

PETER WOLLNY

New perspectives on Johann Jacob Froberger's biography

Implications of the 'London Autograph'

THE PAST 30 YEARS have been a fortunate period for research on the life and works of Johann Jacob Froberger (1616–1667), for they saw the discovery of three major manuscript sources that contain an abundance of new information yielding valuable insights, challenging hypotheses and a wealth of implications that will inspire future investigations. In 1999, the so-called 'Bulyowsky Manuscript' resurfaced in Dresden and was subsequently acquired by the Sächsische Landes- und Universitätsbibliothek.¹ It was evaluated and edited by Rudolf Rasch the following year.² In 2001 another hitherto unknown source showed up, which apparently had originated in Hamburg and was transmitted among the long-lost holdings of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin.³ A facsimile edition and transcription of this manuscript appeared in 2004.⁴ And finally, the year 2006 marked—so far—the climax in this succession of discoveries: in the November auction of that year, Sotheby's London announced the sale of a substantial volume containing mostly unknown

1 Today shelved under D-Dl, Mus. 1-T-595.

2 Rasch 2000; Rasch & Dirksen 2001, pp. 133–153.

3 D-Bsa, SA 4450; see Wollny 2003, pp. 99–115.

4 Wollny 2006; the manuscript came into the possession of the Sing-Akademie from the collection of the Berlin cantor and music director Johann Georg Gottlieb Lehmann; see *Verzeichniß | der | von dem Königl. Ober-medizinalrath Herrn | Klaproth, Musikdirekt. Hrn. Lehmann | und andern | hinterlassenen | Bücher, | [...] | welche | nebst einer ansehnlichen Sammlung von Musikalien für verschiedene Instrumente. | [...] | den iten Juli u. f. T. d. J. | Vormittags 9 Uhr | am Dönhofsplatz Nr. 36. | durch | den Königl. Auctions-kommissarius | Bratring | gegen gleich baare Bezahlung in kling. Preuß. Cour. | meistbietend versteigert werden sollen. | [...] | Berlin, 1817*; copy in D-B, Ap 12101, fasc. 2.

compositions by Froberger written in his own hand.⁵ I was able to examine the manuscript prior to the auction and assisted in gathering information for the catalogue entry; subsequently, the present owner allowed me to study the source a second time. In this report I present the preliminary results of my current research on the history of the manuscript and discuss its implications for Froberger's biography.⁶

The manuscript and its repertoire

The manuscript has the unusual size of 8.5 × 24 cm in oblong format and thus is surprisingly small. Similar formats and dimensions are frequently found in manuscript collections of Italian cantatas. They are very uncommon for keyboard music, however.⁷ The Froberger volume is lavishly bound in red morocco with elaborate gilt ornaments, displaying the imperial coat of arms of Emperor Leopold I on both covers. Strangely, the autograph contains no title or dedication and there is indeed no indication whatsoever that it was ever presented to the emperor. At a later time, probably after Froberger's death, a makeshift title in rather awkward French was added by an unknown hand: "Livre Primiere Des Fantasies, Caprices, Allemandes, Chigues, Courantes, Sarebandes, Meditations. Composées par Jean Jacque Froberger. Organist de la chambre de sa Majeste Imperiale." Before addressing the problem of the missing dedication in more detail, the repertoire and matters of chronology will be considered.

⁵ See the separate catalogue: *Johann Jacob Froberger: A Hitherto Unrecorded Autograph Manuscript Volume Containing Thirty-five Keyboard Pieces, Eighteen Completely New, Undocumented and Unpublished* (London: Sotheby's, 2006). The manuscript is also described in the catalogue of the sale of Continental Manuscripts, L06409, London, Thursday, 30 November 2006 (lot 50).

⁶ This source is also known under the name the 'Montbéliard Manuscript'; I prefer to use the term 'London Autograph' as the manuscript first appeared in London and because I wish to prevent speculation about its still-obscure provenance.

⁷ See, for example, the volumes A-Wn, Mus.Hs. 17754 (c. 12.5 x 29 cm), Mus. Hs. 17756 (c. 11 x 25 cm), Mus.Hs. 17759 (c. 10 x 29 cm) and Mus.Hs. 17768 (c. 11 x 26 cm); all four manuscripts belong to the Schlafkammerbibliothek of Leopold I.

Like the three other surviving Froberger autographs—the ‘Libro Secondo’, the ‘Libro Quarto’ and the ‘Libro di Capricci e Ricercati’, all three preserved at the Austrian National Library in Vienna⁸—the London Autograph comprises several distinct sections separated by autograph part titles (for a complete inventory see *Appendix 1*): The ‘Premiere Partie’ contains six ‘Fantasies’, not one of which is transmitted elsewhere, and the ‘Second Partie’ presents six equally unknown ‘Caprices’. The concluding ‘Troisiesme Partie’ consists of five suites and three lamentos. It is here that we find the first hints of a chronological frame. Four of the eight pieces can be dated securely, and they all originated within a period of just five years. Emperor Ferdinand III died on 2 April 1657 and the “Tombeau, la quelle se joue lentement avec discretion, faict sur la tres douloreuse Mort de Sa Majeste Imperiale le Troisiesme Ferdinand” (no. 19) certainly originated soon after. Sixteen months later, on 1 August 1658, his son Leopold was crowned in Frankfurt am Main. The Allemande of the Suite in A Minor (no. 13) in the present source contains the note “faicte sur le Couronnement de Sa Majesté Imperiale à Franckfurt”. The date of Froberger’s Meditation “faict sur ma mort future” (no. 17) can be gleaned from the Sing-Akademie manuscript: “à Paris 1 May Anno 1660”. Duke Leopold Friedrich of Württemberg-Mömpelgard (1624–1662), whose death is commemorated in the last piece (no. 20), died on 15 June 1662.

There is reason to assume that the three pieces dedicated to Duchess Sibylla (1620–1707) (nos. 14, 16 and 18) were also composed around that time, i.e., after Froberger had left Vienna and the service of the imperial court and moved to the court of Leopold Friedrich and his wife Sibylla in Montbéliard. I would in fact like to go one step further and suggest that Froberger arranged the first six pieces in the ‘Troisiesme Partie’ in exact chronological order, followed by the two tombeaux. This would imply that the suites in G minor (no. 14), C minor (no. 15) and F major (no. 16) were written between August 1658 and May 1660, while the Meditation for Sibylle (no. 18) was obviously composed after May 1660 as its title is modelled after the famous Meditation “faict sur ma mort future”. We know from another source that Sibylla was

8 A-Wn, Mus.Hs. 18706, Mus.Hs. 18707, Mus.Hs. 16560.

especially fond of this piece, so it is all the more plausible that she may have commissioned a similar work for herself.⁹ The two tombeaux at the end appear to form a separate subgroup within the ‘Troisiesme Partie’ and thus stand outside the strict chronological order of this group.

If this implicit chronology is accepted, we may assume that soon after attending the coronation of Emperor Leopold I in Frankfurt, Froberger moved to Montbéliard and became Sibylla’s music teacher.¹⁰

Biographical implications

Froberger’s affiliation with Leopold Friedrich and his court provides a welcome explanation for Froberger’s travels in those years. Following the Battle of Nördlingen in September 1634—one of the major battles of the Thirty Years’ War—the eight-year-old Prince Leopold Friedrich had been taken under French protection. Between 1641 and 1645 he and his younger brother—and later successor—Duke George II (1626–1699) were educated at the French royal court in Paris. Not much is known about the further life and reign of Leopold Friedrich, but Zedler’s *Universal-Lexikon* claims that he “undertook costly journeys to France, Germany, and Italy almost every year”.¹¹ In 1653 Leopold Friedrich was granted a seat and the right to vote in the Imperial Diet.¹² It may thus be assumed that he attended the coronation of Emperor Leopold I in Frankfurt in August 1658. Perhaps this was the occasion when Froberger met the ducal couple from Montbéliard, if indeed he was present at the coronation in Frankfurt as well. His journeys from now on thus may have been made possible or even instigated by his new patrons. Froberger’s stay

⁹ See Sibylla’s letter to Constantijn Huygens, 23 October 1667; published in Rasch n.d., p. 20.

¹⁰ Even if one regards the order of pieces in the ‘Troisiesme Partie’ of the London Autograph as more or less random, it is still highly probable that the three works dedicated to Sibylla were composed close in time to the tombeau for her husband.

¹¹ See Zedler [1999], vol. 17 (1738), col. 395 (“kostbare Reisen, die er fast alle Jahre in Frankreich, Teutschland und Italien gethan”).

¹² Zedler [1999], vol. 17 (1738), col. 395 (“Im Jahre 1653, erhielt er wegen Mümpelgard Sitz [und] Stimme auf dem Reichs-Tage”).

in Paris in the spring of 1660 could be seen as connected with one of the duke's journeys as well.

All this does not exclude the possibility that Froberger remained in one way or another affiliated with the imperial court in Vienna. This assumption is supported by the fact that even after he had left Vienna he continued to be addressed as "Imperial Chamber Organist" on more than one occasion. Even though after July 1658 Froberger did not render any active musical services at the Viennese court, there must be a reason for this official title. A plausible explanation would be that, instead of being a member of the court chapel, he served as a diplomat, political observer or correspondent, travelling under the guise of his musicianship. On the other hand, a remark transmitted by the lexicographer Johann Gottfried Walther (1684–1748), according to which Froberger had fallen into disgrace at the imperial court after the death of Ferdinand III on 2 April 1657, should also be taken seriously.¹³

Was there any particular reason for the journey to Paris in the spring of 1660? With regard to the major political occurrences of that year, it becomes clear that the main event was the forthcoming wedding of Louis XIV (1638–1715) and the Spanish princess Maria Theresa of Spain (1638–1683). Preliminary negotiations for this marriage had begun as early as 1656 and must be seen in the context of the diplomatic attempts to end the devastating war between France and Spain that had already lasted more than 20 years.¹⁴ The preparations for this wedding did not proceed smoothly. At first the Spanish king, Philip IV (1605–1665), refused the proposed plan as he feared that, since all his sons had died before reaching adulthood, his territories might eventually be inherited by Louis. The background for this reasoning is that the old Merovingian *Lex Salica*, which excluded women from the succession to the throne ("terram salicam mulieres ne succedant"), did not apply in Spain.

With the birth of Philip's son Felipe Próspero on 28 November 1657 this fear became less acute, but the weakness and constant poor health of the child, who eventually died on 1 November 1661, did not promise

¹³ Walther 1732 [1953], p. 264.

¹⁴ For an overview of the war between France and Spain, see Lynn 1999; for the biographical context, see Malettke 2009; the general political and historical background is discussed in Schilling 2010.

much security. In the meantime, the young Louis had fallen in love with Maria Mancini, the niece of his chief minister, Cardinal Jules Mazarin (1602–1661), and seriously considered marrying her. To make things even more complicated, Princess Marie-Thérèse had already been promised as a child to the oldest son of Emperor Ferdinand III, the young Ferdinand IV (1633–1654). After the latter's death on 9 July 1654 (at the age of barely 21), the emperor tried to transfer this promise to his second son, Prince Leopold, who showed a keen interest in marrying his Spanish cousin. All this eventually came to nothing, but the decisive breakthrough for the proposed match between Louis XIV and Marie-Thérèse was reached only in the second half of 1659 in the course of negotiations that took place on the Île des Faisans on the French–Spanish border. It is not necessary in the given context to go into the complicated wedding preparations and procedures, but it should be noted that there was again some delay. The couple eventually married in June 1660 in St-Jean-de-Luz on the Spanish border and did not return to Paris before late August 1660.

All this was not foreseeable, and in Paris the entire court and citizens had to be very patient. Mazarin, for example, had commissioned the Venetian composer Francesco Cavalli (1602–1676) to write a new opera for the occasion. Cavalli came to Paris in April 1660 and was soon caught up in all sorts of difficulties. His wedding opera *Hercole amante* was in fact staged only in February 1662.¹⁵

Judging from the date of his Meditation “faict sur ma mort future”, we may suspect that Froberger came to Paris in the spring of 1660 expecting the royal couple to return to the capital shortly and probably hoped to report about this event to the imperial court back in Vienna. We do not know what inspired him to compose such a reflective piece on 1 May 1660—perhaps frustration about the prolonged stay, sudden melancholy, and lack of money and perspective. In any case, if Froberger fulfilled his assumed mission, he probably stayed in Paris for at least half a year.

Before resuming consideration of this Paris sojourn, it is necessary to first explore whether a similarly convincing reason for another major

¹⁵ Walker 2002, pp. 302–313, esp. p. 304.

journey is documented in the London Autograph, i.e., the remarkable addition of “faict à Madrid” to the title of the Meditation for Sibylle. As discussed earlier, Sibylle’s Meditation must have been composed after the first Meditation of 1660, the Meditation “faict sur ma mort future”.

If it is true that this piece was intended as a solace for the duchess after the sudden death of her husband in June 1662 and her precarious situation as a widow, it may have been composed in the second half of 1662 or in the first half of 1663.

Looking at the history of the royal Spanish court in these years, it is easy to spot a set-up that was similar in importance to the wedding of the French king. After the peace treaty and ensuing wedding negotiations between France and Spain produced concrete results sometime in 1659, the newly crowned Emperor Leopold I began to make advances to the Spanish king with plans to marry his youngest daughter, Princess Margarita Theresa. Born in September 1651, the princess was only eight years of age when official negotiations about her future marriage began. From a detailed study undertaken by the historian Alfred Francis Pribram in 1891, we know that these negotiations were very slow to yield any results.¹⁶ Long stretches of time passed without any progress. Only in October 1662 did matters begin to move, and by April 1663 the official engagement between the 22-year-old emperor and his 11-year-old Spanish cousin was proclaimed. It took almost another four years before the couple was actually married. The wedding celebrations were performed with great splendour in Vienna, beginning in December 1666 and lasting for almost a year. When in September 1666 Froberger mentioned to his friend and colleague Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687) that he planned to be in Vienna shortly (“sta per tornarsi in breve alla Corte Cesarea”), he most certainly had the return of the imperial couple in mind.¹⁷

In the years 1662 and 1663, the negotiations for the projected wedding were conducted by the Bohemian count Franz Eusebius von Pötting (1627–1678), who served as an ambassador in Madrid for more

¹⁶ Pribram 1891.

¹⁷ See Rasch, *Duizend brieven over muziek van, aan en rond Constantijn Huygens* (<https://huygens-muziekbrieven.sites.uu.nl>), Huygens aan Froberger – 8 oktober 1666 (6583); 1917, p. 199.

than a decade, from 1662 to 1673. It is thus quite plausible that for a certain period Froberger belonged to the retinue of Count von Pötting, probably assisting him in his complicated mission.

Further research will be necessary to, it is hoped, confirm the ideas just sketched here in a very rough and preliminary way. However, it is safe to say that these political events—starting with the coronation of Leopold I in 1658 and extending to the wedding of Louis XIV with Maria Theresa of Spain in 1660 as well as to the engagement and eventual wedding of Leopold I with Margarita Theresa of Spain in 1666—provide a convincing frame for Froberger’s travels and professional engagement in the last decade of his life. The established narrative that sees him as a failed and exiled artist or even a displaced vagabond will have to be revised. Instead, his various journeys may be interpreted as an indication of his activities as a diplomat.

Concordances

Let us now consider Froberger’s sojourn in Paris in the first half of 1660 and the repertoire of the London Autograph. In his article ‘A new Froberger manuscript’, Bob van Asperen pointed out thematic relationships between two works in the London Autograph and two pieces in François Roberday’s collection *Fugues, et Caprices a quatre parties [...] pour l’Orgue*, published in Paris in 1660, suggesting that Froberger actually borrowed thematic material from Roberday.¹⁸ A close examination of the London Autograph shows, however, that van Asperen’s assessment is in need of revision.

François Roberday (1624–1680) was a goldsmith and amateur musician who in 1659 had managed to secure the position as a valet to Queen Anne of Austria. The collection *Fugues, et Caprices a quatre parties* is his only contribution to music history. In his preface, Roberday states that his anthology contains one piece each by Girolamo Frescobaldi, Wolfgang Ebner and Johann Jacob Froberger. The remaining works he claims to have composed himself on subjects given to him by famous composers such as Louis Couperin, Antonio Bertali, Francesco Cavalli, and, again, Froberger. Gunther Morche pointed out the strik-

¹⁸ van Asperen 2007.

ing discrepancy between the self-confident preface to the collection and the remarkably poor, even faulty contrapuntal skills displayed in the pieces themselves.¹⁹ Besides, Roberday failed to complete his initial plan of combining twelve fugues with an equal number of caprices on the same subjects—in the end, only six of the fugues were paired with caprices. One may add that the pieces in this collection are remarkably variable in quality. While some of the fugues display large, complex and multi-sectional structures, others are quite short and barely explore their thematic material and contrapuntal potential. Altogether one gains the impression of a rather hurried job. In addition, there is another, even more acute problem: For six of the altogether 18 works we find partial concordances in Froberger's oeuvre. The term "concordance" is used here not in its strict meaning, but rather indicates identical subjects and considerable similarities of musical substance.

One of these correspondences has been known for a long time: the fifth fugue is largely identical to the first ricercare of Froberger's 'Libro Quarto' of 1656. But in fact there are five other fugues in Roberday's collection that are closely related to pieces in the London Autograph (see *Appendix 2*). It is not easy to determine the exact relationship between Roberday's fugues and their versions in the original Froberger sources, however. Regarding the ricercare from the 'Libro Quarto', Siegbert Rampe considered the version published by Roberday to be a genuine later revision by Froberger, to which the composer added a rather long tripla section.²⁰ I personally doubt this explanation.

In Roberday's Fugue no. 5, the entrances of the fugue subjects (*recto* and *verso*) are exactly the same as in Froberger's ricercare (see *Figures 1* and *2*). But while the readings in the 'Libro Quarto' follow the rules of strict counterpoint very faithfully, Roberday presents us with some awkward voice leading (see, for example, measures 4–5, soprano: f#–b-flat–f; and measure 5: resolution of the tritone e / b-flat), and in several instances he introduces diminished intervals, which—at least in the frequency they appear—are foreign to the strict style. In addition, the final tripla section is merely a variant of the first 35 measures.

¹⁹ Morche 2005, cols 214–215.

²⁰ Rampe 1995, pp. 18ff. and 106ff.

None of these characteristics is found in authentic works by Froberger, while Roberday's *Fugues, et Caprices a quatre parties* are full of them. On the other hand, there are numerous indications contradicting the idea that Roberday may have published here an otherwise unknown earlier version of Froberger's piece, for not even Froberger's earliest known compositions display faults of this kind. We can therefore safely conclude that Roberday wilfully corrupted Froberger's piece. Similar observations can be made when analysing the five pieces related to works in the London Autograph.

Turning to the question of how Roberday may have gained access to Froberger's works, the most likely scenario is that, during his stay in Paris, Froberger made a number of his compositions available to Roberday. This may have been a friendly, collegial exchange (as van Asperen suggested), but the possibility should also be considered that, due to his unexpectedly long stay in Paris, Froberger ran into financial difficulties and was forced to sell a number of his works. It is also quite possible that Roberday received the subjects or models for other fugues from Froberger as well. How else could he have gained access to unpublished pieces by the Viennese court musicians Wolfgang Ebner and Antonio Bertali?²¹

The impression that Roberday assembled the works for his collection rather hurriedly, using a favourable opportunity, is supported by his claim to have used a subject, unidentified, by Francesco Cavalli, for the Venetian composer arrived in Paris in April 1660, only half a year before Roberday's collection was placed on the market.

Fortunately, with his irreverent treatment of these fine works by a great composer, Roberday provides a valuable clue to the chronology of the 'Premiere' and 'Seconde Partie' of the London Autograph. At least five of the twelve pieces must have been composed by early 1660. In view of the other dates we have established for the works assembled in the 'Troisiesme Partie' of the London Autograph, I would like to suggest that—like the suites—all the fantasies and caprices stem from the five-year period between 1657 and 1662.

²¹ If Roberday received these models, or fugue subjects, from Froberger, we may gain some insight from his music library.

The fate of the Autograph

Froberger's plans regarding the London Autograph will now be considered. From the morocco binding displaying Leopold's coat of arms it is obvious that the composer planned to dedicate the volume to the emperor. Since no later compositions are found in the manuscript, the volume was likely assembled in 1662 or 1663. Froberger first copied the music onto unbound fascicles. This is evident from the trimming the manuscript underwent during the binding process, causing occasional cuts of caption titles. A fragment of a watermark helps to identify the paper as probably being of Viennese origin. It can be assumed that after concluding his mission to Madrid, Froberger returned to Vienna, made a fair copy of his most recent works, and supervised the binding.

A look at the other three autograph volumes by Froberger, kept in the Austrian National Library, reveals that for the substantial 'Libro Secondo' and 'Libro Quarto', the composer only copied out the music, while the title pages, the dedications and all the caption titles were added by a calligraphic artist. As Siegbert Rampe was the first to point out, in the case of the 'Libro Quarto' this artist hid his name in one of the decorated initials: "Iohannes Fridericus Sautter Stuttgardanus".²² Sautter may also have been responsible for decorating the 'Libro Secondo'. Regarding the undated 'Libro di Capricci e Ricercati', dedicated to Emperor Leopold I, Froberger wrote not only the music, but also the captions. What has gone unnoticed so far, however, is that the title page and dedication were again entered by a calligrapher. After taking a look at other dedicatory manuscripts of the time, it is clear that this was the standard procedure.²³

As the evidence of the London Autograph confirms, in the process of preparing a manuscript, the additions by a calligrapher always represented the very last stage. It may thus be asked why in this volume this last step towards completion was not taken. At present only a speculative explanation can be given: the process of dedicating a manuscript to the emperor must have involved protracted bureaucratic formalities.

²² Rampe 1995, preface.

²³ See, for example, the dedication copy of Giuseppe Tricarico's "Opere a capella" (A-Wn, Mus.Hs. 19067).

Fugue 5me

F. Roberday

1

5

8

12

16

Ricerca [I]

J. J. Froberger

1
1
5
5
9
9
13
13

Figures 1 and 2. Roberday's Fugue no. 5 and Froberger's ricercare. The entrances of the fugue subjects (recto and verso) are exactly the same.

Probably a written permission was required. For some unknown reason in the case of the London Autograph, this official courtly permission was not granted. It cannot be ascertained whether this would have been a downright refusal of the favour asked or whether the notorious Viennese bureaucracy was slower than Froberger had expected, while in the meantime he was sent on his next diplomatic mission. In any case, one can assume that the volume remained in Vienna. Perhaps Froberger deposited it with a friend and left instructions about how to proceed with it should the permission for the dedication eventually be granted. It is also possible, however, that Froberger was forced to sell the volume after he finally realized that his plans would not meet with success. Be that as it may, the manuscript never reached its prospective dedicatee.

There is no indication why the manuscript was rejected by the emperor. Could it be that the private nature of the pieces related to Sibylla, Leopold Friedrich and Froberger himself made them unsuitable? Did the suites perhaps not meet Leopold's taste? In this case, the 'Libro di Capricci e Ricercati' may represent another—this time successful—attempt to approach the emperor. Likewise, it is not known whether the failed dedication had any specific consequences for Froberger's life or had anything to do with the obscure biographical event hinted at by Walther ("fallen into disgrace"). From the present perspective, we are all the more grateful that the manuscript has survived, for it sheds light on a hitherto completely obscure period in the biography of one of the most fascinating composers of the 17th century and reflects with remarkable clarity some of the decisive occurrences of European politics.

Brief thoughts regarding the general topic of the dissemination, use and adaptation of music in early modern Europe may be pertinent here. When attempting to study how French and Italian music was circulated and used all over Europe, particularly in the north, there is a need to take a close look at travelling musicians. Froberger may be an extreme case, but he was certainly not the only virtuoso who almost constantly travelled from court to court. A similar case two decades later is that of the German violinist Johann Paul Westhoff (1656–1705), who embarked on journeys to London, Paris, Milan, the Netherlands and the Baltics. Following the routes of these figures and tracing the pieces they

had in their luggage may contribute to a new understanding of cultural relations in early modern Europe.

Bibliography

Johann Jacob Froberger: A Hitherto Unrecorded Autograph Manuscript Volume Containing Thirty-five Keyboard Pieces, Eighteen Completely New, Undocumented and Unpublished, London: Sotheby's, 2006.

Lynn, John A. 1999. *The Wars of Louis XIV 1667–1714*, London: Longman.

Malettke, Klaus 2009 [1994]. *Ludwig XIV von Frankreich: Leben, Politik und Leistung*, rev. and enlarged ed.; 1st ed. Göttingen: Muster-Schmidt.

Morche, Gunther 2005. 'Roberday, François', in Ludwig Finscher ed., *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik*. Begründet von Friedrich Blume: Zweite neubearbeitete Ausgabe, vol. 14. Personenteil, Kassel & Stuttgart, cols. 214–2015.

Pribram, Alfred Francis 1891. *Die Heirat Kaiser Leopold I. mit Margaretha Theresia von Spanien* (Archiv für österreichische Geschichte 77:2), Vienna: Tempsky.

Rampe, Siegbert ed. 1995. *Neue Froberger-Ausgabe*, vol. 2, Kassel: Bärenreiter.

Rasch, Rudolf n.d. *Duizend brieven over muziek van, aan en rond Constantijn Huygens: Muziekbrieven 1667*, <https://huygens-muziekbrieven.sites.uu.nl>

Rasch, Rudolf ed. 2000. *Vingt et une suites pour le clavecin de Johann Jacob Froberger et d'autres auteurs: Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Ms. 1-T-595 (Strasbourg, 1675)*, Stuttgart: Carus.

Rasch, Rudolf & Peter Dirksen 2001. 'Eine neue Quelle zu Johann Jacob Frobergers Claviersuiten: Michael Bulyowskys Handschrift', in Georg Günther & Reiner Nägele eds, *Musik in Baden-Württemberg Jahrbuch 2001*, vol. 8, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, pp. 133–153.

Schilling, Lothar 2010. *Das Jahrhundert Ludwigs XIV. Frankreich im Grand Siècle. 1598–1715*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

van Asperen, Bob 2007. 'A new Froberger manuscript', *Journal of Seventeenth-Century Music* 13:1.

Walker, Thomas 2002. 'Cavalli, Francesco', in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, Second Edition*, vol. 5, pp. 302–313.

Walther, Johann Gottfried 1732 [1953]. *Musicalisches Lexicon oder Musicalische Bibliothec*, Leipzig, reprint Kassel: Bärenreiter.

Wollny, Peter 2003. "Allemande faite en passant le Rhin dans une barque en

grand peril". Eine neue Quelle zum Leben und Schaffen von Johann Jakob Froberger (1616–1667)', in Günther Wagner ed., *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz 2003*, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, pp. 99–115.

Wollny, Peter ed. 2004/06. *Johann Jacob Froberger, Toccaten, Suiten, Lamenti. Die Handschrift SA 4450 der Sing-Akademie zu Berlin. Faksimile und Übertragung* (Documenta Musicologica, vol. II/31), 1. Kassel: Bärenreiter, and 2. revised edition.

Worp, Jacob Adolf 1917. *De briefwisseling van Constantijn Huygens 1608–1697*, vol. 6, 'S-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.

Zedler, Johann Heinrich 1732–1754 [1999]. *Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexikon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*, 1. Halle and Leipzig, 2. reprint Graz.

Appendices

Appendix 1

LONDON AUTOGRAPH – CONTENTS

Primiere Partie

1. Fantasie [1]	a Minor
2. Fantasie [2]	G Major
3. Fantasie [3]	F Major
4. Fantasie [4]	g Minor
5. Fantasie [5]	B-flat Major
6. Fantasie [6]	F Major

La Seconde Partie

7. Caprice [1]	a Minor
8. Caprice [2]	G Major
9. Caprice [3]	B-flat Major
10. Caprice [4]	e Minor
11. Caprice [5]	G Major
12. Caprice [6]	F Major

La Troisiesme Partie

13. Suite XV a Minor Allemande faicte sur le Couronnement de Sa Majesté Imperiale à Franckfurt [1 August 1658]
– Gigue – Courante – Sarabande

14. Suite XVIII g Minor Allemande, faicte à Montbeliard, a l'honneur de Son Altesse Serenis^{me} Madame Sibylle, Duchesse de Wirtemberg, Princesse de Montbeliard – Gigue, nommé la Philette – Courante – Sarabande

15. Suite XIX c Minor Allemande – Gigue – Courante – Sarabande

16. Suite F Major Afligée, la quelle se joue lentement avec discretion faict à Montbeliard pour Son Altesse Serenissime Madame Sibylle, Duchesse de Wirtemberg, Princesse de Montbeliard – Gigue – Courante – Sarabande

17. Suite XX D Major Meditation, la quelle se joue lentement avec discretion, faict sur ma mort future – Gigue – Courante – Sarabande [“1 May 1660”]

18. Meditation g Minor Meditation, la quelle se joue lentement avec discretion faict à Madrid sur la Mort future de Son Altesse Serenis^{me} Madame Sibylle, Duchesse de Wirtemberg, Princesse de Montbeliard

19. Tombeau f Minor Tombeau, la quelle se joue lentement avec discretion, faict sur la tres douloreuse Mort de Sa Majeste Imperiale le Troisiesme Ferdinand [† 2 April 1657]

20. Tombeau d Minor Tombeau, la quelle se joue lentement avec discretion, faict sur la tres douloreuse Mort de Son Altesse Serenis^{me} Monsieg^r le Duc Leopold Friderich de Wirtemberg, Prince de Montbeliard [† 15 June 1662]

Appendix 2

ROBERDAY – FROBERGER CONCORDANCES

Roberday, <i>Fugues et Caprices</i> (1660)	Froberger concordances
Fugue 1 Caprice	
Fugue 2 Caprice	London Autograph, Caprice 5
Fugue 3 Caprice	
Fugue 4	
Fugue 5	Libro IV, Ricercar 1
Fugue 6 Caprice	
Fugue 7	
Fugue 8 Caprice	London Autograph, Fantasia 1 London Autograph, Caprice 1
Fugue 9 Caprice	London Autograph, Fantasia 6 London Autograph, Caprice 6
Fugue 10	
Fugue 11	
Fugue 12	