



*Performing the Many Roles of
Queenship: Mary II as a Character
in Dutch Songs*

Sonja Kleij



Performing the Many Roles of Queenship: Mary II as a Character in Dutch Songs

Sonja Kleij

UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

Abstract: During Mary II's reign (1689-1694), several dialogue songs were written and performed in the Dutch Republic that featured her as a named character. This article studies five songs in which the character of Mary plays a number of roles, including daughter, wife, naval commander, and above all else, Queen of England. Building on previous research on queenship, studies of royal family loyalty, and recent work in performance theory, this article examines how these songs aided in constructing and interrogating queenship through performance. Through analysis of the songs, three intersections of power and performance, and how they overlap and interact, will be investigated. First, the wielding of power by a monarch as a form of performance. Second, performances that interrogate political power, as well as the possibilities and limitations of such acts. These two relations will then be combined to study the explicit use of performance as a metaphor by purposely 'casting' those in power into specific roles. This study will demonstrate how for a queen, especially Mary II, being cast in the role of wife whose husband is co-monarch, or a daughter whose father was forced to abdicate to make way for her, goes beyond stereotypical gender roles, as significant political relationships and governmental circumstances worthy of public discussion. Finally, this article explores how views of monarchy—and in particular, queenship—were constructed in the Dutch Republican context in which these songs were performed, thus providing an outsider perspective on the concept of queenship.

Keywords: Mary II; Dutch Republic; England; power; performance; song culture; early modern

During the early modern period, the Dutch Republic had a rich song culture. While English and German songs were most commonly printed on single-sheet broadsheets, Louis Peter Grijp has described how in the Dutch Republic songs were frequently printed and sold in book form, and often centred on a theme (such as love, religion, or politics, like the beggar songs that were prominent during the Dutch Revolt). Often these songs were not made by professional composers, but were instead produced by poets who wrote *contrafacta*—that is, new texts for existing melodies. These

poets could be professionals, but they were also often amateurs.¹ Likewise, the performers were often ‘ordinary’ people. Singing, according to Natascha Veldhorst, was a normal, everyday activity for most people: they sang at home, in the street, while doing their job, in the pub, at the theatre, and so on. Singing was an integral part of early modern Dutch life.² As such, Dutch songs can give us insight into the public debate on various topics.

Nieuw vermeerdert konincklijke lied-boeck (*Newly Expanded Royal Songbook*) is part of this tradition. The frontispiece (Figure 1) clearly shows the subject of this songbook. The image shows Mary II and William III, Queen and King of England, Scotland, and Ireland, side by side with the royal regalia.³ William was the third of his name to be stadholder as well, so in the Dutch Republic he was also known as William III. In the aftermath of the so-called Glorious Revolution of 1688-1689, they became joint monarchs of the British kingdoms. While the roses that frame the royal couple in the songbook likely symbolise England, the “Hollandse Tuin” (Garden of Holland)—recognisable by its characteristic fence and gate, here surrounding a lion holding a sword and arrows—is a well-known and often used symbol for the Dutch Republic in the seventeenth century.⁴ The roses would have reminded the viewer of England, and they appear to grow from this garden, reiterating that the co-monarchs of England, Scotland, and Ireland originate from the Dutch Republic. In this article, I offer a close reading of five dialogue songs from this songbook that feature Mary II as a named character. In doing so, this article investigates the intersections between performance and power, and demonstrates how such performances aided the construction and interrogation of the concept of queenship.⁵

I would like to thank the editors of this special issue, Aidan Norrie and Sophie Shorland, as well as the anonymous peer reviewers for their helpful feedback and valuable suggestions.

¹ Louis Peter Grijp, “Muziek en literatuur in de Gouden Eeuw,” in *Een muziekgeschiedenis der Nederlanden*, ed. Louis Peter Grijp et al (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2002), 247.

² Natascha Veldhorst, *Zingend door het leven: Het Nederlandse Liedboek in de Gouden Eeuw* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2009), 12.

³ Anonymous, *Nieuw vermeerdert konincklijke lied-boeck*, 5th ed. (Amsterdam, 1695; KW 174 C 20).

⁴ See the digital database *Het Geheugen* for more examples of the *Hollandse tuin*:

<https://geheugen.delpher.nl/nl/geheugen/results?query=&facets%5Bsubject%5D%5B%5D=Hollandse+tuin&page=2&maxperpage=36&coll=ngvn>. Sometimes the garden features a woman or ‘virgin’—another popular image of the Republic—or the lion holds other objects, but the fence and gate are always present.

⁵ No evidence could be found to suggest these were translations of English songs, meaning that they were instead written by Dutch authors for a Dutch audience. While there were certainly English ballads with similar themes and some in dialogue form featuring Mary II and William III, a search of the English Broadside Ballad Archive and Early English Books Online did not yield evidence of any translations.



Figure 1: Frontispiece of *Nieuw vermeerderd konincklijck lied-boeck*. Fifth edition, 1695. Den Haag, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, KW 174 C 20.

These five songs were likely written and first performed during Mary's reign (1689-1694), though only the fifth and sixth editions of the book survive. The fifth edition was published in 1695, likely in response to Mary's death on 28 December 1694, and the sixth edition was published in 1703, a year after William's death. Even though the text on the frontispiece promises that the collection was expanded, the registers at the end of the book (which function as contents pages) show that the song titles and page numbers are identical. While this is not definitive proof that the songs were not amended, their length certainly did not change, suggesting that any amendments that might have been made were not very substantial and certainly indicating that no songs were added to later editions. The lack of

elegies for the dead monarchs in the songbook is particularly striking. According to Lois G. Schwoerer, Mary was the most eulogised English monarch of the seventeenth century; Schwoerer counts

about 110 printed sermons and elegies ... for Mary, as compared with approximately thirty for Charles II, William III, and Anne. ... At least thirty-six medals were cast at Mary's death, as compared with three for Charles II, nine for William, and none for Anne.⁶

There were also a substantial number of Dutch poems published to commemorate Mary, which implies that there would have been a market for such songs.⁷ The absence of elegies for the recently passed queen thus suggests that the fifth edition likely does not differ much from the ones that came before either, but rather that this was a reprint of previous editions. For the purposes of this article, we can therefore assume that these songs were written during Mary's reign.⁸

Furthermore, these songs were written for, and intended to be performed by, the general public. The multiple editions printed during Mary's reign, as well as the timing of the fifth and the sixth edition, hints at a certain popularity. As was typical for songbooks at the time it was published in octavo format, ideal for everyday use for both private and public occasions, such as the local festivities. Both surviving editions were printed in Amsterdam by Gijsbert de Groot. The frontispiece further states that the book includes "Eenige hedendaeghs in gebruyck zijnde Amourent Liederen" (Some Love Songs currently in use), and the book does indeed contain several love songs that have no clear link to Mary and William; a fact that points to the book's publication being a public and commercially driven enterprise, rather than a government-sponsored project.⁹ Mary and William were known for having prominent poets and theatre managers in their circle in the Dutch Republic, some of whom the couple financially rewarded for their literary efforts, which could be construed as an encouragement for authors to write favourably about them.¹⁰ However, there is no evidence that these songs

⁶ Lois G. Schwoerer, "Images of Queen Mary II, 1689-95," *Renaissance Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (1989): 743n104. See also: Rachel Weil, *Political Passions: Gender, the Family and Political Argument in England, 1680-1714* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 109.

⁷ Nina Geerdink, "Rouw om een 'cieraat grooter vrouwen': Lijkdichten bij de Dood van Maria Stuart (1695) door Mannen en Vrouwen," *Historica* 32, no. 1 (2009): 3-5.

⁸ The fifth edition misses pages 16-47, which according to the register at the back of the book held three of the case study songs. Therefore, for the sake of uniformity, all citations are from the sixth edition. All translations are my own.

⁹ Anonymous, *Nieuw vermeerdert konincklijck lied-boeck*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40), frontispiece.

¹⁰ Nina Geerdink, "Cultural Marketing of William III: A Religious Turn in Katharina Lescaijle's Political Poetry," *Dutch Crossing* 43, no. 1 (2010): 28-29; J.J.V.M. De Vet, "The Image of William and Mary in Dutch Poetry," in *The Age of William III and Mary II: Power, Politics and Patronage, 1688-1702*, ed. R.P. Maccubin and M. Hamilton-Philips (Williamsburg, VA: The College of William and Mary in Virginia, 1989), 354.

are part of such an effort. The exact price of *Nieuw vermeerderd konincklijck lied-boeck* is unknown, but songbooks of this format standard without sheet music, were usually sold for about fl. 0.15 (about €1.43 today), fairly affordable for most craftsmen and labourers.¹¹ The public at large was thus the likely performers of these songs, thereby embodying the monarchs.

Politics and performance are inextricably linked, and power and performance therefore intersect in many different ways. In this article, I explore three such intersections in relation to the concept of queenship. The first is the wielding of power as a form of performance. Power is demonstrated through actions and within interactions, between individuals and groups who occupy various positions within a social hierarchy. These actions and interactions can take different forms: coronation ceremonies, public speeches, council meetings and appointing officials. This intersection is present in the songbook as a topic of debate. How do these monarchs enact their power?

The second intersection between power and performance looks to performances as a means for public debate to interrogate political power, as well as to support or subvert such authority. In their collection *Performance and Debate: Theatre and Public Opinion in the Early Modern Period*, Jan Bloemendal, Peter G.F. Eversmann, and Elsa Strietman argue that there are three principal ways in which drama can connect to public debate: to depict a debate, to voice one side of the debate and to be the subject of debate.¹² The same is true for songs—especially dialogue songs, which have the potential to show both sides of an argument. In *Literary Cultures and Public Opinion in the Low Countries*, Bloemendal and Arjan van Dixhoorn also identify seven functions that literature can fulfil in the early modern public sphere, one of which is especially relevant here: “To announce, confirm or contest specific opinions and add arguments to a debate.”¹³ Songs were thus an ideal medium for public debate about politics and power.

The third intersection that I discuss here combines power and performance in the explicit use of performing as a metaphor, by purposely “casting” those in power into specific roles. This means that a political figure is turned into a dramatic persona to act out and to show situations, rather than describing their actions. These are interactive conversations in direct speech with assigned roles to indicate who is speaking at any given point. I argue that these rulers were not only made into dramatic personas, but also characters with a specific function. These powerful figures are ‘cast’ into roles, such as spouse, parent, child, counsellor, or military leader, to discuss and critique their conduct. They can be cast in these roles in

¹¹ Grijp, “Muziek en Literatuur in de Gouden Eeuw,” 246. The conversion of Guilders into Euros was done with the use of the conversion website hosted by the International Institute of Social History (<http://iisg.nl/hpw/calculate.php>).

¹² Jan Bloemendal, Peter G.F. Eversmann, and Elsa Strietman, “Drama, Performance, Debate. Theatre and Public Opinion in the Early Modern Period: An Introduction,” in *Drama, Performance and Debate: Theatre and Public Opinion in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Jan Bloemendal, Peter G.F. Eversmann, and Elsa Strietman (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 8.

¹³ Jan Bloemendal and Arjan Dixhoorn, “Literary Cultures and Public Opinion in the Early Modern Low Countries,” in *Literary Cultures and Public Opinion in the Low Countries, 1450–1650*, ed. Jan Bloemendal, Arjan van Dixhoorn, and Elsa Strietman (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 35.

various ways. It is possible by referring to them specifically by that role, calling them “daughter” or “father”, for instance. Another way to do this is by placing them in a conversation with other characters so that through their relationship these roles are highlighted or strongly implied. For instance, a dialogue between spouses can be used to explore their partnership or collaboration in governing. By “casting” them in this fashion the audience is able to interrogate a specific facet of that person’s power, for example a particular political relationship between co-monarchs or a governmental responsibility they (should) have.

In the five dialogue songs that feature Mary II as a named and speaking character, I have identified three roles: daughter, wife, and military leader, and I will discuss these in this order. I will interrogate how Mary being cast in these roles allowed the public to discuss the recent events of her ascending to the throne and the conflict with France, as well as the way queenship was viewed, and the roles that the people wanted (or expected) a political leader to fulfil.

The Role(s) of Queenship

In early modern England it was possible for a royal woman to be queen regnant, queen consort and queen dowager, not to mention that English princesses could also become queen elsewhere, thus creating relationships with other royal dynasties and countries. In each of these roles lies power that was expected to be performed in certain ways. Mary II is an ideal subject through which to study queenship, as well as the intersections between power and performance stated above. She was in the unusual position of simultaneously being both queen regnant and queen consort, since she was co-monarch with William III. Her troubled and much discussed relationship with her ousted father James II provides further insight into how loyalty to one’s dynasty was viewed and valued. Through her marriage she was also Princess of Orange and therefore had a political relationship with the Dutch Republic.

The Dutch Republic had a complicated relationship with the concept of monarchy. After declaring independence from Spain through the Act of Abjuration (1581), there was a brief search for a new sovereign, but the States General decided to continue as a republic instead. The role of stadholder remained: while technically a civil servant in service of the provincial and national government, the stadholder had the power to appoint officials and functioned as general of the national army.¹⁴ The stadholder managed to accrue a great deal of power. Since the start of the Dutch Republic, the role had always been given to a member of the Orange-Nassau family, but the States of the respective provinces had to elect him to that role. The position of the Stadholder thus required the support of the people to keep his position. This is demonstrated by the First Stadholderless Period (1650-1672), a time which Republicans themselves called “True Freedom.”¹⁵ The decision of the State of Holland not to

¹⁴ For a detailed description of the position and duties of the Stadholder, see: J.L. Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: The Politics of Particularism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 134–148.

¹⁵ Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477–1806* (Oxford: Oxford University Press,

appoint a new stadholder after William II suddenly died in 1650 was motivated by their conflict with William II earlier that same year. Among other things, William II had been accused of tyranny and wanting monarchical power.¹⁶ This does not mean, however, that monarchy was necessarily seen as something negative. In fact, as Helmer Helmers demonstrates, there was widespread support for the Stuarts during the English Civil War.¹⁷ The Orange-Nassau and Stuart dynasties were also linked by William II's marriage to Mary, Princess Royal (daughter of Charles I and Henrietta Maria), which played a role in this as well.

However, the Anglo-Dutch relationship was not without its problems in the seventeenth century. The massacre of Amboyna in 1623, for example, caused serious hostility between the two countries.¹⁸ Furthermore, the tension between republicanism and monarchism caused political friction between the Dutch Republic and England during the second half of the seventeenth century. The Dutch support for the Stuarts is often named as a contributing factor for the First Anglo-Dutch War (1652-1654), which meant the end of almost a century of alliance.¹⁹ The Second (1665-1667) and Third Anglo-Dutch Wars (1672-1674), however, were at least partly motivated by the threat of republicanism to the Restoration of Charles II.²⁰ To many in the Dutch Republic, the accession of Mary II and William III to the English throne was a restoration of their natural alliance, especially as their conflict with France escalated further.²¹ So, while the Dutch Republic *itself* did not have a monarch, they nevertheless had expectations of Mary II: in her position as queen of the Stuart realms, she was expected to maintain and support this important alliance, and to act not only in the best interest of England, but also of the Republic.

Mary as Daughter, Mary as Heir

Mary II's queenship and the manner in which it was first achieved raises questions about dynastic loyalty. It was understood that royal women had a responsibility to help establish,

1998), 700–713.

¹⁶ Herbert H. Rowen, *The Princes of Orange: The Stadholders in the Dutch Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 93. For a detailed study of the pamphlets written as part of this public debate, see: Roeland Harms, *Pamfletten en publieke opinie: massamedia in de zeventiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011), 91–127.

¹⁷ See: Helmer Helmers, *The Royalist Republic: Literature, Politics and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

¹⁸ The Amboyna Massacre was often used in anti-Dutch discourse. See, for example, John Dryden's play *Amboyna or the Cruelties of the Dutch to the English Merchants*, which was first performed in 1673.

¹⁹ Maarten Prak, *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 47; Andrew C. Thompson, "After Westphalia: Remodelling a Religious Foreign Policy," in *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648–1713*, ed. David Onnekink (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 53. Other reasons included trade, the dominance of the North Sea, and the fear of universal monarchy. See: Steven Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650–1668* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) for a more elaborate discussion on the reasons behind for the Anglo-Dutch Wars.

²⁰ Thompson, "After Westphalia," 60.

²¹ Sonja Kleij, "Early Modern Theatre and the Public Sphere, 1585-1702: Anglo-Dutch-Spanish Politics" (PhD thesis, Queen's University Belfast, 2017), 183–185.

reconfirm, and maintain connections between dynasties. Catherine Fletcher has theorised the gendered expectations in the early modern period of elite women to be peace-weavers and thus well suited to act as diplomats.²² They were expected to act as a liaison between the family of their birth and their husband and his family, mitigating any frictions that originated during their marriage.²³ This was the case for Mary's marriage to William. The alliance between England and the Dutch Republic had started during Elizabeth I's reign. James VI & I had continued the support for the Dutch Revolt, thus starting an alliance between the Stuart and Orange families. The marriage of William III's parents (William II and Mary Stuart) had further strengthened that relationship. As mentioned above, the Second and Third Anglo-Dutch Wars had put pressure on this alliance. When William III married Mary in 1677, this initially renewed that familial tie. The invasion of 1688, however, forced Mary to make a choice between loyalty to her father and her husband. Her decision to side with William was one that would be debated, praised, and critiqued throughout her reign and long after.

In the songbook, this debate takes shape as a dialogue song, with James VII & II and Mary II as the characters.²⁴ The rather long full title "t'Samenspraek tussen de gewesen koning Jacobus Stuaert en Maria Stuaert sijn Dochter, in haer leven Koningin: weghens de Oorlogh die sy tegens malkander voeren" (Dialogue between former King James Stuart and Mary Stuart his daughter, currently Queen: about the war they fight between them) immediately casts both in their political as well as familial roles to set up the conflict between them, continuous throughout the song. Firstly, in the way that the text is divided between the two characters, which is done using "Father" and "Daughter" instead of their names to indicate the speaker; and in the song text itself, where the two characters address each other by those familial terms every time they start to speak. Only in the first line of the song does James call Mary by name, as if to ensure that the audience knows which of his daughters he is in conversation with.

With their respective roles established in this manner, Mary's struggle between being a good daughter on the one hand and a good wife and monarch on the other can be fully explored in their conversation. James opens the song by complaining to Mary that William has replaced him as King: "Ach Maria wat moet ik hooren / Dat u Man tot Koning is verkooren, / Ende gekroont is van mijn Rijck" (Oh Mary, what do I hear / That your Husband is destined

²² Catherine Fletcher, "The Ladies' Peace Revisited: Gender, Counsel and Diplomacy," in *Queenship and Counsel in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Helen Matheson-Pollock, Joanne Paul, and Catherine Fletcher (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 111–133.

²³ Caroline Dunn and Elizabeth Carney, "Introduction: Royal Women and Dynastic Loyalty," in *Royal Women and Dynastic Loyalty*, ed. Caroline Dunn and Elizabeth Carney (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 5; Helen Matheson-Pollock, Joanne Paul, and Catherine Fletcher, "Introduction," in *Queenship and Counsel in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Helen Matheson-Pollock, Joanne Paul, and Catherine Fletcher (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 6.

²⁴ To make the distinction between the historical figures and the characters clearer in analyses of these songs, the characters are referred to by their first name, e.g. Mary, while the historical figures have their royal name, e.g. Mary II.

to be King / And has been crowned in my Realm).²⁵ After Mary responds with a defence of her husband, James expresses regret for agreeing to Mary's marriage: "Ach kind het spijt my nog op hede, / Dat ick u aen William ging bestede" (Oh child, I am still sorry now / That I gave you to William).²⁶ The transaction implied by 'giving' a daughter to a husband infers a transfer of loyalty and responsibility. Even though royal marriages were often meant to strengthen alliances and avoid friction, the James character feels it has backfired. Not only does William oppose him, but Mary also sides with him. Indeed, James II and his supporters viewed this as a betrayal. Jacobites criticised her for breaking the fifth commandment to honour one's parents.²⁷ The argument was used to undermine the image of a good Christian Queen, with some going so far as to explain her childlessness as a punishment from God for this offence.²⁸ She was even accused of orchestrating the whole invasion.²⁹ Though these ideas mostly circulated in manuscript form, this criticism still needed to be refuted by presenting Mary II as the legitimate heir, who had good reason to take action.

In a seven-stanza speech—the longest speech in the song—Mary proceeds to explain some of the reasons for the invasion. She accuses James of being a tyrant who "Predikanten liet ... vangen / En liet haer sonder rede op-hangen" (had preachers arrested / and hanged them for no reason).³⁰ Such accusations of religious persecution were used to create a narrative aimed at vilifying James II's Catholicism. Mary then continues with a more political criticism, by pointing out that he has also "gebroken het Parlement" (broken the Parliament), another sign of tyranny.³¹ Cathleen Sarti argues that James II's overestimation of personal, royal authority clashed with English ideas of institutionalised monarchy, which ultimately contributed to his downfall.³² James II was in conflict with parliament virtually from the start of his reign and prorogued it in early November 1685, just months after his coronation. Here, the Mary character reiterates one of the official arguments for the invasion, as stated in *The Declaration of the reasons inducing him to appear in arms in the Kingdom of England* (1688). In this important document, William III explains that "our expedition is intended for no other design but to have a free and lawful Parliament assembled."³³ It is highly likely that the performers

²⁵ Anonymous, "t'Samenspraek tussen de gewesene koning Jacobus Stuaert en Maria Stuaert," in *Nieuw vermeerderd konincklyck lied-boeck*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40), 55.

²⁶ Anonymous, "Koning Jacobus Stuaert en Maria Stuaert," 56.

²⁷ Elaine Anderson Phillips, "Creating Queen Mary: Textual Representations of Queen Mary II," *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 37, no.1 (2013): 63, 65, 72; D. Christopher Gabbard, "'The She-Tyrant Reigns': Mary II and the Tullia Poems," *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 25, no. 2 (2001): 103–116.

²⁸ Phillips, "Creating Queen Mary," 63, 65.

²⁹ Gabbard, "'The She-Tyrant Reigns'," 103.

³⁰ Anonymous, "Koning Jacobus Stuaert en Maria Stuaert," 56.

³¹ Anonymous, "Koning Jacobus Stuaert en Maria Stuaert," 56.

³² Cathleen Sarti, "Losing an Unexpected Throne: Deposing Second Sons of the Stuart Dynasty," in *Unexpected Heirs in Early Modern Europe: Potential Kings and Queens*, ed. Valerie Schutte (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 169–171.

³³ William III, *The Declaration* (1688) in, *England's Glorious Revolution, 1688-1689: A Brief History with Documents*, ed.

and audience of this song knew about the content of *The Declaration*, since there were also Dutch, German, and French versions in circulation.³⁴ This argument would likely have resonated with the Dutch audience, since the States General was in essence the most important and powerful political institution in the Dutch Republic.

Furthermore, Mary addresses James's alliance with France and his suspected plan "Om met Louys in Holland te komen" (To enter into Holland with Louis).³⁵ This focus on Louis XIV is in line with other Dutch works about the events of 1688 and 1689, which often place William III and his fleet going to England in the context of the Nine Years' War (1688-1697). William III and many others in the Dutch Republic were concerned about the expansionist policies of France. They had not yet forgotten Het Rampjaar (the Disaster Year) (1672), in which a simultaneous invasion by England, France, and two German states had almost resulted in the country being surrendered. The threat that the alliance between England and France represented even meant that the reasoning for viewing James II as an enemy to the Republic was, on occasion, less focused on his Catholicism and more on his relationship with France.³⁶ This is the case in *Konincklijck lied-boeck* as well. In the songbook, James appears as a character in five songs and, other than this song in which he speaks with Mary, he is in conversation with Louis XIV in all of them.³⁷ In the wider context of the songbook, James's character is therefore established as being in alliance with France against the Dutch Republic. By presenting the union between James and Louis as a motivation for Mary to support the invasion, her character is established as a Queen who is concerned not only for England but also the United Provinces. Near the end of the song, it appears that, to a certain extent at least, Mary manages to convince her father of his wrongdoing as James states:

Dochter 't is waer ick moet het belijden,
Jck heb mijn seer laten verleyden,
Van Lodewijck en mijn Biecht-vaer,

Steven C.A. Pincus (Boston: St. Martins, 2006), 42. The declaration was drafted by William in collaboration with English and Dutch advisers, and selected members of the English expatriate community in The Hague.

³⁴ Lisa Jardine, *Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory* (London: HarperPerennial, 2009), 30–31.

³⁵ Anonymous, "Koning Jacobus Stuaert en Maria Stuaert," 56.

³⁶ See: Kleij, "Early Modern Theatre and the Public Sphere," 165, 167–170, 185–186, for a discussion of the debate on the Anglo-French alliance in Dutch theatre.

³⁷ Anonymous, "Aen-Klagten van den Koning Jacobus van Engelant over de droeve staet van sijn Rijck aen de Koning van Vrankrijck," in *Nieuw vermeerdert konincklijck lied-boeck, versien met verscheyden lof en triumphgesangen*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40); Anonymous, "Een Nieuw Liedt, ofte Samen-spraecck, tussen den Koningh William, en den Koninck van Vrankrijck, en de gewesene Koninck Jacobus, ofte hertog van Jorck," in *Nieuw vermeerdert konincklijck lied-boeck, versien met verscheyden lof en triumphgesangen*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40); Anonymous, "Een t'Samenspraek, tusschen Jacobus Stuwaert, Pater Peters, Pater la Chaise, en den Koning van Vrankrijck," in *Nieuw vermeerdert konincklijck lied-boeck, versien met verscheyden lof en triumphgesangen*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40); Anonymous, "Het beklagh, gedaen by de Gewesene Koning van Engelandt, klagende sijn noot aen de Coningh van Vrankrijck, op het groot verlies van de slag in Yerlandt, bestaende in een t'Samen-spraecck, tussen Louis Bourbon en Jacobus Stuaert," in *Nieuw vermeerdert konincklijck lied-boeck, versien met verscheyden lof en triumphgesangen*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40).

Wy waren seer slecht allegaer,
Jck sie voor ogen,
dat ick ben bedrogen;
Maer het is nu te laet voorwaer.³⁸

Daughter, it is true, I must admit
That I have let myself be so tempted
By Louis and my Confessor,
We were all together very bad
I see clearly
That I was deceived
But it is too late now.

James confesses his crimes, but he cannot turn back. The song thus argues that Mary II becoming Queen of England is beneficial to the Dutch Republic, while simultaneously also urging the monarch not to forget about the needs of the Dutch.

The James character might have been compelled to make this confession because of a sense of intimacy created through the familial bond between the King and his daughter. Mary's political justification for their actions is paired with the compassion of family. The Queen explains that:

Want mijn Man die quam hier te Landt
Door liefde, maer niet als Vyand;
Hy heeft verheven,
g' Salveert u leven,
Anders waert ghy al langh van kant.

Hadder een ander Veldheer gekomen,
U leven waer al lang benomen,
Dat ick u seg dat is certeyn;
Daerom Vader wilt danckbaer zijn,³⁹

Because my Husband that came here to land
Through love, but not as Enemy
He has elevated
And guarded your life,

³⁸ Anonymous, "Koning Jacobus Stuaert en Maria Stuaert," 57.

³⁹ Anonymous, "Koning Jacobus Stuaert en Maria Stuaert," 56.

Otherwise you would already have been dead.

Had another general arrived,
Your life would have been taken long ago,
What I say is certain
Therefore Father will be grateful.

Here, Mary argues that James has only been shown mercy out of familial love. Any other invader would have killed him. Mary II had indeed expressed anxiety over James II's safety and had asked William to let people know that no harm would come to her father.⁴⁰ In the remainder of the song, Mary tries to deter her father from following through on his threat to come back with an army of sixty thousand Irish and French soldiers (which suggests that the song was written shortly before or after the Battle of the Boyne in 1690). Mary pleads with him "Ach Vader laet my niet beleve, / Dat ghy u meer tot strijden gaet geven" (Oh Father do not let me experience, / That you will give yourself to battle again).⁴¹ And Mary concludes the song by stating "Vader ick heb vrees voor een quaed end" (Father I fear for a bad ending).⁴² Not only does this signal a clear end to the song, it also leaves the audience with a sense of dread. While the argument of the song has been in support of Mary taking her father's place on the throne, it also invokes sympathy for the emotional toll that being at war with her father must have taken on Mary II, refuting in turn the criticism that she was a bad daughter.

The way in which this song would have been performed aids this argument. The members of the public who sang this song were allowed to identify briefly with these powerful people. This process of humanising powerful figures is a useful tool to both encourage sympathy and support, as well as expose flaws. The aim of this song was, I argue, to subvert James II's authority and win support for Mary II. In the larger debate on who gets to perform power, the depiction of Mary's struggle between familial love and monarchical duty reaffirms the idea of the holy contract between ruler and ruled, in which the ruler governs the people's best interests and the subjects obey the sovereign in exchange. The song thus presents the argument of how a good ruler ought to perform. James II is presented as having broken the contract, therefore justifying his deposition. However, by casting Mary II so explicitly as his daughter in this song, her character is presented as the example of a good ruler who, despite the hurt she personally feels over the situation with her father, ultimately puts the wellbeing of her subjects first.

⁴⁰ Schwoerer, "Images of Queen Mary II," 739–740.

⁴¹ Anonymous, "Koning Jacobus Stuaert en Maria Stuaert," 57.

⁴² Anonymous, "Koning Jacobus Stuaert en Maria Stuaert," 57.

Mary as Wife, Mary as Co-Monarch

As the dialogue song between Mary and James has already established, Mary's marriage was a key factor in her queenship. One of the reasons for the union was to unite the two strongest claims to the English throne.⁴³ Once William and Mary had gone over to England to claim that throne, problems arose about who would rule, finally resulting in the unique situation of being co-monarchs, with William III holding the administrative power.⁴⁴ Whenever William III was away to lead his army against France, which was often, Mary II would reign in his place, although always with William III's approval and sometimes leaving items until he was back to make a decision. Scholars have therefore observed how in English media Mary II was often portrayed as the loving wife, who obeyed her husband and happily made way for him when he was in England to rule himself. Rachel Weil points out that "the image of Mary joyfully relinquishing the reins of power was a favourite theme of the poets" during her reign.⁴⁵ Phillips, Richard Price, and Schwoerer also observe that Mary was recognised as a competent ruler, but she was described as having no or little personal ambition.⁴⁶ In the Dutch songs, Mary's role as a wife and co-monarch was important as well, but here she is less subservient, resulting in an image of a somewhat more equal partnership between Mary and William.

The way in which the songbook presents the royal couple is immediately established via the frontispiece described above. The manner of their portrayal and positioning here is significant. They are shown side by side and each with royal regalia, which reflects their coronation ceremony—a special chair as well as a second globe, sceptre and sword of state were made for Mary II for the occasion. While the actual coronation ceremony did indicate that Mary was subordinate to William III, here they are presented as equals.⁴⁷ Their postures mirror each other, creating a united image through symmetry. The angel in the back and the crown that floats in the centre above them further points to their coronation having the approval of God.⁴⁸

The songbook includes two dialogue songs between William and Mary, which are quite similar, and even have a stanza in common. The unified image of the co-monarchs as presented on the frontispiece also resonates in both. William and Mary are portrayed as a

⁴³ Richard Price, "An Incomparable Lady: Queen Mary II's Share in the Government of England, 1689–94," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 75, no. 3 (2012): 307.

⁴⁴ For more detailed analyses of this process, see for example: Weil, *Political Passions*, 105–109.

⁴⁵ Weil, *Political passions*, 115.

⁴⁶ Phillips, "Creating Queen Mary"; Price, "An Incomparable Lady"; Schwoerer, "Images of Queen Mary II."

⁴⁷ For a detailed account of the coronation, see: Lois G. Schwoerer, "The Coronation of William and Mary, April 11, 1689," in *The Revolution of 1688-89: Changing Perspectives*, ed. Lois G. Schwoerer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 107–130.

⁴⁸ The imagery of Mary II and William III forms an interesting contrast to depictions of Mary I and Philip II, who were also co-monarchs of England. In portraits of Mary I and Philip II the royal regalia are not present, and their poses are more distant. The Dutch depiction of the monarchical couple thus both emphasises their royal status as well as their romantic relationship. Nevertheless, there are coins minted during their reign that depict Mary and Philip facing each other with a crown above them in a similar fashion as in this Dutch image. This might have been meant to signal co-rule, two people sharing one crown.

genuine romantic couple through a mix of formal and informal language. As the title “‘t Verwelkomen van sijn konincklijcke Majesteyt binnen Londen” (The Welcoming of his royal Majesty to London) describes, the song opens with Mary greeting her husband when he returns from the Battle of the Boyne:

Weest wellekom mijn Coning uytverkooren,
Jck dacht dat ghy waert verlooren,
Mijn Oranje Blom ich ben verblijd,
Dat ick magh aenschouwen,
Met gesontheydt,
Mijn Majesteyt[.]⁴⁹

Be welcome my chosen King
I thought that you were lost,
My Orange Flower, I am rejoiced,
That I may observe
In health
My Majesty.

Mary addresses William formally as Majesty and King, but her use of possessive pronouns makes the poem more intimate. The nickname “Orange Flower” furthermore creates a sense of affection between the pair, while simultaneously emphasising William’s Dutch roots. He is called by the same nickname in some of the other songs that are sung from the perspective of the Dutch public.⁵⁰ In “Het vertrek na Hollant” (Leaving for Holland) similar language is used, as Mary calls him “mijn koning.” Weil observes that in contemporary English sources the use of ‘monarch’ instead of ‘husband’ changes Mary II “from a wife into a political subject” and the reader is encouraged to obey the King in the same way as Mary.⁵¹ The use of the nickname “Orange Flower” by both Mary and the Dutch public could be seen as operating in the same way. However, she also addresses him as “lieve Man” which could be translated as dear husband or dear man. The first suggests a depiction of their relationship as simply two people in love, while the latter humanises him, not only a king but a normal man at the same time.

⁴⁹ Anonymous, “Een heerlik Lied, over ‘t verwelkomen van sijn konincklijcke Majesteyt binnen Londen, uyt Yerlandt, bestaende in eene t’samen-spraek, tusschen de koning en de koningin,” in *Nieuw vermeerderd konincklijck lied-boeck*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40), 38.

⁵⁰ For example: Anonymous, “Een nieu Liedt, gemaect tot lof en eere van sijn Koninklijke Majesteyt van Groot Brittanjen over de groote Victorie die hy bevochten heeft in Yerlandt,” in *Nieuw vermeerderd konincklijck lied-boeck*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40), 39–40; Anonymous, “Vreughde Liedt, gemaect over de groote preparatien in ons Nederlandt, om ons prins van Orangien, Koning van Engelandt, Schotland en Yerlandt, die in ons Nederlant in ‘t kort verwacht wordt,” in *Nieuw vermeerderd konincklijck lied-boeck*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40), 47–49.

⁵¹ Weil, *Political Passions*, 114.

This desacralises the position of monarch in a positive way as it urges the audience to sympathise with the royal couple.

Moreover, William III reciprocates. He uses similar terms of endearment toward his wife, thus further creating the image of a more balanced relationship between them. In both songs he calls her “Koningin soet” meaning “Sweet Queen” and in “Het vertrek na Hollant”, William opens the song by addressing Mary as “Myn waerde Pant, / Mijn Koningin verheven” (My true Pledge/ My noble queen).⁵² “Pant” is short for “onderpand” meaning “pledge”, which in the context of William leaving England it could be interpreted as his wife being the reason he will return. These songs intermix formal and informal language to maintain Mary’s role as a wife and not another political subject. Their relationship is depicted as more equal here, a love match. The choice of music further emphasises this view of the royal couple in an affectionate relationship. As Grijp showed in his taxonomy of contrafacta, one of the ways a song can borrow from its source text is “thematic borrowing,” meaning not the words, but an idea or even just a mood is carried from the model to its contrafactum.⁵³ The song uses the melody “Amarant” (Figure 2), a cheerful tune that appears to have been used frequently for love songs.⁵⁴ Because of the accessible range and the way in which the notes are quite close to each other, this song would have been fairly easy to sing for non-professional singers and the relatively fast pace of the music suits a dialogue song, as it imitates speech patterns. Using a well-known, easy-to-perform love melody for this dialogue between Mary and William highlights their romantic relationship.

⁵² Anonymous, “Een Samen-spraek, tusschen Koning William, en sijn Koningin, wegens het vertrek na Hollant,” in *Nieuw vermeerderd konincklijck lied-boeck*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40), 37.

⁵³ Grijp and Van der Poel, “Introduction,” in *Identity, Intertextuality, and Performance in Early Modern Song Culture*, ed. Dieuwke Van Der Poel, Louis P. Grijp, and Wim van Anrooij (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 17–19. See also: Louis Peter Grijp, *Het Nederlandse lied in de Gouden Eeuw: Het mechanisme van de contrafactuur* (Amsterdam: P.J. Meertens Instituut, 1991).

⁵⁴ Anonymous, “‘t Verwelkomen van sijn konincklijcke Majesteyt binnen Londen,” 38. The Nederlandse Liederbank even narrowed the melody of “‘t verwelkomen van sijn konincklijcke Majesteyt binnen Londen” down to Amarante 2, as two variations of this tune survive. See: “Weest welkom mijn Coning uytverkoren / Ick dacht dat ghy waert verloren,” *Nederlandse Liederbank*, accessed 11 July 2020, <http://www.liederbank.nl/liedpresentatie.php?zoek=165372&lan=nl>.



Transcriptie Simon Plantinga

Figure 2: Sheetmusic *Amarant* 2, transcribed by Simon Plantiga from *Oude en nieuwe Hollantse Boeren Lietjes en Contredansen* (7) 1711 p24 nr. 85. Amsterdam, Amsterdam Toonkunst: 212 D 22. Made available by the Meertens Institute.

While the genuine nature of their love is the subject of scholarly debate, the “sorrowful partings and joyful reunions” serves as evidence to suggest that they did.⁵⁵ Stephen Baxter, for example, argues that when they married “it was undoubtedly a marriage of convenience ... In time to come, it was to develop into a love match.”⁵⁶ These songs certainly took this view as well. The combination of formal titles and affectionate adjectives and nicknames depicts the characters as being involved in a genuine romantic relationship, yet the audience is also never allowed to forget that this is a royal couple. In both songs the roles are indicated as “Koning” and “Koningin”, reminding the singers that they are portraying monarchs in their performance.

This depiction of a more equal and loving relationship might have partly been made possible by William III’s firmer grip on power in the Dutch Republic. In England Mary’s subservience to her husband was necessary to establish and maintain his authority, but in the Dutch Republic this was not the case as he had already taken up the position of Stadholder five years before their marriage. There were concerns in England about William III spending time in Holland, which could suggest that he was favouring the Dutch Republic more than England.⁵⁷ The Dutch, on the other hand, seemed similarly worried that William III would forget about his home country. Such anxieties are expressed in the majority of songs in the book that feature or mention the monarch, which urge William III to come home or at the very least continue the fight against France, and often these claim him as primarily Dutch. Some of the songs in this book even call him Prince instead of King on occasion. For example, in “Oranjens verheerlikte staet in Engelant, Schotlant en Yrlant” (Orange’s glorious state in England, Scotland and Ireland) William III is continuously called “Prins van Oranje” and the song opens by stating “Victorie brant, / Voor den Prins van Nassouwe, / Sijn Gemalin, / Js

⁵⁵ Price, “An Incomparable Lady,” 323.

⁵⁶ Stephen Baxter, *William III* (London: Longmans, 1966), 149.

⁵⁷ Weil, *Political Passions*, 111.

Coningin,” (Victory fires / For the Prince of Nassau, / His Consort, / Is Queen).⁵⁸

In these dialogue songs, similar anxieties and the desire to claim William III as a Dutch leader are present as well. While “t Verwelkomen van sijn konincklijcke Majesteyt” starts with the King returning from Ireland, both songs end with William leaving for Holland, which he calls his “vaderlant” (fatherland).⁵⁹ This visit to the Dutch Republic is marked as a necessary (as well as a joyous) occasion. Because of the repetition, the stanza that the songs have in common stands out here. Although the lines are made shorter in “Het vertrek na Hollant”, probably to fit the different melody, the text is exactly the same:

In 's Gravenhage staense met groot verlangen,
Lief om daer te ontfangen,
Yeder een is graegh om mijn persoon,
Met blijdschap te aenschouwen.
Nu ik draeg de kroon,
Van Engelant schoon
Duysenden Mans en Vrouwen
Staen op straet ten toon.⁶⁰

In The Hague they stand with great longing,
Kindly to receive me there,
Everyone would like to observe
My person with joy.
Now I wear the crown
Of beautiful England
Thousands of Men and Women
Are standing in the streets.

The song anticipates that William will be greeted by large crowds who are happy he has become King of England. The sources show that their main target audience are Orangists looking to express their support for William III. That is not to say that the song is intended as mere propaganda: while the songs aid the argument that William III's position as monarch of England is beneficial to the Dutch Republic, especially in relation to the conflict with France, they also express a hope that the new monarch does not forget about the needs of the Dutch Republic. Even in “t Verwelkomen van sijn konincklijcke Majesteyt” in which William returns

⁵⁸ Anonymous, “Oranjens verheerlikte staet in Engelant, Schotlant,” in *Nieuw vermeerderd konincklijck lied-boeck*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40), 27.

⁵⁹ Anonymous, “Het vertrek na Hollant,” 37

⁶⁰ Anonymous, “Het vertrek na Hollant,” 37; Anonymous, “t verwelkomen van sijn konincklijcke Majesteyt binnen Londen,” 39.

from the Battle of the Boyne, France is branded as the main enemy. Mary briefly mentions James II, saying “ik hoorden gerugten / Dat mijn vaer door u most vluchten” (I heard rumours / That my father had to flee because of you).⁶¹ However, Mary then quickly moves on to graphically describe the French threat:

De Francen wouden landen,
Hier in Engelandt,
Met moordt en brandt,
My hier komen aenranden.⁶²

The French wanted to land
Here in England
With murder and fire
Come here to assault me.

The threat is national and personal, and Mary, as Queen of England, can also be interpreted as a personification of her country, which the French wish to assault. Therefore, it is necessary for William to continue his war effort against France. The image of William as a military man is further established when Mary calls him “Mijnen Oorloghs-helt” (My War-hero) and she speaks of his “Heldendaden” (acts of heroism).⁶³ These songs cast Mary II in the role of the faithful military wife, who waits and longs for her husband to come home while he is off to defend the realm. Such dialogues would have shown to military wives that even the Queen shared their experience, providing some comfort perhaps, while simultaneously modelling good behaviour.

Moreover, in these songs the Mary character does not protest William’s departure in the same way as her literary counterpart does in contemporary English poems.⁶⁴ Alicia D’Anvers’s *A Poem upon His Sacred Majesty, his voyage for Holland* makes for an interesting comparison, since it is a dialogue poem in a similar fashion to the homecoming songs, but in a more elevated style.⁶⁵ Here, Mary is represented by Britannia, a personification of England, who argues with William’s “mother” Belgia, the personification of the Low Countries, about William leaving. The argument of the English poem was to convince the reader that William III’s international dealings were beneficial to England, but it also creates an image of Mary II as a somewhat selfish bride whose jealousy stood in the way of his duty, until she is convinced otherwise. In these Dutch songs, however, she expresses some unhappiness at him leaving,

⁶¹ Anonymous, “t Verwelkomen van sijn konincklijcke Majesteyt binnen Londen,” 38.

⁶² Anonymous, “t Verwelkomen van sijn konincklijcke Majesteyt binnen Londen,” 38.

⁶³ Anonymous, “Het vertrek na Hollant,” 37.

⁶⁴ For a more detailed analysis of such poems, see: Weil, *Political Passions*.

⁶⁵ Alicia D’Anvers, *A Poem Upon His Sacred Majesty, His Voyage for Holland: By way of Dialogue between Belgia and Britannia* (London 1691; Wing D221).

pointing primarily to the worry she feels for his safety, but no more than any other military wife might do. She makes no attempt to stop him.

It is noteworthy that there is no talk of who would be regent while William is away. The continued mention of her royal title implies she rules England while William is absent, though it is not explicitly stated. This could be interpreted as a representation of Mary's lack of political ambition as observed by Richard Price in his article.⁶⁶ Yet, while Mary does not exhibit political ambition, there is no denial of such ambitions, nor a portrayal of humility either. Rather, the Queen supports his efforts to protect England and the Dutch Republic from the French threat. William's journey home shows a stronger link with the Dutch Republic, while Mary is portrayed as completely English. This again suggests that the Dutch still viewed William primarily as their Stadholder, whose new royal position would aid *them* in the fight with France. Mary, on the other hand, was now primarily Queen of England and she acted as such. In England, Mary's role as queen was meant to inspire loyalty to William by being subordinate to him; in the Dutch Republic she did this by encouraging him in his endeavours against France and by ruling England while he was away.

Mary as Naval Leader, Mary as the Queen

The roles of daughter and wife were familiar parts for Mary II to perform in public discussions of her queenship. However, two dialogue songs presented in the songbook show yet another side of Mary: that of military leader. In one of these songs Mary instructs the English navy to support the Dutch in their conflict with France, which highlights the Dutch context in which they were written and further emphasises the restored alliance between England and the Dutch Republic. In addition to showing support for the war against France, these songs also interrogate the performance of power in this traditionally more 'masculine' way of commanding the military as performed by female rulers.

"Oppergesagh van de Engelsche vloot" (High command of the English Fleet) shows Mary in conversation with three naval commanders. The title names them as Vice-Admiral Henry Killigrew, John Aschby, and Richard Haddock—the latter two being given the title "Ridder" (knight), highlighting that Aschby and Haddock had been knighted. They are all listed as admirals in *The New State of England*, a rather detailed tract of the city, governmental, and religious officials under Mary and William's rule, which was published in 1691.⁶⁷ In the song their role is indicated as "De Bevel-hebbers", which translates to 'the Commanders'. There are no specific instructions about whether those parts are meant to be sung by one person or three, but regardless, they are meant to act as a collective, signifying that the navy acts as a whole. Mary's role is indicated as "De Koninginne" (The Queen): the prefix is noteworthy,

⁶⁶ See: Price, "An Incomparable Lady."

⁶⁷ Guy Mieke, *The New State of England under Their Majesties K. William and Q. Mary* (London, 1691; Wing M2019A), 214. This suggests that the song was written sometime between 1691 and 1694 and that this tract made its way to the Dutch Republic.

because it is missing in the dialogues with William. This could be a coincidence, but it could also imply that Mary is *the* Queen, thus pointing to her authority. The commanders' obedience and service to Mary, which is immediately established in the opening stanza, supports this image of authority:

Wy komen met eerbiedigheden,
Tot u O Majesteyt getreden,
En versoecken van u te gaer,
Also dat onse vloot leyt klaer,
Dat gy naer begeeren,
Wilt consenteeran
Om 'er mee uyt te Zeylen maer.⁶⁸

We come with reverence,
To you, O Majesty,
And request from you absolutely,
Since our fleet is ready,
That you, by your desire,
Will give approval
That we take it to sail.

These naval commanders present themselves as being ready and motivated to go to war, but this also suggest that they will not make a move without Mary's approval. This level of respect is expressed again after Mary commands them to help the Dutch in their conflict with France:

Wy sullen al ter goeder trouwe,
Uwe geboden onderhouwe,
O Majesteyt en Koningin,
Zijt vry versekert dat u zin,
En order genome,
Men sal nakome.⁶⁹

We shall in good faith
Maintain your commands,

⁶⁸ Anonymous, "Een nieuwe samen-spraak, tusschen de Koninginne, en de drie Bevelhebbers, die gekoosen zijn om het Oppergesagh van de Engelsche vloot te hebben, als namentlijk: den Ridder Richard Haddock, den Vice-Admirael Killigrew, en de Ridder John Aschby, die nu alle haer afscheyt van haer Majesteyt de Koninginne genomen hebben," in *Nieuw vermeerderd konincklijk lied-boeck*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40), 42–43.

⁶⁹ Anonymous, "Oppergesagh van de Engelsche vloot," 43.

Oh Majesty and Queen,
Be assured that your will,
And given orders
One will follow.

Unlike the dialogue songs with William, Mary expresses some humility as a response to their loyalty, explaining why she became Queen: “De Kroon begeerde wy niet te dragen, / Was het niet om te onderschragen, / De Protestanten ware leer” (The Crown we did not desire to wear, / If it were not to support / The Protestant true faith).⁷⁰ However, this is not borne out of submission to William, but rather to refute criticism for replacing her father, as well as to depict her as a good Protestant monarch and defender of the faith. This is echoed in the way that the commanders say goodbye by declaring “Wy sullen daer ons vlijt voor throone, / Voor Godes kerck, U staf en Kroone” (We will do our best for the throne / For God’s Church, Your Sceptre and Crown).⁷¹ The reference to the royal regalia draws attention to Mary as queen regnant, not a queen consort. Mary is here ruling in her own right and her navy obeys her.

In “Admirael Tromp,” something similar happens when Mary gives the command to Admiral Tromp, who, during a long tenure in the Dutch navy, led successful actions against England, France, and Sweden and gained a reputation as something of a war hero. In 1691, he received the title lieutenant admiral general of the Republic and with it the command of the Dutch fleet. However, he did not actually get to fulfil this function because of illness, and he died in March of that year.⁷² Nevertheless, this promotion appears to have been a reason to celebrate and the songbook includes a song entirely devoted to it, without any mention of William or Mary.⁷³ It thus stands to reason that this song too is part of those celebrations. Indeed, the song expresses the hope that he will continue fighting the French as the character Tromp states “Jck kom hier op mijn oude dag, / En ick sal hebben het geheel gesag” (I come here in my old age / And I will have full command).⁷⁴

This, however, is an unlikely pairing, since Mary held no official power over the Dutch navy, which was controlled by the States General and William III in his position as Stadholder. This point of confusion is solved with a brief mention that “De Heere State van Nederlande, / Hebben ‘t gestelt oock in mijn hande” (Lords of State of the Netherlands / Have also placed it

⁷⁰ Anonymous, “Oppergesagh van de Engelsche vloot,” 44.

⁷¹ Anonymous, “Oppergesagh van de Engelsche vloot,” 44.

⁷² “Cornelis Tromp,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, accessed 27 July 2020, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Cornelis-Maartenszoon-Tromp>.

⁷³ Anonymous, “Een nieu Liedt van den admirael Tromp, hoe dat hy in 't jaer 1691 in Zee sou gaen, benefens de Zee Capiteynen die met hem sullen gaen, de welke alle met Namen hier gestelt zijn” in *Nieuw vermeerdert konincklijke lied-boeck*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, 1703; KW 3 E 40).

⁷⁴ Anonymous, “Admirael Tromp,” 72.

[the command] in my hands).⁷⁵ Yet, because these characters were selected to be in conversation, the focus lays firmly on Mary as the authorising power. Tromp and Mary's roles are indicated by their first names, but the name of the song states their official positions, which in Mary's case is her full title as Queen of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland. Tromp refers to her as noble, high born queen to emphasise her lineage. It is clear that Mary has appointed Tromp to this position on her own authority, not William's. In the first lines she welcomes him and states "Jck sal u het Commando geven, / Ghy sult wesen mijn Admirael" (I shall give you the command / You shall be my Admiral).⁷⁶ The use of the possessive pronoun here links Tromp to her personally, not the royal couple. Later on, she states "Jck geve 't Commando al in uw' handen" (I place the command in your hands).

What is especially noteworthy in these particular songs is the distinct absence of William, who is normally designated as the military leader of the royal couple. While he was central in the dialogue song with Mary and James, as well as most other texts about, and depictions of, their reign, here he appears to be little more than an afterthought. In "Oppergesagh van de Engelsche vloot", he is only referred to by Mary once, not by name but as her "Gemaal", meaning 'consort'. In this song she uses 'we' when she tells the commanders of her reluctance at becoming Queen of England—it is unclear whether this is a reference to her and William, or a use of the royal "we".⁷⁷ Nevertheless, referring to William as consort could imply that he is not an equal partner as co-monarch. In "Admirael Tromp", Mary speaks in the first person singular, thus further erasing William from the conversation. In fact, it is Tromp who briefly mentions William when he says goodbye to Mary:

God de Heer wil u bespare,
En Koning William oock beware,
Dat hy magh krijge de overhand;
Brenge Jacobus geheel van kant;
...
Hy sal hem brenge in Engeland.⁷⁸

May God keep you
And King William save, too
That he may prevail
And entirely defeat James
...
[William] shall bring [James] to England.

⁷⁵ Anonymous, "Admirael Tromp," 72.

⁷⁶ Anonymous, "Admirael Tromp," 71.

⁷⁷ Anonymous, "Oppergesagh van de Engelsche vloot," 43.

⁷⁸ Anonymous, "Admirael Tromp," 73.

Not only is William not centred in their interaction, but this also implies that he is still fighting James, while Mary has the foresight to turn her attention to France. As this was the threat that the Dutch audience seemed to fear most, this could suggest that she was perceived as the better leader, anticipating the needs of the people.

William's absence also places more focus on the role of military leader, as performed by Mary II and queens more generally. A queen may not necessarily enter the battlefield, but she is the one who selects the people who do. Appointing the right person is equally, if not more, important for the war effort. She is therefore expected to make the right decisions. In return, these army leaders are loyal and obedient to her. The songs thus describe how both parties should perform their duties.

Of course, several queens before Mary II performed in military roles themselves. Katherine of Aragon acted as regent for Henry VIII and in that position dispatched troops to Scotland. Her decision resulted in the death of James IV at the Battle of Flodden and thus had a substantial impact. However, this active military role does not match the image that was created of Mary and William in other media, including the songs within this songbook, in which William takes up the military role of the monarch. Yet, not only is William missing in these songs, but in "Admiraal Tromp" Mary actually performs this military part of her role as monarch without any hesitation:

Seventien heb ick doen dooden,
Want sy waren my ontrouw,
Daerom wil ick bevelen jou,
Wilt niemant spare.⁷⁹

Seventeen I have killed
Because they were disloyal to me
That is why I order you
Spare no one.

Mary II did indeed have traitors executed during her reign, but this pronouncement, in combination with the order not to spare any of her enemies, seems almost contradictory to the character of a compassionate monarch that is depicted elsewhere. Furthermore, by involving herself in warfare, the Mary character is going against the gendered expectations in the early modern period of elite women to be peace-weavers. Mary II is here characterised as a monarch who can perform her power ruthlessly if necessary and will not have her power be undermined, either internally by traitors or externally by the French.

⁷⁹ Anonymous, "Admiraal Tromp," 72.

Moreover, what stands out here is that it is the public who cast Mary in this military role. It is possible that putting Mary in this role is meant to resemble the reality of the co-monarchs' reign. As Richard Price has shown, while William had a firm grip on the army, he did not have the same control over the navy, and Mary made several appointments while William was away.⁸⁰ However, that does not explain why she has authority over the Dutch navy, effectively replacing her husband in the Dutch Republic as well. It is possible that Mary II in her position as Queen had also become a symbol for England and as such her support for the Dutch acted out the renewed alliance between England and the Dutch Republic, which was often signalled at as the main benefit of the pair taking the English throne. Or perhaps Mary II is being portrayed as England's primary monarch so as to not create a problem with the Dutch continuing to claim William III as a political leader within the Dutch Republic. Either way, by casting Mary II in military roles these songs indicated that showing military might is part of the way in which a queen ought to perform her power. In the Dutch view, Mary II was a competent and capable monarch, who could also perform this role without issue.

Conclusion

The songs discussed in this article address either directly or indirectly the conflict between France and the Dutch Republic, framing Mary's royal position as an asset. Mary and William's coronation restored the alliance between England and the Dutch Republic, and Mary serving as regent allowed William to lead his army in person. The songs can thus be interpreted as a celebration of this renewed alliance, as well as expressing an expectation of the monarchs not to forget about the Dutch Republic and its problems once their reign in a foreign land had begun. In these songs, the audience hears the performance of power in different ways, from the Queen's private struggles with her father, showing power through mercy, and public displays of authority when she appoints admirals for the navy.

All of these songs also to some extent address the role allocation between William and Mary as co-monarchs. A common factor seems to be that William cannot shake the role of Stadholder. He is still a warrior-king, who leads his army into battle; while he is praised for this, it makes him a rather static character. But while William gets to play general, Mary commands generals. Her command of Tromp is especially striking, as she had no authority over the Dutch navy. I would suggest that this is because, within this songbook at least, William is still claimed as Dutch, while Mary is considered fully English. It is possible that the Dutch needed Mary II to act as Queen in order to justify their continued claim to William III as their own leader, so as to not leave England without a capable ruler in William's prolonged absence. Furthermore, her involvement with the Dutch navy would thus point to and celebrate the renewed Anglo-Dutch alliance in the fight against France. This could also explain why, especially in

⁸⁰ Price, "An Incomparable Lady," 310.

comparison with contemporary English media, Mary is not portrayed as subservient to William. While she fears for his safety, she supports him travelling to the Dutch Republic and going to war against France; more research into the Dutch representation of Mary's queenship would be necessary to see if this sentiment was shared more broadly.

For now, I conclude that all of the dialogue songs from the *Koninklijk Lied-boek* together show a queenly character that is multi-layered, with different facets to her personality, abilities, and actions. The songs show the complicated familial and marital relations that queens had to navigate by casting Mary in the roles of daughter and wife as well as queen regnant. Mary is portrayed as a caring queen who can make tough political decisions in the best interests of her people, upholding the social contract between ruler and ruled. She is also capable of navigating international politics and defending her realm with the use of her navy. In these songs Mary is "De Koninginne"—the Queen—depicted in different interpretations of what that entailed. Mary plays the many roles of queenship, and she performs them well.