Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci

Filozofická fakulta

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Mary, Queen of Scots in Popular Culture

Diplomová práce

Bc. Gabriela Taláková

Vedoucí diplomové práce: Mgr. Ema Jelínková, Ph.D.

Olomouc 2016

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně a uvedla jsem všechny použité podklady a literaturu.

V Olomouci dne 28. 4. 2016 ....

Poděkování

Na tomto místě bych chtěla poděkovat Mgr. Emě Jelínkové, Ph.D. za odborné vedení práce, poskytování rad a materiálových podkladů k diplomové práci, a také za její vstřícnost a čas.

Content

Introduction

This diploma thesis sets as its objective to examine the depiction of Mary, Queen of Scots in popular culture, mainly the 20th and 21st century fictional, film and historical representation of her life. Born into the era when Protestantism spread like wildfire across Europe, Mary ruled in a Protestant country as a Catholic sovereign from 1542 to 1567. Being raised at the French court, she was welcomed back in Scotland, where she returned after the death of her first husband, Francis II of France, with apprehension. Despite her upbringing and Catholic faith, she managed to win over her subjects in Scotland thanks to her beauty, charm and religious tolerance. However, Mary's unfortunate choice of husbands eventually led to several rebellions against her reign and in 1567 she was forced to abdicate in favour of her one-year-old son, James. When she attempted to regain her throne, she was defeated and fled to England where she sought help of her cousin Elizabeth I. There she became the centre of the conspiracies of English Catholics who considered Mary to be the legitimate sovereign of England and were enraged at her imprisonment ordered by Elizabeth. Thus, Mary's existence threatened the peace in the realm and the very life of Elizabeth. This dangerous situation finally culminated with Mary's execution on the orders of her royal cousin in 1587.

Even after four centuries since her death, Mary does not cease to fascinate historians and fiction writers alike. This fascination is given by many turbulent events in her life which remain shrouded in mystery to the present day. Every author writing about Mary, Queen of Scots has to deal with the following debatable questions. Was Mary privy to the plan of murdering her second husband, Lord Darnley? Was she infatuated with the Earl of Bothwell so she decided to marry him even though he was a chief suspect in the murder of Darnley? Or did he force her into marriage by raping her? Did Mary write the famous Casket Letters which proved her adultery with Bothwell and her foreknowledge of the planned murder? Or were the letters forged by the rebels in order to justify their uprising against their anointed Queen and to blacken Mary's reputation in the eyes of other European monarchs? Did she give direct consent to the plan to assassinate Queen Elizabeth in the Babington Plot? The attitude of writers and film makers to these questions determines whether Mary is portrayed as an innocent woman destroyed by the ruthless political scheming of the 16th century, or as a murdering adulteress who would have stopped at nothing to achieve her goals and who brought her fate upon herself. In the thesis, I am going to analyse and compare how the chosen authors and film makers deal not only with the questions mentioned above, but also how they depict Mary's childhood in Scotland and her stay in France.

The thesis is divided into five chapters. Four of them are further divided into several subsections dealing with the selected topics from the point of view of historical biographies, fiction and, if applicable, films. The first chapter gives a general overview of the notions about kingship and queenship in European society to provide reader with necessary historical background for better understanding of Mary's and Elizabeth's unique position in the world dominated mostly by men. Additionally, the question of English succession that played a significant role in the relationship between the two Queens is dealt with in this section. After this introductory part, a chapter follows which is concerned with Mary's childhood in Scotland where her position was precarious because of the English who sought to seize and take her to England.

The third chapter focuses on Mary's stay at the French court, in particular her relationship and marriage with the Dauphin, and the brief period of her being the Queen of France when she was advised by her manipulative uncles, the Guises, who regarded Mary and her husband as means of the political power for themselves. Attention is also given to Mary's uneasy relationship with Catherine de Medici, her mother in law, a woman coming from the most powerful Florentine family, de Medici, but in whose veins was no drop of royal blood.

The following chapter deals with her actual rule in Scotland and the challenges awaiting her there, mainly the necessity to come to terms with Protestantism and provide the realm with an heir. The main focus of interest is Mary's marriage with Darnley and Bothwell, and her involvement in the murder of her second husband.

The last chapter is centred around Mary's imprisonment in England, the problematic relationship with Elizabeth I whom she never met in person, the dubious authenticity of the Casket Letters and finally Mary's involvement in the Babington plot which resulted in the final tragedy for Mary and Elizabeth alike.

The sources used in the thesis are mainly historical biographies, fiction and films. The historical biographies are represented by Antonia Fraser's *Mary Queen of Scots* (1969) in which the author explores the legends surrounding Mary and tests their truth or falsehood; Roderick Graham's *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots: An Accidental Tragedy* (2009) who portrays the Scottish Queen as an inexperienced politician in comparison with Elizabeth I or Catherine de Medici; and John Guy's *My Heart is My Own: The Life of Mary Queen of Scots* (2004) whose carefully written biography represents Mary as a woman ruled by emotions and feared by Elizabeth's secretary, William Cecil, who is portrayed as her nemesis.

The fiction about the Scottish Queen includes variety of recent novels of various quality, such as *Immortal Queen* (1957) by Elizabeth Byrd, *The Memoirs of Mary Queen of Scots* (2009) by Carolly Erickson, *Mary Queen of Scotland and the Isles* (1992) by Margaret George, Philippa Gregory's *The Other Queen* (2008), Reay Tannahill's *Fatal Majesty: The Drama of Mary Queen of Scots* (1998) and other. Apart from these novels that are aimed particularly at grown-up readers, there are also novels intended for children, namely *Queen's Own Fool: A Novel of Mary Queen of Scots* (2000) by Jane Yolen and Rober J. Harris, and *Mary, Queen of Scots: Queen Without a Country, France 1553* (2002) by Kathryn Lasky.

The film adaptations of Mary's life are represented by the following films and TV series: the first episode of *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot* (2004) directed by Gillies MacKinnon, *Mary, Queen of Scots* (1971) directed by Charles Jarrott, the Swiss adaptation bearing the same title as the latter from 2013 by Thomas Imbach, and highly fictionalized TV series *Reign* (2013-). Miniseries and a film centred around the conflict between Elizabeth and Mary from the point of view of the English Queen are also included in the selection. Namely, the third episode of the BBC TV miniseries *Elizabeth R* (1971) and *The Virgin Queen* (2006), the first episode of *Elizabeth I* (2005) and *Elizabeth: The Golden Age* (2007).

1. Two Queens in One Isle

Britain of the second half of the 16th century witnessed an extraordinary political situation. Not only was Protestantism gaining the upper hand over Catholicism but also the rulers of England and Scotland were women. This was something quite unusual in the early modern Europe where the notion of woman's subordination to man was still deeply rooted. Thus, the unique position of Elizabeth I and Mary, Queen of Scots meant for their contemporaries a deviation from the natural order of things which was supported by the conceptions of King's and Queen's status in European society.

The King's status derived from the legacy of the antiquity, Germanic pagan customs and, above all, the Old and New Testament. The parallel with the latter could be seen in the identification of Christian Kings with biblical rulers, especially David, and the anointing of Kings in coronation ceremony,[1] referring to the anointments of both Saul and David by the prophet Samuel. The scholars further enhanced the monarch status during the Middle Ages by coming up with a theory of the King's two bodies. According to this notion, the King had the body natural, susceptible to human weaknesses, and the body politic, representing his office and never dying. These two bodies constituted one whole in which the body politic was superior and influenced positively the other one.[2] In the light of these views, it is no surprise the society regarded kingship as the best form of government not only because of its ordination by God but also for the role and duties adhering to the office. The King represented a father to his subjects and was responsible for their well-being and salvation.[3] On top of that, he had to defend his realm in times of crisis and to obey the Church and the laws of the realm.[4]

The Queen, on the other hand, was seen as a mere spouse of her royal husband to whom she had to submit and show total obedience. In this respect, the Queen was no different from any other woman who was in general considered intellectually, physically and morally weak in comparison with a man. Furthermore, the Queen did not hold any public office as she was deemed incapable of grasping the subtle nuances of

[1] Jacques Le Goff, 'Král,' in *Encyklopedie středověku*, ed. Jacques Le Goff et al., trans. Lada Bosáková et. al. (Praha: Vyšehrad, 2008), 305-306, 310.
[2] Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *Dvě těla krále*, trans. Daniela Orlando (Praha: Argo, 2014), 26-29.
[3] Cynthia Herrup, 'The King's Two Genders,' *Journal of British Studies* 45 (2006): 497, accessed November 7, 2015, http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/503588.
[4] Goff, 'Král,' 310.

political life and was considered to be best fitted for the private sphere. If such a situation occurred that a woman inherited a throne, it was assumed she would follow an advice of her councillors and find a husband as soon as possible so the natural order of things would be restored.[5]

The unsuitability of female monarchs was backed up by the biblical stories where women's supremacy over men was in a stark contrast with God's commandments in which he declared women's subservience to men as the punishment of Eve for the original sin. Moreover, only two women were found worthy of exercising any power over Israelites, Deborah and Huldah. Despite their positive qualities, their rule was regarded only as a special intervention from God, something unlikely to happen again. For the reasons mentioned above, many contemporary thinkers and preachers, especially the leader of the Protestant reformation in Scotland, John Knox, considered female rule as God's punishment for human sinfulness and met the ascendancy of Mary Stuart and Elizabeth Tudor with apprehension.[6]

Such were the notions about kingship and queenship in the era in which Elizabeth and Mary were destined to rule. Both had to deal with the prejudices against women practically since they were born. Henry VIII's disappointment caused by Elizabeth's birth instead of a longed-for son is well known, likewise James V's words after hearing of Mary's birth expressed his disappointment: 'The devil go with it! It will end as it began. It came from a woman, and it will end in a woman.'[7] Neither of the Kings deemed their daughters as proper heirs to the throne. Henry VIII came so far as to accuse Elizabeth's mother, Anne Boleyn, of adultery, ordered her execution when she miscarried their next child, and proclaimed Elizabeth illegitimate. Soon after Anne Boleyn's execution, he sought to marry again in order to secure male succession of the English throne. Unlike Henry, James had no time to father another child, he died six days after Mary's birth[8] and thus left Scotland in the hands of a six-day-old infant and a female on top of that.

---

[5] Victoria de la Torre, '"We Few of an Infinite Multitude": John Hales, Parliament, and the Gendered Politics of the Early Elizabethan Succession,' *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 33 (Winter, 2001): 561-562, accessed November 9, 2015, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4052892.
[6] Rober M. Healey, 'Waiting for Deborah: John Knox and Four Ruling Queens,' *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 25 (Summer, 1994): 371, 376, accessed November 9, 2015, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2542887.
[7] John Guy, *My Heart is My Own: The Life of Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Fourth Estate, 2009), 16.
[8] John Guy, 'The Tudor Age,' in *The Oxford History of Britain*, ed. Kenneth O. Morgan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 287, 292.

Elizabeth and Mary were not only linked with their extraordinary position as rulers of sovereign states but also were both descended from Henry VII, Elizabeth through Henry VIII, and Mary through Margaret Tudor, elder sister of Henry VIII.[9] This blood relation meant that Mary presented the nearest kinswoman to Elizabeth and had the best claim to succeed the English Queen if she died without issues.

The question of succession was crucial for ministers of both Queens. Elizabeth's councillors urged her to marry and provide the kingdom with an heir. Nevertheless, Elizabeth seemed reluctant to comply with their wishes and settle the succession once and for all. Her justification for refusing to name a successor during her lifetime was that such a person would inevitably become the centre for intrigue. In spite of Elizabeth's unwillingness in this matter, she expressed her preference for Mary's claim without naming her outright as heir during several meetings with Mary's chief minister, William Maitland. This attitude and evasiveness caused despair among the Protestant lords and the increasing possibility of Mary becoming the next Queen of Protestant country terrified them. Therefore, they favoured another possible candidate, Catherine Grey, descendant of Henry VIII's younger sister, Mary Tudor. In favour of Catherine spoke her Protestant upbringing and the fact that she was already married and delivered a son, a prospective Protestant heir. However, Elizabeth frustrated this plan when she proclaimed the marriage invalid and the child illegitimate.[10]

Likewise, Mary Privy Council's first concern was with the Queen's marriage. Because of Scotland's turn to Protestantism, Protestants suitors were preferred over Catholic ones. The question of Mary's marriage interested also England. Despite the wishes of the Protestant lords of both realms for her marriage with an English Protestant nobleman, Mary chose to wed a Catholic, Lord Darnley. This marriage strengthened her claim for the English throne as a male heir was born from the wedlock, but at the same time compromised it in the eyes of Protestants, because the child came from the union of two Catholics.[11]

As could be seen from the attitude of the councillors of both Queens to the question of succession and marriage, they did not consider their Queens fit to rule

[9] Guy, 'The Tudor Age,' 306.
[10] Torre, '"We Few of an Infinite Multitude,"' 572-573.
[11] Anne McLaren, 'The Quest for a King: Gender, Marriage, and Succession in Elizabethan England,' *Journal of British Studies* 41 (2002): 269, 284, accessed November 7, 2015, http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/341150.

without male advice and leadership. Mary complied with their notions by marrying and producing an heir. Elizabeth, on the other hand, decided not to marry and the succession remained unsettled till her death.

Regardless of the close blood relation between Elizabeth and Mary, and Elizabeth's preferences when it came to the question of a successor, insurmountable obstacles existed which marred their relationship. These obstacles are going to be analysed in more detail in the fifth chapter in which the relationship between Elizabeth and Mary will be subjected to closer scrutiny.

Having outlined the status of Queens regnant and the prevailing ideas surrounding them, I shall now analyse the depiction of Mary Stuart in historical biographies, fiction and films through the stages of her life, starting with her childhood in Scotland.

2. A Child Queen of Scotland

As was stated in the previous chapter, Mary became the sovereign of Scotland when she was six days old. It had severe consequences for her country which was left practically leaderless in its hour of need as it was threatened by the English invasion after the crushing defeat of the Scottish army at Solway Moss few days before Mary's birth. Scotland's only hope lay in the prompt choice of a competent regent who would rule the country during Mary's minority and protect the independence of the realm. It proved to be a remarkably challenging task and Mary's mother, Mary of Guise, had to use all her cunning to defend the position of her daughter, not only from the quarrelsome Scottish nobility but especially from the King of England, Henry VIII, who sought to marry Mary to his son, Edward, and annex Scotland to England.[12]

2.1 Historical Biographies

James V, King of Scots, died of dysentery[13] on the 14th of December 1542 without leaving a will in which he would clearly name a regent who would rule in his daughter's name until she came of age. Even thought David Beaton, Cardinal-Archbishop of St Andrews, presented a will of the late King naming him and three of his allies as governors, the will was immediately proclaimed to be a forgery, a statement believed to be truthful by historians. According to Guy, the reason why James V failed to write such a vital document is that he was probably unaware of his approaching death.[14] However, James V's prophecy mentioned in Fraser's biography about Mary Stuart calls this claim into question and indicates his severe depression after the lost battle. The King replied to his servants who asked him about his whereabouts during Christmas with the following words: 'I cannot tell: choose ye the place. But this I can tell you, on Yule day, you will be masterless and the realm without a king.'[15]

Be that as it may, James V's failure to draw up the will enabled James Hamilton, the Earl of Arran, to seize power for himself. Arran who was next in line to the throne, due to the share of Stuart's blood in his veins, was the nobles apparent candidate for the regency. Unfortunately, he was far from being an ideal regent, given his tendency to

[12] Roger Mason, 'Renesance a reformace: 16. století,' in *Dějiny Skotska*, ed. Jenny Wormaldová, trans. Markéta Šerá (Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2007), 95-96.
[13] Roderick Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots: An Accidental Tragedy* (New York: Pegasus Books, 2009), 9.
[14] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 19-20.
[15] Antonia Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots* (New York: Dell, 1971), 13.

change his mind whenever it suited his interests and his pro-English policy.[16] Mary of Guise was well aware of Arran's shortcomings. Hence, she was determined to keep Mary in her care and prevent Arran from seizing the Queen. To achieve this goal, she even pretended that she agreed with her daughter's betrothal to Henry VIII's son while at the same time she tried her best to besmirch Arran in the eyes of English ambassador, Sir Ralph Sadler.[17]

Both Graham and Guy depict Mary of Guise as a shrewd politician who gained this ability from her French family, the Guises, who raised to remarkable power at the French court. Given her background and upbringing, it was to be expected that she would do anything to advance French interests in Scotland. For this reason, her consent to the marriage of Mary and Prince Edward is regarded only as a pretence which should have given her more time to outmanoeuvre Arran.[18] However, Fraser does not deem Mary's consent to be a mere pretence. According to her, Mary of Guise might actually have been swayed by the Scottish nobility into supporting this plan.[19] Considering the next actions of Mary of Guise which were clearly pro-French, Fraser's assumption is hardly plausible and Graham's and Guy's interpretations of the events are more likely.

Apart from skilfully manoeuvring through the foreign policy, Mary of Guise managed to handle the Scottish nobility in the first years of her daughter's life. She accomplished this uneasy task by giving the two powerful noblemen hope of becoming stepfathers to the Queen. These men were none others than Patrick Hepburn, the Earl of Bothwell, and Matthew Stuart, the Earl of Lennox. Both fathers of the men who were about to play a significant role in the life of Mary Stuart. By giving them a chance to court her, Mary of Guise gained powerful allies both for her domestic and pro-French policy. Nevertheless, the brief period of rest was interrupted as Lennox left angrily for England when he found out Mary of Guise had no intention of marrying him. At the same time, Henry VIII started to plan an invasion of Scotland because he wanted to be revenged on the Scots for their dishonouring of the treaty that should have ensured the marriage between his son and the Scottish Queen.[20]

---

[16] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 20.
[17] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 16-17.
[18] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 18, 22.
[19] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 20.
[20] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 30-33.

While the dark clouds were gathering over Scotland, the infant Queen was blissfully unaware of the ongoing political machinations and was behaving in a way typical for any baby. Graham expresses it aptly when he describes Mary's foremost needs with the following words: 'who, at this moment, only knew that she was hungry and was yelling loudly in the first of many celebrated royal tantrums.'[21] Crying of the infant Queen was not to be avoided even during her coronation when she was nine months old. Paying no heed to the solemnity of the occasion, Mary kept on crying while the present nobility swore its allegiance. Notwithstanding her extremely bad behaviour, the coronation marked the turning point in the Scottish policy because Mary of Guise marginalized Arran and enforced the pro-French faction at the court at last.[22]

As Mary grew older, she could not have failed to notice the attention of the courtiers and began to exercise her legendary charm over them. Thus, many of them beamed with pride as she smiled at them, becoming victims of her charisma. Furthermore, Mary's mother made sure that due respect was shown to her under all circumstances. Due to this treatment, Mary grew accustomed to the life at the court which was full of dancing and music and was oblivious of the threatening English invasion.[23]

Henry VIII launched his planned attack on Scotland in May 1544. The commander of the army, Hertford, received instructions to burn and sack everything in his way and he carried them to the point. These manoeuvres of the English army are aptly termed 'the Rough Wooing'[24] and Graham is not far from the truth when he parallels them to the practices of Hitler's SS during the Second World War.[25] The pillaging briefly ceased when Hertford's forces were needed in France where Henry VIII attempted to capture Boulogne, but was renewed a couple of months later with the same savagery and continued even after Henry VIII's death in January 1547.[26]

It was during these final stages of the English raids and the catastrophic defeat of the Scottish army at Pinkie Cleugh that Mary was removed from Stirling Castle to an island Inchmahome for her safety. There was a priory and Mary supposedly spent three

[21] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 7.
[22] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 27.
[23] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 22-23.
[24] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 27.
[25] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 29.
[26] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 34, 36, 38.

weeks within its precincts. To this day, a few places on the island honour the memory of her short stay such as Queen Mary's Garden, Queen Mary's Bower and Queen Mary's Tree. Even a legend exists stating that Mary learned Latin and other languages at the priory and planted a number of trees there.[27] Judging from the short period Mary spent on the island and the fact that she was only four years old at the time, this legend cannot be founded on any fact and must have been invented only to make of the island a place of special significance for Mary's life.

Although the English pillaging was devastating for Scotland, it benefitted Mary of Guise's pro-French policy as it persuaded the Scottish nobility to seek an alliance with the French King, Henry II. Not only was Henry II able to send much needed troops in Scotland but the prospect of the marriage between his son, Francis, and Mary Stuart seemed like a better alternative to the union with the new King of England, Edward VI. Therefore, the negotiations concerning the betrothal of the Scottish Queen and the Dauphin began in 1548 and Mary was transferred to Dumbarton Castle from where she could have been shipped more easily to France. Finally on the 29th of July 1548, Mary boarded on the ship bound for France and left her mother behind to take care of the Scottish affairs in her name. Four girls of her own age and noble birth accompanied Mary on the way, Mary Fleming, Mary Seton, Mary Beaton and Mary Livingstone, who were acting as Mary's maids-of-honour. During the journey, Mary proved herself to be immune to seasickness, unlike the rest of her retinue, and teased her suffering companions.[28] At this point, Mary probably did not realise the whole significance of her removal to France and she must have seen the journey across the raging sea as a big adventure.

All in all, the historical biographies focus predominantly on the actions of Mary of Guise and the English aggression in the course of Mary's childhood in Scotland as Mary did not exercise any power over her subjects due to her youth. Mary's sole concerns, as depicted in these writings, give the impression of a child trying to enjoy herself under the watchful eyes of her nurses while her mother tried her best to secure Scotland for her. It is up to the fiction writers to provide young Mary Stuart with more space in their writings and give the reader an insight into the mind of the royal child.

[27] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 33.
[28] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 36, 39, 40

2.2 Fiction

Owing to the fact that most of the selected novels begin with Mary's stay at the French court and neglect entirely her childhood in Scotland, only two of them are going to be analysed in this subsection. Namely, Margaret George's *Mary Queen of Scotland and the Isles* and *The Royal Road to Fotheringhay* (1955) by Jean Plaidy. At the beginning of Plaidy's novel, Mary is already four years old and starts to notice disturbances happening in Scotland. On the other hand, George also deals with the death of James V and the efforts of Mary of Guise to protect her daughter's birthright, thus emphasising the role of Mary's mother in the turmoil following the King's passing.

Mary of Guise in George's novel is a determined woman and she regards herself as a 'wolf-mother in a harsh winter'[29] who must protect her infant at all costs. From the start, she distrusts the Scottish lords' vows of loyalty when the leading nobles pay respect to their new sovereign and wish her the best in the world:

> The Earl of Arran, James Hamilton, was there; had not this baby been born, he would now be king. He smiled benevolently at the infant. 'I wish her a long life,' he said. The Earl of Lennox, Matthew Stuart, who claimed to be the true heir rather than Arran, came shortly and stood looking longingly down at the baby. 'May she have all the gifts of grace and beauty,' he said. Patrick Hepburn, the 'Fair Earl' of Bothwell, stepped forward and kissed the Queen Mother's hand lingeringly. 'May she have power to make all who gaze upon her love her,' he said... Earl of Huntly strutted past the cradle and bowed. 'May she always rest among friends and never fall into the hands of her enemies.'[30]

Considering the fact that Mary's birth prevented Arran from becoming a King, his wish of the long life for the infant sounds insincere and Mary of Guise is well aware of that. Besides their apparent hypocrisy, the wishes of the four noblemen resemble prophecies of the Fates and the last one has a sense of foreboding for the child's future.

Likewise, Plaidy represents Mary of Guise as a woman fully dedicated to the well-being of her daughter. On top of that, her religious zeal is emphasised when she lectures Mary on the importance of the Catholic faith after the Cardinal's assassination

[29] Margaret George, *Mary Queen of Scotland and the Isles* (London: Pan Books, 2012), 8.
[30] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 8-9.

by the Protestants. Needless to say, she is horrified at Mary's reply that she approves of the Cardinal's murder as he brought this end about himself by burning at the stake a Protestant leader.[31] Her argument shows her childlike sense of right and wrong and her unfailing honesty under all circumstances, admirable but impractical quality in the ruthless world of politics.

The shortcomings of such behaviour come to the surface in Mary's conduct to her half-brother, James, one of many illegitimate children of James V. Trusting and kind as she is, she fails to notice his smouldering ambition and longs for his being her true brother,[32] not realising what it would mean for her own position. Similarly, George depicts Mary's adoration of James but she further reveals his mean nature in the following episode. One day, Mary explores her father's apartments where she is forbidden to enter and runs into James there. She mistakes him for a ghost and is terrified. James takes an advantage of her childish fear and refuses to lead her out unless she gives him the miniature of their father which she is wearing. Mary obeys him grudgingly and makes up her mind to forget about this event.[33] As it is evident from this incident, she is so kind-hearted and affectionate towards her half-brother that she is incapable and unwilling to enforce her regal authority, and punish James for his disrespect and presumption.

Apart from her kindness and trustfulness, her adventurous spirit emerges every now and then in Plaidy's novel. She gets excited at the mention of the possibility of being kidnapped by the English, regarding the threat as a welcome change from a boring routine.[34] The same disregard for dangerous situations is apparent in George's novel as well when during a hasty night flight from Stirling Castle to Inchmahome, Mary is more thrilled than apprehensive about the imminent danger.[35]

As was mentioned above, Mary's stance on the religion is rather indifferent at the beginning of Plaidy's novel as she puts a sense of justice above any religious doctrine. However, the stay at Inchmahome marks a change in her religious life. She takes a liking to the tranquillity of the island and the life in the priory, and enjoys the lessons of

---

[31] Jean Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, trans. Alena Maxová (Praha: Baronet, 1999), 19.
[32] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 16.
[33] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 18-19.
[34] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 20.
[35] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 31.

Latin and other languages given by the monks.[36] The brief passage about the lectures makes from the legend about Mary's acquisition of Latin on the island, mentioned in Fraser's historical biography, a true story and indicates Mary's inquisitive nature and her ability to learn quickly.

Just like Plaidy, George uses the episode of Mary's stay at Inchmahome to depict her attitude to the religion. She vividly describes Mary's enchantment by matins and her personal discovery of God which leads to her transformation into a strong believer. This experience is so powerful the prior even suggests to Mary of Guise that her daughter should become a nun. When Mary of Guise retorts this destiny is out of question for Mary as she must marry, the prior warns her about the danger of ignoring God's will but she does not heed this warning and sets her mind firmly on the marriage between Mary and the Dauphin.[37]

When the moment of leaving for France arrives, Mary is excited about the journey but at the same time downcast because she must go without her mother. Mary of Guise tries to cheer her up and promises to join her as soon as she will secure Scotland for her.[38] Not fully grasping the difficulties awaiting her mother in Scotland, Mary does not realise that her mother has committed herself to a life-long duty and the chances of the two of them ever living together are slim. Also in Plaidy's novel, Mary is devastated at the parting with her mother but nevertheless determined to fulfil her duty and to look after the sickly Dauphin, her future husband.[39]

To sum up, both authors portray the child Queen as a kind-hearted, trusting person with the inclination to spirituality who is ready to see the best in people even though some of them do not deserve it. It remains to be seen whether these personal qualities had a chance to survive at the French court renowned for its flamboyance and loose morals.

[36] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 27-28.
[37] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 35-36.
[38] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 38.
[39] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 30.

3. France

The prearranged betrothal and the removal of Mary to France was a mutually advantageous agreement for both parties. Scotland was to be protected against the English aggression and France gained a foothold from where a potential invasion to England could be launched should the long-lasting enmity between England and France be rekindled. Given the cold feelings towards the English, Mary was welcomed with enthusiasm as soon as she landed on the French soil, and was viewed as a romantic figure who fled from the English and found a safe haven in France,[40] a country she was supposed to rule one day by the side of the Dauphin.

3.1 Mary and the Dauphin: A Marriage of Convenience?

The first meeting between Mary and the Dauphin was eagerly anticipated by the courtiers and the French King who were curious to see if the children would grow fond of each other. Mary fulfilled the expectations as she charmed her future bridegroom as well as the rest of the court. But did she develop deep feelings for Francis as the time went by? Or did she only consider him as a friend with whom she spent most of her childhood and whom she eventually married?

3.1.1 Historical Biographies

All selected authors emphasise the sickly appearance of the Dauphin in contrast to Mary's robust health when he met his future bride for the first time. Furthermore, they agree on the instant liking the children felt for each other. Fraser assigns Francis's attraction for Mary to the natural admiration which an unattractive or unhealthy child feels towards a beautiful or a healthy one. For this reason, she has no doubt the Dauphin's adoration of Mary was genuine and not just a fabricated tale of the courtiers.[41] While her opinion cannot be dismissed out of hand and may have the ring of truth, Guy's explanation is also worth considering. He sees behind their fondness for each other someone else's influence. He regards Diane de Poitiers, the French King's mistress, as a crucial element in the successful outcome of the meeting because she oversaw that the shy Francis was instructed in the principles of courtship. Besides Diane's interference, Mary's perceptiveness played its part as well, as she became aware

[40] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 41.
[41] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 49.

of what was expected of her, and acted accordingly. She transformed herself into Francis's beloved during public occasions and encouraged him to behave towards her like a gentle knight to his lady.[42]

This subtle manipulation gives an idea who was the superior in their relationship. Nevertheless, Mary was careful not to dominate him openly. She treated him like a brother, ensuring that he did not attempt anything beyond his powers and encouraging him to take up outdoor activities.[43] Without a doubt, this attitude could only have strengthened the bond between them as Francis had a companion of similar age who cherished him.

As regards Mary's feelings for her bridegroom a few months before the wedding, Fraser deems that Mary's readiness to love those who showed any affection for her combined with the constant assurances of the courtiers of the Dauphin's love, eventually led her to a conviction that she loved him as well. However, Fraser expresses a belief that Francis's infantile physique could not truly appeal to Mary or evoke any romantic feelings.[44] Similarly, Graham does not dismiss the existence of mutual affection between them but points out that Mary's conduct to Francis was that of an elder sister to a brother who must be protected from any harm.[45] Thus, both authors consider the union between Mary and Francis to be purely a marriage of convenience which enabled Mary and Francis to fulfil their dynastic roles.

Whether the marriage was ever consummated remains a mystery. According to Fraser, the courtiers were certain there would be no child fathered by Francis. Despite these gloomy predictions, Mary herself assumed she was pregnant at one time. This notion probably stemmed from her ignorance which might have led her to substituting Francis's feeble attempts in a marital bed for the true consummation of the marriage.[46] Also Graham expresses a doubt that the Dauphin was able to beget a child owing to his physical deformity which made him sterile.[47] Therefore, there is a small chance the relationship between Mary and Francis ever evolved into something more than a friendship and that Mary found in her husband a satisfactory lover.

---

[42] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 48.
[43] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 53.
[44] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 77.
[45] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 72.
[46] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 109-111.
[47] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 72.

The need of an heir must have increased when the young royal couple became the King and Queen of France after the unexpected death of Henry II. His demise brought to the power the Guises who manipulated their politically inexperienced niece and her husband to achieve their goals. The new sovereigns did not take any major steps to extract themselves from their control, although Mary slowly began to realise their policy weakens her own precarious position in Scotland. When the Guises failed to help her ailing mother to suppress the rebellion of the Protestant lords, she confronted the Cardinal and blamed him for the loss of her realm.[48] Notwithstanding this outburst of royal indignation, neither she nor Francis had the strength or will to remove the Guises from power permanently and rule France independently.

The end to the Guises' ambition was put by Francis's death caused by an ear infection. Mary scarcely left his side and nursed him lovingly during the final illness. Her grief following his death was considered to be earnest by her contemporaries. Fraser shares their opinion and believes that Mary mourned the loss of her childhood companion rather than her transformation from the Queen of France into the Queen Dowager.[49] Even though Guy does not cast doubt upon her grief, he mentions that her mother's death a few months earlier was a bigger blow than Francis's passing, because she never truly loved him and regarded him only as a close friend.[50]

All things considered, the relationship between the Dauphin and Mary, as portrayed in the historical biographies, is that of a brother and a sister. In spite of being married, no romantic feelings developed between them and thus their marriage was only a dynastic one. Its main purpose lying in the unification of Scotland and France against their mutual enemy, England.

3.1.2 Fiction

As well as the historical biographies, the fiction writers point out the stark contrast between the Scottish Queen, radiating with health and energy, and the Dauphin whose appearance does not show a good state of health. When the two of them meet for the first time in George's novel, Francis is not depicted as an attractive child. He is a small, pudgy boy with a fat face who is prone to tiredness. Mary, however, is not repulsed by

[48] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 105, 112.
[49] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 123-124.
[50] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 121.

his appearance but feels protective towards him, and Francis begins to like her immediately.[51] Plaidy offers a slightly different physical description of the Dauphin. According to her, Francis is a boy with very thin legs which barely supports the weight of his body, pale complexion and disproportionately large head. Despite these differences in his physique, he and Mary get on well from the start as well, and he is determined never to let her out of his sight.[52]

Apart from his unattractive physique, Francis is not endowed with a bright mind either. When Madame de Paroy, Mary's governess, rebukes him for not living up to the expectations of being the next King of France, Francis retorts that Mary knows enough for both of them.[53] As is obvious, he relies entirely on Mary's judgement and thus reverses the traditional roles of men and women and indicates who is the unofficial leader in their relationship. Even though Francis's intellectual abilities are not great, he demonstrates a remarkable insight in Lasky's novel. He catches Mary by surprise one day by asking her: 'Did it ever strike you, Mary, that we are not so much children and sons and daughters of parents as we are pieces on a gigantic chessboard called Europe? You are given to me to help checkmate England.'[54] Apparently, he is aware of the true nature of things, that is of being manipulated by others who regard the royal children as a means to an end. Mary, on the other hand, is oblivious of this fact as she replies in puzzlement: 'But I am a Queen.'[55] Unlike Francis, she is not ready to admit to herself that someone else could control her actions and assumes she is in charge of her own destiny.

The persons benefitting most from Mary's betrothal to Francis are her ambitious uncles, Francis and Charles of Guise. Charles, the Cardinal of Lorraine, is in most novels described as the more cunning of the brothers and he shapes Mary's mind in a way that will suit the Guises' purposes. Plaidy also adds to his political abilities a more disturbing characteristic. She presents him as a notorious womaniser who has an unhealthy interest in his niece's body and her sexual potential. Although Mary loves her

---

[51] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 40-41.
[52] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 39-40.
[53] Elizabeth Byrd, *Immortal Queen* (London: Pan Books, 1971), 21.
[54] Kathryn Lasky, *Mary, Queen of Scots: Queen Without a Country, France 1553* (New York: Scholastic Inc., 2002), 73.
[55] Lasky, *Queen Without a Country*, 73.

uncles, she finds the Cardinal's occasional kisses and caresses disconcerting and prefers the Dauphin's brotherly love to this kind of behaviour.[56]

Given her sisterly love for Francis, she is slightly apprehensive about the change which the marriage will bring about to their relationship. She can hardly bear to hear about the marriage plans,[57] clearly favouring friendship over love in Lasky's novel. This attitude is hardly surprising as Mary is merely eleven years old at the time. George's recount of the events, on the other hand, shows Mary who is thrilled with the approaching nuptials. As soon as the wedding day arrives, she considers herself lucky to marry a man she knows so well although she admits she regards Francis only as a friend. According to her, an arranged marriage is the normal order of things and the possibility of a love match is something unimaginable for her. Due to her inexperience, she does not realise the marriage is not consummated on the wedding night and views the whole marital business as another sort of a game.[58] Francis fails to perform marital duties although he tries to fulfil them in Byrd's novel as well. When he whimpers afterwards, Mary snaps at him angrily for not behaving like the next King of France. Her anger quickly fades away, however, and she decides to lie to the Cardinal about the consummation in order to protect their reputation.[59]

From the selected authors, only Plaidy explicitly mentions that the marriage is consummated but not without difficulties. It requires Cardinal's intervention and his unconcealed mockery of the Dauphin during their honeymoon to make him perform marital duties. The whole business is very embarrassing and unpleasant for the newlyweds, and it destroys the paradise in which they lived.[60] Despite the fact that their friendship is marred by marital life, their fondness for each other endures and Mary never stops to feel protective towards her sickly husband.

Her protectiveness of Francis remerges after the tragic death of Henry II in a jousting when they become the King and Queen of France. She tries to coax him out of the mourning as soon as possible, in order to make him assume his King's duties. She is supportive of him when he is reluctant to deal with the Huguenots harshly, because she

[56] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 47, 71.
[57] Lasky, *Queen Without a Country*, 30.
[58] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 74-75, 78.
[59] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 51-52.
[60] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 95, 97.

wishes to be a perfect ruler on whose word the subjects can count upon.[61] An admirable sentiment but one which has no chance to withstand the reality. The Cardinal demonstrates clearly who are the real rulers of France as she commands him to send more troops to Scotland to help her mother in suppressing the rebellion of the Scottish lords: 'I take no orders from sick children... Queen Catharine and I rule France. Make no mistake.'[62] After this statement, it must be evident to Mary that she and her husband represent only puppets which the Guises use as they see fit, and how her position as the Queen of France is precarious due to Francis's deteriorating health and their childless marriage.

Whereas Mary tries unsuccessfully to enforce her regal authority, the same cannot be said about Francis in the novel by Yolen and Harris. He generally considers the affairs of state tedious because they divert him from entertainment. Therefore, he signs every document presented to him by Mary's uncles without thinking of the effects of his action.[63] Inevitably, this attitude leads to the strengthening of the Guises' position to the detriment of the official sovereigns.

Due to the Guises' anti-Protestant policy, the peace between the Catholics and the Huguenots is out of the question and neither Mary nor Francis can prevent the macabre executions of the Huguenots in Amboise. All fiction writers recounting this event mention Mary's and Francis's horror at witnessing the gruesome affair. In Yolen's and Harris's novel, the fool, Nicola, finds her mistress sobbing uncontrollably and Mary tells her: 'Oh, Nicola, what fools we all are. What grief we bring down upon our own heads by this cruelty... How will we ever pay for what has been done this day?'[64] These words show Mary's disapproval of the persecution based on different religious doctrine and her fear of an inevitable retaliation from the Huguenots.

Francis's health worsens and he slowly dies of an ear infection shortly after the event in Amboise. Mary likens her lingering uncles and Catherine de Medici to vultures who are just waiting impatiently for Francis's last breath. She has no illusions left when it comes to their actions and she is the only one who sincerely mourns Francis's death.[65]

---

[61] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 92, 101.
[62] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 63.
[63] Jane Yolen and Rober J. Harris, *Queen's Own Fool: A Novel of Mary Queen of Scots* (New York: Speak, 2003), 64-65.
[64] Yolen and Harris, *Queen's Own Fool*, 112.
[65] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 73.

Likewise, Yolen and Harris describe Mary's grief and add her deep conviction 'how great a ruler he might have been.'[66] It is hard to share Mary's belief as during his life, Francis did not evince any sign of political greatness. His kindness alone could not make of him a respected and a powerful ruler. More likely, he would have stayed in the shadow of more ambitious men who would have exploited him for their own benefit.

Overall, the fiction writers do not differ from the authors of historical biographies in their account of the relationship between Mary and Francis. Even though she cares for him sincerely, she is not in love with him and regards him only as a brother or a friend. It is obvious Francis feels the same way about her. Nevertheless, both of them are ready to do their duty, therefore they enter into matrimony and fulfil the expectations of others at the expense of a love match.

3.1.3 Film

Mary's arrival in France and her first meeting with Francis is portrayed only in the newest adaptation of Mary's life, *Mary Queen of Scots* (2013), starring Camille Rutherford, and directed by Thomas Imbach. Surprisingly, young Francis does not look like a sick child at all. He is just a little timed as he hides behind his father's cloak while Mary and her companions, the four Maries, introduce themselves. The moment Mary smiles radiantly and reaches out for him, she wins him over and the children run away hand in hand.[67]

The same feeling of friendship and affection can be seen a couple of years later in Charles Jarrott's adaptation *Mary Queen of Scots* (1971), starring Vanessa Redgrave. At the beginning of the film, Mary and Francis leave a chateau early in the morning to run in the gardens and sail in a boat on a river. Nothing seems to be amiss with Francis at first glance until he is suddenly seized with an acute pain in head and collapses at the bottom of the boat.[68] Whereas in this film version Francis's illness is not apparent from his appearance, Imbach's portrayal of the Dauphin after his wedding with Mary is more accurate because it presents Francis as an ailing youth. As the newlyweds sit on their marital bed, Francis's left ear is red and swollen, and there is a piece of cloth stuck in it. Not only does this scene draws the viewer's attention to the Dauphin's sickly

[66] Yolen and Harris, *Queen's Own Fool*, 117.
[67] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach (2013; London: Metrodome, 2014), DVD.
[68] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott (1971; London: Second Sight Films, 2010), DVD.

appearance, it also indicates that the marriage is not going to be consummated. Even though Mary seeks to divert his attention from a pistol, which he keeps under a pillow, to herself, her efforts are fruitless as the weapon fascinates him more than his wife.[69] Despite slight differences between the two films, their depiction of Mary's and the Dauphin's relationship is in accordance with the historical records. Thus, they do not give the viewer any reason to complain about the excessive distortion of facts concerning Mary's stay in France.

On the contrary, the same does not apply for the TV series *Reign*. Its representation of Francis and his relationship with Mary differ greatly from both films, the historical biographies and fiction as well. In this series, Francis is a dashing and an intelligent young man who does not suffer from any ailment and has several mistresses before his marriage with the Scottish Queen. Furthermore, his relationship with Mary is rather tense at the beginning as he does not regard Scotland as a powerful ally for France. Therefore, he refuses to marry her in the foreseeable future,[70] putting the needs of his country before any personal feelings for Mary.

When the two of them finally admit to themselves they have feelings for each other, Mary finds out about Nostradamus's prophecy which says she will be the cause of Francis's death. For this reason, she renounces Francis and announces to the King she will marry the Dauphin's elder half-brother, Sebastian (a non-existent character in history), if he legitimises him.[71] This twist of events is supposed to show Mary's true love for Francis as she is willing to sacrifice her own happiness for his well-being, but in fact the series creators introduce pointlessly a love triangle which has no chance to last for long. Eventually, Mary makes up her mind that she loves Francis more than Sebastian, and she marries her original fiancé.[72]

The influence of the Guises during Mary's and Francis's reign is indicated only in the film version by Jarrott. Neither of the uncles, however, have an ample opportunity to show the full scale of their cunning and manipulation of the royal couple as their role is rather a small one in this film. Their sole interaction with Mary during Francis's life

[69] *Mary Queen of Scots,* directed by Thomas Imbach.
[70] Laurie McCarthy and Stephanie Sengupta, *Reign: Season 1, Episode 1,* directed by Brad Silberling (17 October 2013; Nova Cinema, 19 January 2015), TV.
[71] Laurie McCarthy and Stephanie Sengupta, *Reign: Season 1, Episode 9,* directed by Helen Shaver (22 January 2014; Nova Cinema, 3 February 2015), TV.
[72] Laurie McCarthy and Stephanie Sengupta, *Reign: Season 1, Episode 13*, directed by Fred Gerber (5 March 2014; Nova Cinema, 9 February 2015), TV.

occurs when they take her aside while the doctors tend suffering Francis, and they urge her to consider life after the Dauphin's death. They point out their power will be over if Francis leaves no heir.[73] Whereas the Guises at least appear for a brief period in Jarrott's adaptation, their role in *Reign* is taken over by a charismatic but scheming lord Narcisse. He blackmails shamelessly the new King of France to achieve his goals and to prevent the civil war, which he believes the idealistic policy of Mary and Francis will bring about. His leverage for controlling Francis's decision lies in the fact that he has proofs that Francis killed intentionally Henry II in a jousting in order to protect the realm from the King who had gone mad. Francis's concessions to Narcisse cause a marital crisis because he lies to Mary about his motives and his reserved behaviour, letting her believe the miscarriage of their baby led him to the conviction that she will never give him an heir.[74] Once again, the TV series diverts significantly from the historical facts and this whole episode of Narciss's manipulation and its consequences serves only for one purpose, to bring discord between Mary and Francis whose love is so perfect it cannot be damaged by some trifling matter.

The manner of Francis's death is similar in both Imbach's and Jarrott's films. In Jarrott's adaptation, Francis is on the verge of insanity because the excruciating pain in his head. He leaves a chateau on horseback despite Mary's pleas, and tries to outrun the pain. He collapses during his ride and perishes in the woods.[75] Likewise in Imbach's film, the Dauphin decides to go riding as he feels better but only his horse returns to Mary who knows instantly that Francis is dead.[76] Even though the circumstances of his death are slightly altered from the historical biographies and fiction alike, his final illness has natural causes and not supernatural ones as in *Reign*. When Francis's half-brother, Sebastian, is mortally wounded, he is healed by a witch. But there is a price to be paid, a life for a life. As soon as Sebastian is alright, Francis collapses and blood trickles from his ear.[77] He is not fully recovered at the end of the second season, and it remains to be seen whether he will die from the pain in his ear or if the creators of the TV series will find a way to safe him.

[73] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[74] Laurie McCarthy and Stephanie Sengupta, *Reign: Season 2, Episode 5,* directed by Norma Bailey (29 October 2014; Nova Cinema, 1 September 2015), TV.
[75] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[76] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[77] Laurie McCarthy and Stephanie Sengupta, *Reign: Season 2, Episode 17,* directed by Sudz Sutherland (19 March 2015; Nova Cinema, 29 September 2015), TV.

There can be no doubt about Mary's and Francis's love in *Reign* but it is fabricated by the creators of the TV series in order to appeal to the widest possible audience. Imbach's and Jarrott's adaptations, on the other hand, are more truthful with regard to the historical facts and present their relationship as nothing more than a friendship.

3.2 Catherine de Medici: An Adoptive Mother?

Apart from the Dauphin and the Guises, another person affected Mary's stay at the French court. This was Catherine de Medici, an Italian noblewoman elevated to the French royalty and destined to exercise extensive political power in the years following her husband's death. However, she was mostly in the shadow of the King and was merely seen as a mother of the royal children during Mary's stay in France. Mary was an addition to the royal nursery, therefore it was expected that Catherine would be in a sense her adoptive mother. But their relationship proved to be complicated and was affected by the political situation in France as is going to be analysed in the following subsections.

3.2.1 Historical Biographies

The first meeting between Mary and Catherine took place at St-Germain. Catherine got a favourable impression of Mary as she described her as beautiful and vivacious and remarked: 'our little Scottish Queen has but to smile to turn all the French heads.'[78] There is no evidence of tension or an indication of enmity between them at such an early stage. On the contrary, Catherine seemed to welcome Mary warmly into the midst of her own children and even oversaw her education along with Diane de Poitiers and the Cardinal.[79] Fraser, as well as Guy, describes an ideal relationship between them after Mary's arrival in France, mentioning no royal children in Europe were so fussed over as the French ones and Mary received the same devotion when she joined them.[80]

Graham assumes Catherine's attitude to Mary began to change as soon as Mary became the Queen of France and thus sidelined Catherine from this position. Consequently, her friendliness turned into hostility.[81] Likewise, Guy sees in Catherine's

[78] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 46.
[79] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 72.
[80] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 46.
[81] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 109.

insistence to be called Queen Mother instead of Dowager Queen after the death of her husband an indication of her political ambition and her perception of Mary as a threat.[82] Fraser, however, does not share their opinion. She points out that the popular story about Mary's insolent remark that Catherine is the daughter of a merchant rests on the word of the Cardinal de Santa Croce alone, and she is confident Catherine treated her daughter-in-law kindly while Francis lived. She was well aware of her son's adoration of Mary, and would do nothing which would upset him as his well-being was uppermost in her mind. Besides exhibiting kindness towards Mary, she used to join her during interviews with ambassadors and it was due to Catherine's influence that Mary became an enthusiastic intriguer.[83]

Whereas the authors have different opinions on the relationship between the two women during Mary's reign in France, they do not doubt Catherine's feelings for Mary changed when Francis drew his last breath. Suddenly, Catherine saw an opportunity to seize power for herself in the name of her ten-year-old son, Charles, and did not perceive Mary as a part of her policy. Graham is certainly not far from the truth when he calls Catherine a pragmatist who, unlike romantic Mary, knew when to take a chance and exploit it to her own advantage.[84] Not only did Catherine exclude Mary from the French policy but was also fiercely in an opposition to the possibility of marriage between her and Charles. Apart from this, Catherine also frustrated the Guises' plan to wed Mary to Don Carlos, an heir to Spanish throne, because it would endanger the position of her daughter who was married to the Spanish King.[85] Undoubtedly, the change of her position and the realisation she is no longer welcome at the French court, led Mary to a decision to return to Scotland and reign there rather than quarrel with her former mother-in-law in France.

On the whole, Catherine represented a mother to Mary to some extent, especially during the first years of her stay in France. Things changed radically between them as soon as Catherine started to regard her as a threat to the well-being of her own children. Thus, the initial amity turned into hostility and Catherine wished to be rid of Mary who had no place in her plans.

---

[82] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 104.
[83] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 118-120.
[84] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 107.
[85] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 120.

3.2.2 Fiction

Unlike the historical biographies, the first encounter between Mary and Catherine is not idyllic in fiction. It is represented as an awkward event for the young Queen which anticipates an uneasy relationship between these women. The awkwardness of the situation lies in the fact that Mary mistakes her for a noblewoman of low rank when Catherine visits the royal nursery, and she reprimands her to behave properly and respectfully in the presence of the Queen of Scotland. Catherine replies to this insolence, letting her know she addresses the Queen of France, and leaves Mary speechless and embarrassed.[86] The reason why this misunderstanding takes place is that Catherine does not look regal in Mary's eyes as she is 'a squat little woman'[87] and lacks the grace and beauty of Henry II's mistress, Diane of Poitiers.

Even a few years after this unfortunate event, there is no warm feeling between Mary and Catherine in Lasky's novel. Mary clearly prefers the presence of Diane to being in the vicinity of the Queen of France and justifies her attitude towards Catherine with the following words: 'there simply is not room for two queens in one country, let alone in one palace.'[88] This observation coming from an eleven-year-old Mary indicates her excessive sense of self-importance. She considers herself to be an equal to the Queen of France and disregards the fact of being only an honourable guest at the French court and a child who has so much to learn before she is fit to rule.

Other reasons for Mary's dislike of Catherine, mentioned in the previous novel, seem to be childish and petty. For instance, Mary is annoyed with a ballet practice ordered by the Queen and her protectiveness towards Francis.[89] Given Francis's frail health, Catherine's concern for the well-being of her firstborn should not surprise Mary, let alone give her a pretext to hold a grudge against Catherine. In truth, there is only one incident between the two Queens, taking place at the end of the novel, which could justify Mary's aversion. She finds out Catherine has been spying on her, using a servant to steal Mary's correspondence from her writing compartment. Infuriated, she challenges Catherine who is so agitated with the accusation that she faints and suffers miscarriage in the following days. This culmination of events frightens Mary to such an

[86] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 44.
[87] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 48.
[88] Lasky, *Queen Without a Country*, 35.
[89] Lasky, *Queen Without a Country*, 48, 99.

extent that it leads her gradually to the realisation how selfishly she behaved towards Catherine. Therefore, she decides to reconcile with her and asks her to stand by her side during her First Communion.[90]

Even though Catherine does not show any apparent hostility towards Mary in Lasky's novel, the same does not apply for other writers. Plaidy represents Catherine as a malicious woman who wishes eagerly that Mary will bring discredit on herself. When she meets Mary in the company of a courtier Montmorency without a chaperon, she hints that they should retire to Mary's bedchamber where nobody will disturb them,[91] knowing too well Mary's prospects of marrying the Dauphin would be frustrated if something inappropriate happened between the two of them. The Queen of France does not favour the marriage of her son and Mary also in Byrd's novel. As the young Queen worries about Francis's distance after their marriage is announced officially, Catherine tells her he has probably a mistress and she should become accustomed to this situation.[92] Thus, she does not show any sympathy to Mary in spite of experiencing humiliation from Diane's long-term relationship with her husband. Instead, she is gleeful and savours Mary's discomfort and hurt feelings.

As soon as Francis and Mary become sovereigns of France, Catherine obediently gives precedence to the new Queen and does not interfere with their politics which is actually pursued by the Guises in George's novel. However, she gives Mary a sensible advice and shows a better comprehension of politics than the idealistic Mary, when she points out: 'you must not be so dainty and honourable, if you hope to reign well.'[93] While George's Catherine stays in the shadows during Francis's life and there is no visible tension between her and Mary, Plaidy depicts how Catherine mocks the barrenness of the royal couple and hints Francis is too weak to beget a child. Mary sees through the right meaning of this mockery, because she has grown wiser since the wedding, and she knows Catherine fears her prospective pregnancy as her child would prevent Catherine from becoming a regent for her other son, Charles, in case of Francis's demise without an heir.[94]

[90] Lasky, *Queen Without a Country*, 161, 173-174.
[91] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 74-75.
[92] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 39.
[93] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 101.
[94] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 119-120.

The conflict between the two women does not cease but culminates during Mary's reign in Byrd's novel as well. Catherine's hostility towards Mary reaches its peak when Mary reminds her that she has no royal blood running through her veins and calls her a peasant.[95] This is the last straw for Catherine and a possibility of reconciliation between them is out of the question. The reckoning comes after Francis's death. Catherine informs Mary she has only six months to decide whether she will marry again or return to Scotland. As Mary is well aware of the turmoil in Scotland, she is reluctant to go there, therefore she diminishes herself by begging Catherine for leave to stay in France as a mere dowager away from the court. Catherine declines this request without hesitation.[96] Although the relationship between Mary and Catherine is tense in Yolen's and Harris's novel as well, there is no ultimatum coming from Catherine when Mary becomes a widow. Nevertheless, she makes it clear there is no place for Mary in the forming government. Mary is thus forced to reflect on her future which leads her to a decision to return to Scotland and rule there alone, naively assuming that to reign over such a small country cannot be hard.[97]

All things considered, Catherine is hardly an adoptive mother to Mary in fiction. There is no warm feeling between them and, with the exception of George's novel, their rivalry is undisguised even during Francis's life. After his demise, Mary is practically driven away from the French court by Catherine's enmity and leaves for Scotland.

3.2.3 Film

Despite being an integral part of Mary's life in France, Catherine de Medici is seldom portrayed in the films which focus on Mary. Catherine does not appear in Imbach's film at all, and she has only a small part in Jarrott's adaptation although the director manages to depict her dislike for Mary after Francis's death. Catherine holds Mary responsible for the death of her son, expresses her objections to their marriage and announces her intention to rule as a regent during Charles's minority. If the Guises object against her reign, she will banish Mary from the court as well as from France.[98] Given the brief sequence in which she appears, there is no thorough portrayal of her character and Catherine's motives for disliking Mary are never presented to the viewer.

[95] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 59.
[96] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 76, 79.
[97] Yolen and Harris, *Queen's Own Fool*, 120, 128.
[98] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.

Thus, Mary is made into a helpless victim of a vindictive mother-in-law who finally grasps an opportunity to settle accounts with Mary for whatever wrongs she might have done her.

The TV series *Reign*, on the other hand, provides ample opportunities for Catherine to show her attitude and feelings for the Scottish Queen but it takes liberties with history as it does in the case of Mary's relationship with Francis. Catherine is depicted as a strong, intelligent woman who loves her children and would go to any lengths to secure their well-being. When she learns about Nostradamus's prophecy concerning Francis's death, she is determined to prevent his marriage with Mary at all costs. Shortly after Nostradamus has his vision, Catherine makes a young Scottish boy to force himself on Mary but his attempt fails. If he had succeeded, Mary would have been dishonoured, unable to marry Francis and the prophecy would not have been fulfilled.[99]

Since Catherine's plotting against Mary is caused solely by the prophecy, she has no objections to the marriage and supports it with all her heart as soon as Nostradamus has another vision more favourable to Mary. Nevertheless, the relationship between her and Mary remains tense. Mary turns from a defenceless girl into a more ruthless woman, and takes Catherine's lesson that weakness has no place at the French court to heart in the course of the TV series. She orders a mercenary to kidnap Catherine because she needs to know where Catherine keeps her money which she intends to send to her mother in Scotland who is under an attack. As Catherine swears to get revenge on a person responsible for her kidnapping, Mary finds a scapegoat, Catherine's unscrupulous cousin Hortenza, and the mercenary delivers her head to Catherine, diverting the suspicion from Mary.[100]

Besides these moments of rivalry, Catherine can also be protective and supportive of her daughter-in-law if need be. When Mary is raped during an attack on the castle, it is Catherine who finds out what happened. She soothes Mary and encourages her to find the strength to face the court in order to stop any rumours spread by her guards who saw her wandering through corridors. Thanks to her, Mary manages to look composed

[99] Laurie McCarthy and Stephanie Sengupta, *Reign: Season 1, Episode 2*, directed by Matthew Hastings (24 October 2013; Nova Cinema, 21 January 2015), TV.
[100] Laurie McCarthy and Stephanie Sengupta, *Reign: Season 1, Episode 20*, directed by Sudz Sutherland (30 April 2014; Nova Cinema, 19 February 2015), TV.

before the nobles as she announces that the attackers did not harm her and swears they will be punished for their attempt to kill the King of France.[101] This event demonstrates Catherine still harbours kind feelings towards Mary as she decides to protect her status of an untouchable Queen without hesitation.

Even though the creators of *Reign* twist historical facts as it suits them, their portrayal of Catherine as a woman putting her children first corresponds with her depiction in the historical biographies and fiction. Unlike Jarrott's adaptation, it provides the viewer with Catherine's motives for her hostility towards Mary which spring from Nostradamus's prophecy. On top of that, their relationship evolves during the TV series and Catherine exhibits maternal feelings for Mary now and then.

[101] Laurie McCarthy and Stephanie Sengupta, *Reign: Season 2, Episode 9,* directed by Fred Gerber (3 December 2014; Nova Cinema, 9 September 2015), TV.

4. Personal Rule in Scotland

As the shoreline of France faded away in distance, Mary left forever a country which felt more like home to her than her own native land. She had only dim memories of Scotland and could not have been sure how her subjects would welcome their long-absent Queen. An unusually thick fog shrouded everything when she landed in Leith. It seemed as though the Nature itself gave an ominous sign of what awaited her in Scotland,[102] and true enough there were many challenges lying in store for Mary who had scarce political experience so far.

4.1 A Catholic Queen in a Protestant Country

First of all, Mary had to deal with the religious situation in Scotland which had changed while she had dwelt in France. Protestantism had taken root there and owing to Elizabeth I's military help, the Lords of the Congregation had managed to oppose Mary's mother regency and strengthened the Reformed faith. After the death of Mary of Guise in 1560, the Reformation Parliament had declared a Protestant confession of faith, banning the mass and rejecting the supremacy of Pope.[103] It was to this Protestant country into which Mary who was a Catholic returned to rule. Her subjects awaited whether she would seek to impose Catholicism back in Scotland, following the infamous example of Mary Tudor, or keep the religious *status quo*.

4.1.1 Historical Biographies

Preceding her return to Scotland, there was an agreement between Mary and her half-brother, James, about her acceptance of Protestantism as an official religion in exchange for no interference with her pursuing Catholic rites in private. Guy points to Mary's wisdom in this decision because she realised she would need James's support (he was the leading member of the Scottish nobles) in order to build a functional government. For this reason, she pardoned the rebels who took up arms against her mother as well.[104] This representation of Mary as a woman who thought carefully about the best possible action that could be undertaken is in stark contrast to Graham's portrayal of her. He regards the above mentioned concession to Protestantism as 'the

[102] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 157.
[103] Mason, 'Renesance a reformace: 16. století,' 101-104.
[104] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 127-129.

path of least resistance'[105] and not as an indication of her awakening political abilities. Furthermore, he is convinced Mary was being manipulated by her nobles from the very first day since she set foot on the Scottish soil. This manipulation sprang from a seemingly coincidental encounter with a mob who demanded pardon for a man sentenced to death for taking part in a Feast of Misrule, a feast disliked by Protestants. When Mary consented to their pleas, she was hailed as a merciful Queen and bonfires awaited her in Edinburgh.[106]

In contrast to Graham's view of Mary as a puppet controlled by the Scottish nobles, Fraser shares Guy's conviction that, at the beginning of her actual rule, Mary evinced political wisdom in her toleration of Protestantism. Moreover, Fraser deems Mary's first interview with John Knox to be a sign of her determination and political potential. Knox who was a leading Protestant reformer in Scotland was discontented with Mary's adherence to Catholicism and the rule of women in general. Therefore, she decided to give him an audience and an opportunity to present his arguments. Despite the fact that he drove her to angry tears when he defended the right of subjects to raise against an unworthy sovereign, Knox regarded their confrontation as a clash of equals and did not perceive Mary as a puppet,[107] a notion Fraser is ready to embrace. Graham, on the other hand, sees the interview as Mary's political debacle because she was incompetent to defeat Knox in his arguments and adopted an attitude of a child whenever she found herself at a loss for words.[108] Taking into consideration that Fraser's interpretation is based on Knox's account of his interview with Mary and his reluctant admission that Mary possesses a political craft, her conclusion seems more plausible than Graham's. Thus, she presents Mary as a woman who was ready to cope with the challenges of reign in Scotland and was not daunted by them.

Mary had other political goal besides the religious tolerance. She sent one of her best politicians, William Maitland, to England to arrange a personal meeting between the two Queens. Mary believed she would win Elizabeth over and persuade her to acknowledge her as an heir to the English throne. Despite the objections of Elizabeth's chief minister, William Cecil, the English Queen finally agreed with the proposed meeting. The plans, however, were thwarted because of the outbreak of war between the

[105] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 115.
[106] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 124-125.
[107] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 177-178.
[108] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 137.

Catholics and the Huguenots in France, and Elizabeth's decision to send troops there to help the Huguenots.[109] Whereas Guy is inclined to regard Elizabeth's agreement with the meeting as sincere, Graham is convinced the English Queen never intended to meet personally with her cousin. He deems the whole enterprise as another sign of Mary's political naivety and he is certain Mary would have achieved nothing even if the meeting had taken place.[110]

Unlike Elizabeth, Mary steered clear of direct involvement in the conflict in France. Instead, she set off to the north-east of Scotland to settle accounts with the Earl of Huntly, the most powerful Catholics of the realm, who became a liability for her politics of tolerance. Fraser dismisses the notion that James, who desired the earldom of Moray in which Huntly was interested as well, played the vital part in persuading his sister to punish the mighty northern lord. According to her, Mary did not make up her mind how she would deal with Huntly beforehand. It was not until he and his son openly rebelled against her that she decided to treat them as traitors. Mary had no doubts about the justifiability of her actions even though the defeat of Huntly and forfeiture of his lands meant the elimination of the powerful Catholic lord.[111] While Fraser does not refute Mary's political involvement in Huntly's case, Graham is confident that she mainly enjoyed the expedition because no political activity was required of her and her romantic self was thrilled with the adventure.[112] His statement seems exaggerated as Mary could hardly have avoided making political decisions during the entire journey, and it merely serves to prove his point about Mary's political incompetence.

Mary's actions following the fall of Huntly further call Graham's representation of her as a naive young Queen into question. She became aware of the growing ambition of James, therefore she decided to make Maitland her chief councillor and sent him to London to advocate her right to succession. He had other mission as well. Mary made up her mind to marry again so Maitland was to approach the Spanish ambassador in London and propose marriage to Don Carlos.[113] These steps clearly attest Mary

[109] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 160-163.
[110] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 156-158.
[111] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 223, 232-233
[112] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 161.
[113] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 172-173.

possessed a political mind as this candidate for a husband would enhance her position with respect to other European monarchs and forge a powerful alliance.

Her choice of a husband was not unopposed. Protestants in Scotland preferred marriage with a Protestant and the English Queen insisted on a union which would not endanger her position. Hence, Elizabeth was against the possibility of marriage with Don Carlos and decided to impose upon Mary one of her own English subjects, Robert Dudley. Mary regarded this offer as an insult because Dudley was perceived to be Elizabeth's secret lover. Despite this fact, Mary was willing to accept the offer on one condition. Elizabeth would definitely acknowledge her as a successor to the English throne, a condition the English Queen was not ready to meet. Besides Dudley, there was another English candidate for Mary's hand, Henry, Lord Darnley,[114] son of the Earl of Lennox, the former suitor of Mary's mother.

All in all, with the exception of Graham, Mary is represented as a woman taking active part in politics of Scotland. With regard to her foreign policy, she tried to convince Elizabeth I to name her an heir to the English throne and to arrange a personal meeting between them but failed. Despite these failures, she commenced her reign successfully and wisely kept religious *status quo*, thus preventing an outbreak of civil war in her realm.

4.1.2 Fiction

Similarly to the historical biographies, the attention is given to Mary's attitude to Protestantism and her involvement in the Scottish policy at the beginning of her reign. Some fiction writers do not focus solely on Mary but provide the insight into the minds of the Scottish nobles as well. Therefore, the contrast between the expectations of the nobles, who wish to rule while Mary enjoys herself,[115] and Mary's own ideas is clearly visible. The first demonstration of a clash of wills is the meeting between James and Mary in France which does not go according to his plans in George's novel. Instead of an easily manipulated woman, he finds one who has a determination matching his own. Mary rebukes him for the rebellion against her mother and for the passing of laws without her consent. When he suggests she becomes a Protestant, Mary cuts him short and tells him she will never change her faith for political purposes. Nevertheless, she is

[114] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 175, 185, 200-201.
[115] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 116.

ready to tolerate Protestantism if her subjects respect her religion. She writes down a proclamation confirming religious tolerance without the foreknowledge of James and other nobles soon after her arrival in Scotland,[116] showing her resolution not to depend entirely on the lords, and her readiness to act independently whenever she wishes.

On the other hand, Mary is not so confident in dealing with the nobles in Tannahill's *Fatal Majesty*. She is aware of her own political inexperience and for this reason, she accepts the guiding of James and Maitland until she knows her way about the Scottish policy. She does not conceal from them she would prefer the restoration of Catholicism, but she is willing to issue a proclamation of religious tolerance for the time being.[117] Even though these two novels slightly differ in their representation of Mary, they still portray her as a woman who is not indifferent to the affairs of Scotland and who does not indulge herself solely in festivities.

Whereas the above mentioned novels portray Mary as a sensible ruler who does not despise her Protestants subjects openly, Erickson presents a woman totally lacking any tact in *The Memoirs of Mary Queen of Scots*. When the citizens of Edinburgh gather below her window and sing psalms, she screams at them that she is a Catholic Queen and orders them to leave immediately. [118] Besides this imprudent incident which could hardly win her favour with the Protestants, she is convinced of her own infallibility and completely ignores any advice coming from her councillors.[119] A conviction based on an excessive sense of self-importance and not on her actual abilities.

Apart from the toleration, another episode presenting Mary's attitude to Protestantism is her personal confrontation with John Knox. Even though she is left speechless several times during the interview in Byrd's novel, the speechlessness is not caused by fear but rather by his ideas which are alien to her own beliefs. She is angry when he compares her to Nero as she has done nothing to justify this appellation. The last straw is when he bluntly offends the Catholic Church, an offence at which she loses her temper. Nevertheless, she is careful not to dismiss him as a fanatic. She feels there is something more behind his conviction and his appeal to his followers. Therefore, she is

[116] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 124-125, 146.
[117] Reay Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty: The Drama of Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Orion Books, 1998), 58.
[118] Carolly Erickson, *Paměti Marie Stuartovny*, trans. by Marta Bárová (Ostrava: Domino, 2010), 69.
[119] Erickson, *Paměti Marie Stuartovny*, 70.

reluctant to imprison him, knowing it would be unwise to make a martyr of him.[120] Byrd's recount of the interview presents two strong personalities, neither of whom are willing to acknowledge the rightness of the religious conviction of the other. The only difference between them is that Mary tolerates the Protestantism while Knox prefers the total elimination of the Scottish Catholics to any middle ground.

In contrast to Byrd's novel, Yolen and Harris describe the interview from the point of view of Mary's fool, Nicola, who listens to it in secret. When she catches sight of Knox, she compares him to a crow in whose presence the Queen seems vulnerable. Nicola does not hear every word of the exchange but notices Mary's tears as she leaves the audience chamber. Despite this state of agitation, Nicola is certain Mary proved Knox's equal in the debate and was not frightened by him.[121] However, it is rather a wishful thinking than a reality because Mary resembles a fragile girl who needs protection against the unscrupulous nobles when she arrives in Scotland.[122] Hence, it is doubtful she could handle Knox on her own.

The authors also differ in the description of Mary's attitude to Elizabeth in the first years of her reign. According to George, it is Mary's initiative, not Maitland's, that commences the diplomatic relations between the two Queens. Mary wishes for putting aside all differences between them and is genuinely sincere in her amity towards Elizabeth.[123] Mary, on the other hand, is not so well disposed to the English Queen in Byrd's novel. She does not trust Elizabeth and regards her behaviour as insincere although she seeks the personal meeting. Nevertheless, she presents herself as Elizabeth's sister in their correspondence,[124] showing diplomatic qualities as well as prudence.

When the meeting is cancelled, James suggests they could travel north and confront Lord Huntly who hides his son from justice in Tannahill's novel. According to James, it would tarnish Mary's reputation if a Catholic went unpunished. Mary is eager to seize upon the idea because she does not like Huntly's reproaches for being so tolerant to Protestantism. However, she remarks mockingly they could also give the

[120] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 129-131.
[121] Yolen and Harris, *Queen's Own Fool*, 152-153.
[122] Yolen and Harris, *Queen's Own Fool*, 141.
[123] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 147.
[124] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 150-151.

earldom of Moray to James,[125] letting him know, she is aware of his true motives for wishing for Huntly's punishment. Despite this knowledge, she proceeds with the journey north but it is James who is the actual commander of the royal army while Mary admires the breathtaking nature. He even makes his sister witness the gruesome execution of Huntly's son after the rebellion is crushed.[126] Thus, her inability to excuse herself both from the journey north and the execution shows her excessive reliance on James. An imprudent behaviour because she endows him with too much power to the detriment of her royal authority.

On the contrary, Mary is the exact opposite when it comes to James during the northern journey in *Immortal Queen*. Without his knowledge, she mingles with the common soldiers, trying to win their love and loyalty. She eventually succeeds and cannot help but think about James's reaction: 'He suspects, but he will not know for sure unless his arrogance pushes him to outright defiance of me, and then it will be too late. Without the loyalty of the army he is helpless, just as I was.'[127] It is obvious Mary nurses doubts about James's intentions, does not trust him, and wisely takes precautions in case of his rebellion.

As was mentioned in the paragraph preceding the northern journey, Byrd and George differ on the account of Mary's and Elizabeth's relationship. The difference remains even when it comes to Mary's marriage plans and Elizabeth's interference with them. Mary is willing to submit to her royal cousin in the question of her own marriage, hoping to be named a successor to the English throne in George's novel. However, she naively believes the English Queen would consent to her union with Darnley whom she begins to contemplate as a possible suitor even before his arrival in Scotland.[128] Likewise in *Immortal Queen*, Mary thinks about the union with Darnley in case the negotiations with Spain fail. She believes Darnley would help her strengthen Catholicism in Scotland and weaken Knox's influence at the same time. She finds Elizabeth's interference annoying but pretends to contemplate her suggestion of Robert Dudley until she receives final word from Spain. When the plans for Spanish marriage fail, she decides to summon Darnley to Scotland despite objections from James and

[125] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 143.
[126] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 150-151, 154.
[127] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 161.
[128] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 209.

Maitland.[129] The above lines clearly show that Mary is not content to be a mere supplicant of Elizabeth and does not like being controlled by her in Byrd's novel. On the other hand, George's Mary is too trusting when it comes to her cousin and believes submission to Elizabeth's wishes will bring her closer to the English throne. To achieve this goal, she positions herself into a subordinate role even though they are both Queens of independent realms.

While the selected authors agree on the religious tolerance pursued by Mary, they differ in their view on her involvement in policy, a disagreement which is also apparent in the historical biographies. Both Byrd and George depict the Scottish Queen as a resolute young woman who keeps the nobles under control and not vice versa, but they are in stark contrast with respect to Mary's attitude towards Elizabeth. The independent policy is also adopted by Mary in Erickson's novel, however she acts more like a spoilt child and not a prudent monarch. Unlike them, Yolen and Harris, and Tannahill portray Mary who is dependent on the Scottish nobles, mainly James, following their advices unconditionally, sometimes to her own detriment.

4.1.3 Film

The film adaptation which best depicts Mary's unenviable position in Protestant Scotland is *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*, starring Clémence Poésy. Shortly after her arrival, she attends a mass along with other Catholic nobles. James warns her against it but she enters the chapel nonetheless. During the mass, an angry mob led by John Knox throws open the door. Knox confronts Mary and tells her there is no place for a mass in a Protestant country. Although she replies she does not intend to impose Catholicism on her subjects, he is not placated. He keeps on talking loudly and angrily so everyone can hear him. Nothing Mary says can silence him. When he tells her he puts an obedience to God before an obedience to her, she leaves the chapel without another word.[130] In spite of her sudden departure, Mary does not show any sign of weakness during their conversation. She does not seem to be intimidated by Knox's presence. On the contrary, she gets angrier with his obstinacy when he is deaf to reason. She barely keeps her temper under control and only her expression indicates how hard it is for her not to slap him.

[129] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 176, 179-180.
[130] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon (2004; London: Contender, 2004), DVD.

Whereas there is no doubt about the tension between Mary and Knox in the latter film, this feeling is completely missing in Imbach's adaptation. This may be partly caused by the fact that their meeting takes place in private and not in a presence of an angry mob. But most importantly, both actors playing Mary and Knox are unconvincing in their roles. He fails to express a religious zeal although he offends Catholicism and promotes his doctrine. At the same time, Mary's shock at his ideas is shown by her stony expression but the effect is ruined when she smiles and reaches out for his hands, proposing a harmony between their beliefs.[131] Despite its defects, the meeting is more historically accurate than in Jarrott's adaptation. He does not set the meeting either to an audience chamber or a chapel. Instead, Knox appears out-of-nowhere while Mary rides to her palace after the landing in Scotland. He expresses an ardent wish that Mary was dead as it would be better for her country. She is stunned but retorts everyone can choose his religion according his conscience, letting him know she promotes tolerance.[132] In comparison with the films mentioned above, Knox gives the impression of a real religious fanatic who actually commits treason as he bluntly suggest the sovereign's death. However, Mary does not exploit the opportunity to be rid of him. Instead, she decides to forget about this comment and is merciful.

With regard to Mary's involvement in the Scottish policy, none of the three films portray her as a powerful ruler. It is James who holds the reins of power in all of them. He even announces to Mary that he will rule and she does not need to bother herself with the affairs of state in Jarrott's adaptation. She listens to him in silence but as soon as he is gone, she gives vent to her true feelings. In spite of her indignation, she does not see a way how to reverse the course of things. Therefore, she eagerly embraces the suggestion of a new marriage, believing a husband will help her to remove James from power.[133] While James's influence is evident in Imbach's adaptation as well, Mary does not accept this situation meekly. When he seeks to patronise her, she lets him know she is not ignorant of the situation in Scotland and expresses a wish to make things better.[134] Unfortunately, this reassertion of authority is the only episode presenting Mary's determination to be an actual ruler of Scotland as Imbach pays little attention to her

[131] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[132] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[133] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[134] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.

involvement in the matters of state. He mentions her personal meeting with Elizabeth only in passing[135] and entirely omits Huntly's rebellion.

MacKinnon, on the other hand, includes the punishment of the most powerful Catholic family in his film although he handles the historical facts loosely. There is no northern expedition but James's vital part in John Huntly's downfall cannot be denied. He tricks John into believing that Mary will approve of any action against Protestants so John kills one of the nobles. Mary has no choice but to agree with the execution despite the pleas for mercy from Lady Huntly, John's mother. His final words are addressed to Mary and he warns her against trusting James. Mary refuses to believe him but there is a suspicion in her eyes as she looks at her half-brother afterwards.[136] This event leads her to a realisation she is shamelessly manipulated by her nobles. Instead of challenging them on her own, she makes up her mind to find a husband and announces in front of her Privy Council she needs a strong and trustworthy man,[137] letting it unspoken that she lost faith in James and his followers.

Elizabeth's interference with Mary's marriage plans is presented in its full extent in Jarrott's adaptation. She warns foreign ambassadors that any alliance with Mary will be perceived as an act of war against England. Although she offers her Dudley along with the promise of succession, she is not sincere and secretly wishes for Mary's union with Darnley. Being aware of the chaos it will bring to Scotland, she despatches both men to Mary's court and awaits the outcome. According to her expectations, Mary is enchanted by Darnley when he arrives to her palace and refuses Dudley whose offer of marriage insults her.[138] Elizabeth's machinations clearly show who is shrewder politician of the two Queens in this film. While the English Queen gives thorough consideration to her plan and risks willingly the possibility of Mary accepting Dudley, Mary in her impulsiveness throws away a perfect chance to be confirmed as Elizabeth's successor and lets her feelings cloud her judgement.

All things considered, the film makers do not point out Mary's political abilities in their adaptations. This is given by the fact that most of the political affairs of Scotland, in her first years of reign, are omitted or the attention is centred on James who is the

---

[135] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[136] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.
[137] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.
[138] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.

ruler of the realm in all but name. Hence, Mary is portrayed as a young woman manipulated by her nobles and unable to reassert her authority over them. With respect to the religious situation, the division of Scots on Catholics and Protestants is represented mainly by the character of John Knox and several references on the necessity of toleration. Otherwise, the selected films fail to capture convincingly the tension between the two faiths. The exception among them is MacKinnon's adaptation which presents the anger of a mob at the Catholic rites as well as the rivalry between Catholic and Protestants nobles.

4.2 Marriage with Darnley

As was mentioned in the previous subsections, Mary commenced her search for a second husband and Henry, Lord Darnley, was considered as a possible candidate. His chances were not small although he was not a Prince and could not bring her an alliance of a powerful country. Not only was he a young, handsome man but he was also descended from Henry VII of England. Thus, their union could strengthen Mary's claim to the English throne,[139] the fact she was unlikely to overlook. Little did she know what sorrow he would bring to her when he set out for Scotland, and that he would change the course of her reign for the worse.

4.2.1 Historical Biographies

Darnley made an impression on Mary when they first met, and the nobles began to wonder whether he would really become her second husband and their King. According to Guy, Mary was not infatuated with him from the start. She still behaved rationally and awaited Elizabeth's intentions. It was Elizabeth's reply in which she refused to grant her the succession even if she married Dudley that led Mary to the decision to consider Darnley as the only suitor. Especially when she fell in love with him. She began to pursue her own policy irrespective of Elizabeth who fiercely opposed Mary's marriage with Darnley as well as of the growing division among the Scottish nobility, and she married him in June 1565.[140]

While Guy cannot conceal his admiration for Mary's defiance against her opposition, especially Cecil and Elizabeth, Graham is harsher in his judgement of her

[139] Mason, 'Renesance a reformace: 16. století,' 105.
[140] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 205-207.

behaviour. He does not see a sovereign who finally ceased to be a supplicant of the English Queen. Instead, he describes Mary as a spoilt girl who experienced her first love and pressed for the marriage out of spite, ignoring the consequences.[141] Even though Fraser also expresses an opinion that Mary behaved irrationally and rashly, she is more sympathetic to her than Graham and seeks to provide an insight into her mind. She is convinced Mary's infatuation with Darnley was mainly caused by her unsatisfying first marriage and the following years of celibacy. That is why all reason and caution left her and she set firmly on the marriage, being oblivious to Darnley's defects of character which manifested themselves even before the wedding.[142]

The opposition against the union resulted into a rebellion led by James. He justified it as a defence of Protestantism in Scotland, but Mary acted quickly and issued a confirmation of toleration, ensuring the loyalty of most of her subjects. At the end, the rebellion was crushed without any actual fighting taking place as James and his followers fled to England.[143] Guy regards this event as the moment when Mary's popularity and power reached its peak. Accordingly, he overflows with praise for her courage and wisdom,[144] something Graham is not willing to endow her with. He claims Mary's idea of her popularity among Scots was illusory as well as her seeming triumph over the nobility.[145] Given the course of events following the unsuccessful rebellion, the latter opinion cannot be dismissed as Graham's prejudice against Mary and Guy's praise cannot be taken literally.

Despite their different opinions with respect to Mary's actual power, both authors, along with Fraser, agree on the marital discord between Mary and Darnley.[146] Guy provides a thorough analysis of its causes. He recounts Darnley's growing ambition and his sense of self-importance which began to endanger religious *status quo* as he presented himself as a great Catholic King. Although his campaign led Mary to a statement that the mass would be allowed once more, she sought the papal recognition of her dynastic claim to the English throne, a wish intensified by her pregnancy, and did not intend to overthrow Protestantism.[147] Besides this difference in their policy,

[141] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 190.
[142] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 258-259, 262.
[143] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 268-269.
[144] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 232.
[145] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 200.
[146] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 201.
[147] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 237-240, 243-244.

Darnley's drunkenness was becoming unbearable and the royal couple quarrelled more frequently. As Mary made up her mind to deny him the Crown Matrimonial, Darnley commenced to plot against her and allied with discontented nobles who resented Mary's plan to forfeit the lands of the rebels during the next session of Parliament.[148] This plotting was about to result into the brutal murder of Mary's secretary, David Rizzio, and put Mary and her unborn child into grave danger.

As was mentioned in the previous paragraphs, the authors do not always perceive Mary's actions in the same light. While Guy gets carried away when he mentions Mary's defiance against Elizabeth and her suppression of the rebellion, Graham does not conceal his contempt for her irrational behaviour. It is left to Fraser to occupy the middle ground. Unlike Guy, she does not praise Mary's conduct in pushing through the marriage, but neither does she judge her harshly like Graham. Notwithstanding their differences, none of them doubt that Mary found out soon enough what a grievous mistake the marriage with Darnley was.

4.2.2 Fiction

Like the writers of historical biographies, the fiction writers describe the impact of the first meeting with Darnley on Mary. His allure has an instant effect on her in Yolen's and Harris's novel. He behaves like prince Charming in her presence but the others are not so easily fooled. Nicola worries about the Queen and seeks to dissuade her from marrying him, saying: 'it is *my* duty to play the fool ... not yours.'[149] Unfortunately, Mary is so smitten with love for him she pays no heed to Nicola's words and takes them as a jest. Similarly, Erickson depicts Mary's infatuation with Darnley after their first meeting. Unlike the previous novel, Mary notices his tendency to violence before the wedding, but naively dismisses it as a normal nobleman's behaviour. Even though she hears out Bothwell's account of Darnley's faults and acknowledges he may be right about his unsuitability, she is not strong enough to send him away, admitting her rationality gives way to desire.[150]

Love at first sight is also described in the novels by George and Plaidy. Mary, however, is even more careless and rash, showing how far she is willing to go in pursuit

[148] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 283-284.
[149] Yolen and Harris, *Queen's Own Fool*, 192.
[150] Erickson, *Paměti Marie Stuartovny*, 87-88, 94-97.

of her physical needs. Instead of taking enough time to think about the consequences, she betroths Darnley in secret and sleeps with him so no one could separate them.[151] The same occurs in Plaidy's novel but with one small alternation, there is no secret betrothal. Mary and Darnley become lovers months before the wedding. For this reason, the growing discontent among her nobility does not bother her and she does not press for the marriage, being content with the current situation for the time being.[152]

Unlike the above mentioned novels, Tannahill portrays Mary who does not fall for Darnley immediately. She behaves courteously to him but waits patiently for the final word from Spain. When all hopes for Spanish marriage are gone, she sends Maitland to Elizabeth to announce her intention to marry Darnley. She is not consummated by love and regards the union solely as a marriage of convenience at this point. However, all caution and reason leave her as soon as Darnley falls ill. He reminds her of Francis and when he kisses her, she is irrevocably in love with him.[153] Likewise, Byrd depicts Mary who is mindful of her station at first. She forbids herself to dream although she begins to like him. She is determined to comply with Elizabeth's wishes and decides to send him back to England. Despite her resolution, one kiss from Darnley suffices to change her mind.[154] Thus, these depictions of Mary present her as a young woman overcome by physical desires at the expense of rational conduct. One handsome though calculating man has not much difficulty in infatuating her, a result which is to be expected with respect to Mary's youth and innocence.

As quickly as she falls in love with him, she is disillusioned with her new husband. The most rapid change from adoration to hatred occurs in Erickson's novel. Darnley lets Mary know he is not interested in her body and walks away from her chamber without fulfilling his marital duties. Mary feels betrayed and as a retaliation denies him the Crown Matrimonial. Besides, she mocks him for not being a man during the repression of James's rebellion in front of the whole royal army. His response is aggressive. One night, he forces himself on her while two of his men hold her down. As a result of this violent act, Mary gets pregnant.[155] Even though it is not mentioned explicitly, it is obvious Darnley is a homosexual and he wooed Mary only for one

[151] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 258-260.
[152] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 272-273.
[153] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 236-241.
[154] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 183-185.
[155] Erickson, *Paměti Marie Stuartovny*, 104-109.

purpose, to become the King of Scots. Like Erickson, Byrd alludes to Darnley's actual sexual orientation. He is unable to consummate the marriage without the stimulation of several glasses of wine on their wedding night. Most importantly, Mary finds him abed with a man one day. This is the last straw for her. She loses faith in his incessant promises of correction and denies him an access to her bedchamber.[156]

The best representation of the development of Darnley's debauchery provides George. She includes passages focusing on him and thus enables the reader to better understand this character. Even before the wedding, he has a tendency to drink too much but he restricts it to his private apartments so Mary does not know about it. At first, it is his celebration of being far away from his overprotective mother but it soon changes into an addiction. The alcohol makes him abusive towards his wife shortly after the marriage, and when Mary refuses to comply with his sexual wishes, he starts to frequent brothels in Edinburgh. The more Mary distances herself from him, the more he suspects her of infidelity with her secretary, David Rizzio, who is often in her presence. He is devastated with an idea that she never truly loved him. Therefore, he is intent on punishing Rizzio whom he blames for turning Mary against him.[157] Unlike Darnley in the previous novels, he seems to have feelings for Mary for the brief period when they are both happy. Unfortunately, vain as he is, he is unable to admit to himself that the marital crises is completely his fault, and does not try to change his ways.

None of the selected authors deny Mary's infatuation with Darnley which utterly suppresses her reason. George and Plaidy even go a step further than other authors and make of them lovers before their wedding takes place. The fiction writers also agree unanimously with the writers of historical biographies on Mary's disillusionment with him, presenting his drunkenness and unfaithfulness as main reasons for their marital discord and estrangement.

4.2.3 Film

Whereas both historical biographies and fiction emphasise Mary's love for Darnley, Imbach's and MacKinnon's adaptations fail to capture this sentiment in a convincing manner. Imbach's Mary does not look like a woman smitten with love. Instead, her intention to marry Darnley seems to be based on her wish to spite Elizabeth

[156] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 196-197, 210, 213.
[157] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 248, 289, 296, 301.

whose offer of Dudley insults her. James makes his objection to the marriage with Darnley clear and threatens the nobles will raise against her but she is not daunted.[158] Even thought in MacKinnon's adaptation Mary is more thrilled in the presence of Darnley and smiles at him constantly, the chemistry between the two characters is missing. The truth be told, the only character whose feelings are apparent is the Earl of Bothwell. He is jealous of Darnley and offends him in front of the present nobles. Darnley's violent nature comes to the surface later that evening when he strikes drunken Bothwell in his sleep.[159] This scene anticipates the next development of Darnley's character and indicates that he is not a perfect husband for Mary.

The full extent of Darnley's depravity is represented in Jarrott's film. His arrogance and vanity is shown in his dealing with Rizzio who is his lover. He requires total obedience from him and lets him know he does not intend to do Mary's bidding after the marriage. With respect to his feelings for the Scottish Queen, he does not have the slightest interest in her apart from her status. He even mocks Mary's infatuation[160] which is portrayed best from these three films.

Mary sees Darnley in his true colours on their wedding day both in Jarrot's and MacKinnon's adaptations. Darnley is drunk when he stumbles into Mary's bed to her great chagrin, and he is perpetually in that state in the following days.[161] While Clémence Poésy has difficulties portraying convincingly her love for Darnley in the early stages of their courtship, she succeeds in performing Mary's disillusionment as she has a look of distaste whenever someone mentions Darnley's drunkenness. In Jarrott's film, Darnley gets drunk during the wedding feast and boast in front of the guest that he will rule Scotland and Mary will obey him. Mary is disgusted and announces he is not worthy of the Crown Matrimonial. All the love for him leaves her and she even makes as if to wipe her mouth when he kisses her.[162]

Unlike MacKinnon and Jarrott, Imbach does not portray Darnley as a drunken brute. Darnley is seldom drunk in fact, but that does not mean he is not a liability for Mary. His main fault lies in his intention to restore Catholicism both in Scotland and England. He goes so far as to mention it inopportunely before an English ambassador

---

[158] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[159] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.
[160] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[161] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.
[162] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.

but Rizzio silences him with a warning look. Although he remains silent for the rest of the interview, his discontent cannot be overlooked[163] and he must think about a retribution for Rizzio's supposed slight. Darnley's hatred towards Rizzio is even more apparent in Jarrott's film. He swears to get a revenge on him because he holds him responsible for his banishment from the royal apartments. To achieve this goal, he allies with the nobles who are against Mary's personal rule, and he asks them to kill Rizzio in her presence.[164]

In spite of the shortcoming of the films when Mary's passion for Darnley is concerned, the actors playing Darnley manage to express his faults of character quite convincingly. Thus, the viewer cannot help but sympathize with Mary's plight with her hopeless husband, and wish for her deliverance from this wretched union.

4.3 Rizzio's murder

The resentment of the Scottish nobles towards David Rizzio sprang from his growing influence on the Queen as he became her private secretary. They took it hard that she consulted affairs of state with a foreigner (Rizzio was an Italian) and they felt excluded from the council meetings, especially after James's rebellion. For these reasons, they filled Darnley's ears with poison as they hinted that he was a cuckold. Furthermore, they made him privy to their conspiracy which was aimed at Rizzio who was blamed for the turn towards Catholicism. Darnley agreed to join them because he was angry with Mary for her supposed adultery, and the nobles offered him an irresistible reward. They promised him the Crown Matrimonial, his heart's desire, in exchange for pardoning the rebels and keeping the religious *status quo*.[165]

4.3.1 Historical Biographies

The conspiracy took place on the 9th of March 1566 while Mary enjoyed the company of her close friends in her supper room. The authors draw on several accounts describing the murder, including Mary's own, and do not differ in the description of the main events of the evening. It was Darnley who let the armed nobles and their followers in Mary's quarters, using the private staircase connecting his and the Queen's apartments. Mary who was six months pregnant was surprised to see her husband and

[163] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[164] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[165] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 245.

even more when the other conspirators appeared. Darnley held Mary while the others sought to lay hands on Rizzio who clung to Mary's skirts and pleaded for mercy. To prevent her from resisting, one man aimed a pistol on her belly. Rizzio was first stabbed over Mary's shoulder with Darnley's dagger, which was wielded by George Douglas, and then dragged from the room into the presence chamber where he was stabbed to death, receiving over fifty wounds.[166]

Fraser thinks the brutal manner of Rizzio's death points to the ill intentions of the conspirators towards Mary. Given her pregnancy, the shock could have easily brought about a miscarriage and subsequently her death.[167] Guy, on the other hand, does not believe the conspirators wanted to do Mary any harm. According to him, her death would avail Darnley nothing as he did not have the Crown Matrimonial. If she had died before it was granted to him, he would have ceased to be King Consort, thus losing his position.[168] Guy's arguments are worth considering but Fraser's idea cannot be ruled out as well. The conspirators could not have known for sure that Mary would regain her composure after the initial shock and would not lose the child instead.

Apart from the description of the murder, all authors agree on her remarkable presence of mind which she put to good use in planning her escape from the palace. Even Graham finally admits she discovered some political skills within herself in that moment. Mary managed to sway Darnley into supporting her, pretended to grant a pardon to the conspirators, smuggled a letter to her loyal nobles, received James who returned from England, feigned labour pains, escaped from the palace and arrived at Dunbar Castle. There she mustered troops and marched back to Edinburgh from which the conspirators fled to England.[169]

As we can see, the authors are not at odds over the course of events during that fatal evening, apart from the conspirators' motives towards the Queen, and her actions afterwards. They depict her as a courageous woman who handled the unenviable situation as best as she could, succeeded in outwitting her captors along with her husband, and reinstated her regal authority for the time being.

[166] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 204-205.
[167] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 291.
[168] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 249-250.
[169] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 208-210.

4.3.2 Fiction

From the selected fiction writers, George's recount of Rizzio's murder resembles most its account in the historical biographies. She portrays Mary who does not allow fear to overcome her and faces her adversaries courageously. Her initial shock is quickly followed by anger which she has trouble to control. She screams at the conspirators, accusing them of treachery. When it dawns upon her what part Darnley played in the assassination, she swears to never again let him into her bed. However, her composure returns to her after a while. She realises she needs his help in order to escape from her captors. Immediately, she begins to wonder how to achieve this goal.[170] Whereas Mary in George's novel is undaunted, Byrd's Mary is beside herself when the conspirators throw themselves on Rizzio. She even promises them a pardon if they spare his life but to no avail. Afterwards, she forbids anyone to wipe away the blood in her bedchamber, intending to keep it as a reminder of Darnley's treachery.[171]

In spite of the difference between the two novels with regard to Mary's reaction to Rizzio's murder, both authors depict her as a skilful manipulator and a shrewd woman in the days following this event. It is not hard for Mary to sow a doubt into Darnley's mind and to persuade him to help her, pointing to the fact the nobles will not need him once the child is born. Likewise, she tricks the conspirators into believing she is about to miscarry so they remove the guards from her door.[172] On top of that, Mary in both novels is convinced James's return from England is no coincidence. Even though she receives him warmly, she harbours no kind feelings towards him in Byrd's novel as can be seen in the passage where they converse about the elimination of Darnley. Her unspoken thought being: 'Not until I have used him against you.'[173] Thus, she makes it clear she is bent on revenge against those who are involved in the murder of her secretary.

Just like Byrd, Erickson depicts Mary who is frightened to death when the conspirators attack Rizzio. During the macabre event, she is pressed against a wall by Darnley and expects to be the next victim as soon as Rizzio is dead. Although this is exactly what is intended for her, one of the assassins is bribed and takes Mary to

[170] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 315-319.
[171] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 226, 231.
[172] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 323-325, 330.
[173] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 237.

Bothwell. Together they escape from the palace, take begging Darnley with them and find refuge at Bothwell's castle.[174] By changing the circumstances of her escape and denying her any active part in it, Erickson makes of Mary a dame in distress who is rescued by a chivalrous Bothwell from certain death. On top of that, the contrast between Darnley and Bothwell is stressed. Darnley is a plotting weakling while Bothwell would go to any lengths to save Mary and his action anticipates the further development of their relationship.

Erickson is not the only writer altering Rizzio's murder, the same applies for Liz Lochhead. In her play *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off* (1987), she disguises the conspirators in mummers' costumes. They burst in Mary's apartments and perform the biblical story of Salome and her dance of the seven veils. At the end of the dance, they make her read Herod's lines where he asks Salome what reward she desires for the dancing. Darnley, playing the part of Salome, asks for the head of John the Baptist. This is the signal for the mummers to attack Rizzio and stab him to death. Mary is raging and swears her child will revenge her if Darnley lets her live. He is sorely tempted to kill her but the mummers restrain him.[175] Lochhead's alteration of the events is not to the detriment of the play. On the contrary, the addition of Salome's story increases the dramatic effect of the whole scene and it also implies what is going to happen to Rizzio once the performance is over. Thus, the author treats the well-known subject in an original and interesting way and enhances the quality of her play.

While Yolen and Harris do not change the circumstances of Rizzio's death as Lochhead does, they assign to Nicola the crucial part in the Queen's escape. It is her idea to make Darnley change sides again as Mary is stubbornly determined never to speak with him. Without a hesitation, Nicola climbs down from Mary's window to his apartments. She masterly manipulates him and makes him uncertain about the conspirators' intentions. As soon as he is convinced that his life is in danger, he is willing to beg Mary for forgiveness and together they plan their escape.[176] Despite Nicola's role in rescuing Mary, the Queen is not an irresolute woman as someone might wrongly assume. On the contrary, she shows the same determination to escape as in George's and Byrd's novels. Nicola's impression of her mistress shows Mary's feelings

[174] Erickson, *Paměti Marie Stuartovny*, 115-119.
[175] Liz Lochhead, *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off* (London: Penguin, 1989), 52-55.
[176] Yolen and Harris, *Queen's Own Fool*, 229-238, 245.

few hours before the escape and it proves Mary's bravery when she is in jeopardy: 'I marveled that six months pregnant, surrounded by vicious men who had threatened her life, she showed no sign of fear nor would she entertain any suggestion of defeat. Gone was the grave woman of the night before. Here was the true Mary of Scotland.'[177]

To sum up, the fiction writers approach the subject of Rizzio's murder in different ways. Some follow historical facts almost to a point, depicting Mary who shows remarkable courage both during and after the murder of her faithful servant. Other, like Erickson, makes of Mary a passive participant rescued by Bothwell. And there are also writers who remake this familiar event into an original one, adding another scene or a character with whose help Mary escapes. Notwithstanding these varieties, the portrayal of Mary as a valiant woman who overcome the crisis prevails in fiction. Thus in this point, the writers are in accordance with the historical biographies.

4.3.3 Film

The films succeed in capturing the intimacy among the present persons in Mary's chambers which precedes the outburst of violence. However, the quality of representation of the actual murder differs. Both Jarrott and MacKinnon manage to portray vividly the horror of the moment as the actors are cramped into a small space, everyone is shouting and Rizzio tries to get away desperately. Jarrott also includes a scene which shows Mary in peril of her life as a pistol is diverted from her just in time before it fires. The murder of Rizzio is a gruesome affair as the conspirators throw themselves upon him and stab him repeatedly while Mary is made to watch it.[178]

The difference between these two films is that Mary is not visibly pregnant in MacKinnon adaptation, and the conspirators are reluctant to murder Rizzio in her presence at first. They resolve to do it because they are unable to tear him away from Mary and then they lose all restraint.[179] Not only do the directors successfully recreate the horrific atmosphere of Rizzio's murder but also both actresses playing Mary excel. They perform perfectly Mary's indignation at the intrusion of the nobles and her consternation when the violence erupts.

---

[177] Yolen and Harris, *Queen's Own Fool*, 246.
[178] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[179] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.

On the other hand, the same cannot be said about the performance of Camille Rutherford in Imbach's adaptation. Even thought she tries to appear shocked, it is not so believable as in the above mentioned films. Furthermore, the struggle between Rizzio and the conspirators is reduced to a single blow with a dagger, then the door is shut while Rizzio's corpse is carried away.[180] Thus, the scene fails to make use of its potential and the leading actress does not enhance its quality. However not to disparage her performance entirely, she has a genuine look of sincerity when she promises Darnley a fresh start and talks him into escaping.[181] No one could suspect her of ulterior motives by her facial expression and she plays a repentant wife perfectly.

Also in Jarrot's adaptation, Mary tries her best to get Darnley on her side and the actress continues to portray her in the most satisfying way. Her determination to save herself is evident and it is not hard for her to fool Darnley who feels remorse for Rizzio's death. She feigns labour pains in order to get rid of the nobles and to be with him alone, knowing it will be easy to control him. As soon as they are alone, she drops to her knees and begs him for forgiveness. She persuades him that his live is in danger and they both escape from the palace.[182]

Mary does not give herself to grief for a faithful servant also in MacKinnon's adaptation. Instead, she is bent on escaping but Darnley is not the crucial part of her plan. In case he has any doubts about her true feelings towards him, she slaps him when he accuses her of sleeping with Rizzio. Moreover, she is aware of Darnley's part in the conspiracy because James showed her a list with the names of culprits shortly after the murder. Nevertheless, she consents to take Darnley with her when he begs her not to leave him behind.[183]

All in all, the films do not offer such a variety in their depiction of Rizzio's murder as fiction. All of them more or less stick to the historical facts concerning Mary's behaviour. The main difference among them lies in the performance of actresses playing Mary, and the elaboration of the assassination's detail. Whereas the viewer of Jarrott's and MacKinnon's adaptations is immersed in the scene and is also shocked by its brutality, Imbach does not succeed in creating the atmosphere present in the previous

[180] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[181] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[182] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[183] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.

films. Therefore, his adaptation does not live up to the expectations of the viewer and his representation of the murder is the least convincing of these three films.

4.4 Kirk O'Field

The aftermath of Rizzio's murder left Darnley in a precarious position. By instigating the assassination and subsequently betraying the conspirators, he lost trust of Mary and the Scottish nobles. The gap between the married couple was insurmountable even after the birth of their son, James, and a reconciliation seemed impossible. What was even worse, Darnley did not cease to undermine Mary's position in the eyes of Catholic monarchs as he presented her as a lax Catholic ruler.[184] Due to these circumstances, the nobles began to plan his elimination. Their plotting led to his assassination while he dwelt at Kirk O'Field, a house on the outskirts of Edinburgh. To this day, the precise details of his murder are shrouded in mystery due to many contradictory evidence, and neither Mary's foreknowledge nor her ignorance of it has never been satisfactory proven or disproven.

4.4.1 Historical Biographies

The first implicit mention of Darnley's assassination in front of Mary was made at Craigmillar Castle. The nobles discussed the possibility of divorce in return for pardoning the conspirators involved in Rizzio's murder. Mary was opened to the idea, supposing the legitimacy of her son would not be questioned. Then a more sinister hint was made. The divorce might not be enough to prevent Darnley's plotting. In case of more severe steps against Darnley, Mary's half-brother would pretend to look elsewhere. To this Mary replied: 'I will that ye do nothing whereto any spot may be laid to my honour or conscience, and therefore I pray you rather let the matter be in the state as it is.'[185]

The authors differ in their interpretation of Mary's words. This contradiction shows the question of Mary's foreknowledge of the plot is far from being resolved and it is affected by authors' attitudes to her. As was illustrated in the previous subsections, Graham is not very sympathetic to the Scottish Queen. Therefore, it is not surprising he does not show a flicker of doubt about her awareness of the forthcoming assassination.

[184] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 327-328.
[185] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 283.

According to him, she knew exactly that the nobles were contemplating some violent action against her husband and she did nothing to stop them. By giving them the above answer, she convinced them they can proceed with their plan but without informing her of its details.[186] Unlike Graham, Guy regards her answer as a prohibition of any action against Darnley and not as a silent assent. His main argument for professing Mary's innocence is that she had nothing to gain from Darnley's murder at that moment because she was finally close to reaching an agreement with Elizabeth about the succession.[187] Thus, he positions himself into the role of Mary's defender and seeks to clear her name from any suspicion. Fraser, on the other hand, is careful to avoid pronouncing a definite verdict of either Mary's tacit consent or innocence. However, her likening of Mary to the English King Henry II, who had wished to be rid of Thomas Beckett and to whom his nobles had granted this wish, hints at Mary's awareness of the true intentions of the nobles.[188]

Regardless of the true meaning of Mary's words at Craigmillar Castle, the nobles took the matter in their own hands. A massive explosion woke the citizens of Edinburgh on the 10th of February 1567 around two o'clock in the morning. The house in which Darnley dwelt during his cure of syphilis was reduced to a rubble and his body was found in the garden without visible traces of violence.[189] Both Fraser and Guy conduct almost a detective research as they try to unravel what exactly happened on that night. Guy mentions several contemporary accounts of the event (especially the accounts of the Duke of Savoy's ambassador, Signor di Moretta; the Cardinal of Lorrraine's agent, Monsieur de Clernault, and Sir William Drury[190]), compares them, considers their probability and then describes the hypothetical course of events. Darnley was woken up by noises and when he saw armed men lead by Bothwell lurking outside, he and his servant escaped through the gallery window. But they were intercepted by another group of assassins, presumably Darnley's kinsmen the Douglases, and strangled just before the explosion took place.[191]

Fraser arrives at the same conclusion as Guy. But she also emphasises Bothwell's role in the conspiracy. Although his part in it is undeniable as he lit the fuse, his

---

[186] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 229.
[187] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 284.
[188] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 321.
[189] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 299.
[190] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 301.
[191] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 306-307.

assumption that the explosion killed Darnley was wrong. Hence, paradoxically, he should not have been blamed for the actual murder of the King by his fellow conspirators who turned against him.[192] Furthermore, Fraser presents arguments why Mary was surely unaware that the murder would happen that night. She is certain the conspirators did not inform her because they were apprehensive about Mary's merciful nature which could have wrecked their plans. Besides their worries, Fraser emphasises Mary's relaxed manner at Kirk O'Field, just a few hours before the explosion, when the house was already mined with gunpowder. Therefore, she deems it highly improbable that Mary had any foreknowledge of Darnley's assassination.[193]

In comparison with Fraser and Guy, Graham does not pay so much attention to the circumstances of the murder. He only briefly narrates the course of events which implicates Bothwell as the main culprit. Then he focuses on the analysis of Mary's part in the plot. According to him, Mary must have been aware immediately that the assassination was the result of the discussion at Craigmillar Castle. He is critical of her actions following Darnley's murder and stresses her unwillingness to investigate it properly. A conduct which enabled Bothwell to become one of the most powerful nobles in Scotland. He also compares Mary to Diane de Poitiers, Catherine de Medici and Elizabeth and mentions that any of the three women would have dealt with this calamity in a better way to divert any suspicion from themselves.[194]

In spite of being sympathetic to Mary, Fraser and Guy agree with Graham that she behaved irrationally when she did not undertake necessary steps to punish the culprits.[195] According to Fraser, all political judgement left Mary when she needed it most as she immersed into a melancholy. In this state, she relied on those who had not the slightest interest to unravel the facts surrounding Darnley's murder.[196] This inaction combined with her association with the chief suspect, the Earl of Bothwell, blemished her reputation in the eyes of her subjects as well as other European monarchs and was about to cost her the Crown.

All things considered, there is a discrepancy among the authors only when it comes to Mary's foreknowledge of the crime. Fraser and Guy profess her innocence and

---

[192] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 350-351.
[193] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 347.
[194] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 240-242, 246.
[195] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 314.
[196] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 357-358.

regard her nobles as the main culprits. Even though Graham does not doubt the role of the nobles, he is convinced Mary gave a tacit consent to the murder of her second husband and thus she was partially guilty of his demise. With respect to Mary's conduct after the assassination, none of the writers judge her favourably. Even Fraser and Guy who have presented her as a prudent monarch so far, cannot help but admit that she made a fatal mistake when she did not put any suspects on trial and enabled Bothwell to become too powerful.

4.4.2 Fiction

The mysterious circumstances of the murder provide a thankful theme for the fiction writers as well. Inevitably, two groups are formed. One professing Mary's ignorance of the nobles' intentions, the other making of her Bothwell's accomplice in the crime. Given the fact that the probable circumstances of Darnley's murder resemble much its course in the historical biographies, this subsection is going to focus mainly on the actions of Bothwell and Mary's attitude to the crime.

Both George and Tannahill are champions of Mary's innocence and emphasise the role of nobles in the planned murder. In George's novel, James enumerates possibilities how Mary could be rid of Darnley at Craigmillar Castle during his private conversation with Bothwell. Bothwell is not naive, he sees right through James and does not doubt for a second what is really on his mind. Therefore, he refuses to play the part of a pawn in James's scheme. After the meeting with the Queen, Bothwell feels sorry for Mary because he is convinced the nobles will not respect her explicit prohibition of any violent act against Darnley.[197] Whereas Bothwell in George's novel is not willing to participate in Darnley's murder, Tannahill makes of this character the chief instigator of the crime. It is he who says bluntly that Darnley must be killed after the fruitless discussion with Mary. He urges the other nobles to sign a bond, taking no heed of Mary's words which forbid any dishonest action.[198]

In contrast to these authors, Plaidy and Byrd portray Mary as a guilty party. In Plaidy's novel, it dawns upon her instantly what are the nobles' true intentions towards Darnley. Despite being smitten with love for Bothwell, she is disturbed by his ambition and understands how much he desires to replace Darnley as her husband. However, she

[197] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 394-396.
[198] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 366-367.

does nothing to curb her lover and even succumbs to his wish to bring Darnley back to Edinburgh from Glasgow where he is more vulnerable.[199] The same dependence of Mary on Bothwell can be noticed in Byrd's novel as well when the two of them discuss Mary's journey to Glasgow and Bothwell hints at Darnley's death:

> 'Though we treat him like filth Darnley *is* the King and they shudder at being involved in regicide.' 'Please!' she begged. 'Please say no more.' 'I must. For you shall help me.' *'No!'* 'You will go to Glasgow and persuade Darnley to return here.' 'No! I cannot, I will not!' Her eyes stretched wide and she tried to break away from him, but he held her tightly. 'For the love of God-' His lips stilled hers.[200]

The above lines show Mary's inability to resist Bothwell even though she detests his idea to involve her in his plan which is going to lead to Darnley's death. Her objections, however, are caused by the fear to burden her conscience with the foreknowledge of the planned assassination and not by any remaining feelings for her husband as she is already Bothwell's lover.

Likewise, Lochhead makes of Mary and Bothwell lovers and links them to the murder. At first sight, nothing seems to be amiss when Mary nurses Darnley at Kirk O'Field. Their conversation is amiable and Darnley promises to improve his behaviour. Mary is moved by his remorse and suddenly asks him to join her at the wedding of her servants. But Darnley points out to his sickness and Mary leaves without him. Outside the house, she embraces Bothwell lovingly and soon explosion follows.[201] Her conduct towards Bothwell leaves no doubt that she is aware of the conspiracy. In retrospective, her kindly behaviour towards Darnley can be regarded as a charade which is supposed to placate him, and her change of mind in the house is merely a momentary vacillation brought about by guilty conscience.

Conscience troubles Mary also in Byrd's novel but once away from Bothwell, she is less influenced by him. She is about to tell Darnley that she has changed her mind and will not take him to Edinburgh, thus deciding to save his life. Unknowingly, Darnley ruins everything when he behaves with his typical arrogance and vanity. Mary keeps her silence and proceeds with Bothwell's plan afterwards.[202] On the other hand, Mary's

[199] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 354, 356-357.
[200] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 305.
[201] Lochhead, *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off*, 58-60.
[202] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 314-315.

conscience remains unburdened in Tannahill's novel and there is no liaison between her and Bothwell before Darnley's demise. This is probably the reason why she is surprisingly ignorant of the nobles' plans till the very day of the assassination. She even seriously considers staying at Kirk O'Field overnight, and only Bothwell's remainder of the duties awaiting her the next day convinces her to sleep at Holyrood instead.[203]

While Mary's innocence or guilt has been so far evident in the above writings, it is harder to determine in the novel by Yolen and Harris. As there is no access to Mary's thoughts, the reader depends on the events recounted by Nicola and she is not sure of the Queen's foreknowledge either. Almost by chance, she overhears a conversation between Mary and Bothwell a few hours before the murder. Bothwell behaves presumptuously to Mary and urges her to reveal her intentions concerning Darnley. She does not give him a direct answer but she is on the brink of a nervous breakdown. After his departure, Mary notices Nicola behind the door and entrusts her with a task to set out to Kirk O'Field at once and deliver a cross to Darnley which should protect him overnight.[204] Mary's concern for Darnley's well-being on this particular night as well as her reaction to Bothwell's words suggest that she knows some evil is about to befall him, but her intervention comes too late to save Darnley's life.

Unlike the authors mentioned above, George sees Mary as an intended victim of the gunpowder plot whose instigator is none other than Darnley. As soon as he finds out he has a syphilis, he conceives the following thought: 'I want to die... I want her to die. If we cannot be together, then I want us to die in each other's arms, and then I'll know no one else can ever have her, and I'll die happy.'[205] As is evident from these lines, Darnley still harbours feelings for Mary but his love borders on madness. He cannot bear the idea of Mary being happy after his death, therefore he is determined to kill her and himself at the same time. This thinking leads him to a plotting with the Balfours who mine the house at Kirk O'Field with gunpowder. However, the conspirators betray him and sold this information to Bothwell. Notwithstanding his scruples at Craigmillar Castle, he makes up his mind to kill Darnley: 'It is fitting, he thought. It is I who am the Queen's lover, and it is my child within her. My responsibility is personal.'[206] In contrast to Plaidy's and Tannahill's representation of Bothwell, it is not a craving for the Crown

[203] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 386.
[204] Yolen and Harris, *Queen's Own Fool*, 274-276.
[205] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 417.
[206] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 453.

which leads him to this decision but sincere love for Mary. He regards it as his duty to save Mary's life because no other nobles are willing to get their hands dirty and risk being blamed for the regicide.

The same danger looms over Mary in Erickson's novel. She and Bothwell catch a servant who leads them to the cellars of Holyrood where a large amount of gunpowder is stored. While Mary is in shock that her life has been threatened, Bothwell uses his wits, removes the barrels, places them at Kirk O'Field and lit a fuse without her knowledge.[207] Although Bothwell is not Mary's lover at this point, he risks his reputation to save her, behaving like a loyal subject. However, it cannot be said for certain that he punished the main culprit as there is no proof pointing at Darnley and implicating him in the plot against his wife.

Paradoxically, Darnley intends to kill Mary at Kirk O'Field in Byrd's novel as well. His gunpowder plot is revealed by Bothwell's servant who accidentally finds barrels in the vaults. Bothwell does not hesitate and carries out his plan of murdering Darnley a few days earlier. After the assassination, Mary falls into apathy and is unable to behave reasonably. Hence, it is up to Bothwell to minimise the damage to their reputation as the citizens of Edinburgh are already suspicious of their part in Darnley's death.[208] Mary is also shocked in George's novel but is still capable of a rational thought when she looks at Darnley's corpse:

> Why could he not have just died of his disease? she thought wildly. Why this? It is his legacy to leave mystery and guilt. He sought to kill me; now he will be exonerated, and trouble me even from beyond the grave.[209]

Her contemplation about Darnley's death shows clearly she had no interest in his violent demise and was not privy to Bothwell's last minute plan. In spite of her state of mind, she does not fool herself and is aware of the severe consequences which his mysterious death is going to have.

The explosion at Kirk O'Field throws Mary in depression in Tannahill's novel as well. She portrays Mary whose ignorance is finally shattered as she realises it was her wish to be rid of Darnley at Craigmillar Castle that lead to his murder. Guilty

---

[207] Erickson, *Paměti Marie Stuartovny*, 134-135, 139.
[208] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 326, 333, 336.
[209] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 464.

conscience renders her incapable of dealing with the situation to the horror of Maitland who sought to catch Bothwell in the act of murdering Darnley but failed.[210] The same inability of Mary to bring the suspects to justice is also shown in Plaidy's novel. However, her apathetic attitude is caused by her unenviable position. She knows too well what part Bothwell played in the murder. For the love for him, she is unwilling to prosecute him and rather risks the wrath of her subjects.[211]

Overall, the authors are almost equally divided in their stance on Mary's foreknowledge or ignorance of the plot. Whereas some writers depict Mary as an innocent person, all of them involve Bothwell in the crime. Furthermore, some of them make of these two characters lovers while Darnley is still alive and assign Mary's consent with her husband's murder to her obsession with Bothwell.

4.4.3 Film

Like the fiction writers, the film directors link the love affair of Mary and Bothwell to Darnley's assassination. In Jarrott's adaptation, Bothwell proposes Darnley's elimination to Mary and asks her to pardon the conspirators of Rizzio's murder who will settle their accounts with Darnley. Although Mary cries and seems upset with the idea, Bothwell's comforting and kisses change her mind. Soon after the proposal, Bothwell and other nobles discuss how to murder the King. James informs them about Darnley's plan to kill Mary at Kirk O'Field whose vaults are full of gunpowder. He suggests that they forestall Darnley and kill him by his own means. He asks Bothwell whether he will join them. Bothwell agrees and takes charge of the plot.[212] The scene depicting the nobles' plotting shows brilliantly the cool-bloodiness and manipulative skills of James. By playing on Bothwell's vanity, he makes of him the chief assassin and diverts any suspicion from himself.

MacKinnon, on the other hand, completely omits the role of other nobles in Darnley's murder. The plan is conceived entirely by Mary and Bothwell who are already lovers. At first, Mary has objections and forbids Bothwell to kill Darnley but when her husband threatens to harm their child, she finds Bothwell and bluntly asks him to eliminate Darnley.[213] In contrast to the preceding films, Imbach does not make it clear

[210] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 394.
[211] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 372.
[212] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[213] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.

whether Mary has any foreknowledge of the plot. Bothwell asks her to keep Darnley close, therefore she brings him to Kirk O'Field and there nurses him with reluctance.[214] However, there is no conversation between her and Bothwell or any other nobles concerning Darnley's assassination. Hence, her part in the plot remains dubious and cannot be ascertain with certainty.

Whereas nothing in Mary's manner towards Darnley at Kirk O'Field in Imbach's film indicates what is going to happen, Jarrott portrays Mary who is unmistakably reserved while she is near Darnley. She plays on Rizzio's lute and when her husband points to this fact, she reminds him with a severe expression that a year just passed since Rizzio's death. As soon as she leaves the house, the conspirators lit the fuse. Darnley hears voices outside, notices the assassins, escapes through the window but is strangled by a group of men after the explosion. Mary hears the detonation and it dawns upon her instantly what happened as she exchanges a look with Bothwell.[215] Despite omitting Bothwell's direct part in the assassination, Jarrott's representation of it is the best from the selected films. He manages to depict convincingly Darnley's panic, his desperate efforts to escape the mined house and his futile pleas addressed to the assassins.

Unlike Jarrott, MacKinnon involves Bothwell directly into Darnley's murder. In fact, he is the only one manipulating with the gunpowder and no accomplices are ever seen in the film. Darnley is still in the house when it explodes but he survives the detonation and stumbles outside where he runs into Bothwell, and they start fighting. Bothwell, stronger of the two men, overpowers Darnley and strangles him. While the deed is done, Mary confesses her sin to a shocked priest and asks for absolution.[216] Mary does not show any remorse during the confession, and the priest is unable to dissuade her from the plan. She is determined to proceed with the murder as she does not see any other way how to get rid of her unstable husband. Moreover, she is in love with Bothwell and she is willing to risk everything for him.

On the contrary, Imbach's Mary is stricken with guilt on the night of the murder which could suggest she is aware of the plot after all. She scribbles a letter to Bothwell with eyes filled with tears in the privacy of her chamber. However, she pretends that nothing is amiss during a dancing in the palace and looks composed before other guests.

[214] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[215] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[216] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.

Bothwell is in the room as well when an explosion is heard. Everyone leaves a shocked Mary alone. Afterwards, she has a vision of Rizzio who warns her of retribution for what she has done. Mary defends herself and professes her innocence, but Rizzio tells her that her inaction is responsible for Darnley's murder.[217] By omitting the details of assassination and focusing on Mary's reaction instead, Imbach maintains the mystery that surrounds the murder till this day. The viewer cannot tell for sure who are the assassins or to what extent is Mary privy to the whole conspiracy.

As was shown in the above paragraphs, Mary is far from being innocent of her husband's murder in Jarrott's and particularly MacKinnon's films. She plans Darnley's elimination along with her lover Bothwell and shows no remorse when the deed is done. Whereas Mary's complicity in these films is undeniable, it is not so easily proven in Imbach's adaptation. This is given by the fact that there is no scene involving her directly with the conspiracy. Therefore, it is hard to determine her part in the plot against Darnley.

4.5 Mary and Bothwell

As was mentioned in the previous subsections, Mary was in a confused state of mind after Darnley's murder. Consequently, she was unable to handle the arisen situation and depended increasingly on Bothwell, the chief suspect. She married him eventually just three months after the explosion at Kirk O'Field to the amazement of Scotland and the rest of Europe. Inevitably, the following questions arose. Did he force her into marriage by abducting and raping her? Or were the two of them already lovers who planned the abduction together in an attempt to save Mary's reputation?

4.5.1 Historical Biographies

Bothwell became so sure of his influence over Mary at the end of March 1567 that he presented the nobles with a bond declaring his innocence and suggesting him as a candidate for the Queen's hand. He asked the nobles to sign it, thus supporting the proposed marriage. Shortly afterwards, he began to woo Mary and sought to persuade her to marry him. Fraser states that despite being uncertain what action she ought to take, Mary refused his courtship and pointed to the scandals surrounding him.[218] While

[217] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[218] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 362-363.

Guy omits this particular episode, Graham expresses the same opinion as Fraser and credits Mary with a sensible behaviour.[219]

Bothwell, however, was not to be put off so easily. He abducted Mary while she journeyed back to Edinburgh from Stirling Castle. According to Guy, the abduction did not occur with Mary's consent and he dismisses the contemporary accounts claiming otherwise as works of Bothwell's enemies. Furthermore, he contemplates whether Bothwell raped Mary to ensure her consent with the marriage. He deems it highly improbable, stating it would be unlike Mary to forgive such an act. More likely, Bothwell convinced her of his love and showed her the bond with the nobles' signatures which won her over.[220]

Graham agrees with Guy both on the abduction and the supposed rape. But he sees Mary as a woman overcome with the romantic aspect of the kidnapping who was quite willing to sleep with Bothwell,[221] thus he stresses the love she felt for her captor. Unlike Graham and Guy, Fraser is not so quick to reject Mary's foreknowledge of the abduction. She is inclined to believe Mary knew of it and regarded this action as a solution to her troubles. Besides her different view on the abduction, she does not exclude the rape either, citing Mary's and other witnesses' accounts of the event to support her arguments. She puts Mary's love for Bothwell in doubt, pointing to the lack of gifts she gave him on their wedding day in comparison with her nuptials with Darnley, and the scarce correspondence between them during her life in captivity. Therefore, she is convinced that theirs was a marriage of convenience and not a love match, as Mary saw in Bothwell a man who was able to control the troublesome factions in Scotland.[222]

Despite having different opinions on Mary's feelings for Bothwell during her short captivity at Dunbar Castle, all authors come to an agreement about her disillusionment after the wedding. Guy assumes Mary soon realised Bothwell's insincerity about his feelings for her. Apart from this finding, he assigns their frequent quarrels to the possibility that Bothwell imparted some details of Darnley's murder on her.[223] Fraser, on the other hand, dismisses this possibility because she supposes Mary was not ignorant

[219] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 251.
[220] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 329-330.
[221] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 252.
[222] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 365-369, 373.
[223] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 335, 337.

of Bothwell's part in it by then. According to her, Mary's depression was caused by the realisation what damage she had done to her reputation by marrying this violent man who did not have the unwavering support of the Scottish nobles as he had made her to believe.[224] In contrast to Fraser and Guy, Graham does not concern himself with the question of Bothwell's conveying some information about Darnley's murder to Mary. He regards Mary's awareness of her husband's unfaithful nature and his possessiveness as sole reasons for the marital discord.[225]

Their quarrels were not the only setback of their marriage. The nobles who had signed the bond turned against Bothwell and raised an army, justifying this action by a wish to punish Darnley's murderer and free Mary from her oppressive husband. They were led by a less noble reasons in fact. They could not have tolerated that Bothwell became more powerful than them. Eventually, the royal army and the rebels faced each other at Carberry Hill on the 15th of June 1567. However, neither one of them was willing to charge at the foe, and the negotiation began. The rebels asked Mary to abandon Bothwell and promised their loyalty, but she refused at first. Only when her army began to melt away, she agreed with their demand in exchange for a safe conduct for Bothwell.[226] Graham portrays the couple's farewell as if there were still some feelings left between them: 'Bothwell and Mary then embraced in plain sight of everyone, pledging mutual loyalty,'[227] and does not question from what sources the description of their final moments comes. Guy, on the other hand, assigns the accounts of their passionate parting to the rebels' propaganda. Instead, he offers a portrayal of Mary who lost all trust in Bothwell, due to his involvement in Darnley's murder, and whose attitude to her husband was more practical than romantic. She knew he could have been of any service to her only while he remained free. It was her safeguard against the nobles' potential treachery, therefore she insisted on his safe departure from the battlefield.[228] When they parted, it was the end of their short marriage as they never saw each other again, as well as of Mary's reign in Scotland. The nobles did not keep their promise and instead of serving loyally to Mary, they imprisoned her.[229]

[224] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 373-374.
[225] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 255-256.
[226] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 378-383.
[227] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 261.
[228] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 348-349.
[229] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 387.

Judging by the authors' opinions on the relationship of Mary and Bothwell, they do not describe it as an epic love affair. None of them even consider that the affair started before Darnley's murder. Although Graham and Guy make allowances for the possibility that Mary was briefly infatuated with Bothwell during her capture at Dunbar Castle, they state it faded quickly away. Because of this disillusionment, they agree with Fraser who regards the union between Mary and Bothwell as a marriage of convenience which should have helped Mary to deal with the factions in Scotland. Unfortunately for her, it had completely opposite effect than she had hoped for, and it cost her both her realm and freedom.

4.5.2 Fiction

Whereas the writers of historical biographies analyse the relationship between Mary and Bothwell only after Darnley's murder, some fiction writers focus on it since their first meeting. In Byrd's novel, Mary is fascinated with him from the start and even admits to James she could love him in the future. To which he replies:

> 'I pray that you never will,' he said. 'Apart from political reasons and my own dislike of him, he is too violent for a woman of your breeding. He has no regard for convention, no gentleness. Bothwell is as close to a brute as a man can be. He has a surface culture which he maintains in your presence. But I have drunk with him, gamed with him - I know him well.'[230]

James's words express clearly what he thinks of the possible marriage of Mary and Bothwell. He does not favour it and points to Bothwell's character faults in order to dissuade Mary from this idea. Although he does not say it bluntly, he also regards it as a political folly which would bring no good to her rule, thus unknowingly predicting what is going to happen eventually.

The instant attraction between these two characters is also portrayed by Erickson. Mary meets Bothwell shortly after her marriage with Francis. Bothwell's physique so different from her sickly husband impresses her and she has a strange feeling in his presence, imagining there is something drawing them together. As she spends more time with him at the French court, she begins to trust him completely, a familiarity develops between them and she starts to think about him affectionately, addressing him

[230] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 123.

as Jamie in private.[231] Bothwell, on the other hand, does not make such a favourable impression on Mary when they meet in France in Plaidy's novel. She finds him arrogant and impudent, yet she decides to follow her mother's example and trust him. Bothwell does not think highly of Mary as well. He deems her a weak and naive girl who will not be able to control the nobles in Scotland, and he feels a slight contempt for her because of it.[232] Considering their opinions and the lack of attraction for each other, nothing at this point suggests, in comparison with the above mentioned novels, that an epic romance lies in store for them.

As was illustrated at the beginning of this subsection, Mary's feelings for Bothwell are quite the opposite in Byrd's novel. Even though she suppresses them after James's advice, they remerge with renewed force when her marriage with Darnley is in crisis. Possessed by uncontrollable longing for him, she is bent on destroying his marriage with Jean Gordon, filling Jean's mind with suspicion of Bothwell's infidelities. As soon as Bothwell finds out what she is doing, he is mad with rage and wants to punish her. He bursts into her bedchamber, after her son's christening, and rapes her. At first, Mary is so ashamed and humiliated that she swears to have him executed but changes her mind as their night together proceeds. At the end of it, not only is she willing to forget about his treasonous act but she is persistent about the continuance of their affair.[233] The reason why she lets him get away with the rape is that he, being more skilful lover than Darnley, awakens her passionate side and she falls even more in love with him. The combination of love and lust wins over her sense and she becomes totally dependent on her lover from this moment.

Similar event happens in Plaidy's novel as well. While Mary dwells at Exchequer House, making preparations for her son's christening, Bothwell visits her unexpectedly. When he sees Mary only in her nightgown and with loose hair, he is overcome with lust and forces himself on her despite her protestations. Afterwards, Mary cannot decide what to do. She is afraid of the mockery of others and John Knox's condemning sermons, therefore she does not order Bothwell's immediate arrest. However, it is not only fear that holds her back. She yearns for the repetition of the experience unconsciously, and Bothwell is well aware of it. When she returns to the Exchequer

[231] Erickson, *Paměti Marie Stuartovny*, 25, 31, 39, 57.
[232] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 146, 150.
[233] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 260, 291-298.

House, he follows her and their affair commences.[234] In giving herself in passion, Mary behaves in the same way as in Byrd's novel. The only difference between these novels is that Mary has no interest in Bothwell before the rape which means her love for him is brought about by the sexual satisfaction she finds in his arms.

In contrast to Byrd and Plaidy, George does not portray Bothwell as a rapist. Although both Mary and Bothwell start to have feelings for each other after James's birth, they try very hard to suppress them. Eventually, they succumb to them after the christening of the Prince and make love in an abandoned chapel at Stirling Castle. Bothwell feels remorse afterwards because he knows their affair cannot bring anything but trouble.[235] This thinking is something which is completely missing in the novels by Byrd and Plaidy. Due to this portrayal of Bothwell, George makes of him an honourable man who admits to himself he acted wrongly and seeks to remedy the mistake. To achieve this goal, he wants to nip the affair in the bud and reasons with Mary:

> 'Surrounding this little chamber is Scotland, and it is not very forgiving of its sinners. In order to reach the wider world, we must flee through Scotland, where we will be stoned and treated as criminals. Is that what you wish?' 'No. But I believe that somehow we can avoid that. The fates will be kind, Bothwell. They have to be.' 'All lovers think that. But it is not fate we must contend with, but people.'[236]

As is evident from the above lines, Bothwell acts more reasonably than Mary. He points out the troubles they will have to face if their affair continues, but she is deaf to his arguments, optimistically believing his worries will not come to pass.

The trouble of which is Bothwell afraid escalates after Darnley's assassination. At this point, also Byrd presents him as a prudent man. He refuses to hear about the marriage with Mary, pointing to the fact she could lose her Crown. However, he changes his mind when she tells him she is pregnant. After this announcement, he makes the nobles sign the bond supporting his marriage with the Queen and makes her privy to the ensuing abduction and ravishment.[237] Given his initial reluctance to marry her, it is obvious he does not crave for the Crown and would be content to remain her

[234] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 335-342.
[235] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 404-407.
[236] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 415.
[237] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 352-355.

lover. His reaction to Mary's pregnancy also shows that he has fallen in love with her after the violent outset of their affair. To save her from the shame of giving birth to a bastard, he is willing to sacrifice his reputation and become a villain who dares to abduct and rape his sovereign, while Mary will be perceived as an innocent victim of his ambition.

Bothwell, on the other hand, is not so noble and his desire for the Crown is insatiable in Plaidy's novel. He does not have any misgivings about the consequences as he insists on immediate marriage. It is Mary who is rightly concerned about the reaction of her subjects and does not doubt they will be convicted as murderers of Darnley. Unfortunately, she is not strong enough to oppose him and because of his intransigence, she comes up with the idea of abduction and rape to justify their hasty union before others.[238] The abduction is agreed upon beforehand also in Erickson's novel. Mary's and Bothwell's close friendship turns into love affair shortly after Darnley's death. They are so consumed with love for each other that they throw caution to the wind and decide to marry as soon as possible. Bothwell suggests the abduction in order to save Mary from slander and she agrees with it without a hesitation, leaving him in charge of the plan.[239] Despite trying to present their affair as an epic love, Erickson fails to achieve this goal. Their romance is rushed because it is described only in a few pages before they are separated at Carberry Hill. Consequently, the characters' thoughts and motives are not explored so thoroughly as in the other novels to the detriment of the story.

While Mary behaves recklessly and can think of nothing but her love for Bothwell in the latter novel, she is genuinely shocked and indignant when Bothwell abducts her in George's novel. She has no foreknowledge of the abduction and reproaches him for doing such a folly, pointing out that everyone will be convinced of their guilt. However, she stops being angry when she realises he did it to protect her reputation. She represses her misgivings and willingly cooperates with him thereafter.[240] As we can see, Bothwell's conduct is very similar to the motives of this character in Byrd's novel and it shows the depth and sincerity of his love for Mary for whom he would do anything.

Only novels in which Mary and Bothwell are lovers and the abduction should solve their dilemma have been analysed so far. Unlike them, Tannahill portrays a

[238] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 374-375.
[239] Erickson, *Paměti Marie Stuartovny*, 144-148.
[240] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 492-494.

completely different course of events. Bothwell resorts to the abduction because Mary refuses to marry him even though he shows her the bond with the nobles' signatures. When Bothwell surrounds her little party on the way to Edinburgh, she does not resist because she is still apathetic after Darnley's murder. Maitland seeks to rouse her from this state, mentioning the insignificance of the bond and imploring her not to submit to Bothwell's demand. This intervention almost costs him his life but Mary saves him, ordering Bothwell not to kill him. However, this is the only action she is capable of. She agrees to the marriage after a few days, justifying her decision by explaining she has no choice left as everyone is convinced that the rape has taken place.[241] Undoubtedly, Mary is truly a victim of Bothwell's ambition and the love match is out of the question in this novel. In fact, he takes advantage of her state of mind and forces her into marriage by spreading the rumour of the rape, thus ensuring her compliance.

Mary's willingness to marry Bothwell can be questioned in the novel by Yolen and Harris as well. In contrast to the previous novels, the abduction is not described directly but it is mentioned to Nicola, who is in hiding, after the marriage of the Queen and Bothwell. Nicola does not believe for a second Mary would have married him willingly but Joseph, Rizzio's brother, challenges her unswerving faith in Mary, letting her know that her opinion on the matter is influenced by her love for Mary and the Queen may not be so innocent as she would like to think, : 'You see those you love with a fool's eyes, Nicola... We are none of us as good as you paint us.'[242]

Given Mary's reluctance to marry Bothwell in Tannahill's novel, her unhappiness in the marriage is not surprising. It begins on the wedding night as Bothwell behaves abusively and the situation does not improve in the following days.[243] Her hysterical reaction after their night together suggests she was not raped at Dunbar Castle after all. Furthermore, contrary to the representations of Bothwell's amorous advances in the novels by Byrd and Plaidy, Mary does not find any joy in his embraces and does not fall in love with him because of them.

The marital trouble does not avoid the couple in Byrd's novel either despite their sincere love for each other. However, the fault lies entirely in Mary in this case. She behaves like a vixen, suspecting Bothwell of having an affair with his ex-wife. No

[241] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 410-411, 413-416, 419-420.
[242] Yolen and Harris, *Queen's Own Fool*, 306.
[243] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 422.

wonder, Bothwell is fed up with her endless accusations and leaves her one day.[244] Notwithstanding their differences, they are reconciled a few days before Carberry Hill and their final parting after the lost battle shows once again the intensity of love between them: 'the kiss was deep, desperate with pain and passion and prayer. For a long while they clung, heedless of time, of watching eyes. Then abruptly Bothwell left her and swung on his horse.'[245] Similar farewell depicting the immensity of their feelings takes place in the novel by George: 'He looked at her, as if he would imprint the image forever in his mind. "Nothing can part us," he finally said. "I love you, wife of my heart." Then he stepped away again, and quickly mounted his horse.'[246]

Mary and Bothwell do not see each other again after Carberry Hill in most novels. Erickson, on the other hand, adapts the historical facts to her will. The two characters meet again in secret several times during Mary's captivity in England and they even have a daughter, Mary Elizabeth, who is born while Mary is a prisoner at Lochleven and who is being raised by Mary's grandmother in France.[247] This storyline is far-fetched as it is very improbable that Mary's rendezvous, let alone giving birth to a living child, could have gone unnoticed by her captors. Thus, it is an unnecessary addition to the story and it fails to enhance its quality.

All things considered, the portrayal of Mary and Bothwell as lovers predominates in fiction. As they are having an affair, the abduction is often agreed upon beforehand in their mistaken belief it will save Mary's reputation. From the selected authors, Byrd and George depict their love as an epic one which was destined to end tragically because of the malice gathering over them after Darnley's murder. Erickson seeks to achieve the same goal but fails to do so convincingly due to insufficient insight into Mary's and Bothwell's thinking. Apart from the writers who portray them as lovers, there are two novels making of Mary a victim who does not enter into the marriage with Bothwell without reluctance and their union is not a love match. It is rather a fulfilment of Bothwell's ambition who exploits her emotional state to his own benefit and leads her, unknowingly, to a tragic end.

[244] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 382, 387.
[245] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 408.
[246] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 536.
[247] Erickson, *Paměti Marie Stuartovny*, 166-167, 183-184.

4.5.3 Film

The instant attraction is not only depicted in some novels but in MacKinnon's adaptation as well. In this case, however, it is Bothwell who is in love with Mary while she remains oblivious of his feelings for a long time. He acts like her guardian angel, shielding her with his own body as they leave the chapel surrounded by the angry Protestants, and never shows the slightest disrespect towards her station unlike other members of her council.[248] Imbach, on the other hand, does not portray any affection felt by either Mary or Bothwell at the beginning of their acquaintance. Besides, Bothwell does not always treat her with the utmost respect. He is rather an audacious young man, undaunted by the prospect of displeasing his Queen if need be. During the voyage from France, he throws her over his shoulder when she is not inclined to go below deck for the safety sake, and lets her know he is the commander of the ship and even she must obey him aboard.[249]

The same impudence is also typical for Bothwell in Jarrott's adaptation, but he provokes Mary with his remarks and not with any physical action against her person. The best example of this behaviour is his conversation with Mary shortly after her marriage with Darnley. Bothwell announces he is leaving the court because she has such a brilliant husband who makes him redundant. Mary does not doubt for a second he is mocking her and he confirms her opinion, stating he finds her choice of husband foolish. They quarrel afterwards and she asks him if he feels jealousy. He admits the possibility and agrees to return to the court in order to help her with the affairs of state after he finds a wife. Mary is stunned by the news and reminds him he needs her permission, but he does not listen and walks away.[250] This scene shows the first hint of their true feelings for one another. Not only does he despise Darnley but she is not pleased with the prospect of his marriage either, unknowingly giving away how much she cares for him.

Whereas Bothwell in the latter version seriously considers marrying another woman, the character remains unswervingly faithful to Mary in MacKinnon's adaptation. He even diminishes himself and professes his love for her on her wedding day with Darnley, but Mary is still blind and dismisses it as a drunken confession.

[248] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.
[249] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[250] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.

However, as her dissatisfaction with Darnley grows, she begins to realise she has feelings for Bothwell as well. When she is informed about his severe injury, she rides to him at once and is relieved the news about his dying has been untrue. They fall into each other arms and their affair commences.[251] MacKinnon does his best to capture the all consuming love between Mary and Bothwell. Even though Bothwell's devotion in the first half of the film may seem exaggerated, the director still manages to depict their affair more convincingly than Imbach.

In Imbach's film, Mary also falls in love with Bothwell after he is wounded. She observes him closely and cannot stop thinking about him from this moment. Eventually, she cannot control her feelings and they become lovers after the christening of her son.[252] Despite offering the viewer an access to Mary's thoughts about Bothwell via her unsent letters to Elizabeth, Imbach's representation of their love is marred by the performance of the main actress. There is no chemistry between them although Mary's letters keep on claiming how much she is consumed by love for him. Bothwell, on the other hand, does not seem very interested in Mary apart from fulfilling his physical desires and ambitions. Thus, there can be no talk of any affection for her on his part and their affair fails to get sympathies and interest of the viewer.

As was mentioned in the subsection focusing on Darnley's assassination, in Jarrott's adaptation, Mary and Bothwell become lovers after he urges her to pardon the conspirators of Rizzio's murder. At first, Mary tries to push him away but he is insistent and she submits willingly to his desire in the end.[253] After the explosion at Kirk O'Field, their affair is rushed as the events are recounted briefly by indignant Elizabeth who wears mourning colours for Darnley. There is no mention of the abduction (the same applies for the other films as well), only of their marriage which turned the Scots against them. Then, the focus turns again on Mary and Bothwell. They are at his castle which is surrounded by James's army. Bothwell wants to fight but Mary locks him in his chamber and begs him to escape while she surrenders to her half-brother. James forces her to abdicate but she resists him although she is under a great pressure. It is the mention of captured Bothwell which brings about her nervous breakdown. The lovers are allowed one last meeting and Bothwell convinces her to abdicate. In return, they

[251] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.
[252] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[253] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.

will go to exile, Mary to England and he to Denmark. They cling passionately to each other and Bothwell swears to love her always before they are parted.[254] In spite of offering the viewer only a few scenes depicting their affection for each other in comparison with the other film versions, Jarrott is definitely more successful in capturing the love between these characters than Imbach. The parting scene is the proof of this as it captures convincingly Mary's desperation at the prospect of condemning to death the man she loves or living separately forever in exile.

In contrast to Jarrott's representation of their last moments together, Imbach's version of their parting lacks any hint of passion between the characters. They just kiss briefly and Bothwell rides quickly away.[255] On top of that, there are no declarations of ever-lasting love that would help to convince the viewer of an epic love for which Mary lost everything. MacKinnon, on the other hand, continues to put an emphasis on their love till the very end. However, he overreaches himself in this endeavour. Mary and Bothwell are obsessed with each other to such an extent they start to behave illogically after Darnley's murder, and their irrationality borders on ridicule. He presses for the marriage, believing no one would harm him then. Her folly is even greater than his as she leaves the encampment with her baby son after a passionate night with Bothwell, and surrenders to the rebels who do not treat her kindly to her utter astonishment.[256]

To sum up, all selected films make of Mary and Bothwell lovers before Darnley's murder but the quality of the representation of their relationship differs greatly. Jarrott and MacKinnon succeed in conveying the emotions of the characters even though the latter exaggerates both Bothwell's adoration of Mary and the events leading to their downfall. In contrast to these directors, Imbach fails to portray an epic love due to the disappointing performance of the actors who cannot convince anyone about the passion between them.

[254] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[255] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[256] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.

5. Captivity in England

After Mary's surrender at Carberry Hill, the rebels removed her to the seclusion of Lochleven Castle. They forced Mary to abdicate there as they exerted pressure on her shortly after she miscarried Bothwell's twins.[257] Despite these misfortunes, she remained unbroken and managed to escape. She rallied an army round her but lost a battle at Langside against her half-brother. Then, she became a fugitive and faced several choices what to do next. She could have stayed in Scotland and raise a new army. Or she could have left for France where she had relatives and a possible support of the French King. Going to England was the last and the most unwise option. Nevertheless, Mary decided to set out there, turning a deaf ear to her nobles' counsel, in hope of persuading the English Queen to help her back on the throne.[258]

5.1 Mary and Elizabeth: Loving Cousins?

As was already mentioned in the first chapter, the two Queens were close blood relatives through Henry VII of England. It could have been this fact that lead Mary to a fatal decision to seek help in England rather than France after the lost battle at Langside. However, she was about to be sorely disappointed. Instead of Elizabeth's support in suppressing the rebellion, she was watched over by English noblemen while Elizabeth pondered what to do with her. It led to Mary's chagrin but she did not realise she put her royal cousin into an unenviable position by coming into her realm. Not only was Mary a Catholic ruler while Elizabeth was a Protestant but also she had a strong claim to the English throne. Suddenly, all unresolved questions concerning their relationship came back to life and were about to affect Elizabeth's attitude to Mary.

5.1.1 Historical Biographies

The very first episode indicating the development of Mary's and Elizabeth's relationship took place while the Scottish Queen still dwelt in France. As soon as Elizabeth ascended the English throne in 1558, her right to it was denied by the French King, Henry II, on the grounds of her illegitimacy because the union of her parents was deemed invalid in the eyes of Catholics. He named Mary as the rightful Queen of England instead. Mary began to use heraldic arms of England in her coat of arms and

[257] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 397, 399.
[258] Mason, 'Renesance a reformace: 16. století,' 107-108.

thus gave cause for the birth of rivalry between her and Elizabeth as this slight was never forgotten in England.[259]

The writers of historical biographies see in this act solely the hand of Henry II and the Guises, and absolve Mary from any initiative on her part. The most fervent supporter of Mary is Fraser who stands up for her, remarking Mary was not given an opportunity to judge the wisdom of this action against Elizabeth.[260] Although similar opinion is expressed by Jane Dunn, whose biography *Elizabeth and Mary: Cousins, Rivals, Queens* (2003) focusing on their relationship is going to be analysed in this subsection as well, she is more critical of the young Queen than Fraser. She points to Mary's never-ending aspiration to be recognized as the rightful heir of the English throne which initiated at that moment,[261] making of her an ambitious woman craving for her cousin's Crown. With regard to Elizabeth's reaction to Mary's pretensions, Graham is convinced she was offended and did not believe in the feeble excuse that it was entirely Henry II's idea.[262] Dunn, on the other hand, views Elizabeth as a benevolent woman, who admitted Mary should not be blamed for this situation due to her youth and inexperience.[263]

Following this unlucky event was Mary's effort of conciliation and personal meeting as can be seen in chapter 4. However, it did not bear any fruit because Mary achieved nothing in the question of succession due to Elizabeth's unwillingness to name an heir. Notwithstanding her vacillation when her heir was concerned, Dunn and Guy are confident the English Queen found no glee in Mary's downfall. Both authors portray Elizabeth's sympathies for Mary's plight and her infuriation when she heard the news from Scotland. It was unthinkable for her that nobility could rebel against their anointed monarch and feared her own subjects could be inspired by the Scots. Consequently, she wanted to send an army to Scotland but was advised by Cecil against it.[264] Dunn, unlike Guy, does not assign to Cecil such an influence over his Queen. According to her, Elizabeth did not waver in her intention to help Mary back on the throne even though she did not declare war on Scotland. She continued to threaten the rebels, an action

[259] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 95-96.
[260] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 97.
[261] Jane Dunn, *Alžběta a Marie: sestřenice, rivalky, královny*, trans. Michaela Ponocná (Praha: Beta-Dobrovský, 2005), 47.
[262] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 81.
[263] Dunn, *Alžběta a Marie*, 48.
[264] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 365.

which Dunn believes saved Mary's life.[265] As is evident from Dunn's and Guy's description of Elizabeth's attitude to her cousin, she behaved like her champion and was not content to let her rot in prison. Instead, she was bent on enforcing Mary's rights and showed a wholehearted support to her cause.

In contrast to these authors, Fraser and Graham do not paint such a noble picture of Elizabeth. Fraser regards the English Queen as a pragmatic woman who apart from being indignant at Mary's treatment also sought to get some benefit for England in the form of Prince James's guardianship.[266] Graham, on the other hand, makes of Elizabeth a patronizing relative who took advantage to rebuke Mary for her irrational behaviour in the past months, and he interprets one Elizabeth's letter to Mary as follows: 'If you will be so stupid as to marry a murderer who incriminates you, what did you expect?'[267]

Not only does not Graham portray Elizabeth as sympathetic to Mary while she was still imprisoned in Scotland but he continues in this tone to depict Elizabeth's reaction to the news of Mary's hasty flight to England. He hints at the possibility that the English Queen could have been secretly pleased about the changed political situation in Scotland, preferring regency of Mary's half-brother to her rule. However, at the same time, she was apprehensive about imprisoning Mary without a just cause. Hence the idea of the trial which should have investigated Mary's participation in Darnley's murder and Elizabeth's refusal to meet Mary in person till her innocence was established.[268] Whereas Graham's Elizabeth is depicted as a calculating woman wondering how to detain her cousin lawfully in England, Guy ascribes this antagonistic role to Cecil and sidelines the English Queen in this crucial moment. He expresses a belief that Elizabeth's intention was to restore Mary to the throne but Cecil forestalled this decision. He issued the orders about keeping Mary under guard at Carlisle Castle while he prepared the trial against her, and thus he seized the opportunity to destroy the threat for his Queen once and for all.[269]

Unlike Graham and Guy, Dunn and Fraser do not perceive Elizabeth's behaviour in black-and-white as they both give sufficient space to her insecurity and dilemma how to deal with Mary. They point to the danger of a Catholic rising in the northern England

[265] Dunn, *Alžběta a Marie*, 314-315.
[266] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 393.
[267] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 270.
[268] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 296-297.
[269] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 369.

in Mary's favour and the unwise course of letting her seek help in France or Spain because it would lead to Catholic intervention in British Isles. These were the primary reasons why Elizabeth decided to keep her cousin guarded in the north for the time being, using the unresolved question of Darnley's murder as a pretext for this action.[270] Notwithstanding the prudence of this course from the English point of view, Fraser is inclined to make of Mary the victim of the English injustice. She draws the reader's attention to Mary's pleading letters in which she implored Elizabeth for the meeting and sisterly help that were ignored by her cousin.[271] Dunn, on the contrary, draws on Mary's letters to depict how was Elizabeth torn apart between her duty to her realm and the right attitude to Mary. Consequently, she does not regard Mary as a defenceless victim and Elizabeth as a deaf gaoler on the grounds of them. She remarks on their authoritative tone and allusions to the help from Catholic countries. This on one level hardened Elizabeth's resolve to keep Mary in England, but on another level made her wish for Mary's dispatch back to Scotland where she would cease to be her problem.[272]

When the trial finally commenced in York in October 1568, Mary was not allowed to appear in person even though the Scottish nobles received a permission. It is worth remarking that throughout the proceedings the word *trial* was not mentioned due to the dubious legitimacy of trying a sovereign of a foreign country. In the end, it resolved nothing although the rebels presented the evidence in the form of the Casket Letters to the juries. Mary was proclaimed neither innocent nor guilty when Elizabeth halted the proceedings and she remained as unofficial prisoner in England.[273]

Elizabeth's attitude to the trial causes once again a discrepancy among the writers. Graham is convinced she longed for proving Mary's guilt and was disappointed the rebels did not present more tangible proofs against her. He believes it was Mary's obstinacy to not answer charges before anyone but Elizabeth that lead to the ambivalent conclusions of the trial. Although Elizabeth did not achieve the desired outcome, she satisfied herself with besmirching her cousin's reputation for the time being.[274] Dunn, in contrast to Graham, does not portray Elizabeth as a villain who craves for Mary's downfall. Quite the opposite, she regards her as Mary's protector. She claims that by

[270] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 427-428.
[271] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 432-433.
[272] Dunn, *Alžběta a Marie*, 327-328.
[273] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 438, 444, 450.
[274] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 308, 323-325.

stopping the proceedings, Elizabeth defended not only Mary's honour but also the reputation of all women rulers. She is further convinced Elizabeth was not indifferent to her cousin's fate and was troubled by the arisen situation dictated by necessity which made of her a captor of a fellow sovereign.[275] Similar sentiment is expressed by Guy who supposes Elizabeth did not believe in the authenticity of the Casket Letters. Therefore, she adjourned the trial indefinitely in order to avert a verdict prejudicial to Mary and forbade the judges to mention the incriminating letters in public.[276] Even though he does not make of Elizabeth a spiteful woman, he has an understanding for Mary's feelings as well. According to him, this was the pivotal moment that changed Mary's attitude to Elizabeth forever. Because she felt betrayed by her cousin, she assumed the role of a devoted Catholic who is held in captivity without justification, a proclamation posing a threat to the English Queen for the rest of Mary's life.[277]

On the whole, the writers, apart from Graham, do not perceive Elizabeth as Mary's mortal enemy. However, they take great pains to avoid calling them loving relatives either. They point to the ambivalent nature of their relationship that arose from Mary's aspiration to be named the heir to Elizabeth's throne and the uneasy situation in which the English Queen found herself after Mary's flight to England. Although they mention Elizabeth's sympathy for her cousin's plight, they ascribe this sentiment mainly to her notions of sovereign's inviolability as she feared the rebellion against an anointed Queen could give a dangerous precedence in her own realm. Thus, they make it clear that Elizabeth's attitude to Mary was dictated more by politics than family consideration.

5.1.2 Fiction

Henry II's proclamation that Mary is the rightful Queen of England is the cornerstone of her and Elizabeth's relationship in fiction as well. The writers portray Mary either as an honourable young woman who is shocked at the proposition or as an opportunist who has no doubts about the justifiability of this action. The first case is best represented in George's and Tannahill's novels. During an interview with Henry, George's Mary is defiant and refuses to submit to his will at first: "'...I will have the heralds formally proclaim you Queen of England." "No." "Yes. You will obey. I am your King." "I am an anointed queen in my own right... I am your equal, not your

[275] Dunn, *Alžběta a Marie*, 332-334.
[276] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 435, 437.
[277] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 435-436.

subject.'"[278] Tannahill's Mary, in comparison with George's, is not so audacious and does not voice her doubts out loud. Nevertheless, she abhors this pretensions and fears the consequences which take form of Elizabeth's support of the rebels in Scotland shortly afterwards.[279] In contrast to these authors, Byrd describes Mary who is not troubled by misgivings. She adopts rather an opportunistic attitude and eagerly grasps at the idea. However, she is disappointed that her right will not be enforced by an invasion, realising the emptiness of the gesture and the likely wrath of Elizabeth.[280]

While Elizabeth's reaction is not mentioned in the latter novel, George, Plaidy and Tannahill refer to it further in their novels. George depicts Elizabeth who seems willing to forget about the slight for the moment as she consents to the fresh start between them after Mary's return to Scotland.[281] Tannahill's Elizabeth, on the other hand, does not show such leniency. Her thoughts about Mary when she is left alone with Cecil leave no doubt she considers her to be a threat: '...for as long as she lives she will be a danger to me and to my throne... Something must be done about her.'[282] The similar attitude is present in the novel by Plaidy *The Captive Queen of Scots* (1964), a sequel of *The Royal Road to Fotheringhay*, but it resembles more a hatred on the part of Elizabeth than mere apprehension. This emotion comes to surface when Mary seeks help in England. Immediately, Elizabeth is wary of a Catholic rising in Mary's favour and remembers her pretension to her throne. A fact that she regards as a sufficient reason why Mary should be punished.[283]

To the contrary of Plaidy's unfavourable portrayal of Elizabeth, George continues to see the English Queen in a good light and presents her as Mary's protector while she is held a captive in Scotland. Elizabeth is irritated by the rebellion and only the rebels' threats of killing Mary prevent her from sending an army to Scotland. She sends a letter to Mary, imploring her to abdicate in order to save herself and pointing to the invalidity of this act if it is done under duress.[284] Even though Tannahill depicts Elizabeth's indignation as well, she does not forget to mention her ulterior motives. That is getting

[278] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 80.
[279] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 36-38.
[280] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 55.
[281] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 166-167.
[282] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 94.
[283] Jean Plaidy, *Královnina zajatkyně*, trans. Alena Maxová (Praha: Baronet, 1999), 218-219.
[284] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 568-569.

Mary's son into English custody.[285] Whereas these authors put Elizabeth into the position of Mary's supporter, though Elizabeth's proclamations in Tannahill's novel are not entirely sincere, Plaidy uses Mary's difficulties to demonstrate another illustration of her villainy. As is clear from the conversation between James and another nobleman about Elizabeth's reaction, she is secretly pleased about the change of regime in Scotland and greedily bargains for Mary's precious pearls with James.[286]

Notwithstanding Elizabeth's varying attitude to Mary during her imprisonment in Scotland, all authors capture her displeasure when she finds out about her cousin's arrival to England. However, in most cases, it can be judged solely on the grounds of Mary's treatment because few writers provide direct insight into Elizabeth's mind. One of them is George who excels in portraying her conflicting emotions. At first, Elizabeth is shocked and furious that her cousin acted so irrationally. Then, she starts to feel sympathy towards Mary and makes up her mind to send for her. Yet, her councillors dissuade her from this notion and suggest a trial instead which will settle Mary's disputes with the rebels and investigate her involvement in Darnley's assassination. Reluctantly, Elizabeth consents to their advice, thus gaining more time to ruminate about the matter.[287]

Although Elizabeth's dilemma is not elaborated to such an extent in Lochhead's play, she manages to capture it and the tension between Elizabeth and her two advisers as well. The English Queen is exasperated about the task she is facing, listing the things she cannot do for Mary while trying to ignore her advisers' urges to nip the danger in the bud. Eventually, she proclaims her love for Mary, swearing she will not harm her unless she is tricked into it by others. Despite this vow, there is an ominous suggestion her repetition of the oath should prompt her advisers into tricking her,[288] an indication she secretly wishes for Mary's death.

With regard to Mary's reaction to Elizabeth's vacillating stance at the beginning of her captivity, the authors offer greater variety as her attitude ranges from complete trust in her cousin to barely hidden outrage. Mary in George's and Plaidy's novels is the representative of the first case. In spite of not being allowed into Elizabeth's presence,

[285] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 447-448.
[286] Plaidy, *Královnina zajatkyně*, 122-123.
[287] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 646-651.
[288] Lochhead, *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off*, 61-63.

George's Mary is convinced about her sincerity and concludes prematurely the hearing should serve as the first step to her restoration. Hence, she does not raise objections against it and looks forward to defending her cause.[289] Plaidy's Mary evinces the same optimism but her faith in Elizabeth's goodwill borders on naivety as the following episode illustrates. When her friends intercept correspondence between James and Elizabeth by chance, Mary refuses to believe the English Queen plots against her and means to detain her in England indefinitely. Instead of learning from her past mistakes, Mary writes Elizabeth about the letters, expresses a belief it is a foul work of her advisers[290] and thus lets her know unwisely, she is not bereft of outside information and faithful servants.

Quite the opposite stance from the above representations is adopted by Mary in Phillipa Gregory's novel *The Other Queen* which focuses on Mary's captivity in England. Far from trusting Elizabeth blindly, the Scottish Queen, who is a spoilt woman with an excessive sense of her royal rights, is defiant from the start. She regards Elizabeth's acting as stupid and detrimental to other female rulers. Moreover, it is obvious she cherishes no love for her cousins as she mentions several times Elizabeth seized the English realm which is rightfully hers.[291] Likewise, Byrd shows Mary as a spirited woman who is not willing to tolerate Elizabeth's prevarication. As soon as the news of the refused meeting reaches her, she loses all illusions of her cousin's good intentions. Rather than containing her fury within herself, she pours out her emotion on Elizabeth's unfortunate nobleman, swears to leave for France at once and refuses to submit to her cousin's jurisdiction.[292] Similar frustration appears also in Tannahill's novel but it takes on an original form as Mary dreams about meeting Elizabeth. The moment Mary notices her, she reproaches Elizabeth for letting her wait and for intending to investigate Darnley's murder. Elizabeth seeks to soothe her by promising her the restoration but Mary accuses her of insincerity. Afterwards, they have a heated argument which ends up in a physical assault,[293] an untypical act for Tannahill's Mary who has been rather a gentle woman up to this moment.

---

[289] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 652, 654.
[290] Plaidy, *Královnina zajatkyně*, 177-178.
[291] Philippa Gregory, *Královská hrdost*, trans. Blažena Kukulišová (Frýdek Místek: Alpress, 2009), 15-16.
[292] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 475-477.
[293] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 479-482.

Owing to the varying feelings which Elizabeth harbours for Mary in the individual novels, the authors differ in their portrayal of Elizabeth's notion of the trial's desired outcome. The two contradictory conceptions can be illustrated by Tannahill and Gregory. Whereas Tannahill's Elizabeth privately wishes for a proof that will justify Mary's detention in England,[294] it seems the English Queen seeks to act fairly in Gregory's novel. She orders the end of the proceedings and confides in the Earl of Shrewsbury that she intends to restore Mary back on the throne when the time is ripe.[295] However, as her intentions are interpreted from the Earl's point of view, there is no guarantee she is completely sincere though he believes in her words.

Taken everything into consideration, the fiction writers are almost equally divided in their representation of Mary's and Elizabeth's relationship. Lochhead, Plaidy and Tannahill present the English Queen as Mary's adversary as the examples of Elizabeth's conduct illustrate. George and Gregory, to the contrary, portray her as a woman who is rather sympathetic to her cousin despite detaining her in England out of necessity. With regard to Mary's feelings for Elizabeth, she is openly hostile to her from the start, the enmity springing from her aspirations for Elizabeth's throne, in the novels by Byrd and Gregory. In comparison to the latter writers, George and Plaidy depict Mary's goodwill to her cousin, both before and shortly after her arrival to England, a misplaced feeling in the second case.

5.1.3 Film

Given the little attention Jarrott and MacKinnon pay to Mary's stay at the French court, her immediate feelings concerning the claim to Elizabeth's throne are depicted merely in Imbach's adaptation. When Henry II raises the subject of Elizabeth's illegitimacy and states Mary will become the next Queen of England, she evinces no elation at the news. Although she does not argue with the King, it is apparent his wish is in stark contrast to her initial notion of friendship with Elizabeth which she shared so enthusiastically with her friend earlier.[296] Whereas Imbach's Mary does not crave for Elizabeth's throne and resorts to this action only after the King's urging, MacKinnon portrays Mary with a more ambitious streak. She recalls the iniquities of the English on her way back to Scotland, and looks forward to her revenge, prophesying her child will

[294] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 483.
[295] Gregory, *Královská hrdost*, 22, 29.
[296] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.

become the next ruler of England.[297] Thus, this scene indicates Mary has no inclination of befriending her cousin or an intention to relinquish her claim to the English throne. Likewise, Jarrott's Mary has no qualms about being the rightful Queen of England as she calls Elizabeth a 'usurper.'[298] Notwithstanding this feeling, unlike MacKinnon's Mary, she seems willing to make compromises as she expresses a wish to travel back to Scotland through England in order to win Elizabeth over,[299] naively assuming it will be an undemanding task.

Needless to say, Elizabeth is not pleased about Mary's claim to her throne and her attitude to her cousin is strongly influenced by it. Her sentiments are expressed in MacKinnon's adaptation when she confronts James with Mary's return to Scotland. She is upset with the news and she lets him know she perceives Mary's claim as a threat to her rule. James seeks to placate her by promising he will be the actual ruler of Scotland, a promise she urges him to keep.[300] Owing to the fact that almost the same scene is depicted by Jarrott, one cannot help but wonder MacKinnon got his inspiration for linking Elizabeth and James together as Mary's adversaries from this older film version. However, his is the poorer imitation as Jarrott's choice of an actress representing Elizabeth is more fortunate. Not only does she appear more regal but also she does not overplay her indignation at Mary's return. Instead of evoking an idea that she is on the verge of hysteria, she maintains her royal dignity and is inclined to hear out Cecil's and James's advices relating to Mary.[301]

Unlike these two films, Imbach does not assign the role of the English Queen to any actress but it does not mean he completely ignores the relationship between her and Mary. Apart from countless letters from Mary to Elizabeth which express her feelings, he includes a few scenes depicting Rizzio as a puppet master who controls puppets of the two Queens, thus he approaches their relationship in an interesting and original way. Elizabeth acts as a patronizing relative who likes to tell her cousin what to do but Mary does not always oblige her in Rizzio's performance. When Elizabeth proposes a sisterly embrace on the condition that Mary will remove her crown, Mary refuses unless she does the same. Elizabeth declines and their conversation reaches a stalemate. Rizzio

[297] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.
[298] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[299] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[300] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.
[301] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.

summarises their obstinacy with the words aptly expressing the paradox of their relationship: 'What we have here, my dears, is a tragic situation. Two sisters. Two Queens. Who can't even embrace each other.'[302]

Any concession either from Mary or Elizabeth is out of the question also in Jarrott's and MacKinnon's films. Mary's return to Scotland does not turn Elizabeth's enmity into friendship as her scheming concerning Mary's marriage proves in Jarrott's adaptation.[303] However, to be fair, Mary is not an innocent party either. Far from laying aside her claim to Elizabeth's throne, she contrives plans to invade England and depose her cousin as soon as she stabilises Scotland.[304] Although the Scottish Queen does not voice such ambitious plans in MacKinnon's adaptation, their relationship remains tense throughout the film. Elizabeth behaves like a spiteful woman who wishes only the worst to Mary. When she hears about Mary's pregnancy, she prays for a sickly girl[305] as the thought of a healthy boy who will become her successor fills her with horror. Likewise, Mary does not cherish any warm feelings for Elizabeth. She gloats over giving birth to a son and mocks Elizabeth's infertility and jealousy.[306] The same pride over her son is felt by Mary in Imbach's film and she confides to Bothwell how eager she is to see Elizabeth's reaction if she attends christening. Despite this mischievous remark, Mary is not hostile to Elizabeth. She is convinced a bond originating from their station and kinship exists between them which draws them together,[307] and thus she idealistically believes that they can become friends and the closest allies in the future.

Due to the fact that MacKinnon's adaptation ends before Mary escapes to England and Imbach skips several years and then focuses on the moments before her execution, only Jarrott's highly adapted depiction of Mary's reception there is going to be analysed. Contrary to the historical facts, Elizabeth does not refuse Mary's pleas for personal meeting and they meet in the woods secretly. At first, they both behave civilly and they even kiss each other. However, the hypocrisy of this gesture is soon revealed. When Elizabeth forbids her to leave for France and declines to provide Mary with funds and an army unless she is cleared of Darnley's murder, it dawns on Mary she is a prisoner and loses her temper. She gives vent to all her frustration and screams insults on her

---

[302] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.
[303] See subsection 4.1.3.
[304] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[305] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.
[306] *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot*: *Episode 1*, directed by Gillies MacKinnon.
[307] *Mary Queen of Scots*, directed by Thomas Imbach.

cousin. In return for these slanders, Elizabeth calls her an incompetent Queen who brought all misfortunes upon herself. Their meeting does not end well consequently. Mary warns Dudley to guard his mistress against assassins and rides angrily away while Elizabeth realises she will have to keep her in prison till her death.[308] Notwithstanding its historical inaccuracy, the scene succeeds in capturing the tension accumulated between the two Queens during the years. On top of that, both actresses play their roles convincingly. While Mary has difficulties in curbing her bad temper, living up to her image of a woman controlled by emotions, Elizabeth gives the impression of being more composed of the pair even when she scolds her cousin.

On the whole, Jarrott's and MacKinnon's representations of Mary's and Elizabeth's relationship are far from portraying them as loving relatives. They are bitter rivals from the start due to Mary's claim to the English throne and neither of them wishes any good to the other. Imbach, on the other hand, is careful to present any definite opinion, especially when Elizabeth is concerned. Whereas Mary seems to mean her professions of friendship, her cousin's attitude is ambivalent even though Rizzio's puppet shows suggest, she does not feel such hatred for Mary as in the previous films.

5.2 The Casket Letters

The Casket Letters were among the chief evidence presented on the trial in England. They were supposedly found in the royal apartments in a silver casket by the Scottish lords either before or after Mary's surrender at Carberry Hill. The documents included eight letters, two marriage contracts and twelve sonnets. Five letters were said to incriminate Mary in the planning of Darnley's demise with Bothwell, the rest were supposed to prove her foreknowledge of the abduction and her adultery with Bothwell. Nowadays, only the transcripts in French, Scots and English survive because the original documents disappeared in 1580s.[309] This fact makes it harder to determine whether they were genuine or outright forgeries, a question over which many historians and fiction writers ponder till this day.

[308] *Mary, Queen of Scots*, directed by Charles Jarrott.
[309] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 397-398.

5.2.1 Historical Biographies

Both Fraser and Guy go to great lengths to unravel the mystery of the letters. According to them, the potentially most devastating first two letters, so called Glasgow letters, do not prove Mary's involvement in Darnley's murder. Guy admits the letters could have been truly written by Mary, but there are also passages which were added later by some of the Scottish nobles. He claims the letter I was not written in Glasgow and did not concern Darnley's removal to Craigmillar Castle but her son's. He builds his argument on the improbability that Mary would apply the following loving description to her estranged husband: 'the merriest that ever you saw, and doth remember unto me all that he can to make me believe that he loveth me.'[310]

Fraser is of the same opinion when she regards the content of the first Glasgow letter.[311] She also agrees with Guy about the possibility that the incriminating parts describing a woman's longing for a lover in the second letter were interpolated in one of Mary's own letters in which she confidentially described her attitude to Darnley in Glasgow. Whereas Fraser assigns the authorship of these love parts to another woman who had a love affair with Bothwell,[312] Guy does not rule out the possibility that most of these parts were taken from Mary's letters addressed to Bothwell after her abduction.[313] Graham, unlike Fraser and Guy, does not consider whether Mary or another woman was the author of the interpolated parts and dismisses them as forgeries right away.[314]

Not only do Guy and Fraser differ in the question of authorship of the inserted parts, they analyse differently the following letters as well. Just as in the case of the love parts in the second letter, Fraser is convinced letters III, IV and V were actually written by Bothwell's former lover who is complaining of being neglected and who is being jealous of another woman.[315] Guy, on the other hand, suggests these letters could have been written by Mary. However, they were not describing her relationship with Bothwell but Darnley presumably in 1566. He backs up his argument by focusing on the contents of these letters as he points out the described relationship of the couple and

[310] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 402.
[311] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 454.
[312] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 457.
[313] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 416.
[314] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 316.
[315] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 460-462.

their living apart resemble more Mary's marriage with the adulterous Darnley than with Bothwell. Besides, Guy holds the view the allusion to the turtledove escaping to freedom, said to refer to the planned murder, more likely refers to the possibility of divorce. In this case, the turtledove stands for Mary and not for Darnley.[316] Interesting as his deductions are, he is the only one advocating these views as Graham shares Fraser's opinion and assigns the authorship of the letters to Bothwell's lover but not to Mary.[317]

The same discrepancy among the writers occurs in the analysis of letter VI. Once again, Guy seriously considers its authenticity but he remarks it was written by Mary after the abduction not beforehand. He draws the attention to the editing of the English copy where the word *after* was crossed out by Cecil and replaced with *afore*. Guy is convinced this was done deliberately in order to prove Mary's foreknowledge of the abduction as he deems it improbable that Mary would confuse future tense for past tense while writing in French.[318] Fraser, in contrast to Guy, dismisses Mary's authorship of this letter. However, she is ready to admit it at letters VII and VIII due to its style typical for Mary. According to her, if the letter VII is genuine, it proves Mary's foreknowledge of the abduction. On the other hand, Fraser believes the letter VIII was written after the marriage and concerned Mary's worries of rebellion.[319] Whereas Graham holds the same views as Fraser,[320] Guy regards the letters VII and VIII as edited versions of letter VI. These versions should have corrected the mistakes present in the latter, particularly the references to Bothwell's brother-in-law, Huntly, in order to implicate Mary as Bothwell's accomplice in the abduction.[321]

Overall, the writers do not believe the Casket Letters prove Mary's guilt of the charges held against her. However, they differ in their opinions on the authorship of the incriminating parts. Guy asserts Mary could have been the author but wrote them in different context than the Scottish lords claimed. Fraser and Graham, on the other hand, are convinced some of the letters were forgeries or described Bothwell's liaison with another woman, and they dismiss Mary's authorship out of hand.

---

316 Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 420-425.
317 Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 316.
318 Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 426-428.
319 Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 463-465.
320 Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 317.
321 Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 428-429.

5.2.2 Fiction

Given Mary's liaison with Bothwell in some novels, the fiction writers differ from the historical biographies in the question of the letters' authenticity, especially the so called Glasgow letters. Byrd, George and Plaidy include a scene in their novels in which Mary scribbles love letters to Bothwell while she dwells in Glasgow with Darnley. Yet, there is a difference among these novels. As was mentioned in the subsection dealing with Darnley's murder, Byrd and Plaidy portray Mary as Bothwell's accomplice in the crime. Therefore, passages implicating her in planning of the murder appear in her letter: 'Consider if you might not find some way more secret than a draught, for he will take physic at Craigmillar and the baths also.'[322] Even though this particular citation is not mentioned in Plaidy's novel, Mary is wracked with guilt and writes about the task that she detests,[323] undoubtedly referring to Bothwell's plan to lure Darnley from safety to Edinburgh. George's Mary, on the other hand, makes no allusions to Darnley's elimination in her letter because neither of the lovers intend to kill him at this point. She merely pours out her disdain for Darnley and her longing for Bothwell on the pages: 'seeing that I cannot do what I most desire, that is to lie between your arms, my dear life... Cursed be this pox-marked person who vexes me!'[324]

Whereas Mary's authorship of the letters in the novels mentioned above cannot be denied, the novel by Tannahill does not portray her as their author. The nobles find a casket containing Mary's private letters and after a while present them at the privy council to prove her guilt. The forgery of the letters is implied by Maitland as he reflects on the means how the incriminating evidence could have been created: 'A few discarded drafts of the sonnets the queen wrote for her own amusement; scraps of letters to Bothwell from past mistresses; an amorous phrase inserted here or there.'[325] As is evident from his thoughts, he nurses doubts about the letters' authenticity and is inclined to believe in the falsification. Likewise Tannahill, Gregory does not assign the authorship of the Casket Letters to Mary. However, she does not put doubts into Maitland's head but voices them through Bess of Hardwick in whose household Mary is going to be placed. Bess finds the idea of the letters' genuineness ridicules because no

[322] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 312.
[323] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 360.
[324] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 436-437.
[325] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 446.

real woman would have ever acted in this way, and she marvels at the effort put into the forgery, suspecting Cecil's hand in the business.[326]

The tampering with Mary's letters to suit the rebels' needs is also suggested in George's and Plaidy's novels. In the novel by George, Maitland seeks to persuade the Duke of Norfolk to consider marriage with Mary and for this reason, questions the authenticity of the letters: 'Lord Morton swears they were found as he described, but the truth is we have no way of knowing what exactly he found. He has had more than a year to prepare the contents of the casket.'[327] Maitland's suspicion about the forgery is more than plausible because the discovered letters could have only convicted Mary of adultery with Bothwell but not Darnley's murder. Although the matter is quite different in Plaidy's novel as Mary alludes to the conspiracy against Darnley in her letter from Glasgow, she ruminates the possibility that the letters have been forged as she does not recall using such harsh words against her murdered husband.[328] In this case, the forgery is hard to prove because there is no episode in which the rebels find the letters and the reader has only Mary's word whose reliability is questionable.

In Byrd's novel, on the other hand, the rebels have no need to forge the letters as they are already condemning on their own. This is shown by Mary's consternation when she receives copies of them from Maitland during the Conference in York and reads them. She is aware the revelation of their contents could damage her reputation forever and decides to disclaim her authorship even though they are hers in their entirety.[329]

All things considered, whereas Gregory and Tannahill regard the letters as outright forgeries, Byrd, George and Plaidy portray Mary as the author of the love letters to Bothwell. Moreover, Byrd and Plaidy even include the parts in the letters convicting her of premeditating Darnley's murder. However, despite Mary's authorship of the letters, these writers do not rule out the possibility, apart from Byrd, that the rebels tamper with her private letters to make them more devastating.

---

[326] Gregory, *Královská hrdost*, 20-21.
[327] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 659-660.
[328] Plaidy, *Královnina msta*, 404.
[329] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 479-480.

5.3 The Babington Plot and Mary's Execution

Following the inconclusive trial which proved Mary neither guilty nor innocent, she became a focal point for the Catholic intrigues and plots, for example the Northern Rising in 1569 which aimed at overthrowing Elizabeth as well as Protestantism. Even though nothing came from the plots and the Rising was soon suppressed, the danger to Elizabeth's life was not underestimated. It became more acute in 1570 when Pope Pius V issued a bull that appealed to Catholics to depose this pretender to the English throne.[330] Consequently, Elizabeth's advisers urged her to deal with Mary whom they saw behind every conspiracy. Elizabeth, however, refused to put her cousin on trial which could end up with Mary's execution throughout the 1570s and early 1580s. All her advisers achieved was the confirmation of the 'Act for the Queen's Safety' in 1585 that charged the English subjects to find and kill the supposed beneficiaries of Elizabeth's murder. Thus, the first step was taken in condemning Mary to death as soon as another conspiracy against the English Queen emerged. [331]

An opportunity presented itself in 1586 when a young Catholic, Anthony Babington, contacted Mary and asked her for an approval of his plan to rescue her with the help of the Spanish and to assassinate Elizabeth, a deed which was to be done by six gentlemen. Unknown to her, their correspondence was infiltrated and every letter was read by Francis Walsingham, Elizabeth's spymaster, before it reached its intended recipient. He impatiently waited for her reply, scenting a chance to eliminate her once and for all.[332]

5.3.1 Historical Biographies

There is no doubt among the authors that Mary agreed with her cousin's assassination though she did not mention it explicitly in her reply to Babington. In his analysis of her letter, Graham is not far from calling her action the stupidest one in her whole life. Notwithstanding this harsh judgement, he speculates she might have lied to herself about the true intentions of the six gentlemen, as he compares her state of mind to her self-denial before Darnley's murder.[333] Hereby, he seeks to avoid labelling her a murderess. Likewise, Fraser justifies Mary's conduct by drawing an attention to the

[330] Guy, 'The Tudor Age,' 306.
[331] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 468-469, 475.
[332] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 481.
[333] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 393, 395.

dashed hopes and misfortunes that had befallen her during the years of imprisonment. According to her, the last straw for Mary was her son's treaty with Elizabeth made shortly before her reply to Babington. This disillusionment with her son cast Mary in a profound state of despair and compelled her to act irrationally as nothing mattered to her anymore but freedom.[334] Although Guy does not go to such great lengths as Fraser in order to clear Mary's name and rather focuses on the description of her action, he seems to be rather sympathetic to her as well. He suggests she felt cornered by that time, therefore she decided to take a risk, preferring an action to the tedious routine of her days.[335]

As soon as Walsingham obtained this longed-for reply, he presented the evidence to Elizabeth who finally made up her mind to put Mary on trial. The proceedings took place at Fotheringhay Castle. Mary refused to appear in person at first, and she pointed out that none of the present judges was her equal and she did not come under English jurisdiction. However, she changed her mind in the end, sensing she would be tried nonetheless. When she faced the judges, she bluntly refused the charges of consenting to Elizabeth's assassination although she was confronted with the testimonies of her secretaries and the other conspirators.[336] This defiance along with her overall conduct on the trial is praised by Fraser and Guy who can hardly conceal their admiration. Fraser looks up to her composed way in which she defended herself without any advocates and describes her bearing as 'unwaveringly regal.'[337] Guy expresses a similar opinion but he puts the greatest emphasis on Mary's short exchange with Cecil when she accused him of being her adversary and he confirmed it.[338] A statement which he uses readily to back up the main argument of his biography. That is describing Cecil as Mary's nemesis who all those years sought to destroy her.

The judges did not proclaim a sentence immediately after they heard Mary's defence as Elizabeth needed more time to consider what to do. Fraser is convinced her prevarication was caused not only by the fact that Mary was an anointed Queen and her kinswoman but also by her apprehension regarding the reaction of other monarchs. Consequently, she was torn apart and wished someone else would take the

---

[334] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 566-567.
[335] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 482-484.
[336] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 487-489, 493.
[337] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 597.
[338] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 492-493.

responsibility from her. A wish leading to a suggestion to Mary's gaoler, Amyas Paulet, to murder her which Elizabeth made a few days after she had signed the death warrant. To her displeasure, he refused to burden his conscience with such a crime.[339] Guy, just like Fraser, mentions Elizabeth's effort to shrug off her responsibility and make others to kill Mary. However, he points to her motives for this dishonest behaviour. Mainly, her fear that an official execution would give a precedence to any regicide in the future. Therefore, he believes Elizabeth never had in mind the actual usage of the signed death warrant and Cecil sent it to Fotheringhay without her foreknowledge.[340] Whereas Guy does not doubt Elizabeth's awareness of signing the death warrant, Graham presents to the reader another version of the event. In this particular version, her secretary handed Elizabeth a bundle of papers, among them was the warrant, and she signed them all but never read them.[341] Graham dismisses the story as highly improbable and is inclined to believe that it originated later, stating: 'This sounds very much like a version of the event after it had passed through the Tudor spin doctors.'[342]

The death warrant was read to Mary on the night before her execution. All authors agree unanimously she received the news calmly and expressed joy to die for the Catholic Church. According to Fraser, Mary's intention of making of herself a martyr originated shortly after she was accused of conspiracy in the Babington plot. From that moment, she acted with this view in mind, hoping to triumph through death.[343] Graham is of the same opinion as Fraser and he backs up his argument by mentioning the episode when Paulet removed Mary's cloth of state, and she replaced it with a cross, thus substituting 'secular power for spiritual faith.'[344] In comparison with these writers, Guy does not pay such attention to Mary's stylising into the martyr's role. He just briefly mentions it in passing while he describes her reaction to the news of being executed the next morning and her preparations to play her final part.[345]

The writers' description of the execution is almost identical and differs only in insignificant details. These differences are caused by, as Graham aptly states, the

[339] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 603, 610-611.
[340] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 495-497.
[341] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 420.
[342] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 420.
[343] Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 577.
[344] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 415.
[345] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 499.

number of witnesses watching Mary's last moments.[346] However, Mary's conduct is always portrayed as courageous and composed till the very end. Unlike her servants, she shed no tears and persisted in her role of the Catholic martyr. She prayed loudly to drown out a Protestant preacher and was dressed in a red petticoat, a colour symbolising martyrdom. Although she played her part perfectly, the same cannot be said about the executioner. It took him two times before her head was severed from the body and even then something unimaginable happened. When he raised her head, it fell to the ground while a wig stayed in his hand to the astonishment of the audience. Afterwards, the castle gates were closed and everything with Mary's blood on it was burned in order to prevent Catholics from obtaining a relic.[347]

Overall, the authors show the least varieties in their opinions on Mary's last months than could be seen in the rest of their biographies. They perceive her consent to Elizabeth's assassination as an act of a desperate woman, therefore they do not condemn her for it. They evince rather an admiration for her conduct on the trial and at the execution as they point to her composure with which she played her part of the martyr, professing her affiliation to the Catholic Church till the very end.

5.3.2 Fiction

The fiction writers make Mary privy to the Babington plot in most cases as well, but they differ in the depiction of her conflicting emotions and her reply concerning the matter of Elizabeth's assassination. Whereas Tannahill's recount of the event gives an impression that Mary makes up her mind instantly and shows no misgivings while she draws up the reply which only mentions her rescue,[348] George's Mary is torn and wavers in her final decision. She gives the answer a serious thought, refusing to agree with the plan but searching for its justification at the same time. Eventually, she consents to the plot in its entirety, regarding it as an end to her troubles whatever its outcome.[349] On the other hand, Mary does not adopt such a fatalistic attitude and does not admit to herself a possibility of the plot's discovery in Byrd's and Plaidy's novels. She views it as a unique opportunity how to regain her freedom, nevertheless she has scruples about planning Elizabeth's assassination. Not wishing to burden her conscience, Byrd's Mary makes no

[346] Graham, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, 425-426.
[347] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 6-8.
[348] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 567-568.
[349] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 803-808.

mention of the matter in her letter although she assumes the conspirators will perform the deed nonetheless.[350] Plaidy's Mary acts in a similar way as she does not include the passage commenting on the murder either. However, she is not willing to accept Elizabeth's death on any conditions. Hence, she deludes herself into believing she will be able to save her cousin's life once she is free.[351]

Despite not giving her consent to Elizabeth's assassination in Tannahill's and the latter novels, these writers do not portray Mary as a completely innocent party as she urges the conspirators to liberate her with the help of the Spanish. Unlike them, Erickson goes a step further in her attempt to clear Mary's name and highly fictionalises the events leading to her execution. She makes of Mary a victim of the biased English judges who procure false evidence in order to sentence her to death. Mary is far from devising intrigues against Elizabeth in her novel, because she fears the repercussions for her daughter's safety. Instead, she devotes her time to prayers and is totally ignorant of the Babington plot till she hears she is to be tried for it at Fotheringhay. At first, she is apathetic, seeing no point in attending the trial in person, but regains her composure when she faces the judges. She tries to defend herself as best as she can, however she is soon worn out as she cannot shout down the accusers. Rather than allowing them to see her weakness, she decides to leave the chamber with the last remnants of dignity and forgives the judges.[352]

While Mary is in a tight corner in the latter novel, Tannahill's Mary professes her innocence tirelessly and denies the authorship of the passages referring to Elizabeth's murder. She is so relentless in her defence that Phelippes, Walsingham's man, cannot help himself but admires her conduct and anticipates a crisis after her execution.[353] The same determination is demonstrated by Mary in Byrd's novel as well. Despite the evidence against her, she does not give into despair but remains defiant throughout the proceeding. She finds in herself enough courage even to challenge Walsingham before she withdraws from the chamber: 'Send me to the block, but I promise you will see a martyr's death. You think me helpless, but time is on my side and the judgement of the future will brand your mistress a murderess.'[354] Likewise, Mary stylises herself into the

[350] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 517-518.
[351] Plaidy, *Královnina zajatkyně*, 474-475.
[352] Erickson, *Paměti Marie Stuartovny*, 276-279, 284-285.
[353] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 579-582.
[354] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 530.

role of a martyr during her brave defence in George's novel, and clearly indicates how she intends to die: 'I am the last Catholic member of both royal houses of England and Scotland, and I would cheerfully give my best blood to procure relief for the suffering Catholics of the realm.'[355]

Even though the judges find Mary guilty, Elizabeth is in a quandary about the next steps. In Plaidy's novel, Walsingham is exasperated with her indecision to such an extent that he proposes to her secretary to slip the death warrant among other papers so Elizabeth could pretend she signed it by chance. She acts according to their expectations but spoils the farce at the last moment when she expresses a pity that someone else have not taken a responsibility for Mary's death.[356] The death warrant is signed in the same way also in Tannahill's novel, however Elizabeth is more explicit about her wish that Paulet should murder Mary. As a result of her underhand behaviour, she is tormented by vivid dreams about Mary who comes to visit her. Instead of being angry with her cousin, Mary is lenient and forgiving. She urges Elizabeth not to postpone her execution and promises the English Queen will know the exact moment of her death as she will scream just for her.[357] In comparison with Plaidy's and Tannahill's novels, it seems that George's Elizabeth is going to act more honourably as she reads the warrant thoroughly before signing it. Yet, she spoils the favourable impression by making the same remark about Mary's death[358] as in the previous novels.

Notwithstanding Elizabeth's wish, Mary is not killed secretly in none of the novels. When the death warrant is read to her in Erickson's novel, she appears to be calm and reconciled with the fact that she is about to die. Nevertheless, she inwardly clings to the hope that the Spanish led by Bothwell will rescue her, a dream which does not come true.[359] Likewise, Byrd's Mary contemplates a chance how to stall the executioner for a brief moment, that is submitting to Elizabeth's will and confessing her part in the Babington plot. However, her pride wins over this momentary weakness and she decides to proceed courageously with her role of a Catholic martyr.[360] Plaidy's Mary, on the other hand, does not dwell on the thoughts of a miraculous deliverance or shows a momentary hesitation. She looks forward to the execution, regarding it as an

[355] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 829.
[356] Plaidy, *Královnina zajatkyně*, 497-498.
[357] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 590-594.
[358] George, *Mary Queen of Scotland*, 845-848.
[359] Erickson, *Paměti Marie Stuartovny*, 290-292.
[360] Byrd, *Immortal Queen*, 537.

end to her earthly troubles. This state of mind does not leave her even in her last moments as she encourages her servants not to weep but rejoice for her. Consequently, she dies without showing the slightest sign of fear and with her last words commands her soul to God.[361] Whereas Mary seems to be wholly concentrated on the spiritual matters at her execution in the latter novel, Tannahill's Mary is not oblivious to the secular world as she enters the hall. She is pleased to see what a large crowd has gathered to witness her end, thinking: 'They should see how proudly a queen of Scotland and of France could die, a martyr for her faith.'[362] The thought indicates that she means to play a part for them for which she will always be remembered.

Apart from the above descriptions of Mary's execution that mostly, with the exception of Erickson, stick to its representation in the historical biographies, there are two authors who let their imagination run riot. One of them is Lochhead who unexpectedly turns the setting of Mary's last moments into the twentieth century where a little Mary is bullied by other children, lead by Wee Betty (Elizabeth). Their bullying becomes more savage as Mary offends James Hepburn (Bothwell) and all children call for her execution as they begin to chant: 'Mary Queen of Scots got her head chopped off!'[363] Thus, Lochhead draws an analogy between the present setting and the historical one, and makes of Mary a victim of Wee Betty's malice who finds pleasure in tormenting her. Even though the other author, Susanna Clarke, does not create such an alternate setting in her short story 'Antickes and Frets' (2006) which depicts Mary's efforts to get rid of Elizabeth, she diverts from the other writers as well. Her short story has features of fantasy because she assigns a significant role to the magic present in an embroidery. It is by its means that Mary hopes to regain her freedom as she starts to sew a crimson petticoat, imagining the flames will bring down the prison walls. This idea comes true on the day of her execution when she dresses up in the petticoat[364] as she is liberated by death.

All in all, the majority of fiction writers absolve Mary from the blame for consenting to Elizabeth's assassination. They portray her as a partly innocent victim whose admirable defence on the trial avails her nothing as her fate is decided

[361] Plaidy, *Královnina zajatkyně*, 500-504.
[362] Tannahill, *Fatal Majesty*, 597.
[363] Lochhead, *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off*, 66.
[364] Susanna Clarke, 'Antickes and Frets,' in *The Ladies of Grace Adieu and Other Stories* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2007), 217-219.

beforehand. With regard to her execution, some of the writers divert from the historical biographies and seek to depict Mary who ruminates about a way how to avoid the sentence although she seems to be composed outwardly. Besides these authors, there are Lochhead and Clarke who go a step further and adapt the event into something new and original. Lochhead replaces the judges with naughty children from the twentieth century who embody the historical characters and torment Mary, and Clarke assigns magical properties to Mary's crimson petticoat by which means she is set free.

5.3.3 Film

The film directors, in comparison with the fiction writers, do not pay much attention to Mary's inner conflict when she receives the letter from Babington. A negligence caused most likely by the fact that the plot is mainly depicted in the films focusing on Elizabeth and almost ignored in the ones whose heroine is Mary. Consequently, the director of *Elizabeth: The Golden Age*, Shekhar Kapur, portrays Mary as a scheming villain who seeks to undermine Elizabeth's rule by replying without hesitation to Babington's letter and sanctioning the plan.[365] Similar unfavourable representation of Mary is also present in Tom Hooper's miniseries *Elizabeth I*, starring Helen Mirren, where it is intensified by personal meeting between the two Queens. Whereas Elizabeth gives an impression of a prudent monarch when she implores her cousin to cease plotting, Mary is her complete opposite. She shows no signs of political wisdom as she challenges Elizabeth haughtily that she does not have the courage to execute her, an unnecessarily provocation for one in her position. Nevertheless, she swears she does not seek Elizabeth's death. An oath whose worthlessness is soon revealed by Walsingham as he intercepts her letter to Babington.[366]

Unlike the above mentioned film adaptations, the fourth episode of Roderick Graham's TV miniseries *Elizabeth R* which depicts most accurately the Babington plot and its aftermath does not paint a black picture of Mary. Rather than being an arrogant woman who does not think long and hard before replying to Babington, she is more circumspect and does not take the matter lightly. When she reads the letter, her face is solemn and she seems to be distressed with its content.[367] Apart from this shot, another

---

[365] *Elizabeth: The Golden Age*, directed by Shekhar Kapur (2007; London: Universal Pictures UK, 2008), DVD.
[366] *Elizabeth I, Episode 1*, directed by Tom Hooper (2005; London: Channel 4, 2006), DVD.
[367] *Elizabeth R. Episode 4*, directed by Roderick Graham (1972; London: BBC Worldwide, 2006), DVD.

scene indicates she has given the matter much thought as she confides in Gifford, Walsingham's spy, that she was thinking about her past actions. She states that she feels no remorse but rather hope for the future. Thereafter, she hands him over her letter to Babington and asks him to keep it safe because her life depends upon it,[368] indirectly expressing she has taken a gamble for her life by consenting to the plot. Apart from Graham's miniseries, another one indicates Mary does not act rashly. That is Coky Giedroyc's third episode of *The Virgin Queen*. However, Mary's hesitation can only be deduced from the delay in sending her reply when Gifford does not discover the letter in a beer barrel straightaway,[369] as she has hardly an opportunity to speak for herself in this adaptation. Due to her small part in the film, not only it is impossible to draw conclusions regarding her feelings but also to ascertain whether she is directly involved in the plot. An uncertainty which arises after Phellipes's tampers with her letter before Walsingham presents it to Elizabeth.[370]

Upon hearing the news of Mary's part in the conspiracy, Elizabeth gives into despair and feels cornered by her advisers who call for her cousin's death in all analysed films. While Graham's Elizabeth seeks to avoid the responsibility by asking Paulet to murder Mary,[371] she behaves more honourably in Jarrott's adaptation. She declares she will be merciful if Mary asks for forgiveness, and she pays her a visit for this purpose. Yet, the meeting does not go according to her expectations. Mary refuses to humble herself though she admits she regrets agreeing with the plot. When Elizabeth perceives her reasoning is to no avail, she descends to threats of revealing Mary's love letters to Bothwell to the public. This statement gives Mary a pause but she regains her composure and persists in her intention to die as a martyr, thus redeeming herself from all her sins. She gives Elizabeth no choice but to face her greatest fear, sentencing to death a fellow sovereign.[372] Likewise, Graham's Mary is not daunted by the prospect of death. She awaits her end calmly and keeps her spirits up, announcing to her servants a few moments before the execution: 'The end of Mary Stuart's troubles is now done.'[373]

---

[368] *Elizabeth R. Episode 4,* directed by Roderick Graham.
[369] *The Virgin Queen: Episode 3*, directed by Coky Giedroyc (2006; London: Spirit Entertainment Limited, 2014), DVD.
[370] *The Virgin Queen: Episode 3,* directed by Coky Giedroyc.
[371] *Elizabeth R. Episode 4,* directed by Roderick Graham.
[372] *Mary, Queen of Scots,* directed by Charles Jarrott.
[373] *Elizabeth R. Episode 4*, directed by Roderick Graham.

Whereas Jarrott's and Graham's Mary arouses sympathy and admiration for her tragic but heroic death, it is Elizabeth whom the viewer pities in the following films as he perceives her sincere grief at having to order the execution of her ungrateful and treacherous cousin. In Hooper's adaptation, Elizabeth's quandary is depicted at its best. At first, she seeks to be lenient as she swears she will not sign the death warrant, thus wishing to spare Mary's life. However, she yields to the persuasion of her beloved Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester, and signs the warrant after all. Nevertheless, she changes her mind one more time and forbids the secretary to hand it over to the Council. A prohibition he does not heed so the execution takes place and Mary dies bravely, clad in a crimson gown to let the world know she is a martyr.[374]

The same conduct is also shown by Mary in Kapur's adaptation, but the scene outdoes the previous film due to the enhancement of its dramatic effect. This is achieved by alternating scenes focusing on Mary's composure as she comes near to the executioner's block with scenes capturing Elizabeth's exasperation and restless pacing through her palace.[375] Thus, the director juxtaposes the behaviour of the two Queens and successfully manipulates the viewer into feeling sympathy for Elizabeth who is tormented by guilty conscience for signing the death warrant. On the other hand, Giedroyc makes a bad job of the execution as Mary neither wears the crimson petticoat nor professes her Catholic faith loudly in front of the assembled crowd. She merely walks straight to the block and lays her head on it. In that moment, the focus shifts on Elizabeth who dreams about being beheaded and wakes up with a scream.[376]

To sum up, the film directors, apart from Giedroyc, depict Mary who gives her consent to Elizabeth's assassination. Yet, the view on her crime differs according to the adaptations. While Jarrott's and Graham's films are sympathetic to her, she is represented as a villain in the other films which focus on the English Queen. An impression which is not improved by her courageous conduct at the time of her death.

[374] *Elizabeth I, Episode 1*, directed by Tom Hooper.
[375] *Elizabeth: The Golden Age*, directed by Shekhar Kapur.
[376] *The Virgin Queen: Episode 3*, directed by Coky Giedroyc.

Conclusion

The life of Mary Stuart ended at Fotheringhay after nineteen years of imprisonment in England, nevertheless her motto: 'In my end is my beginning'[377] proved to be prophetic for the years to come. Far from being forgotten, her popularity among the public is undiminished as the vast number of historical biographies, fiction and films clearly shows. She continues to live on in the people's imagination and her life takes on new forms. Due to this fact, the true Mary Stuart is irrevocably lost as her life story is reshaped for purposes of individual writers and film directors. This could be seen not only in the fictional representations and film adaptations but also in the historical biographies which have been analysed in this thesis. Although they represent only a small sample of the total number, the different attitudes of their authors to Mary are clearly visible. While Fraser manages to be sympathetic to her without overstating her virtues and abilities like Guy, Graham's criticism of Mary indicates he is no fan of hers. Consequently, there are discrepancies among the historical biographies that prove many questions about Mary's life and her personality still remain unsettled.

Whereas the authors of historical biographies are in accordance with their view of Mary's marriage to the Dauphin, regarding it as a marriage of convenience between two young people who grew up together and loved each other as siblings, and her uneasy relationship with Catherine de Medici, the main differences among them emerge after Mary's return to Scotland. Fraser and Guy evaluate the first years of her personal rule positively and regard her as a promising ruler who did not seek to impose Catholicism on her Protestants subjects. Graham, on the other hand, is reluctant to assign to Mary any political skills and depicts her as a naive young woman controlled by the Scottish nobles and her own irrational impulses. His conviction is strengthened by her unfortunate decision to marry Darnley and subsequently his alleged murderer Bothwell, and he does not doubt for a while Mary had a foreknowledge of Darnley's assassination and gave her tacit consent.

Even though Fraser and Guy concede Mary behaved irrationally when she married Darnley and then Bothwell, they believe she was innocent of her second husband's murder and had no adulterous relationship with Bothwell while Darnley still lived. Consequently, the writers, along with Graham, dismiss the Casket Letters as

[377] Guy, *My Heart is My Own*, 444.

insufficient proof against Mary's liaison with Bothwell before the events at Kirk O'Field, although Guy allows for the possibility that some parts of the letters were written by Mary and taken out of their original context. Despite their statement regarding the letters, Graham and Guy, unlike Fraser, do not rule out the possibility that Mary was briefly in love with Bothwell during her detention at Dunbar Castle and therefore decided to marry him. A decision which brought about the end of her rule in Scotland and eventually lead to her martyr's death in England.

With regard to the fictional representations of Mary's life, the fiction writers are in agreement with the historical biographies when it comes to Mary's brief marriage with the Dauphin. However, unlike the authors mentioned above, they highlight the rivalry between her and Catherine de Medici, presenting their hostility as the main reason why Mary decides to return to Scotland after her husband's death. The beginning of her personal rule causes the first division among the writers as two sides are formed. The first one, represented by Byrd and George, adopts the view held by Fraser and Guy and portrays Mary as a competent monarch who strives for religious tolerance and good relations with England, while the other side is inclined to share Graham's opinion, that is presenting Mary as a ruler in name only.

Whereas the fiction writers do not divert much from the historical biographies in their portrayal of Mary's political abilities and her marriage with Darnley, the situation is quite different in their representation of the events leading to and following Kirk O'Field. The majority of the writers depicts Mary and Bothwell as lovers whose affair commences while Darnley is still alive, an affair which brings up Mary's passionate side to the surface and leads to her obsession with her lover. Consequently, she is aware of the plans for her husband's elimination in some fiction, especially in Byrd's and Plaidy's novels and Lochhead's play, and lurks him from the safety of Glasgow to his doom. Given her liaison with Bothwell, Mary is also the author of the Casket Letters, nevertheless the rebels' alteration of them is suggested, mainly in the novels where they do not prove Mary's foreknowledge of Darnley's assassination.

Apart from these differences from the historical biographies, some fiction writers emphasise the enmity felt by the English Queen who makes use of Mary's flight to England to settle accounts with her cousin. Mary, on the other hand, is mostly represented as a woman feeling sympathy for Elizabeth and honestly believing in her help which does not come to her chagrin. Notwithstanding her bitterness, she does not strive for Elizabeth's death and does not give her consent to Elizabeth's assassination in the Babington plot in most of the novels. Thus, she is represented as a wrongfully convicted woman whose death is brought about by the scheming of Elizabeth's advisers who seek her destruction for the good of England.

Just like fiction, the film adaptations treat Mary's life with more liberty than the historical biographies. This can be seen in particular in the recent television series *Reign* where the relationship between Mary and the Dauphin is portrayed as an epic love affair, and the two of them have to overcome many obstacles before they are finally married and happy for a while. Unlike this highly fictionalised adaptation, the other films provide more accurate representation of Mary's stay at the French court but they fail to capture her political involvement in the Scottish affairs after her return there. Thus, they lead the viewer to the assumption that the actual rulers of Scotland are the nobles. On the other hand, Darnley's perfidy and Mary's infatuation with Bothwell, for whose love she would do anything, are depicted in all adaptations. Therefore, there can be no doubt about her involvement in Darnley's assassination in Jarrott's and MacKinnon's films, as she plans it together with her lover. A crime for which she is punished without exception by losing her realm, and she is forced to look for help in England at her cousin whom she despises in the latter films.

Owing to the fact that in the majority of films dealing with the Babington plot Mary has only a supporting role and Elizabeth is the heroine, her portrayal as a villain is not surprising. Consequently, the viewer is manipulated into believing she deserves to be executed as she shamelessly strives for Elizabeth's assassination. Yet, there are adaptations which seek to represent her more positively, do not condemn her for consenting to her cousin's murder and admire her courage in the face of death and her final part of a Catholic martyr.

Bibliography

Primary literature:

Byrd, Elizabeth. *Immortal Queen*. London: Pan Books, 1971.

Clarke, Susanna. 'Antickes and Frets.' In *The Ladies of Grace Adieu and Other Stories*, 209-219. New York: Bloomsbury, 2007.

Dunn, Jane. *Alžběta a Marie: sestřenice, rivalky, královny.* Translated by Michaela Ponocná. Praha: Beta-Dobrovský, 2005.

Erickson, Carolly. *Paměti Marie Stuartovny.* Translated by Marta Bárová. Ostrava: Domino, 2010.

Fraser, Antonia. *Mary Queen of Scots*. New York: Dell, 1971.

George, Margaret. *Mary Queen of Scotland and the Isles*. London: Pan Books, 2012.

Graham, Roderick. *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots: An Accidental Tragedy*. New York: Pegasus Books, 2009.

Gregory, Philippa. *Královská hrdost.* Translated by Blažena Kukulišová. Frýdek Místek: Alpress, 2009.

Guy, John. *My Heart Is My Own: The Life of Mary Queen of Scots*. London: Fourth Estate, 2009.

Lasky, Kathryn. *Mary, Queen of Scots: Queen Without a Country, France 1553*. New York: Scholastic Inc., 2002.

Lochhead, Liz. *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off*. London: Penguin, 1989.

Plaidy, Jean. *Královnina msta.* Translated by Alena Maxová. Praha: Baronet, 1999.

Plaidy, Jean. *Královnina zajatkyně.* Translated by Alena Maxová. Praha: Baronet, 1999.

Tannahill, Reay. *Fatal Majesty: The Drama of Mary Queen of Scots*. London: Orion Books, 1998.

Yolen, Jane and Harris, Robert J. *Queen's Own Fool: A Novel of Mary Queen of Scots.* New York: Speak, 2003.

Secondary literature:

de la Torre, Victoria. '"We Few of an Infinite Multitude": John Hales, Parliament, and the Gendered Politics of the Early Elizabethan Succession.' *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 33 (Winter, 2001): 557-582. Accessed November 9, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4052892.

Guy, John. 'The Tudor Age.' In *The Oxford History of Britain*, edited by Kenneth O. Morgan, 257-326. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Healey, Rober M. 'Waiting for Deborah: John Knox and Four Ruling Queens,' *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 25 (Summer, 1994): 371-386. Accessed November 9, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2542887.

Herrup, Cynthia. 'The King's Two Genders.' *Journal of British Studies* 45 (2006): 493-510. Accessed November 7, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/503588.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *Dvě těla krále*. Translated by Daniela Orlando. Praha: Argo, 2014.

Le Goff, Jacques. 'Král.' In *Encyklopedie středověku*, edited by Jacques Le Goff and Jean-Claude Schmitt, 305-320. Translated by Lada Bosáková, Alena Boušková and Alena Macháčková. Praha: Vyšehrad, 2008.

Mason, Roger. 'Renesance a reformace: 16. století.' In *Dějiny Skotska*, edited by Jenny Wormaldová. Translated by Markéta Šerá, 87-113. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2007.

McLaren, Anne. 'The Quest for a King: Gender, Marriage, and Succession in Elizabethan England.' *Journal of British Studies* 41 (2002): 259-290. Accessed November 7, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/341150.

Filmography

Elizabeth I. Episode 1. Directed by Tom Hooper. 2005. London: Channel 4, 2006. DVD.

Elizabeth R. Episode 4. Directed by Roderick Graham. 1972. London: BBC Worldwide, 2006. DVD.

Elizabeth: The Golden Age. Directed by Shekhar Kapur. 2007. London: Universal Pictures UK, 2008. DVD.

Gunpowder, Treason & Plot: Episode 1. Directed by Gillies MacKinnon. 2004. London: Contender, 2004. DVD.

Mary, Queen of Scots. Directed by Charles Jarrott. 1971. London: Second Sight Films, 2010. DVD.

Mary Queen of Scots. Directed by Thomas Imbach. 2013. London: Metrodome, 2014. DVD.

McCarthy, Laurie and Sengupta, Stephanie. *Reign: Season 1, Episode 1*. Directed by Brad Silberling. 17 October 2013. Nova Cinema, 19 January 2015. TV.

McCarthy, Laurie and Sengupta, Stephanie. *Reign: Season 1, Episode 2*. Directed by Matthew Hastings. 24 October 2013. Nova Cinema, 21 January 2015. TV.

McCarthy, Laurie and Sengupta, Stephanie. *Reign: Season 1, Episode 9*. Directed by Helen Shaver. 22 January 2014. Nova Cinema, 3 February 2015. TV.

McCarthy, Laurie and Sengupta, Stephanie. *Reign: Season 1, Episode 13*. Directed by Fred Gerber. 5 March 2014. Nova Cinema, 9 February 2015. TV.

McCarthy, Laurie and Sengupta, Stephanie. *Reign: Season 1, Episode 20*. Directed by Sudz Sutherland. 30 April 2014. Nova Cinema, 19 February 2015. TV.

McCarthy, Laurie and Sengupta, Stephanie. *Reign: Season 2, Episode 5*. Directed by Norma Bailey. 29 October 2014. Nova Cinema, 1 September 2015. TV.

McCarthy, Laurie and Sengupta, Stephanie. *Reign: Season 2, Episode 9*. Directed by Fred Gerber. 3 December 2014. Nova Cinema, 9 September 2015. TV.

McCarthy, Laurie and Sengupta, Stephanie. *Reign: Season 2, Episode 17*. Directed by Sudz Sutherland. 19 March 2015. Nova Cinema, 29 September 2015. TV.

The Virgin Queen: Episode 3. Directed by Coky Giedroyc. 2006. London: Spirit Entertainment Limited, 2014. DVD.

Résumé

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá znázorněním Marie Stuartovny, která vládla Skotsku v letech 1542 až 1567, v populární kultuře. Zaměřuje se na nejvýznamnější události jejího života z pohledu vybraných historických biografií, fikce a filmových adaptací a tím poskytuje často se různící názory na její osobnost a činy, které neodvratně zastiňují skutečnou historickou postavu a přetvářejí ji podle představ jednotlivých autorů a režisérů. Tato různorodost je patrná zejména ve čtvrté kapitole, věnující se Mariině vládě ve Skotsku po návratu z Francie, a vztahuje se k jejím politickým schopnostem, účasti na plánech o zavraždění druhého manžela, lorda Darnleye, a vztahu s hrabětem Bothwellem, hlavním podezřelým z královraždy. Zatímco autoři historických biografií, s výjimkou Grahama, hodnotí začátek Mariiny osobní vlády pozitivně a vylučují její spoluúčast na vraždě Darnleye, filmoví režiséři a někteří autoři fikce ji shledávají vinnou jak z plánování vraždy, tak z cizoložného poměru s Bothwellem, jenž v konečném důsledku zapříčinil Mariin pád a vedl k její popravě v Anglii roku 1587.

Annotation

Name and Surname of the Author: Gabriela Taláková

Faculty: Philosophical Faculty

Department: Department of English and American Studies

Supervisor of the Thesis: Mgr. Ema Jelínková, Ph.D.

Title of the Thesis: Mary, Queen of Scots in Popular Culture

Title of the Thesis in Czech: Marie, královna skotská v populární kultuře

Key Words: Mary Stuart, Scotland, England, 16th century, popular culture, historical biography, fiction, film

Annotation: This diploma thesis deals with the depiction of Mary, Queen of Scots in popular culture, especially from the point of view of historical biographies, fiction and films. It focuses on the main events of her life, for example the unresolved questions of her involvement in Darnley's murder and her authorship of the Casket Letters, and their portrayal by the selected authors and film directors.

Annotation in Czech: Tato diplomová práce se zabývá znázorněním Marie, královny skotské, v populární kultuře, především z hlediska historických biografií, fikce a filmů. Zaměřuje se na hlavní události jejího života, například nezodpovězenými otázkami její účasti na zavraždění Darnleye a jejího autorství kazetových dopisů, a jejich ztvárnění vybranými autory a filmovými režiséry.

Language: English

Number of the pages: 108