Women, Gender, and Space in Baroque Music

Organizers: Tanya Kevorkian, Millersville University; Mark A. Peters, Trinity Christian College; Markus Rathey, Institute for Sacred Music, Yale University

This workshop will focus on the roles and perceptions of women in different literal and metaphorical musical spaces of the Baroque era in Germany. The materials that workshop participants will read and hear include contemporary texts translated into English (some by the workshop participants), published works, and music. The subject fits with the “community” and “environment” themes of the workshop. The panel includes presenters whose primary field is music (Peters and Rathey) and history (Kevorkian). Their work is part of a recent trend toward interdisciplinarity in Baroque musicology. The readings, which include primary and secondary texts as well as music, encourage participants to think in innovative ways about Baroque music and society.

Mark A. Peters will discuss Women’s Voices in the Home and in the Church: The Differing Visions of Sophie Regina Gräf and Mariane von Ziegler. Drawing upon Luther’s teachings, the eighteenth-century German church allowed women no public speaking role. But Leipzig poet Mariane von Ziegler overcame this stricture in a unique way. Ziegler “spoke” in Leipzig’s churches through her nine liturgical cantata texts set to music by town cantor Johann Sebastian Bach in 1725. Ziegler’s proclamation is striking, particularly in contrast with Sophie Regine Gräf’s sacred poems published in Leipzig ten years earlier. Gräf closely adhered to the societal strictures placed upon women’s writing: her poems were private, devotional, and anonymous, designed for women’s use in the home. But Ziegler exceeded the bounds of what was considered acceptable for a woman: her cantatas were presented in a public liturgy and later published under her own name together with her secular poetry (in her Versuch in gebundener Schreib-Art, 1728); her poetry was designed for public proclamation in the church. Mark Peters explores Gräf’s and Ziegler’s differing approaches to sacred poetry, with particular attention to the ways in which Ziegler challenged, and transcended, gender norms.

Markus Rathey will focus on The Image of the Coquette in Baroque Music. Literary scholar Theresa Braunschneider has in a recent book outlined the emergence of the term as well as the concept of the “coquette” woman in literature and the arts around 1700. As Braunschneider points out, “the coquette characters of this period exercise choice” and “consume the imported luxury goods flooding domestic market places” like coffee and chocolate. The “coquette” is characterized by consumption, independence, and control over her sexuality (the latter could even be understood as a form of consumption as well.) While Braunschneider’s research focuses on England and on the capitol London in particular, the type of the coquette woman became popular in continental Europe as well. The Leipzig poet Johann Christoph Gottsched, for instance, devotes a short paragraph on the “coquette” in his journal “Die verünftigen Tadlerinnen” in 1726. While there is no room for coquette women in Johann Sebastian Bach’s sacred cantatas, his secular cantatas depict a variety of types of women, ranging from the seductive allegorical figure of “Pleasure” in his Hercules-Cantata (BWV 213) to the glorified female ruler in the birthday cantata for the Queen of Poland (BWV 214). The model of the popular “coquette” encounters in the Coffee-Cantata BWV 211 from 1734 which depicts a young
woman that indulges in consumption (of coffee in particular) and meditates about how she can use her flirtatious behavior to convince both her father and a possible future husband.

Tanya Kevorkian will explore gender, space, and music at Baroque weddings. The performance and reception of music at wedding banquets and dances, in the spaces of private residences, town halls, and dance floors (as well as on the street after the dance) in German towns during the Baroque era were gendered along clear lines. Virtually all musicians were male. The men and women who made up the wedding party were both patrons and audience; as dancers, they can also be seen as participants. The texts of wedding music, and contemporary ordinances that regulated size, length, and behavior at weddings employed clearly gendered language. However, excessive consumption and social striving at weddings was associated with both men and women.

Note: So that the number of pages of reading in this packet stays at no more than twenty, please consider pages 32 - 38 of the “Coquette” article optional. The pdf includes two pages of original text on one pdf page.

************************************************************************

Questions for consideration by workshop participants:

1. How did particular spaces encourage different gender roles in general, and specifically in musical production and reception?

2. How did official regulation, an increase in the consumption of colonial goods, and other social change affect musical life?

3. How can the study of musical life enrich our understanding of early modern culture? Can such study also help us to better understand early modern society?

************************************************************************

Note: music was played at the bride’s and groom’s procession from home to church, during the church ceremony, and at the wedding banquet and dance.

A January 1600 Leipzig city council decree, in Stadtarchiv Leipzig, Tit. I (F) 22.k., #44, fol. 185-188.

Unruly, idle folk … who crowd around in such large numbers on the street and in the church that the bride, groom, and their guests cannot enter or leave the church without
pushing and other great inconvenience, and who are so wild and noisy that some honorable [wedding guests] have been shamelessly whistled at, insulted publicly, and laughed and yelled at [must desist] … idle women and maids with small children are to stop coming into the church in droves as they do, not because of piety, but as bride spectators (*umb Brautschauen*) and for useless gossip, climbing on the pews and making such noise that one can hear neither oneself nor the officiant reading from the Bible.

A 1698 University of Leipzig mandate (Leipzig: Göz, 1698; in Stadtarchiv Leipzig, Tit. LXII.H.15), unpaginated.

Brides are not to dress expensively and far above their estate … processions to church, especially those of people of middling estate, are to be as modest as possible. The extensive processions in which bride or groom go with their servants or other common people are to be restricted so that there should be an obvious distinction between the processions of master and servant, and of prominent and common people … For early weddings, the groom is to be in church by 8:30am, and for other weddings at 10:30. For afternoon weddings, he should be in the church by 4:30. The bride should arrive no more than a quarter hour later. The banquet is to start evenings at 7:00 or at noon on both the first and second wedding day.

Leopold Mozart, *A Peasant Wedding, Depicted in a Work of Instrumental Music*, with the following instruments: Oboe, violin, viola, hurdy-gurdy, bagpipe, dulcimer, bassoon, and bass. [The hurdy-gurdy, bagpipe, and dulcimer were usually associated with popular music-making and unlicenced urban and rural musicians.]

1. The wedding guests process to the tavern with the peasant bride and her groom, with an appropriate peasant march.

2. A peasant dance before the meal with a minuet and trio in peasant style.

3. The modest grief of the bride, occasioned by the loss of her freedom, is depicted, but with the caveat that all of her relatives encourage her.

4. A peasant dance after the meal, as above a minuet and German dances.

5. The concluding wedding joy and dance in a finale.

6. Musicians’ accompaniment of the wedding party home, through the march above.

(From an advertisement for an Augsburg performance of 1765; Stadtbibliothek Augsburg, 4° Aug 1501-1a).
Those who want to attend the dance should accompany the bride and groom appropriately, without dishonorable yelling. At the dance, all should completely desist from impolite swaying, turning, running out of or in front of the round, or bumping or forcing out unmarried and married women, from which fisticuffs and other inconveniences often arise. Violators will be punished with a fine of one Pfund. Those who behave improperly at the dance will be punished with a higher fine or with imprisonment. Further, all the young men who go to the dance should behave quietly and honorably, and not undertake to go up and down the streets with musicians or trumpets throughout the night. Those who do will be subject to a serious fine.
The Cantatas of J. S. Bach

WITH THEIR LIBRETTOs IN GERMAN–ENGLISH PARALLEL TEXT

ALFRED DÜRR
Revised and translated by RICHARD D. P. JONES

1. RECITATIVO T bc
Schweigt stille, plaudert nicht
Und höret, was ist um geschicht:
Da kommt Herr Schindrian
Mit seiner Tochter Liesgen her;
Er brummst ja wie ein Zeitelbär;
Hört selber, was sie ihm getan!

2. ARIA B str bc
Schindrian
Hat man nicht mit seinen Kindern
Hunderntausend Hudeleis!
Was ich immer alle Tage
Meiner Tochter Liesgen sage,
Gehet ohne Frucht vorbei.

3. RECITATIVO SB bc
Schindrian
Du böses Kind, du loses Mädchen,
Ach! wenn erlang ich meinen Zweck:
Tu mir den Coffee weg!

Liesgen
Herr Vater, seid doch nicht so scharf!
Wenn ich des Tages nicht dreimal
Mein Schäfchen Coffee trinken darf,
So werd ich ja zu meiner Qual
Wie ein verdorntes Ziegenbrächtchen.

4. ARIA S fl bc
Liesgen
Bil wie schmeckt der Coffee süß,
Lieblicher als tausend Küss,
Milder als Muskatennwein.
Coffee, Coffee muß ich haben;
Und wenn jemand mich will laben,
Ach, so schenkt mir Coffee ein!

5. RECITATIVO SB bc
Schindrian
Wenn du mir nicht den Coffee läßt,
So sollst du auf kein Hochzeitfest,
Auch nicht spazierengehn.

Liesgen
Ach ja!
Nur lasset mir den Coffee da!

Schindrian
Da hab ich nun den kleinen Affen!
Ich will dir keinen Fischbeinrock

Be silent, do not chatter.
And listen to what happens now:
Here comes Mr Schindrian
With his daughter Liesgen;
How he growls, like a bear!
Hear for yourselves what she has done to
him!

Schindrian
Don't we have with our children
A hundred thousand vexations!
What I always say every day
To my daughter Liesgen
Is quite fruitless.

Schindrian
You bad child, you slack girl!
Ahl when will I achieve my purpose:
To do away with coffee?

Liesgen
Father, please don't be so harsh!
If three times a day I may not drink
My cup of coffee,
To my torment I'll become
Like a dried-up roast goat!

Liesgen
Ahl how sweet coffee tastes,
Lovelier than a thousand kisses,
Milder than muscatel.

Coffee! I must have coffee;
And if anyone would refresh me,
Ah, then pour me some coffee!

Schindrian
If you don't give up coffee for me,
You shall have no wedding feast,
Nor go out walking.

Liesgen
Ah, indeed!
Just leave me my coffee!

Schindrian
(Now I'll have the little monkey!) I
will not get you a whalebone skirt
Nach itzger Weite schaffen.
Lasgen
Ich kann mich leicht darzu verstehn.
Schledriah
Du sollst nicht an das Fenster treten
Und keinen sehnt vorübergehn!
Lasgen
Auch dies; doch seid nur gebeten
Und lasset mir den Coffee stehn!
Schledriah
Du sollt auch nicht von meiner
Hand
Ein silbner oder goldnes Band
Auf deine Haube kriegen!
Lasgen
Ja, jah nur lasst mir mein Vergnügen!
Schledriah
Du lustes Lasgen du,
So gibst du mir denn alles zu?

6. Aria BS bc
Schledriah
Mädchen, die von harten Sinnen,
Sind nicht leichte zu gewinnen.
Doch trifft man den rechten Ort;
Ol so kommt man glücklich fort.

7. Recitativo SB bc
Schledriah
Nun folge, was dein Vater spricht!
Lasgen
In allem, nur den Coffee nicht.
Schledriah
Wohlan! so mußt du dich bequemen,
Auch niemals einen Mann zu nehmen.
Lasgen
Ach ja! Herr Vater, einen Mann!
Schledriah
Ich schwöre, daß es nicht geschicht.
Lasgen
Bis ich den Coffee lassen kann?
Nun! Coffee, bleib nur immer legen!
Herr Vater, hört, ich trinke keinen nicht.
Schledriah
So sollst du endlich einen kriegen!

Of the current width.
Lasgen
I can easily agree to that!
Schledriah
You shall not go to the window
And see anyone passing by!
Lasgen
That too; yet I beg of you,
Let me keep my coffee!
Schledriah
You shall not have from my hand

A silver or golden band
Upon your bonnet!
Lasgen
Yes, yes! Just leave me my pleasure!
Schledriah
You slack Lasgen, you!
Won't you have anything from me, then?

Schledriah
Girls of stubborn dispositions
Are not easy to win over:
Yet if you hit the right spot,
Oh, then you'll be lucky!

Schledriah
Now follow what your father says!
Lasgen
In everything, only not coffee.
Schledriah
Well then, you must put up
With never taking a husband.
Lasgen
Ah yes, father, a husband!
Schledriah
I swear that it will not happen.
Lasgen
Till I can give up coffee?
Now, coffee, stay put for ever!
Father, listen, I shall not drink any.
Schledriah
Then you shall get a husband in the end!

8. Aria S str bc hpschid
Liegen
Heute noch,
Lieber Vater, tut es doch!
Ach, ein Mann!
Wüßtlich, dieser steht mir an!
Wenn es sich doch balde fügte,
Daß ich endlich vor Coffee,
Eh ich noch zu Bette geh,
Binen wackern Liebsten kriegen!

9. Recitativo 'T bc
Nun geht und sucht der alte
Schledriah,
Wie er vor seine Tochter Lasgen
Bald einen Mann verschaffen kann;
Doch, Lasgen streutet heimlich aus:
Kein Freier kommt mir in das Haus,
Er hat es mir dem selbst versprochen
Und rück es auch der Bhestigung ein,
Daß mir erlaubt möge sein,
Den Coffee, wenn ich will, zu kochen.

10. Chorus STB f str bc
Die Katze läßt das Mäuse nicht,
Die Jungfern bleiben
Coffeeeschwestern.
Die Mutter liebt den Coffeebrauch,
Die Großmama trank solchen auch,
Wer will nun auf die Tochter lästern!

This very day,
Dear father, do it please!
Ah, a husband!
Truly, this suits me well!
If only it might happen soon
That at last instead of coffee,
Before I go to bed,
I might get a gallant lover!

Now old Schledriah goes and sees
How for his daughter Lasgen
He can soon provide a husband;
Yet Lasgen secretly spreads it about:
'Tis no suitor may come to my home
Unless he has promised me himself,
And also included it in the marriage contract,
That I may be allowed
To make coffee whenever I want!

The cat won't leave the mouse,
Girls remain sisters in coffee.

Mother loves the coffee habit,
Grandma drank it too,
Who would now blame the daughters?
Our Coquettes

Capacious Desire in the Eighteenth Century

University of Virginia Press
Charlottesville & London

CHAPTER 1

A Prelude

The Novelty of Coquetry

In Tatler 42 (1709), Mr. Bickerstaff records a coffeehouse conversation about the differences between the Elizabethan and the contemporary theater. An elderly gentleman remarks that the greatest contrast between the two in here is in the "Characters of Women on the Stage." The distinctions between the female characters of "the last Age" and this, he asserts, mirror developments in the world off the stage: "It is not to be suppos'd that it was a Poverty of Genius in Shakespeare, that his Women made so small a Figure in his Dialogues; but it certainly is, that he drew Women as they then were in Life; for that Sex had not in those Days that Freedom in Conversation; and their Characters were only, that they were Mothers, Sisters, Daughters, and Wives. There were not then among the Ladies, Shining Wits, Politicians, Virtuose, Free-Thinkers, and Disputants; nay, there was then hardly such a Creature ev'n as a Coquet." The matrons of Shakespeare's day, he proposes, would be astonished if they could see, especially if they could hear, this proliferation of talkative, "conspicuous Women": "They would not believe the same Nation could produce a Creature so unlike any Thing they ever saw in it." In this man's enumeration of modern female types—defined not by their relations to
men but by their own talents, ideas, and modes of social interaction—the final, vaguely incredulous locution of “hardly such a Creature ev’n as a Coquet” suggests that the coquette is the most common conspicuous woman of all. Apparently as familiar to his auditors as to himself, the coquette is offered as a key sign that this old man lives in a new social world, a world radically unlike the one that preceded it.

The proposal that there was no “Coquet” in Elizabethan England turns out to be, at least on the literal level, demonstrably true. That is, the widely shared early eighteenth-century sense of the newness of the coquette is quite accurate in terms of the history of the word itself: “coquette” (and its variant spellings: “coquet,” “coquet,” occasionally “coquette”) did not circulate in English before 1660. Introduced in conjunction with the return to England of a Frenchified Stuart court upon the Restoration, the term quickly gained ascendancy as a disapproving appellation for a woman who eschews feminine modesty and exhibits vain, domineering, and/or flirtatious tendencies. Treated as an English word (rather than a foreign term embellishing English speech or writing) almost immediately, “coquette” also functioned early on as a metaphor signifying some combination of attractiveness, capriciousness, and power: the literary record after 1660 contains, for instance, references to nature, to philosophy, and to pain as a coquette. Such metaphorical resonance attests to the widespread recognition of this new word. And by 1700 “coquet/te” is clearly regarded as an essential part of the English vocabulary.

A survey of English dictionaries from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries confirms these assertions. Seventeenth-century dictionaries—which are primarily foreign-language lexicons—only rarely include entries in their English section for any form or cognate of “coquet.”¹ (This is true even after 1660: the tendency for new dictionaries simply to replicate entries from earlier authors contributes to their lagging slightly behind usage in other contexts.) In contrast, eighteenth-century dictionaries, both monolingual and multilingual, almost without exception include such entries. Latin dictionaries offer one good site to trace this historical change. Robert Ainsworth’s *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Compendiaruis*, for instance, a major Latin dictionary first published in 1736 and widely reprinted well into the nineteenth century, translates the three phrases “A coquet,” “To play the coquet,” and “Coquetry” from English into Latin. In contrast, there are no entries for “coquet” or any of its variants in any of the seventeenth-century dictionaries Ainsworth names as his predecessors.² Similarly, the eighteenth-century forerunners to English monolingual dictionaries, so-called hard-word books, contain no “coquet” entries.³ Nor does Thomas Blount’s 1656 *Glossographia*, which is generally considered the first major monolingual English dictionary. As such dictionaries become more common in the early eighteenth century, however, the term is consistently included: English dictionaries by Phillips in 1706, Kersey in 1714, and Bailey in 1730 all include definitions for forms of “coquet” (including “to coquet,” “coquetry,” “coquetish,” and so forth). These dictionaries attest to the acceptance of “coquet” not as a foreign term but as an English one. Bailey and Phillips, in fact, use what would be a masculine spelling in French—“cocquet” rather than “coquette”—to refer to both men and women, ceasing to make the distinctions of grammatical gender that French would make.⁴ And Samuel Johnson includes differently spelled French sources for various English forms of “coquet” (e.g., *coqueterie* as the etymological source of *coquetry*). Abel Boyer’s 1699 *Royal Dictionary* provides one of the best pieces of evidence that by the turn of the eighteenth century some version of “coquet” is considered an English rather than a French word. Boyer’s dictionary is a major undertaking intended to correct the insufficiencies of the two previous great English-French dictionaries of the seventeenth century, those of Cotgrave and Mieux. In contrast to the earlier texts’ wordier attempts to render the sense of “coquet” into English words (Mieux translates it as “a Woman that loves Men’s Company”), *The Royal Dictionary* offers the following simple translations from French into English:

Coquet: cocquet

Une Coquet: a Cocquet

Coqueter: to be a general Lover, or a Cocquet

Coquetterie: Coquetry

By merely offering subtle changes in spelling as translations, this dictionary depends upon “cocquet” signifying as an English-to-
French section follows the same pattern (translating Cocquet into Coquet, cocquetish into coquet, and so forth), attesting that the English “coquet/te” had at this point come into its own. As the Tatler essay with which I began demonstrates, within the first decade of the 1700s the new English word “coquet” could be utilized to name a sort of woman who was a recognizable and defining feature of modern English society.

The relatively sudden appearance of the coquette as a type can likewise be traced in the genre of “character writing” that thrived in the seventeenth century and continued to be popular well into the eighteenth. Before the 1690s such catalogs of familiar social types do not include sketches of the coquette, nor do they focus on women who combine the sorts of traits most frequently attributed to the type; after that time, books that detail “characters” or “manners of the age” consistently discuss the attributes and often the consequences of coquetry. From the beginning, this genre was influenced by the Characters of the ancient Greek writer Theophrastus, a short work detailing a series of unappealing behaviors (e.g., dissembling, penny-pinching, idle chatter, arrogance) and the types of people who practice them. Nothing remotely resembling a coquette appears in this work, in part because Theophrastus quite clearly describes the vices of men and not women, often referring to the wife, the fatherhood, or the military profession of the sort of person in question. The many seventeenth-century English character books that extend the Theophrastan tradition (including Overbury, Breton, Earle, Lenton, Braithwaite) often take a somewhat different approach: for instance, describing both good and bad instances of both male and female characteristics or types, or sorting characters according to profession rather than traits. Though these new approaches would often more easily accommodate such a type, they do not include any references to coquettes, nor do they contain examples of women defined by their disingenuous encouragement of men’s affections, their excessive enthusiasm for fashionable goods or pastimes, or their insistence on erotic or matrimonial autonomy? (The female characters that most often recur in these books include good wives, scolds, and bawds, harlots, or whores.) In other words, these commentaries on key social types affirm that, for much of the seventeenth century, the concept of coquetry per se did not exist—or at least was not widely enough available or discussed to be useful to writers of character books. This changed in the 1690s, arguably influenced not only by the increasingly widespread usage of “coquette” in other arenas but also by the English translation of French writer Jean de La Bruyère’s Les Caractères de Théophraste. In this 1688 riff on Theophrastus (which also includes a translation of his Characters), La Bruyère strays even further from the original, describing both men and women, discussing traits other than vices or failings, at times shifting toward portraits of individual people, and often including character descriptions within more general commentary on contemporary social mores (such that Les Caractères is often cited as a primary influence on Addison and Steele’s character-writing style). His section “Of Women” contains multiple references to “coquette women” (he introduces the concept with the claim that “une femme coquette” can never be persuaded out of her opinion of her own beauty), and the many English translations of this work that appeared beginning in the 1690s follow suit, often including the nominative “a coquet” or “the coquet” where La Bruyère had used “coquette” as an adjective, a subtle shift that underscores the identification in English texts of the coquette as a distinct type. La Bruyère’s influence can be traced beyond simple translations of the Caractères: works such as Abel Boyer’s 1695 Characters of the Virtues and Vices of the Age and its 1702 expansion and updating, The English Theophrastus (a sort of compendium, enlarged with each new edition, of French character writers and aphorists—Rochefoucault, St. Evremont, and La Bruyère—as well as English authors, Bacon, Cowley, Raleigh, Temple, Dryden, Wycherley, and others), often translate or closely match La Bruyère’s language in their inclusions of descriptions of coquetry. And even when such commentaries generate original language (as do many eighteenth-century periodicals that offer character descriptions, including the Tatler, the Spectator, the Female Spectator, the Connoisseur, the Observer), it is rare to find such a text after 1700 that does not include at least a brief description of a coquette. Although, as I will demonstrate throughout this book, characters of coquettes are not always identical to one another, such descriptions are nonetheless a consistent feature of eighteenth-century texts describing the people and manners of their day.
The history I have been tracing here implicitly contradicts the received scholarly wisdom that coquettes abounded on the stage for decades before the eighteenth century. The coquette has often been cited by literary historians as a stock character in Restoration comedies, taking her place on stage alongside the rake, the cuckold, the suave serving maid, the randy widow, the fop. This period’s comedy has long and justifiably been understood as the domain of a series of character types, and vain, witty, flirtatious, and acquisitive women are certainly well represented in the plays. But a survey of English plays before 1700 indicates that they evince little interest in the figure of the coquette as such. That is, no coherent type emerges under the sign of “coquette” in these plays. And unlike later plays, poems, novels, and essays, Restoration comedies do not regularly include commentary defining or philosophizing about such a woman as a familiar or widespread type or as a behavioral trend to be anatomized if its social context itself is to be fully understood. The word itself (“coquette” or “coquet”) is rarely used in plays before the 1690s and in those cases rather inconsistently labels an array of male and female behaviors. (For instance, in an early example, we find the term applied to Aurelia in Dryden’s 1668 *An Evening’s Love*, who is described as “one of the greatest Coquette’s in Madrid” simply because she scrupulously follows trends—“she cannot speak ten words without some affected phrase that is in fashion” [3.1]—even though she demonstrates no interest in securing any admirers to herself beyond Don Melchor.) And even when it starts to appear in play texts more regularly, “coquet/te” tends to show up only as a description in the dramatic persona of the couple, not as a word spoken by any of the characters. Female characters who might even a few years later be labeled coquettes are often not so identified—and therefore are not offered as representatives of the type that literary critics often associate them with. So, for instance, in Colley Cibber’s 1696 *Love’s Last Shift*, Narcissa is described as changeable and capricious in her affections (“She will [tell me her Mind] as soon as she knows it herself; for within this Week she has chang’d it as often as her Linen, and keeps it as secret too” [1.1]) and as preferring the pleasures of flattery to marriage (“I will have the pleasure of hearing my self prais’d a little; though I don’t marry this Month for’t” [2.1]) but is not identified as a coquette. Her sister Hillaria is described—as again would be typical of the coquette type in the early eighteenth century—as encouraging a series of insipid admirers (“What Beaux’s Box now has [she] taken Snuff from? What Fool has led her from the Box to her Coach? What Fop has she suffer’d to read a Play or Novel to her?” [1.1]) but is also not called a coquette. Yet only a few years later, George Farquhar would lament in his preface to *The Twin Rivals* (1703) that “A Play without a Beau, Cully, Cuckold, or Coquet, is as Poor an Entertainment to some Pallats, as their *Sundays Dinner* would be without Beef and Pudding” (499). Which is to say, in short, that though the idea of coquetry as such rarely emerges as a concern within the dramatic literature of the Restoration, the figure is understood (not only by disgruntled playwrights but by other commentators as well) to be a regular component of the popular theater within the first few years of the eighteenth century.10

Given the general sexual milieu of Restoration comedy, its lack of attention to the figure of the coquette per se should not be much of a surprise. Some generalizations will perhaps suffice to explain this assertion. Plays composed during this period regularly feature plots wherein significant time and energy are expended on elaborate intrigues designed to win, lose, or keep once or future lovers: characters engage with several sexual partners, old partners are abandoned for new ones, successful seduction quickly leads to boredom or contempt, marriage is presumed to be a breeding ground for sexual infidelity. In short, they often construct a world in which multiplicity, exchange, ephemerality, vacillation, and a constant quest for pleasure are the ruling erotic paradigms. In such a sexual milieu, a woman who pursues her own pleasure by drawing attention to herself or by encouraging several admirers is not particularly remarkable; she is not an aberration to be explicated or critiqued but one factor contributing to a more general economy of erotic circulation and play. Moreover, the pervasive emphasis on cuckoldry in this period’s drama suggests that what is primarily at stake in a woman’s polyamorous behavior is frequently enough a man’s honor, not her own reputation, and not the current state of female education and behavior. The scholarly commonplace that the Restoration stage is filled with coquettes thus seems to entail reading backward from the early eighteenth century, a period when the coquette *is* a key fixture of
English cultural commentary and is increasingly codified as a young, unmarried, vain woman of fashion who represents an exception or at least a threat to a general rule of feminine modesty and chastity.

Put another way, as the following chapters detail, the figure of the coquette gains traction in a less libertine literary milieu than Restoration comedy usually offers. She tends (somewhat paradoxically, given the frequent assertion that she represents the most common type of modern woman) to be figured not as an example of a generally dissipated sexual culture but as a worrisome anomaly in the midst of a generally polite society, a society striving against the sorts of libertine morality often depicted in the previous period’s drama. As a figure of the modern, the recent, the novel, she tends not—as most Restoration stage characters arguably do—to inhabit a world defined by aristocratic principles and norms but to be associated with things bourgeois: new wealth, consumption of fashionable but often cheap goods, modes of public interaction that accommodate not only nobles but also fashionable people from the gentry, merchant, and professional ranks.

The discourses that come to feature the coquette most regularly—exemplified by Addison and Steele’s periodicals, with their goal of “instruct[ing]” readers “what to think” (Tatler i)—are usually invested in defining and promoting the values of a respectable middle class. Though the coquette might in some ways represent, or strive for, an erotic economy emphasizing fluidity, circulation, and pleasure, she does so within texts that clearly valorize an erotic economy of prudence, investment, restraint, and plain dealing. As Steele writes in his dedicatory letter to Maynwaring prefixed to the first published volumes of the Tatler (one of the greatest early eighteenth-century repositories of coquette references), that paper’s “general Purpose . . . is to expose the false Arts of Life, to pull off the Disguises of Cunning, Vanity, and Affectation, and to recommend a general Simplicity in our Dress, our Discourse, and our Behaviour.”

All this said, the anti-libertine literature of the eighteenth century that features coquette characters nonetheless frequently adopts a tone toward coquetry that owes a debt to earlier representations of libertine women as entertaining, likable, even admirable characters. Rarely is the early coquette simply an object of invective or scorn. And rarely is the word “coquette” a feature of moralizing texts that critique modern fashionable society as a whole (e.g., sermons, conservative conduct literature, or publications by hellfire-and-brimstone promoters of traditional morality such as the Society for the Reformation of Manners). Rather, the coquette is a hallmark of texts that present themselves as celebrating the modern but striving to maintain virtue and politeness as the guiding lights of personal behavior and social interaction. Accordingly, demands for the coquette’s reform are generally expressed in a tone of indulgent affection. In the knowing mode I described in the introduction, these texts imply, “The coquette may be a problem, but she’s our problem; she may need to change, but we really do like her.” The coquette is generally not chastised, threatened, or shamed, but teased and nudged. And as I will detail further in the chapters to come, texts that critique coquetry often simultaneously reveal some admiration for coquettes’ wit, cleverness, and beauty: even the harshest critics cannot help but appreciate the skill and knowledge that successful coquetry entails.

As one reads through the scores of coquette critiques in the period—especially those that create coquette characters and give them voice—one can almost sense authors begrudgingly developing a fondness for the women they set out to censure.

In this way, the coquette’s early critics often regard the coquette in a manner resembling Mirabell’s expressed feelings for Millamant in William Congreve’s popular 1700 play *The Way of the World*. Often considered a “transitional comedy” for the ways it “reconciles,” in Laura Brown’s words, “aristocratic and bourgeois elements” (*English Dramatic Form* 134), straddling the more libertine milieu of the Restoration and the so-called sentimental dramatic modes increasingly popular after the 1690s, Congreve’s play features a main male character who loves a coquette in spite of his better judgment—indeed, largely as a result of his efforts not to love her. This play can be read as a sort of hinge between the Restoration’s frequently playful endorsement of wanton women and the early eighteenth century’s frequently playful censure of coquettes. Though Millamant is never labeled a coquette in the play, she does indeed exhibit several of the key characteristics regularly ascribed to coquettes in texts of the early 1700s. Her very name, suggesting *mille amans* or “thousand lovers,” encodes her posses-
sion of multiple admirers, and several aspects of her character recur in representations of the coquette throughout the following decades: her constant motion, levity, and fickleness (capturing all of these, Mirabell describes her in 2.1 as a "whirlwind," and Millamant herself declares of women that "motion, not method, is their occupation"); her affected, hyperbolic speech; her devotion to fashion and frequent emphasis on her clothing and accoutrements; her professed hatred of men despite her train of syphonic male admirers; her self-conscious performance of vanity, cruelty in love, and pursuit of power over other women (demonstrated most clearly by her song in 3.1); and, perhaps most characteristically, her perception of herself as the appropriate focus of everyone else’s attention. Soon after her first entrance, in 2.1, Millamant discusses using love poetry to pin up her hair, plainly (albeit somewhat ironically) proposing that the primary end of her lovers’ admiration is to augment her own beauty. Because of Mirabell’s devotion to her and her apparent affection for him, Millamant offers an example of a coquette who seems to be delaying rather than refusing marriage; yet she is perhaps most famous for the unsentimental, pragmatic approach to conjugal life she demonstrates in the so-called proviso scene of 4.1. As it will for so many coquettes who come in her wake, marriage in Millamant’s eyes entails—or at least threatens to entail, if not carefully managed—a loss of a woman’s liberty, solitude, contemplation, autonomy, and choice. By the time we reach this scene, the play has made it clear that Millamant is an estimable negotiator as well as a savvy critic of conjugal fashions, not simply a frivolous woman to dismiss or despise.

But before we even meet this coquette character, the audience hears about Mirabell’s reluctant but resolute love for her. The play’s opening scene, a dialogue between Mirabell and his eventual foe Fainall, implicitly warns the audience that we too will find Millamant impossibly not to love, even though we will readily recognize her many “faults.” As the two men discuss Millamant’s encouragement of multiple other (generally foolish) men’s affections, Mirabell describes his evolving attitude toward her coquettish behavior—particularly her failure to maintain a modest and proportionate sense of her own merit (“She has beauty enough to make any man think [she has wit], and complaisance enough not to contradict him who shall tell her so”). Mirabell responds to Fainall’s comment that “you are a man somewhat too discerning in the failings of your mistress” by explaining that such discernment actually, perhaps paradoxically, bolsters his love for Millamant:

I like her with all her faults; nay, like her for her faults. Her follies are so natural, or so artful, that they become her; and those affectations which in another woman would be odious, serve but to make her more agreeable. I’ll tell thee, Fainall, she once used me with that insolence, that in revenge I took her to pieces; sifted her and separated her failings; I studied 'em, and got 'em by rote. The catalogue was so large that I was not without hopes one day or other to hate her heartily: to which end I so used myself to think of 'em at length, contrary to my design and expectation, they gave me every hour less and less disturbance; till in a few days it became habitual to me to remember 'em without being displeased. They are now grown as familiar to me as my own frailties; and in all probability, in a little time longer I shall like 'em as well. (1.1)

Mirabell details here a process of being gradually more pleased when he expected to grow increasingly disgruntled. He describes himself proceeding through a sort of negative blazon, divvying Millamant’s character into component parts and detailing the problems with each; but such a focus on her flaws does not teach him, as he had predicted, to despise her. Rather, familiarity deprives those faults of their edge, their power, their offense. Having set out to train himself into a hearty hatred, Mirabell actually finds his affection enhanced. In this story the enumeration of faults does not just neutralize those faults; it transforms them from an irritant to a charm. Why? Because in the end they are known, of the self, not wholly other or alien, and therefore not only difficult to fully scorn but easy to forgive and even love.

Mirabell’s description of his attitude toward the coquette whom he loves aptly captures the tone I see generally suffusing discussion of the figure of the coquette in the literature of the ensuing half century.13 His stance of affection-enhanced-by-the-cataloging-of-faults prefigures in many respects the attitude toward the coquette that will soon predominate in such discussion. Without a doubt, such women are criticized and satirized throughout
this literature, but they tend to be treated with a fairly light and playful touch, showing up much more frequently in funny poems than in stern sermons, more often in urban periodicals than in pedantic conduct books. Consider, for instance, an example of the latter, John Essex’s 1722 guide *The Young Ladies Conduct*, which admonishes young women to avoid all the behaviors and tendencies usually attributed to coquettes (levity, love of novelty, vanity) but never uses the words “coquette” or “coquetry”—almost as if the usage of such words would compromise the seriousness of his text by conveying too great a conversancy with frivolous contemporary fashions. In texts that do speak of the coquette, she is generally presented as someone an audience of shrewd and fashionable readers, wise to contemporary trends, knows well, a young woman whose faults “we” like to complain about but also indulge. As the author of the 1753 *Modern Characters* states in a discussion of this societal soft spot for coquettes, “We have a false and foolish partiality which makes us see with some kind of approbation this levity in any woman” (1.115). As a woman characterized by her levity—in a coquettish milieu, nothing is terribly serious or earnest—the coquette tends to be treated with a correspondingly playful and often ironic tone: in this great age of English satire, authors often coquette with the coquette.

Of course, there are exceptions to this general rule. In *Spectator* 172, for example, Steele writes rather sternly, “If we would take true Pains with our selves to consider all things by the Light of Reason and Justice, though a Man were in the Height of Youth and amorous Inclinations, he would look upon a Coquette with the same Contempt or Indifference as he would upon a Coxcomb: The wanton Carriage in a Woman, would disappoint her of the Admiration which she aims at.” But even such a comment seems to acknowledge that it is adopting an unusual stance; its initial “if” suggests that men rarely do look at coquettes with either contempt or indifference. More often, the coquette is looked upon with ambivalence. As Steele’s “wanton Carriage” here suggests, the coquette is a morally ambiguous figure: she is not in fact wanton but gives that impression, carrying herself as if she were. Such ambiguity characterizes descriptions of the coquette through-out Addison and Steele’s periodicals. *Tatler* 107, for instance, defines the coquette as a “chast[e] Jilt,” who “differs only from a common One, as a Soldier who is perfect in Exercise, does from one that is actually in Service.” This description (offered to a young man in an effort to cure him of his love for a coquette) aims to portray coquetry as a danger that needs to be taken seriously, even a vice that ought to be despised. Yet it simultaneously ascribes harmlessness to the coquette: like a soldier well prepared for battle but not actually armed or on the field, she both is and is not capable of inflicting damage. The coquette’s threat to others—like the insecurity of her own chastity—is all potential. Similarly emphasizing the ambiguous moral position of the coquette through a comparison to a clearly vicious woman, *Spectator* 187 explains, “The Coquet is indeed one degree towards the Jilt; but the Heart of the former is bent upon admiring her self, and giving false Hopes to her Lovers, but the latter is not contented to be extremly Amiable, but she must add to that Advantage a certain Delight in being a Torment to others.” Whereas the coquette’s happiness lies in hearing herself praised, “the Happiness of a Jilt consists only in the Power of making others Uneasie.” With its emphasis on the coquette’s self-admiration as the quality that distinguishes her from the indisputably reprehensible character of a jilt, this description proposes that her extreme vanity saves the coquette from advancing through the ranks of wicked women. Such a proposal—that one personal failing may prevent other, more extreme ones—underlies the often-indulgent tone with which the coquette is treated. Certainly, she’s not perfect, these texts often imply, but she could be much worse. And perhaps, as Mirabell has modeled, if we know and understand her foibles well enough, as well as we understand “[our] own frailties,” we may come to find them charming in and of themselves.

Indeed, as the following chapters will explore in detail, the coquette’s frailties and failures are often represented as reflecting the more general frailties of the age. As I have been suggesting, this new type is not only characterized by levity but also treated with a light touch, becoming a way for authors to comment upon modernity without taking it too seriously. The chapters to come focus on the ways the coquette registers a series of
modern developments, including new modes of consumption, new ways of gathering in public, and new possibilities for courtship. Through their often playful discussions of this new type of woman, eighteenth-century writers engage potentially frighteningly serious issues—certainly significant demographic, technological, economic, and cultural changes—with an urbane and lighthearted (and therefore, perhaps, reassuring and even optimistic) tone.
Mark Peters materials:

**Works under discussion**


1. Images: the frontispiece of Gräf’s 1715 publication, and a portrait of von Ziegler from 1733
2. Title pages of Gräf (1715) and von Ziegler, *Versuch* (1728)


3. Selections from the Forewords to Gräf (1715) and von Ziegler (1728)

*EinesandächtigenFrauenzimmers S. R. G.* Foreword by N. N. (the volume’s editor).

Here will the Christian and gentle reader [find] laid before their eyes a work of a pious woman—identified on the title page with her initials—which was entitled from the introductory words of the author herself: Love offering presented to her JESUS in faith; in the which the gentle reader will find edifying and temperate applications of the Sunday and feast day Gospels. These were drafted in the past year every Sunday after the worship service by the woman, and the starting point of the words cited in the sermon were applied together with her own reflections, yet it was in no way her intention ever to edit such meditations or to allow them to be edited. But since without her knowledge, much less her permission to bring forth the same to publication (I take the responsibility for this upon myself), the well-meaning reader should dismiss any thought of evil presumption of the woman to seek after glory, but rather allow this well-established opinion here to be imparted: This is for nothing other than God’s glory, which often reveals itself also in the female gender through the benevolent bestowal on the same natural (and not learned through artifice) spiritual gifts; in addition to this also is the hope to edify other Christian hearts through these and to join these together with the regular devotional Sunday celebration; for with no less of a motivation than this [did she] bring it about. And if perhaps the evil-disposed defame this good intention, herewith also, as far as the verse itself is concerned, whether in the phraseology or in the rhymes and the other desirable features, even so will a well-disposed reader instead excuse that which the author could not help: that she did not have the intention to edit, finalize, or at all revise the arias; but these arias appear as they first flowed out of her quill—and which she sent to me in good faith to read through—and were brought by me to publication without any emendation. Should the devout reader find now in these pages something to their edification, which I heartily wish for him in addition to all spiritual and physical blessings from God, then I will be pleased. Farewell.

`e Museo, 15 November 1715
N. N.


I am certain in asserting that as long as women have entered into the fashion of publishing books, almost no single writing by them has appeared which was not first edited by a man skilled in writing. Since in order to demonstrate this I need only go back to the time of a learned [Anna Maria van] Schurman and [Madeleine de] Scudéry or also one such as [Henriette de Coligny, La comtesse] de la Suze and [Anne] Dacier, then I am also in no way able to criticize this good practice; for I consider it to be much more valuable that the common nature not burden oneself (for that which has not previously gone through supervision), but at least be advised whether they would do well to venture therein, whether it will meet with approval or not when it
appears; what is it to us whether Madame [Antoinette] Deshoulières wrote the lovely verses which were published under her name or not, since they were in other respects esteemed as worthy to be read?

Nonetheless, I have in this instance come to the conclusion to offer the pages before me without drawing upon anyone for council; not as though I stand in the opinion that I would thus [indicate] . . . that perhaps the quill should not be led by another hand; no, in no way, but rather that I here desire, as if I had believed the superb French satirist Mons. [Nicolas] BoileauDespréaux, who . . . wrote that as soon as he received a letter from a lady written after her manner in poetry or prose, he committed the same to memory, over which stood [the maxim]: “Nature is superior to art.” However little of his true opinion may appear in this piece, I nevertheless believe that I have the right to satirize this same satire in order to praise our gender, since I, like he, dissemble and therefore hold it as if he himself also indeed believed it.

For I have thought about this many times with amazement, how it yet must happen that in such a case a woman, both in the court and also in well-established cities, has the glory with applause by all that even the most learned of men has, often speaking better than they; yet in writing it is not so for them, but ten women’s quills do not come up to the writing of one leading man in learning (I would not say in learned, but merely proper, things). The answer to this is evident already in my recitation itself, since when a woman studies, she could easily surpass men also in writing, in that an unlearned man seems to write just as badly as the same woman, and then I suppose that the foundation of a good writing must without fail be training in the art of speech . . .

However, this answer does not give me full satisfaction, since an unlearned man will very seldom outdo a learned man in his speech, but all the learned must concede that women very often surpass them in speech. And where then does the strength of our memories lie, if we arrange the words in a proper and orderly fashion when we speak but cannot keep the same in our mind for a long enough time to bring them to the quill?

. . .

I did not know how a woman, who like me had had the misfortune to be widowed twice already in her youth, could while away her sad time other than through a soothing verse.

. . .

Many poets, both old and new, have long borne the well-deserved glory that they have given the strongest grounds for the improvement of their moral philosophy; so much so that the especially rigid emperor Domitian laudably offered, at the competition which was held every fifth year at the capitol in Rome, that the one who held precedence in both rhetoric and poetry would be honored with the laurel crown from the emperor himself; wherefore in the same manner the German emperor and the Roman pope, in developing this well passed-down practice, have crowned in their imperial and Lateran palaces a woman as poet laureate when her poetry merits it, as the noble and learned Venetian [Elena Lucretia] Cornara [Piscopia] attained directly from both courts, and in addition was resplendent with the glory of her doctoral robes before our eyes, as also the least among us would seek for the same adornment; however, it is unfortunately not the praiseworthy custom in Germany, as it is in sensible France, in so many magnificent cities to award the grandest prize to poetry and fine rhetoric, just as Monsieur [Évrard] Titon du Tillet erected a Parnassus in bronze to the undying glory of poets and musicians.¹

. . .²

If it would appear odd to several readers that I have thrown in among these my poems many joking thoughts, then I know of nothing else to bring forward in my defense than that I am of the absolute opinion

¹Le Parnassefrançois, celebrating both male and female poets and musicians.
²There follows an introduction to the volume’s contents.
that one must not all the time demand from a lady a serious and Catonic face, particularly since my temperament and lively disposition would certainly not allow this when I view a hypocritical larva before my face, not with each occurrence to portray the world with downcast eyes and sighing gestures. There is a time for everything, and I believe the female gender has a right, just as the male, to so order themselves and to amuse themselves in pleasurable hours with an admissible and well-mannered jest.

Finally, I would gladly see those quills that are desirous to serve the editing of newly-completed books and writings and by delivering to the world their judgment of them by going over and enhancing my poor pages, for they would thereby bestow a courtesy and undeserved praise to my insignificant poems; likewise, one might see that they who would wish to encourage my lowly Muse through their flattering words of encouragement may rather strengthen the heckling of others or through their too strong manner of ambiguous speech make the reader suspicious and doubtful; even so, I would not have to cover my face over this or be tempted to blush with shame before the sensible and unassuming of the world, for they may simply remind themselves of this, that this poetry springs from a weak woman’s quill, and should only be called a mere attempt in the same art of writing. But if one would simply indicate my shortcomings to me and guide me along the right path to Mount Parnassus with a tranquil and willing hand, then one can easily believe that I will not remain negligent in offering him the least thanks, but rather that I will be very much in his debt for such sincere instruction and well-intentioned thoughtfulness

4. One poem from each author for the Feast of Pentecost


---

Du edles Feuersüsser Liebe,  
Komm, komm, beseele Sinn und Geist;  
Laß meiner Seeleheisentriebe  
Nur geh' nauff das, was himmlischheiß't.  
Du allerheil' gster Freuden=Schein,  
Komm, flössedichdemHertzen ein.  

O Kleinod, das mir Jesu Treue  
Zum theuren Pfandre hat geschenck't,  
Erquickte, tröstte und erfreue  
Mein Herz, das ohnedichsichkränckt.  
Lacht nur ein Strahl in meiner Brust,  
So labet mich entzückte Lust.  

Erfrischemich mit Lebentropfen  
Du kühler Thau! wennnofft beymir  
Creuz, Elend, Angst und Nothanklopffen,  
Denn nurzudirstehtmein Begier.  
Ergötzemich du hochstes Gut,  
Und stärcke den so blöden Muth.  

Sagt mir die Welt von ihren Schätzen,  
Und viel von eitler Liebe für;  
So kann mich dir doch noch nicht erfreuen,  
Mein ganz Verlangenszudir,  
Zudir du hohes Liebes=Licht  
Und nichtzueittem Thungericht.

---

You noble fire of sweet love,  
Come, come, quicken sense and spirit;  
Let my soul’s ardent impulse  
Only rise to that which is heavenly.  
You all-holy manifestation of joy,  
Come, fill my heart.

O jewel, that to me Jesus’ loyalty  
For a dear pledge has given,  
Quickens, comfort, and gladden  
My heart, that without you is ailing.  
If only your ray shines brightly in my breast,  
Then delightful pleasure refreshes me.

Refresh me with the drop of life,  
you cool dew! when often  
Cross, misery, fear, and need assail me,  
Then my desire is only for you.  
Delight me, you highest good,  
And strengthen the most worn courage.

The world may speak to me about its treasure,  
And much about vain love for [it];  
Even so can this yet not delight me,  
My entire yearning is for you,  
For you, you exalted light of love,  
And not for vain conduct.

---

3 “Versuch in dergleichen Schreib-Art,” a reference to the volume’s title, Versuch in gebundener Schreib-Art.
Drum kommmeinTrost!  
Therefore come, my comfort! 

drum kommmeinLeben!  
Therefore come, my life! 

Kommsüsser Quell! Kommedler Schatz!  
Come, sweet spring! Come, noble treasure! 

Dir, dirhab’ ichmichgantzergeben,  
To you, to you have I given my whole self, 

Komm, nimm in meinerSeelenPlatz;  
Come, take a seat in my soul; 

Behehrsche Geist, Hertz, Muth, und Sinn,  
Rule spirit, heart, courage, and sense, 

Daßichnichtmehr, nurdeine bin.  
That I am not mine, but yours alone.

Christiane Mariane von Ziegler, “Fer. I. Pentec. Vermichliebet, der wirdmeinWorthalten” (Cantata for the First Day of Pentecost.)

- Set to music by J. S. Bach (BWV 74). First performed 20 May 1725. (Recommended listening)
- Published in Christiane Mariane von Ziegler, Versuch in gebundener Schreib-Art (Leipzig, 1728), 266-68.

1. [Chorus]
Wermichliebet, der wirdmeinWorthalten, und  
Whoever loves me will keep my word, and my 
meinVaterwirdihnhlieben, und wirwerdenzuhmkom-  
Father will love him, and we will come to him and 
men und Wohnungsbeihhmmachen.  
make our abode with him.

2. Aria
Komm, komm, meinHerzestehtdiroffen,  
Come, come, my heart stands open to you, 
Ach, laßesdeineWohnungsein!  
Ah, let it be your dwelling!

Ichliebedich, so mußichhoffen:  
I love you, so I must hope:

DeinWorttrifftitzobmeiner!  
Your word will now be fulfilled in me;

Dennwirdsuchtest, fürcht’, liebt und ehret,  
For whoever seeks, fears, loves, and honors you,
Dem ist der Vaterzugetan.  
To him the Father is devoted.

Ichzweiflenicht, ich bin erhöret,  
I doubt not, I have been heard,
Daßichmichdeingetröstenkann.  
So I can comfort myself in you.

3. Recitative
Die Wohnungistbereit.  
The dwelling is prepared.
Du findsteinHerz, das diralleinergeben,  
You find a heart, that is surrendered to you alone,
Drum laßmitsichnichterleben,  
Therefore let me not experience,
Daß du gedenkst, von mirzugehn.  
That you should intend to go from me.
Das laßichnimmermehr, ach, nimmermehr  
That I will never, ah, never allow!
geschehen!

4. Aria
Ichgehehin und kommewiederzueuch.  
I go there and come again to you. If you had loved me, then you would have rejoiced.
Hättetihmhichlieb, so würdethreichfreuen.

5. Aria
Kommets, eilet, stimmetSait und Lieder  
Come, hasten, tune strings and songs
In muntern und erfreuten Ton.  
In lively and glad sound.

Gehtergleichweg, so kömmtensieder,  
Though he goes away, he will come again,
Der hochgelobteGottessohn.  
The highly exalted son of God.
Der Satan wirdindesversuchen,  
Satan will meanwhile attempt
Den Deinigen gar sehrzufluchen.  
Greatly indeed to curse your own.
Eristmirhinderlich,  
He is obstructive to me,
So glaubich, Herr, an dich.  
So I believe, Lord, in you.
6. Recitative
Esistnichtsverdammlichesandenen,dieinChristo
Jesusind. There is nothing worthy of condemnation in those
who are in Christ Jesus.

7. Aria
Nichtskannmicherretten Nothing can save me
Von höfflichen Ketten From hell’s chains
Als, Jesu, deinBlut. But, Jesus, your blood.
Dein Leiden, deinSterben Your passion, your dying
Macht michjazuMorden: Makes me indeed an heir:
Ichlache der Wut. I laugh at the fury.

8. Chorale
KeinMenschenkindhier auf der Erd No human here on the earth
IstdieseredenGabe wert, Is worthy of this noble gift,
BeiusistkeinVerdienen; In us is no merit;
Hier gilt gar nichtsalsLieb und Gnad, Nothing at all is effective here but love and grace,
Die Christusunsverdioten hat Which Christ has earned for us
MitBüßen und Versühnen. With his atonement and reconciliation.