formation, animated by its association with ethnic difference, invaluable as a cache of images, objects, forms, and stories. Some attached themselves to their families through a cherished affiliation to their ancestors’ faith; for others, Catholicism was a discovery, a choice, perhaps even a rebellion. Since Catholicism meant many different things, and because of that very indeterminacy proved mobile, adaptable, and resilient, it is premature to declare it dead and to be mourned in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Like the last Indians, Catholics did not vanish from the cultural landscape; instead, those who succeeded and appropriated them later told stories that erased them. Catholics did not vanish from post-Reformation England, but rather from historiography of post-Reformation England. Consigned to the margins, they played the thankless roles of the losers and spoilers of history. When scholars began to look differently, to ask different questions, we saw them everywhere.

The rare appearances of women in ghost stories might mean either that dead women were rarely imagined to have legitimate claims on the living, or that the accusations and demands they might make were too horrifying to imagine. Perhaps this is why The Winter’s Tale robs its female protagonist of rage and vengefulness even as it so provocatively links her to the spectral and the iconic. Focusing on what Hermione’s apparitions do not do—accuse Leontes or vow revenge—might make it possible to imagine what early modern culture usually chose not to: the prospect of dead mothers or wives who return, of the repudiated mother church who wants to reclaim her properties and power.

The vanishing feminist?

When feminist work is clearly identified it is often so that it may be caricatured or dismissed in references to “the feminist reading of” a given work (as if there were only one and it is predictable) or “the feminist assumption that” all women are victims or all women are agents, that femininity is essential or femininity is constructed. Feminist work is also ghettoized through citation practices that suggest that scholarship on gender, women, and sexuality yields knowledge only on these topics and is only of interest to other specialists rather than to everyone working on politics or nationalism or print culture more generally. Yet gender is a question that might be asked even in studies that are not “about” it. When most ghost stories are about male revenants, then gender is a crucial category for understanding ghost stories and grief. When gender is a crucial resource in attacks on Catholicism, then it should be taken into consideration even by those who assume that they do not “do” gender. To sustain and extend the impacts of feminism, we need to resist removal to the “gender note.” Such marginalization often precedes vanishing altogether.

The premise of this collection is that feminism is now so fully integrated into other knowledge making projects that it is no longer as sharply defined or isolatable. This would make feminism like the Indians and Catholics who appear to have vanished but have instead intermarried, metamorphosed, adapted, and survived. Survival is a good thing; invisibility and dispossession are not. Rather than mourn, we need to seek out, herald, and demand space for feminism’s new manifestations.
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Notes

4. These terms for the dead come from the work of Nancy Caciola. “Spirit Seekers: Bodies: Death, Possession, and Communal Memory in the Middle Ages,” The Place of the Dead, 66-86, esp. 68; and “Wraiths, Revenants and Ritual in Medieval Culture,” Past and Present 152 (August 1996): 3-45, esp. 37 and 30.
6. Marshall, Beliefs and the Dead, 89, 93-123.


19. The magnificent tomb James I had built for Elizabeth in Westminster in 1606 placed her next to her Catholic half-sister, Mary, and in competition with one equally grand tomb for his mother, the Catholic Mary Stuart, Visiting Elizabeth's tomb, then, invited one also to pay homage to the two Catholic Marys. See Michael Dobson and Nicola J. Watson, England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 46.


25. Katherine Eggert links posthumous affection for Queen Elizabeth I to what anthropologist Renato Rosaldo calls "imperialist nostalgia," that is, the longing of colonialism's agents for the very culture they have destroyed. See Showing Like a Queen: Female Authority and Literary Experiment in Spencer, Shakespeare, and Milton (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 133, 160, 161.


32. A. Anderson, Shield of Our Saviour (London, 1581), sigs. H3v-H4r. I found the Babington and Anderson passages through citations in Marshall, Beliefs and the Dead, 249.


37. Gowing, "The Haunting of Susan Lay." The servant, Susan Lay, had borne children to the dead woman’s husband and son. Gowing explores why the ghost appears to her servant, rather than her male relatives.

38. Marshall, Beliefs and the Dead, 133.


40. This stage direction reads: "the spirit of Susan his second wife comes to the bedside. He startes at it, and turning to the other side, it’s there too." The appearance of his first, living wife and Frank’s startled response cause the spirit to vanish. Most editors comment on the fact that, since Susan has already forgiven Frank, "it is unlikely that it is her ghost returning to torment him" (The Witch of Edmonton, ed. Peter Corbin and Douglas Sedge [Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999], 4.2.69,21n); "Susan’s ghost has not returned to accuse Frank, in all probability" (The Witch of Edmonton, ed. Arthur F. Kinney [New York: W. W. Norton, 1998], 4.2.69, 3d); "there would be no real reason for her spirit to torment him here" (The Witch of Edmonton, ed. Etta Sisofe Ornat [New York: Garland, 1980], 356-7).


42. The Woman’s Prize: The Tragedy of Martim, and The Duchess of Malfi are all cited from English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology, ed. David Bevington, Lars Engell, Katharine Eisaman Maus, and Eric Rasmussen (New York: W. W. Norton, 2002).

43. Ann Jones and Peter Stallybrass, Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 245-68, esp. 261. Marjorie Garber argues that while there are few female ghosts in Shakespeare many of the female characters are spectral. "Literal ghosts, portentous Senecan stalkers from the revenge tradition, tend in Shakespeare’s plays to be male and paternal. But... there is another whole group of ghost writers in his plays who are similarly under erasure, and these ghost writers are women—women marginalized by their gender, by their putative or real madness, or by their violation" (Marjorie Garber, Shakespeare’s Ghost Writers: Literature as Uncanny Causality [New York and London: Methuen, 1987], 25).


45. In The Knight of the Burning Pestle, Jasper feigns his own death and thereby accomplishes a reconciliation with his beloved. Valerie Wayne argues that every wife praised as virtuous by Lady Julia in her defense of women in Titus’s Flower of Friendship "metaphorically jumps off the cliff... the very best wife in this narrative is one who proves her love through her own annihilation" (Edmund Tilney, The Flower of Friendship: A Renaissance Dialogue Contesting Marriage, ed. Valerie Wayne [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992], 64).

47. Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory*, 204; Garber also remarks upon "the similarity of this scenario to *Hamlet*" (*Shakespeare’s Ghosts Writers*, 15). Dorothy Osborne warns William Temple that she is going on a voyage by water and if she drowns "this will bee my Last Letter, and like a will. I bequeath al my kindenesse to you in it, with a charge never to bestow it all upon another Mistresse, least my Ghost rise again & haunt you" (June 26, 1654, *The Letters of Dorothy Osborne to William Temple*, ed. G. C. Moore Smith [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947, letter 68, 170]).


52. Beth Vanita, "Maritological Memory*‘"; Velma Bourgeois Richmond, *Shakespeare, Catholicism, and Romance* (New York: Continuum, 2000), 191–201. To argue that Catholic beliefs, practices, objects, and associations turn up in Shakespeare’s plays—as elsewhere in post-Reformation culture—is not to say that he was or wasn’t “Catholic.” There is also an illustrious tradition of placing the statue in an Ovidian context; Leonard Barkan, *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1986), 283–8; Lynn Enterline, *The Rhetoric of the Body from Ovid to Shakespeare* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Lori Humphrey Newcomb, "‘If that which is lost be not found’: Monumental Bodies, Spectacular Bodies in *The Winter’s Tale*," in *Ovid and the Renaissance Body*, ed. Goran V. Stanimirov (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 239–59.


54. Justus Lipsius, *Miracles of the B. Virgin. or, an Historical Account of the Original, and Suspicious Performances of the Image, Entituled Our Blessed Lady of Hale* (London, 1688), sig. C. Although this translation was printed late in the century, Lipsius first published his text in Latin as *Divae virgini Halliensis* in 1604. Floyd and Hoby’s responses to the text suggest that it was widely known by the second decade of the seventeenth century.

55. John Floyd, *Purgatories Triumph Over Hell, Mauring the Banking of Cerberus in Sir Edward Hobys Counter-Swarie* (St. Omer, 1613), 128–35. William Fleetwood’s *An Account of the Life and Death of the Blessed Virgin* (London, 1687) complains that "Papism has made Her a very pattern of Pride and Ambition, always aiming at Divine Honours; angry with all that pay them not, severely Punishing those that offend Her" (sig. D2v).