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ABSTRACT

Tomás Luis de Victoria (c. 1548-1611) occupied divergent worlds: most of his formal education and career occurred in Rome, while he spent his later years as chaplain to the Empress María at the Descalzas Reales convent in Madrid. This study provides a transcription and in-depth analysis of his first Spanish publication, *Missae, Magnificat, Motecta, Psalmi, & alia*... (Madrid: Imprenta Real, 1600) alongside related primary documents; the collection includes an unprecedented number of large-scale works and an organ book that is one of the earliest printed accompaniments for choral music. Its contents and circumstances surrounding its publication reveal Victoria’s Madrid-period style, offer a window into his business practices, and provide insight regarding performance of sacred music in late Renaissance Spain.

A fresh interpretation of primary and secondary sources regarding Victoria’s life and circumstances contributes to discourse on a number of non-musical topics, and reveals two otherwise neglected facets of Victoria’s personality: his prowess at marketing himself by making wise social and business connections, and his acute ability to recognize the tastes of his intended audiences and tailor his published output to meet those needs. Through examination of the composer’s uncanny networking skills, a clearer picture of connections between virtually all of Europe’s prominent nobility, clergy, intellectuals, and businessmen becomes apparent, as does a deeper understanding of general printing practices during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Additionally, an examination of Victoria’s introduction of Roman choral style into Spain is valuable for understanding the dissemination of aesthetic trends during the transition from Renaissance to Baroque style, and contributes to the understanding of liturgical and performance practices in the decades following the Council of Trent.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION, SURVEY OF LITERATURE, AND METHODOLOGY

Tomás Luis de Victoria (c. 1548-1611) has long been considered the finest Spanish representative of the polyphonic vocal style of the late Renaissance, and is often cited as the “Spanish Palestrina.”¹ In turn, his music is commonly described as the aural counterpart to the venerable written tradition of Spanish mysticism. Through the centuries following his death, Victoria has remained subject to a multitude of fanciful descriptions, of which the following are typical:

A man of deep religious sentiment, Victoria expresses in his music all the ardor and exaltation of Spanish mysticism. He is generally regarded as a leading representative of the Roman School, but it should be remembered that, before the appearance of Palestrina, this school was already profoundly marked by Hispanic influences through the work of Morales, Guerrero, Escobedo, and other Spanish composers resident in Rome. Thus Victoria inherited at least as much from his own countrymen as from Palestrina, and in its dramatic intensity, its rhythmic variety, its tragic grandeur and spiritual fervor, his music is thoroughly personal and thoroughly Spanish.²

…like the mystical writers and painters of Spanish humanism, [Victoria] was able to harmonize artistic severity with loving emotion. The secret of this aesthetic achievement lies in the dramatic mysticism with which he infused his works…³

Victoria was a composer of renown during his lifetime, and his posthumous reputation has reached mythic proportions. Ultimately, this project builds upon the efforts of previous Victoria scholars in an attempt to situate the composer’s work—particularly his compositions published in Madrid—in the correct context(s): is he a mystic Spanish genius, Counter-

---

¹ Theorist Severo Bonini seems to be one originator of this notion; see Mary Ann Bonino, Severo Bonini’s Discorsi e Regole: A Bilingual Edition (Provo, U.T.: Brigham Young University Press, 1979).
Reformation hero, shrewd businessman, or all of the above? Extensive work has been done to clarify the composer’s biography, beginning with the monumental study conducted by Felipe Pedrell in the early twentieth century, but much of the traditional narrative surrounding Victoria stems from nineteenth century biographies steeped in the flowery language of the period. These authors felt the need to construct a mystic persona, perhaps in response to the scarcity of primary source materials upon which to generate a compelling account.

This study explores questions regarding the composer’s biography, output, and musical language, in order to provide an alternate contextualization for Victoria. In place of his posthumous image as an austere Spanish mystic, this dissertation offers a depiction of the composer as a savvy businessman who knowingly made significant professional connections and exhibited a keen sense of purpose in identifying target audiences for his publications. The contents of Victoria’s first Madrid prints will be examined as the primary musical focus of discussion, and will be considered alongside primary source documents such as printing contracts, pay records, and the foundation documents for the Monasterio de las Descalzas Reales in Madrid, where the composer spent his final years as organist. Victoria’s life in Madrid, his works from the period, and the broader cultural context in which he lived and worked have not been thoroughly explored. In order to illuminate this poorly defined portion of the composer’s life, this study surveys his publishing activity, including locations of publication, the printing houses involved, geographic spread of extant sources, and a general summary of contents; closely examines the first of two collections printed in Madrid, predominantly through liturgical analysis; explores Victoria’s introduction of Roman polychoral style to Madrid and its potential impact on royal religious ceremony; and assesses the implications of the late repertoire, including performance practice in Spanish churches and the activities of the master’s final years.
Thorough assessment of Victoria’s music has been similarly overlooked, likely due to early assumptions regarding his relationship to Palestrina. Comparisons of the two composers emerged during the seventeenth century; Severo Bonini referred to the Spaniard as “Victoria (called the ape of Palestrina)” in his treatise Discorse e regole, completed as early as 1650. The assumption that Victoria was the “Spanish Palestrina” means that his music often tends to be equated with the Palestrina style, rather than examined for its own merits. Modern music history textbooks usually include a brief overview of Victoria’s works in the wake of a more detailed assessment of Palestrina, which has likely hampered efforts to address the Spaniard’s style and limited interest in studying the repertoire as an independent unit. Although Victoria’s output bears the chief hallmarks of Catholic Reformation polyphony—clear text declamation, increased reliance on homophonic passages rather than complex contrapuntal technique, and avoidance of secular idioms and source materials—his approach also remains allied with Spanish tradition, and most decidedly so upon the composer’s return to his native land sometime during 1585.

Other differences in Victoria’s style include freer use of chromaticism, a more relaxed approach to contrapuntal technique, and extensive use of plainchant quotation.

Survey of Literature and Chapter Outline

Due to a dearth of concrete detail, most popular, rather than scholarly, discussions of Victoria’s biography and works tend to provide sweeping generalizations regarding the composer’s personal character and the mystic and/or Spanish qualities of his music, rather than

---

5 For instance, Norton’s *A History of Western Music* states that “Victoria was the first Spanish composer to master Palestrina’s style,” though the editor does note that “his music departs from it in several respects. Victoria’s works tend to be shorter, with less florid melodies, more frequent cadences, more chromatic alterations, and more contrasting passages in homophony or triple meter.” See J. Peter Burkholder, Donald Jay Grout, and Claude V. Palisca, eds., *A History of Western Music*, 8th ed. (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2010), 234.
providing a practical look at how his life and works suited their context. Victoria never worked for the papacy like other high-profile musicians, but was inconsistently employed by a number of institutions in Rome; extant Roman and Spanish information is fragmentary, occasionally difficult to locate, and frequently contradictory. As a result, numerous non-specialist biographies and historical overviews intended for popular consumption contain statements such as the following by Walter Starkie, which are typical of the more superficial remarks on Victoria:

The mystic-ascetical spirit peculiar to Spain is in both [Victoria and St. Teresa of Ávila], and it is the expression of this spirit in Victoria’s music that justifies us in rebutting the absurd view held by critics in the past who labelled him “the ape of Palestrina.” Victoria is as unmistakably Spanish—Castilian, even—as a portrait by El Greco, a polychrome statue by Berruguete, a plática between Sancho and Don Quixote or a dusty road in La Mancha.

In no other religious music do we find such religious exaltation as in Victoria’s which carries us aloft into the swirling cloud harmonies of El Greco’s picture, but we never lose sight of the austere walled fortress of Ávila, and we remember the words the composer wrote as the preface to his book of Hymns in 1581: “Many evil and depraved men abuse music as an excitant in order to plunge into earthly delights, instead of raising themselves by means of it into the contemplation of God, and divine things...The art of song should be entirely devoted to the aim and end for which it was originally intended, namely to the praise and glory of God.”

No two human personalities could be in greater antithesis to one another than Victoria and Palestrina in spite of the radiance and God-intoxication of their music: whereas Palestrina was an Italian layman of the Counter-Reformation whose lyrical nature and gift of spontaneous melody reflected the suave, undulating lines of the Roman landscape, Victoria was ascetic Castilian priest, born in the austere town of Ávila of the Saints...Having a natural genius for composition, he devoted himself to writing Church music, but would not compose secular works even as a relaxation.

---


8 Ibid.

9 Ibid., 109-10.
Widespread assumptions in past scholarship include a close friendship or teacher-student connection between Victoria and Palestrina. In reality, the two composers moved in similar musical circles and Victoria succeeded Palestrina as the music director for the Roman Seminary; they likely knew each other, but concrete evidence of any close relationship between the two simply does not exist. Other sources provide inaccurate information, in part due to reliance on outdated and incomplete secondary sources, especially the work of Felipe Pedrell. Other standard literature contains information that warrants emendation due to discoveries by subsequent scholars. For example, in *Tomás Luis de Victoria: A Guide to Research*, Eugene Cramer lists surviving copies of 15 prints produced during Victoria’s lifetime; at the time, he was unaware of the existence of a sixteenth print listed in RISM (V1426) and in Agee’s work on the Gardano family presses. This work appears to be a final reprint of Victoria’s first offering, the *Motecta* of 1572 (Venice: Sons of Antonio Gardano, 1604), previously reissued by Alessandro Gardano in 1583 and 1603, and survives in only one partial exemplar.

For a composer of Victoria’s stature, there is a surprisingly small body of in-depth analysis of his works. These studies include investigations of specific segments of Victoria’s output, such as Patrick Brill’s work on the parody masses; Cramer’s examination of the *Officium Hebdomadae Sanctae*; Noel O’Regan’s analysis of the Roman polychoral style as it relates to Victoria; and Lucy Wojcicka-Hruza’s study on the Marian repertoire extant at Toledo. Others

---

12 Treviso, Archivio della Cappella del Duomo. T, 5, 6, 7, 8 only.
provide general introductions to the composer’s compositional technique, as demonstrated by Hans von May and Thomas Rive.\textsuperscript{14} Further examples include comparisons between the music of Victoria and related composers, such as Guerrero, Morales, Palestrina, and others; however, there seems to be no consensus regarding Victoria’s sphere of influence.\textsuperscript{15} Most scholars claim his allegiance to the Roman school of Palestrina, while others suggest he is more indebted to Spanish composers, particularly Morales.

Chapters Two and Three address Victoria’s biography and provide more detailed assessment of related primary and secondary sources. At this point in Victoria scholarship it is well worth considering the composer’s life from a fresh, context-driven perspective, highlighting the institutions with which he was involved and the personal and professional associations he maintained in Rome and Madrid. An examination of these relationships serves to illuminate Victoria’s somewhat unorthodox career choices, which have hitherto been left largely unquestioned. The details of the Ávila portion of Victoria’s story have been covered fully by earlier researchers, though it is sometimes difficult to parse fact from speculation; this subject is addressed in Chapter Two, which traces the composer’s family origin and his activity in Ávila and Rome. The amount of extant information regarding the composer’s childhood is miniscule, even compared to the data concerning his final years in Madrid, so much conjecture must be made regarding his schooling and possible religious, career, and musical influences.

Luis de Victoria: A Guide to Research features nearly 300 entries, many of which are brief dictionary or encyclopedia entries, discussions of the composer in pedagogical contexts, or outdated articles of dubious scholarly quality. This number grows exponentially when newer materials are considered. Those accessed for this study include the two primary biographical works upon which most subsequent accounts are based: the biographies by Felipe Pedrell and Robert M. Stevenson. These are augmented by a variety of more focused investigations, which address specific lacunae in the full life-and-works studies.

The first major biographical sketch appeared as the eighth volume of Felipe Pedrell’s edition of the composer’s collected works, completed between 1902 and 1913. Pedrell’s examination of Victoria is commendable for its time, as it collates all of the data accessible to early twentieth-century scholars. However, the material is problematic for modern specialists, since he frequently referenced contemporary yet inaccurate secondary sources, and these were largely incomplete or filled with hyperbolic language. He also depended upon the testimony of others when citing most of his primary source materials. Like many biographers of the period, Pedrell mythologized his subject to produce an engaging narrative, to act as champion for a composer he viewed as under-appreciated, and to fill in the gaps between scarce primary sources.

17 Felipe Pedrell, Thomae Ludovico Victoria Abulensis: Opera omnia. 8 vols. (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1902-1911). The biography was reprinted as Tomás Luis de Victoria Abulense: Biografía, bibliografía significado estético de todas sus obras de arte polifónico-religioso (Valencia: Manuel Villar, 1918). A modern reprint under the same title is from Valladolid: Editorial Maxtor, 2011; subsequent citations of Pedrell’s biography refer to the 2011 reprint.
19 For example, Pedrell relied upon searches of the Ávila archives executed by his friend Enrique Ballesteros (Pedrell, Tomás Luis de Victoria, 15).
Subsequent biographers draw heavily on Pedrell’s work, including important middle-stage studies such as Higinio Anglés’s entry on the composer in the *Diccionario de la música labor*, and the most comprehensive English-language study to date, which was completed by Robert M. Stevenson.\(^{20}\) The original text appeared in Stevenson’s *Spanish Cathedral Music in the Golden Age*, published in 1961, and was later updated and re-published as “Tomás Luis de Victoria (ca. 1548-1611): Unique Spanish Genius” in the Fall-Winter 1991 issue of *Inter-American Music Review*.\(^{21}\) This remains the most thorough and accurate biographical information available on Victoria.

Stevenson scrupulously cited archival materials regarding Victoria’s family history and the few details known about his childhood in Ávila; much of this work bolsters the extensive archival study done by Ferreol Hernández in the middle decades of the twentieth century. Hernández’s study focused primarily on what he could glean from archives in Ávila and the surrounding area.\(^{22}\) Stevenson’s exploration of Victoria’s time in Rome relies heavily on the most important secondary studies of this portion of the composer’s life. In particular, he drew upon the work done by Raffaele Casimiri at the Jesuit archives in Rome, but his approach does not thoroughly address all of the institutions with which Victoria was associated.\(^{23}\)

---


Incontrovertible data does not survive to detail Victoria’s arrival and departure dates at any of the institutions he served in Ávila or Rome, a frustrating situation that has led dozens of scholars to assume a variety of scenarios. Most agree that Victoria departed Ávila for study at the Jesuit Collegium Germanicum in 1565, when he was approximately 17 years of age, and remained in Rome until 1587; these dates will be addressed in Chapters Two and Three, respectively.

Victoria’s ensuing activity in Rome is reasonably well documented, though many secondary source materials fail to fully grasp the structure of the Jesuit education system in Rome and the function and relationships of confraternities with their sponsoring churches, which has led to misinterpretation of primary source materials. Victoria’s principal locations of employment were quite prominent, and a fair amount of archival information survives. He also collected a number of Spanish benefices, and all of these appear to have been awarded by Pope Gregory XIII. During his last years in Rome, Victoria was employed as a chaplain at San Girolamo della Carità, the church that originally housed the Congregation of the Oratory, a community for secular priests that was founded by St. Philip Neri. Most biographers assume the composer became an Oratorian, and that he maintained close communion with its founder; however, evidence suggests that he did not, as will be addressed in Chapter Two. In addition to occupying important posts in Rome, the bulk of his compositional output was published during his tenure; the first two books were printed in Venice, and an additional six were issued in Rome. Upon return to his native Spain, Victoria produced eight more prints, several comprised primarily of reprints of older material.

Victoria’s lifelong connection to the Jesuit Order has been touched upon but never fully explored; the major sources of material regarding Jesuit musical activity in Rome during the period, as well as evidence of Victoria’s employment at the German College and Roman Seminary, are thoroughly addressed by Casimiri, Thomas Culley, and Frank Kennedy, though their works do not deal solely with Victoria. In Chapter Two, these studies will be supported by an overview of the cultural, educational, and religious atmosphere in Rome in the wake of counter-reform.

The strong associations Victoria maintained with Spanish individuals and institutions in Rome must be addressed. Until recently, little has been done to thoroughly examine this aspect of his activity. Victoria spent a significant amount of time working with the two Spanish churches, Sta. Maria di Monserrato and S. Giacomo degli Spagnoli, and joined the Compagnia della Carità, the confraternity adjacent to the church of S. Girolamo della Carità, where he was employed as a chaplain; the Compagnia was particularly welcoming to Spanish nationals. The first evidence of Victoria’s employment anywhere in Rome is at Santa Maria di Monserrato, where he was engaged as part-time cantor and organist. Although he was never consistently employed by S. Giacomo degli Spagnoli, he was frequently hired to provide special music for major feast days, such as Corpus Christi, and he became a member of the adjacent Spanish Archconfraternity of the Resurrection, for whom he made visits to the poor and organized music for Easter and the vigil of the Forty Hours Devotion. These institutional relationships have been clarified by the substantial work of Noel O’Regan, an expert on the Roman institutions and musical practices of the period. He suggests that much of Victoria’s Easter, Corpus Christi, and

---

24 Thomas D. Culley, S.J., Jesuits and Music I: A Study of the Musicians Connected with the German College in Rome during the 17th Century and of their Activities in Northern Europe (Rome and St. Louis: Jesuit Historical Institute, 1970); [Thomas] Frank Kennedy, “Jesuits and Music: The European Tradition 1547-1622” (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1982).
other large festival material could have been written for these occasions. Another possibility lies
in the church of San Apollinare, the church attached to the German College. O’Regan also
pointed out the disproportionate level of attention paid to Venetian polychoral repertoire from
the last decades of the sixteenth century, particularly when the much larger body of Roman
polychoral works is concerned.25

Chapter Three addresses the composer’s final years in Madrid. Unfortunately, little seems
to survive from Victoria’s tenure at Descalzas Reales, and those primary sources remain largely
unexamined in Stevenson’s biography due to accessibility. Subsequent studies of Victoria’s life
tend to overlook other archival sources associated with this period; most biographies rely heavily
on the major secondary sources, such as Pedrell and Stevenson. Since little has been done to
clarify Victoria’s activities upon his return to Spain, the third chapter addresses this lacunae and
places the composer within the culture of royal court and cloister. From approximately 1587
until 1603, he was directly employed as a private chaplain by the widowed Empress Maria of
Austria, who resided at the royal convent in Madrid. As part of his duties, he might have served
as unofficial maestro de capilla for the convent. Upon the Empress’s death, Victoria received an
endowed chaplaincy from her estate, and was engaged as the convent’s organist until his own
death in 1611.

Extensive scrutiny of secondary sources, particularly of Janet Hathaway’s dissertation on
the musical activity at Descalzas Reales between 1620 and 1700, reveals a large quantity of
primary documents, such as pay records and histories of the convent, in numerous archives in

25 Victoria’s grasp of the Roman polychoral style is addressed in Chapter Five of this study. The most substantial
work on Roman polychoral repertoire is Noel O’Regan, “Sacred Polychoral Music in Rome, 1575-1621”; many of
his shorter articles on the subject are derived from this study. Two articles of particular importance with regard to
Victoria’s activity in Rome are Noel O’Regan, “Victoria, Soto and the Spanish Archconfraternity of the
Madrid, including the Biblioteca Nacional, Archivo General del Palacio (AGP), Archivo Histórico Nacional, Archivo Histórico de Protocolos, Real Biblioteca, and the Archivo del Monasterio de las Descalzas Reales. Cartas de pago and similar documents pertaining directly to Victoria are extant in the Archivo Histórico de Protocolos, including the contract for the publication of the collection printed in Madrid in 1600; a copy of the composer’s will is cited in a number of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century sources, but this document does not survive in situ. The documents owned by the convent have been moved from their original cloistered location to the Archivo General del Palacio and Real Biblioteca. In general, the Archivo del Monasterio de las Descalzas Reales contains a substantial amount of correspondence, some financial records, first-hand histories of the convent, inventories, legal documents, and copious amounts of documentación inconexa. The foundation documents for the convent, which describe the nature of the chapel and the duties of each chaplain, are also held at the AGP. Most of the convent’s extant financial documents are recorded in the Libros de iglesia at the Archivo Histórico Nacional: from these, a partial reconstruction of the Descalzas chapel during Victoria’s tenure is possible.

Unfortunately, very little music prior to the end of the seventeenth century survives in the Descalzas Reales collections. A fire damaged part of the convent during the 1860s, and portions of the library and archive were destroyed at this point. Among the extant documents are a handful of inventories: the earliest dates from the first third of the seventeenth century, and the

26 Janet Hathaway, Cloister, Court and City: Musical Activity of the Monasterio de las Descalzas Reales (Madrid), ca. 1620—1700 (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2005).
27 A preliminary listing of protocol documents pertaining to the composer was compiled from Cristóbal Pérez Pastor, Bibliografía Madrileña, ó descripción de las obras impresas en Madrid. 3 vols. (Madrid: Tipografia de la Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, 1907); some of the citations were incomplete or provided incorrect foliation. The archive’s cataloging system has been updated since his writing; therefore, the sigla indicated in this study reflect modern usage.
last was recorded during the nineteenth century. These provide isolated snapshots of the repertoire studied and performed by musicians serving at the convent over a span of more than two centuries; illuminate the composer’s activities; and reveal how much of Victoria’s output was owned, and presumably performed in, the convent.

Chapter Four provides an overview of Victoria’s publishing activity, including the locations of publication, the printing houses involved, the geographic spread of extant sources, and a general summary of their contents. One of the primary goals of this chapter is to provide context for the composer’s output and reputation, particularly as a musician at the forefront of compositional, performance, and business activity in the late *siglo de oro*. This chapter includes overviews of general printing history and the long sixteenth century in Spanish book production, to which Victoria’s publication practices will be compared.

Victoria formed an extremely close business relationship with the Venetian and Roman branches of the venerable Gardano music publishing house; eight of his sixteen prints were produced by the firm, while a further three were executed by associates. Gardano and Scotto were the finest and most prolific printers of polyphony during the sixteenth century, and both specialized in music, whereas most other Italian presses tended to print music on a rather limited basis. The same is true for Spanish printers, such as Juan Flamenco, the Juntas, and others associated with the Imprenta Real. Of particular importance is the history of the Gardano presses and the quality and craftsmanship of works produced by the firms; the chapter briefly examines a selection of Victoria prints by the two firms as a case study for comparison with the editions printed by the Spanish Imprenta Real.

An examination of secondary sources on print culture and quality during the Renaissance reveals a common assumption that Spanish printing was inferior to its Roman and Venetian
counterparts; however, upon deeper investigation of studies on Italian music printing by Richard Agee, Jane Bernstein, and Mary Lewis, I posit an alternative view of the Spanish presses.\textsuperscript{29} Spanish houses followed the business model of the smaller Italian printers more closely than once assumed. While the Spanish printing industry may not have been large, printers and book merchants maintained a wide network of contacts across the Iberian Peninsula, including wholesale and direct publisher connections to the largest printing centers in Europe. Books were imported in large volumes and for reasonable prices, thus negating any demand for prolific printing in Spain, apart from fulfilling the need for specialized local genres, such as liturgical and vernacular texts.

Chapter Four concludes with a description of each of Victoria’s prints, reserving special attention for the first Madrid collection. Aspects summarized include the dates and locations of publication and the firms involved; Victoria’s dedicatees and the significance of each; and pertinent details regarding physical characteristics and repertoire, including the format and voicings of each edition, their contents, and observations regarding the frequency with which various texts and subjects appear. Musical content is of some importance, as Victoria tended to re-release works frequently, sometimes with significant alterations; however, exhaustive documentation of his editing habits falls outside the scope of this study. The primary intent is to provide a summary of his publications as the basis for comparison with the first Madrid publication. Victoria’s Missae, Magnificat, Motecta, Psalmi, et alia quam plurima of 1600 (1600a) was the first of only two collections produced in Madrid by the composer.\textsuperscript{30} A concise


\textsuperscript{30} This collection is commonly referred to as 1600a, as this is the first of two Victoria prints to appear in the year 1600; subsequent mentions of the collection will reflect this designation.
clarification of the history of the printing house is also included, since secondary sources on the
Imprenta Real are somewhat scarce; furthermore, the sources in English tend to provide
superficial or abstruse discourse.

The 1600a publication is atypical of Victoria’s output for a number of reasons. First, the
contents are intended primarily for a polychoral ensemble of eight, nine, or 12 voices, whereas
the bulk of the material included in earlier collections is written for four, five, or six voices. The
set includes eight partbooks scored for a choir divided into two generally balanced halves, plus
two more items produced in a larger choirbook format. The ninth book contains the extra parts
required for the nine- or 12-voice works, and the tenth book, a set of organ accompaniments, is
one of the first of its kind. Moreover, 1600a is one of only six Spanish polyphonic publications
for which a contract exists from the Renaissance; an overview of each is provided.

Chapter Five is devoted to analysis of the music, including issues of text selection,
liturgical function, text setting, polychoral structure, and harmonic technique. Of the 32 items
included in the 1600a collection, 14 are new and do not appear in subsequent editions; the
remaining 18 appeared in previous prints. This study does not provide an exhaustive analysis of
every printed version, as some of the works were reprinted seven or eight times. It is possible
that the contents of the volume were originally tailored toward the devotional practices at
Descalzas Reales and public liturgical events connected with the crown, then published for a
wider audience. This hypothesis will be explored in part through analysis of the music and the
subject matter of the texts. One notable example of textual “Spanishness” is O Ildephonse, a
motet honoring St Ildephonsus, a seventh-century bishop of Toledo who was important enough
locally to have been portrayed by El Greco during Victoria’s lifetime, yet was little known
outside of Spain.
Robert Stevenson observes a distinct stylistic shift between earlier prints and Victoria’s first Madrid publication; indeed, the repertoire represents a change in approach from compendiums dominated by smaller-scale works in highly contrapuntal textures in favor of a more homophonic and almost exclusively polychoral approach. However, it is difficult to assert that these prints signal a new phase in the composer’s style, as has been implied by Stevenson and a number of subsequent scholars. Victoria consistently employs a number of stylistic elements that adhere to the Roman polychoral style of the late sixteenth century. Of particular significance is the organ score. Victoria provides keyboard accompaniment that largely doubles Choir I, a relationship taken for granted by most biographers. Upon closer examination, the composer made numerous alterations to the vocal lines in order to adapt them to keyboard performance and to reinforce the independence of polychoral groups; these vary from simple reductions of repeated pitches to complete re-scorings of certain passages, all of which are addressed in detail.

This chapter takes as inspiration the work of Noel O’Regan, who has extensively studied both the Roman polychoral style and Victoria’s activity in Rome, and makes valuable connections between the two. Homophony set antiphonally had been in use in Rome for some time by composers such as Animuccia and Palestrina, albeit in an inconsistent manner, likely in response to concerns of intelligibility raised by the Council of Trent. O’Regan suggests that Victoria was the pioneer of the style, rather than Palestrina, and that he was largely responsible for its diffusion in Rome via his successors at the German College. The Venetian polychoral approach was not particularly well-known or emulated in Rome during the 1570s and 1580s, and

---
32 Ibid., 1.
there were “significant differences, especially in the areas of cleffing and harmonic independence of the choirs.”

The 1600a collection represents the apex of Victoria’s pragmatic efforts to attract an elite audience: in particular, the court of his dedicatee, the newly-crowned King Philip III. He collated his finest examples of large-scale writing from his oldest prints and supplemented those with newly composed works in order to provide plenty of grand, multi-purpose music for the most important feasts of the church year. The contents and character of the publication indicate Victoria’s desire to cater toward intensified Spanish taste for spectacle, though the style of composition and the genres included therein do not stray far from the polychoral idiom the composer cultivated at the height of his Roman career.

Rather than offering analysis of older, error-prone transcriptions, this study includes an updated edition of the original prints, based primarily on copies from the British Library and the Biblioteca Nacional de España, which each possess eight of the nine partbooks. One of two known copies of the organ book resides at Munich’s Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, and it is this copy that is referenced. The ninth vocal book has proven more elusive: Eugene Cramer notes that there are copies at the British Library and Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence, but neither institution’s holdings include the volume. The only known copies are in the Archivo Musical de

---

34 Felipe Pedrell’s edition of the opera omnia contains numerous editorial errors, many of which are outlined by Robert Stevenson in Spanish Cathedral Music, 479-80. He also highlighted the mistakes uncovered by Hans von May and Walter Hirschl; the errors pertaining to the 1600a collection are addressed in the edition notes, Appendix D. Anglés lamented Pedrell’s reliance upon a limited collection of source materials, many of which he did not examine himself (Higinio Anglés, “Problemas que presenta la nueva edición de las obras de Morales y Victoria,” in Renaissance-muziek 1400-1600, donum natalicium René Bernard Lenaerts, ed. Jozef Robijns (Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit, Seminaire Voor Muziekwetenschap, 1969), 29).
la Catedral in Bogotá, Colombia and the Archivo General Diocesano de Valladolid; the latter is currently only accessible online and is used for this edition.35

Chapter Six provides an overview of late Renaissance performance practice in Madrid and Rome, and places Victoria’s 1600a prints within those traditions. Choral music had long been accompanied by instruments in Spanish cathedrals; however, the organ part provided by Victoria is one of the first open-score accompaniments to appear in print. The composer’s motivation for providing an organ book for his first Spanish publication is unknown, though instruments were used for special occasions at most Roman institutions, just as the practice of doubling or substituting for vocal parts was extremely common in Spain.

Victoria’s 1600a collection decisively brought the Roman idiom to Spanish audiences and composers; however, Victoria’s interpretation of the technique is also closely aligned with Spanish tradition, particularly with regard to instrumentation. O’Regan indicates that some of Victoria’s clef combinations were uncommon in Roman cori spezzati scoring, suggesting the use of instruments.36 The organ was used in informal confraternity performances in Rome as a substitute for missing voices, but here Victoria seems intent on making this repertoire a viable option for chapels lacking the requisite number of singers, rendering the style accessible to a larger audience and adaptable to a variety of liturgical situations.37 In order to confirm O’Regan’s position and provide additional insight regarding performance practice at Descalzas Reales, this chapter addresses the physical space of the convent’s church, as well as accounts of polychoral performances within the space and other locations in Madrid.

37 Ibid., 3-4.
Methodology

Texts

Spanish names are rendered in their standard Castilian form, and Italian spellings are used for Roman names and locations. Appendix B contains transcriptions of a selection of documents summarized in Chapter Three; spelling, punctuation, diacritical markings, and capitalization have been maintained, and scribal abbreviations are realized. Ellipses indicate damaged or illegible text, or omission of repetitive information and irrelevant legal language. Transcriptions of Latin texts adhere to modern spellings.

Designations for Prints

Victoria’s publications are labeled according to the system employed in Cramer’s Guide to Research, which is the commonly accepted format. The prints are identified according to year of publication, and if necessary, followed by a lower-case “a” or “b” to indicate prints published in the same year. RISM designations for the prints correspond as follows in Table 1-1.

Table 1-1. Identification Formats for Victoria's Publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>RISM</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>V1421</td>
<td>Motecta...</td>
<td>Gardano</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>V1427</td>
<td>Liber Primus. Qui Missas, Psalms, Magnificat...</td>
<td>Gardano</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581a</td>
<td>V1428</td>
<td>Hymni Totius Anni...</td>
<td>Zanetto</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581b</td>
<td>V1430</td>
<td>Cantica B. Virginis Vulgo Magnificat Quatuor Vocibus...</td>
<td>Zanetto</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583a</td>
<td>V1431</td>
<td>Missarum Libri Duo</td>
<td>Gardano</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583b</td>
<td>V1422</td>
<td>Motecta...</td>
<td>Gardano</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585a</td>
<td>V1432</td>
<td>Officium Hebdomadae Sanctae</td>
<td>Gardano</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585b</td>
<td>V1433</td>
<td>Motecta Festorum Totius Anni...</td>
<td>Gardano</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589a</td>
<td>V1423</td>
<td>Motecta...</td>
<td>Tini</td>
<td>Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589b</td>
<td>V1424</td>
<td>Cantiones Sacrae...</td>
<td>Mayer</td>
<td>Dillingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>V1434</td>
<td>Missae...cum Antiphonis...Liber secundus.</td>
<td>Coattino</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600a</td>
<td>V1435</td>
<td>Missae, Magnificat, Motecta, Psalmi, et alia quam plurima...</td>
<td>Imprenta Real</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600b</td>
<td>V1429</td>
<td>Hymni Totius Anni...</td>
<td>Vicentino</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>V1425</td>
<td>Motecta...</td>
<td>Gardano</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>V1426</td>
<td>[Motets]</td>
<td>Gardano</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>V1436</td>
<td>Officium Defunctorum...</td>
<td>Imprenta Real</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Currency and Monetary Values

Currency units are given according to the original sources. Most values are in maravedís (mrs) or ducados; the former is the standard unit for most Castilian recordkeeping. Chapter Two references the Roman scudi; in 1600, the Castilian ducado was worth approximately 1.3 Roman gold scudi. \(^{38}\) One Roman scudi is equivalent to approximately 487.5 maravedís. The equivalencies are as follows:

**Castilian Currency:**
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ducado} &= 375 \text{ maravedís} \\
\text{escudo} &= 350 \text{ mrs} \\
\text{real} &= 34 \text{ mrs}
\end{align*}
\]

**Roman Currency:**
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{scudo} &= 10 \text{ giulii} \\
\text{giulii} &= 10 \text{ baiochi}
\end{align*}
\]

When Victoria served as part-time *maestro* at the Roman church of Sta. Maria di Monserrato, he earned a monthly salary of one scudo. As chaplain at the church of S. Girolamo, he earned 6 scudi per month, equivalent to 2,925 mrs, or 35,100 mrs yearly. This was one of the highest chaplain salaries in the city, and was equivalent to the income of a high-profile *maestro di cappella*; the terms of his chaplaincy included accommodations on the church property. \(^{39}\)

Singers in the *Cappella Sistina* earned approximately 25 scudi per month, including benefits beyond base compensation (approximately 12,187.5 mrs).

24 scudi could purchase food for one gentleman for one month, while 32 scudi sufficed as rent for three gentlemen and their servants for one month. The standard allowance for food in

---


\(^{39}\) Noel O’Regan, “Tomas Luis de Victoria’s Roman Churches Revisited,” 405, 417.
institutional retinues and noble households in Rome was 10 baiocchi per day, or 2.5-3 scudi per month.\textsuperscript{40} In 1600, one pound of beef cost 3 baiocchi in Rome and 16 maravedís in Castile. Another common foodstuff for which prices were fixed in Madrid was pan común, a two-pound loaf of bread. Wheat shortages and famine were widespread during Victoria’s tenure in the city, which drove up prices; in April 1587, a loaf of bread cost 12 mrs, and between 1590 and 1599 the price fluctuated between 16 and 28 mrs.\textsuperscript{41} In Old Castile, a day laborer earned 68 mrs per day in 1568; by 1587, the same labor would have earned 76.5 mrs per day in New Castile, a sum increased to 85 mrs by 1600 (27,540 mrs per year). In contrast, an Andalusian day laborer made approximately 128 mrs per day in 1601, whereas a carpenter in the same region earned 221 mrs (or 79,650 mrs yearly). As chaplain to the Empress María, Victoria earned 200 ducados annually (75,000 mrs), plus perquisites for special services; once he obtained the post of organist at Descalzas Reales, he earned an additional salary of 40,000 mrs, later increased to 75,000 mrs.

\textsuperscript{40} Hill, 22.
CHAPTER 2
THE BIOGRAPHY OF TOMÁS LUIS DE VICTORIA: ÁVILA AND ROME

Tomás Luis de Victoria, the renowned son of siglo de oro Spain, occupies a precarious position among the luminaries of his era. Since the bulk of his public career transpired in Rome, his musical style has most often been associated with the Roman school of Catholic reform espoused by Palestrina and his emulators; however, Spanish musicologists such as Felipe Pedrell promote him as a champion of his native culture, rather than as a product of Roman society. In order to fully comprehend his life and works, a thorough re-examination of available biographical information must be addressed. To this point, no biography of Victoria has considered a complete, context-driven approach to the composer’s early formation, career in Rome, and subsequent return to Spain. In the next two chapters, these issues will be addressed, with particular attention focused on Victoria’s connections to prominent religious and political figures, the Jesuit Order, and the Spanish royal family.

The Ávila and Rome portions of Victoria’s biography have been thoroughly documented in a large number of secondary sources; however, dates and other facts provided by various authors tend to conflict. The purpose of this chapter is to collate and assess this research, and rectify as much of the ambiguity as possible. Unfortunately, little information survives in archival sources regarding the composer’s early life in Ávila. Robert Stevenson addressed Victoria’s family history relatively thoroughly, as did Felipe Pedrell. Much of Stevenson’s data stems from research by scholars working in Spain, particularly Ferreol Hernández Hernández.¹

¹ Ferreol Hernández Hernández, Tomás Luis de Victoria “el abulense” (Estudio biográfico) (Ávila: Excmo. Diputación Provincial de Ávila, Institución “Alonso de Madrigal”), 1960. Hernández’s work is frequently cited in especially detailed accounts of the family, as in Ana María Sabe Andreu, Tomás Luis de Victoria: pasión por la música (Ávila: Diputación de Ávila, Institución Gran Duque de Alba, 2008).
Victoria served as a choirboy at the cathedral in Ávila, where he would have received a basic education; he also may have attended the Jesuit College of San Gil. Cardinal Otto von Truchsess was a prominent supporter of the arts and the fledgling Jesuit college system, and probably funded Victoria’s subsequent education at the German College in Rome. Like most musicians active in Rome during the last third of the sixteenth century, Victoria offered his services as singer, organist, and music director for special functions at a number of churches, particularly the two Spanish churches, Sta. Maria di Monserrato and S. Giacomo degli Spagnoli, and the confraternity connected to S. Giacomo. In addition, archival records point toward Victoria serving as maestro de capilla for the Roman Seminary following Palestrina’s tenure and prior to his work as maestro at the German College. These institutions communed freely as a part of the Jesuits’ Roman College system, and thus relied upon some of the same musicians for support on special occasions.

The work of Noel O’Regan thoroughly augments the information available to earlier biographers regarding the Roman period of Victoria’s career. O’Regan’s dissertation and subsequent research on the Roman polychoral school and musical activity at a number of the city’s confraternities during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries reveals much about the musical and educational atmosphere in the Eternal City in the wake of the Council of Trent. Victoria is revealed as a groundbreaking catalyst in the emergence of early Baroque polychoral style, rather than a strict disciple of Palestrinian counterpoint. This information, combined with the pivotal archival work of Rafaele Casimiri and of two Jesuit priests, Thomas Culley and Frank Kennedy, provides a more complete picture of Victoria’s relationship with the Jesuit colleges.

---

2 Despite assumptions to the contrary, there is no concrete evidence that the composer ever maintained close communion with St. Philip Neri, the founder of the Congregation of the Oratory; Victoria was employed by Neri’s first church in Rome, but his service began after the congregation transferred to another church.

and the musical activities of the institutions. These studies focused on music are further understood through an examination of the history of the Society and its ideals, and the place of Jesuit education within humanist culture. Victoria is revealed as an archetypical example of the Renaissance humanist ideal: a pious, productive member of society.

Unlike other great Spanish composers, such as Cristóbal de Morales or Francisco de Soto, or even his Italian or Franco-Flemish counterparts, Victoria never entered the papal choir nor served as singer or maestro of the Cappella Giulia, both of which were the primary aims of many musicians working in Rome. These positions, particularly those in the papal choir, increased potential for securing benefices and for making valuable contacts with other musicians and prospective patrons. In fact, Victoria never occupied a truly full-time position as singer, organist, or maestro in any church or educational setting, apart from several years heading the German College chapel. Even upon his return to Madrid, Victoria held a full-time chaplaincy, a job that was not exclusively musical. He subsequently turned down offers to serve as maestro de capilla at some of the wealthiest, most prestigious cathedrals in Spain, including Seville and Toledo. While numerous accounts of the composer’s life, including the prominent early work by Pedrell, depict a struggling artist who was underpaid and unappreciated, nothing could be further from the truth: Victoria enjoyed a number of lucrative benefices accumulated during his tenure in Rome, and thus did not require a full-time position to survive, as is evident from the fact that he did not take advantage of his celebrity by seeking a particularly high-profile post upon his return to Spain. Victoria’s prowess as a businessman, both in securing printing contracts and as a

---


5 For instance, the “starving artist” image was perpetuated in Felipe Pedrell, Tomás Luis de Victoria Abulense: Biografía, bibliografía significado estético de todas sus obras de arte polifónico-religioso (Valencia: Manuel Villar, 1918; Reprint, Valladolid: Editorial Maxtor, 2011), 164.
marketer of his publications, will be considered in the fourth chapter, but this aspect of his personal strategy is certainly essential to understanding possible motivations for his earlier career-related decisions.

**Birth Year and Birthplace**

Tomás Luis de Victoria was born and raised in Ávila, Spain. He was probably born in late 1548; unfortunately, no record of the composer’s birth survives, as baptism records for the family’s parish only extend back to 1550. Early researchers placed the date anywhere between 1530 and 1560: Charles Burney suggested 1535, while Fétis chose an arbitrary birth year of 1540, which was accepted by a number of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars, such as Collet and Haberl. Collet backed his assumption with an erroneous reading of documents related to Victoria’s uncle, the *licenciado* Tomás Luis de Victoria, with whom scholars of his era frequently confused the composer. Haberl founded his opinion on his interpretation of the title “Presbiter Abulensis” commonly found on Victoria’s publications; he believed this meant Victoria was ordained in Ávila, rather than a priest from the city or diocese of Ávila, and thus he assumed the composer must have arrived in Rome fully ordained, a process that could only be completed at or after the age of 25. Pedrell accepted Haberl’s analysis as regards Victoria’s ordination, but rather arbitrarily suggested that he was born between 1530 and

---

1535. Once Casimiri uncovered Victoria’s ordination records in Rome and considered the age requirements for enrollment at the German College, it became clear that he could not have been born earlier than 1544 nor later than 1550. Anglés accepted 1548-50, based upon the work of Hernández, whose extensive archival work on Victoria’s family points toward late 1548. The composer was the seventh of eleven children; his parents married in 1540, and the sibling immediately following him was baptized in January 1550. Late 1548 will be assumed here, based upon my reading of Hernández’s evidence.

Victoria’s Castilian Origin: Family

Victoria came from a respectable family whose roots spread throughout the region surrounding Ávila. Since occupations and level of education tended to run in families and were largely confined to certain social classes, many of his relatives were clergy, merchants, or served either the Church or government as lawyers, notaries, or minor officers. Ferreol Hernández provided the most extensive and accurate material on the family available to biographers of the mid-twentieth century, via protocol and capitular documents extant in Ávila and the surrounding community; Stevenson relies heavily upon this research, as do current Victoria scholars, such as Daniele Filippi and Ana Sabe.

An uncle of the same name initially settled in Valladolid, as did one of Victoria’s sisters; the elder Tomás Luis de Victoria took holy orders following the death of his wife, and later

served as a canon at the cathedral in Ávila. Early biographers such as Collet, Haberl, and Pedrell stumbled upon references to a “Tomé de Vi[c]toria” who received a pension of 45,000 maravedís from Philip II via a document dated 14 December 1565. These and several subsequent scholars assumed this was the composer, who in that year began study in Rome, and thus they presumed that Victoria lived at the German College under the king’s patronage. Casimiri laid aside this notion by presenting evidence from other documents that prove this was Victoria’s uncle, a lawyer who worked for the Real Chancillería in Valladolid. The younger Tomé/Tomás de Victoria was certainly not old enough to receive such a pension and never earned the degree of licenciado, nor referred to himself by the title.

Another of Victoria’s uncles, Juan Luis de Victoria, was also a priest and served as the young Tomás’s guardian following his father’s death; he evidently lived with the family in Ávila. Later in life, Juan frequently acted as a legal proxy for the composer. Their relationship closely parallels the “priest-uncle” dynamic noted by Thomas Vance Cohen in his study of Jesuit autobiographies from the period. Young boys who showed intellectual and spiritual promise were sometimes sent to live with a priest and serve in his home and church in exchange for basic instruction in Latin and liturgy; he would eventually inherit the cleric’s position, and perhaps his benefice, though sometimes the priest or other family members assisted the child in securing a separate beneficed position. For families seeking to ensure a stable financial future for multiple

14 Collet, Victoria, 40-41.
15 Casimiri indicated that the elder Tomé de Victoria died around 1620, and that this pension continued to be paid to his son and heir, Nicolas de Neira y Victoria, through at least the early 1620s; Stevenson believed Victoria’s uncle died before 1600, but failed to elaborate further (Robert M. Stevenson, “Tomás Luis de Victoria (c. 1548-1611): Unique Spanish Genius,” Inter-American Music Review 12/1 (Fall/Winter 1991): 3). Ana Sabe stated his death date as 6 February 1584, but does not cite a source (Sabe, Tomás Luis de Victoria: pasión por la música, 25). However, a document dated 23 April 1624 confirms that this income passed from Nicolas de Neira y Victoria to Doña Luisa Vicentelo Leca, the widow of Don Felipe de Zúñiga, in 1620, so perhaps it was the licenciado’s son who died in 1620, or the son simply signed the income over to Doña Luisa (AHP, 4731, fol. 1559r-1560v).
children, seeking benefices early in the boys’ lives was ideal.\textsuperscript{17} Surely a sense of budding piety may have played a role in the custom, but families must have been pragmatic as well: the unmarried uncle likely wanted an informal heir, and the child needed a sound education and career trajectory. Some priests did confirm the influence of a family member when choosing their vocation, frequently an uncle who was a member of the clergy.\textsuperscript{18}

Conversely, very little is known about the family of Francisca Suárez de la Concha, Victoria’s mother. Her parents, Antonio and Beatriz Xuárez, both came from wealthy Segovian families who dealt in textiles. Some authors associate the family with the individuals claimed by the Marqués de Lozoya as the founders of the Castilian Suárez de la Concha line—Pedro de la Concha and Elvira Xuárez—who have occasionally been cited as Victoria’s maternal grandparents. It is unknown whether these are direct relatives of the family, but they appear in Segovian records by 1496. A single author, Eduardo Tejero Robledo, claims that the reason little is known about Victoria’s maternal relatives is due to their \textit{converso} origins; however, his research does nothing to clarify the potential relationship between the individuals in question and the family of Victoria’s mother.\textsuperscript{19} Additionally, it seems unlikely that the family line would include immediate ancestors of Jewish origin, as Victoria and a number of his siblings occupied posts that required proof of \textit{limpieza de sangre}.

Out of the ten surviving children of Francisco Luis de Victoria and Francisca Suárez de la Concha, seven either lived in Madrid or likely did business there at some point. Victoria’s eldest sister, María Suárez de Victoria, died in Madrid and was buried in the parish of Santa Cruz; his other sister, Maria de la Cruz (Suárez de) Victoria, lived with their uncle Juan Luis in Valladolid.

\textsuperscript{17} Cohen, 479.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 453.
until 1602, then resided in Madrid until her death in 1610. Two of Victoria’s younger brothers, Antonio Suárez de Victoria and Juan Luis de Victoria, worked as bankers at the merchants’ trade fair in Medina del Campo until 1596. Juan also opened a branch in Madrid and evidently lived there from about 1590.\footnote{The fair at Medina del Campo was a massive hub for merchants and suppliers in the wool and textile industries, among other commodities.} Another brother, Agustín Suárez de Victoria, studied at the University of Salamanca with the financial assistance of their uncle, Juan Luis. Agustín took a baccalaureate degree in theology and became a lawyer. He also served as one of the Empress María’s chaplains, though he remained at the Descalzas Reales convent only until María’s death.

Victoria’s youngest brother, Gregorio Suárez de Victoria, was a criado to a court secretary in Madrid. Other family members lived in Ávila, Valladolid, and Sanchidrián. The last was suggested as Victoria’s birthplace by Pedrell, among others; however, Ferreol Hernández makes an excellent case for Ávila as birthplace of all of the siblings, as their parents were parishioners of S. Juan and were buried there, and baptism records for the four youngest children survive in the parish archives.\footnote{Unless otherwise noted, the details regarding Victoria’s family members derive from the work of Ferreol Hernández, \textit{Tomás Luis de Victoria}, 7-15, 21-25. Subsequent biographers such as Sabe and Stevenson rely heavily on his work.}

**Choirboy at Ávila Cathedral**

Victoria may have begun singing as a choirboy at Ávila’s cathedral as early as 1556, and thus briefly studied under maestro de capilla Gerónimo de Espinar, who served from 1550 until his death sometime before 21 October 1558.\footnote{Stevenson, “Tomás Luis de Victoria: Unique Spanish Genius,” 6-7.} Most modern biographers cite Hernández, who suggested that Victoria’s time in the choir began in late 1557 or early 1558; the average age of entry for choirboys was nine or ten, and most served for seven to eight years.\footnote{Hernández, \textit{Tomás Luis de Victoria}, 70-71; Sabe, \textit{Tomás Luis de Victoria}, 34.} There is no extant
evidence of Victoria’s tenure, but the first record among numerous presentations of music through his uncle, Juan Luis, states that he had served the cathedral in some capacity.\footnote{24} Moreover, an entry date of late 1557 or early 1558 makes even more sense, since Hernández discovered notice of an opening in late 1557 that was evidently filled by early 1558, according to pay records in the capitular archive. Victoria’s father died in 1557, and his guardian uncle likely felt compelled to find secure sources of income for the children who were not yet married.\footnote{25}

The musical figure who had the best opportunity to impact the young Victoria was Bernardino de Ribera, who served as \textit{maestro} from 2 June 1559 until 18 November 1562, when he was appointed \textit{maestro} of Toledo Cathedral. Most of Ribera’s compositional output survives in manuscript in the Toledan archives, and reveals him as a composer of great skill.\footnote{26} The subsequent \textit{maestro} was Juan Navarro, who arrived from Valladolid by 26 February 1564 and remained until 7 November 1566. Navarro was the most celebrated \textit{maestro} and composer under whom Victoria may have served, albeit briefly; during his early career Navarro sang at the court of the Duke of Arcos and at Málaga Cathedral, both under Cristóbal de Morales. After his departure from Ávila, he held posts at Salamanca, Ciudad Rodrigo, and Palencia.\footnote{27} The sizeable gaps between official \textit{maestros} were filled by other cathedral musicians. The \textit{tiple} Pedro Hernández was not among these, but he evidently knew Victoria reasonably well, as he sang in Ávila from about 1555 and became a conduit through which the composer sent his publications to the chapter until at least 1581.\footnote{28}

\footnote{24}The request from 9 January 1577, recorded in Ávila’s \textit{Actas capitulares}, refers to Victoria as “criado en esta Santa Iglesia” (Hernández, \textit{Tomás Luis de Victoria}, 73).
\footnote{25}Ibid., 53-54, 62.
\footnote{28}Hernández, \textit{Tomás Luis de Victoria}, 73-75.
Victoria possibly encountered the renowned organist Antonio de Cabezón, who maintained a residence in Ávila from approximately 1538 to 1560 and performed in the cathedral on occasion. Other potential connections in Ávila include the keyboard players Damián de Bolea and Bernabé del Águila. Bolea was generally regarded as an excellent musician; he served as organist until October 1556, when he departed for Saragossa. Águila, a priest from Ávila, was appointed to replace Bolea on 27 November, and he remained in the post until at least 4 January 1574.29 Another conceivable acquaintance was Bartolomé de Escobedo, who held a benefice in Segovia, the traditional family home of Victoria’s mother. Escobedo retired to Segovia in 1554 after serving in the papal choir for 18 years.30 He studied at the University of Salamanca and sang in the cathedral choir prior to his departure for Rome; Escobedo earned a reputation as a fine composer and for his broad theoretical knowledge.31 Claims that Morales must have trained the young Victoria either in Rome or in Spain fail to take into account that Morales returned to Spain in 1545, and died when the boy was only five.32

Early Education: Humanism and the Jesuits

Victoria likely began his life long association with the Jesuit Order in Ávila, as he may have attended the city’s Jesuit school until his departure for Rome between the ages of 15 and 19. The Colegio de San Gil opened in 1554 to immediate success; the school’s program was highly regarded by prominent figures, including St. Teresa of Ávila, who recommended the

30 A number of authors incorrectly presumed Escobedo taught Victoria, based upon assumptions made by J.B. Trend and earlier authors. See J. B. Trend, The Music of Spanish History to 1600 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1926), 158, and Karl Proske, Musica divina, Vol. 1 (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1853), LIII.
32 Pedrell addresses this problem at length; among those who suggested that Morales taught Victoria are Karl Proske and Giuseppe Radiciotti. Felipe Pedrell, Tomás Luis de Victoria Abulense, 18-22, 181-82; Karl Proske, Musica divina. Vol. I. Liber Missarum (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1853), LIII.
school for her nephews. Most Victoria scholars agree that this is likely. Unfortunately, only circumstantial evidence connects him to San Gil, as no solid documentation of his presence at the school survives, nor do his precise dates of arrival and departure at the German College; however, the Latin skills required for acceptance to the Roman institution suggest that Victoria must have received a basic humanistic education at an institution like San Gil.

Lower schools like San Gil quickly gained popularity partly because classes were offered for free, and thus an education theoretically became available to boys from across various social strata; however, many schools heeded Ignatius’s advice that they only accept pupils who had at least some knowledge of Latin, which would essentially exclude most from the lower classes. Given the social stature of Victoria’s family, it is likely he either learned the rudiments of reading and writing in Latin from a private tutor or during the early years of his service as a choirboy. Few could afford an education beyond basic grammar school, as higher-level schooling generally required moving away from home and paying living expenses. A small minority of students could be housed on site, and that privilege was normally reserved for the best students. Victoria must have caught the attention of his instructors at his school or the cathedral in Ávila, since he was sent to study at the Order’s finest institution and a patron provided for his room and board expenses as a convittore (boarding student) in the German College. These boarders formed something of an elite circle within the colleges of the Society; thus, Victoria acquired a distinct networking advantage in terms of the students, church officials, and potential patrons with whom he may have associated during these formative years.

Humanist curricula emphasized study of Latin classics, as it was believed that the study of quality literature would lead to a moral and cultural revival, an idea that particularly appealed

33 Stevenson, “Tomás Luis de Victoria,” 10-11; Sabe, Tomás Luis de Victoria, 40.
34 Cohen, 231-233, 622. Cohen discovered that somewhere between 5 and 10% of students lived in the colleges.
to the early Jesuit fathers. Pedagogues placed special emphasis on the study of rhetoric as a means toward more skilled oratory and letter writing, skills that were considered proper training for public service.\textsuperscript{35} Jesuit colleges also implemented an extensive religious program that was followed by Jesuit and lay students alike. All students attended and/or assisted at daily Mass, spent time in personal prayer and examination of conscience, went to confession and celebrated the Eucharist on a weekly basis, and attended sermons or classes on Christian doctrine on Sundays and feasts.\textsuperscript{36}

Jesuit education began with the lower schools, which followed a curriculum similar in structure to the standard humanist institutes of the period. Pupils generally entered between the ages of nine and eleven and remained for five to six years. Many already possessed basic reading and writing skills upon matriculation, since a typical student was expected to commence their humanist education with the five-year Latin school program: three years of Latin and Greek grammar, then a year of humanities, including study of Latin prose, poetry, and histories, and concluded by a year of rhetoric, comprised of the methods of classical oratory. The “arts” curriculum followed Latin education and generally was taught at the university level, though the division between lower studies and university level work is rarely clear or consistent. Students normally entered arts education in their mid- to late teens and studied for three to four years.\textsuperscript{37} Disciplines explored by the arts students included ethics, logic, metaphysics, sciences, and mathematics.

Traditional universities offered terminal degrees in law and medicine, whereas the Jesuits refrained from offering these fields altogether and instead chose to focus on upper-level degrees.

\textsuperscript{35} O’Malley, \textit{The First Jesuits}, 90.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 206.
\textsuperscript{37} Cohen, 304, 306.
Those who studied theology nearly always took an arts degree first, so most Jesuits (and Jesuit-trained students) did not reach theology until around the age of twenty. Many did not obtain a degree in the discipline, even though the baccalaureate in theology took an average of an additional four years of schooling to complete, and students preparing for ordination typically studied theology for one to five years while earning a living on the side.

The content covered by the Jesuit schools was not innovative; rather, the novel aspect of the system was the manner in which it was rigorously and consistently organized. Their schools emulated the structure of the University of Paris, where classes of pupils were grouped according to ability, and individuals were not allowed to continue to the next level until they demonstrated mastery of their current material through disputation (formal debates), various oral and written exercises, and drills. Many of the instructors at the early schools were not much older than their pupils, since Jesuit novices often cut their own upper-level studies short in order to serve the Society’s schools as teachers, and a significant number of them were in their late teens and early twenties.

The Jesuit Order

The role of the Jesuit Order in Victoria’s education and career has been mentioned in previous investigations of his life, but the links between the composer and the Order’s history and ideals have never been thoroughly addressed. The Society of Jesus, despite its origin as a small band of students bonded by a common spiritual goal, grew into one of the largest, most powerful, and respected—yet mistrusted and resented—clerical organizations of the Catholic Reformation. A common assumption was that the Order was created by the church to combat

---

39 Cohen, 308.
Luther and Calvin by winning back those who defected to Protestantism. While many Jesuits did spend their lives engaged in such pursuits, most remained focused on the ideals of the Order’s founders: spiritual renewal of themselves and others, scrupulous doctrinal instruction, and caring for the physical needs of people from all walks of life. The new Society differed significantly from the orders that preceded it; its members maintained full engagement with the humanistic culture of their time, rather than spending their days in secluded prayer and contemplation. 41 They patronized some of the finest artistic talents available for service in their churches, pursued intellectual excellence in various fields, including science, and propagated a powerful educational system throughout much of Catholic Europe.

Since Victoria spent so much time in association with the Jesuits, it is impossible to deny their mark on his life. Quantifiable benefits include his humanistic and ecclesiastical education, which helped lead to his tenures as maestro of the Roman Seminary and German College, two internationally prominent institutions that surely raised his profile as a musician and composer. Details of his connection to Cardinal Otto Truchsess are less measurable, but it is likely Victoria came under the cardinal’s nurture as a result of their mutual involvement with the German College. Truchsess was not a Jesuit himself, yet served as primary patron of the institution while Victoria attended as a student. The composer’s connection with the Empress María of Austria can be less reliably traced to Jesuit influence, yet this remains a possibility: while the Empress lived at the imperial court in Vienna, she acted as advocate and patron for a number of individual Jesuits and institutions of the Order. She also bequeathed a large sum of money to found a Jesuit college in Madrid prior to her move back to the Spanish Habsburg capital, and this institution, the Colegio Imperial, honored her with obsequies following her death.

A possible, yet unquantifiable, impact on Victoria could be his complete engagement with the world around him. Jesuits believed society benefitted best from their active involvement in human culture as a means of relating to a broad demographic in their quest of “helping souls,” as it was described by Ignatius. The Society was known for its practicality in dealing with everyday problems and in drawing people into their churches; this stance often led to loosening of rules, such as the relaxation of Ignatius’s original misgivings regarding polyphonic performance. Victoria’s musical choices, business practices, and interpersonal connections suggest that the composer learned something of the Order’s pragmatic ways, even as a student. He chose to write music appropriate for use in a number of diverse environments, and the vast majority of his output appeared in print during his lifetime, which attests to its flexibility and potential for widespread performance. Victoria also learned to market himself skillfully by sending letters that offered a wide variety of performance solutions for large-scale works, and he aligned himself with some of the best and brightest figures in the church and nobility by seeking prominent dedicatees and ensuring that his music circulated among the principal Roman and Spanish churches.

*The Society’s Foundation and Expansion*

The Jesuit Order’s founder, St. Ignatius Loyola, was born into a respected noble family in 1491, and was destined for a courtier’s life or the military, rather than sainthood. A serious battle injury proved the turning point in his life: as he recuperated at his family home, his reading material was limited to religious works, which inspired him to spend some years in pilgrimage and soul-searching. After this, Ignatius was compelled to return to Spain and pursue an education, which he eventually completed at the University of Paris. In 1534, Ignatius and six of
his companions made vows to each other in a chapel on Montmartre; they did not initially intend to form a new religious order, but promised to bind themselves to each other in a common goal: either “helping souls” in Jerusalem, or, if that plan did not materialize, then in service to the pope. When it became apparent in late 1537 that the voyage to the Holy Land would never happen, Ignatius and two colleagues made a trip to offer their services to the pope, and the others eventually joined them in Rome. By mid-1539, the future saint began a campaign for official recognition as a religious order, enlisting the assistance of newly-found allies such as Cardinal Gasparo Contarini; his wish was granted in 1540 by Paul III in the bull *Regimini militantis ecclesiae*. A year later, Ignatius was elected the first General of the Society.42

Upon receiving papal sanction, the Society set about its task to “help souls” in Rome, and the network of members quickly expanded throughout the Italian states, then across Europe. Worldwide mission projects soon followed, but one of the Order’s most important missions remained at home in Europe: the education of clergy and laity. As the number of novices grew exponentially during the first decade of the Society’s existence, its leaders soon recognized the lack of quality education available to their recruits, particularly in rural areas and regions most strongly impacted by the Protestant Reformation. Initially, Ignatius only authorized the establishment of schools for novices; as the need became apparent, the commitment of the Order grew to include boys from the surrounding communities as well. This shift in focus from itinerant preaching and missionary service to the establishment of permanent schools and houses for its membership made the Society the first religious order to embrace education as a primary ministry. The first schools were established in Spanish territories: Gandía (1546) and Messina,
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Sicily (1547). Surely the Order’s leadership did not fathom the venture’s eventual success; by 1600, there were 56 schools in Italy and Sicily alone, and 77 in Spain and its overseas empire.  

Based upon an extensive series of surveys conducted by Jerónimo Nadal between 1540 and 1568, it is evident that the Order embraced members and non-Jesuit students from all walks of life, though a significant number came from well-respected families of the professional and merchant classes, and a few from the nobility. These represented sectors of society that valued humanist education as proper preparation for professional careers and courtly life. While the schools began as a means for educating the Society’s own members, Jesuits came to believe it was their duty to produce pious and productive members of secular society; they trained lay students to gracefully join courtly ranks through participation in exercises such as dramatic productions and public debates, which required practiced eloquence and clarity of thought.

Much of the Order’s staggering growth and success in education may be traced to its connections to the nobility, wise associations with prominent political and religious figures, and the cultivation of an appealing public image through building projects, celebrations, and ceremony. This philosophy is not unique to the Jesuits, but certainly could have contributed to Victoria’s pragmatic approach to career-building, as he secured favor with a vast array of noble, political, and ecclesiastical patrons over the course of his life. Jesuit priests were confessors to kings, contributed heavily at the Council of Trent, forged relationships with powerful cardinals, and recruited the sons of nobility to attend their schools. Nadal’s surveys suggest that the Order’s leadership preferred to recruit the wealthy or renowned, possibly to gain political leverage or access to desperately needed financial backing. Sometimes a complicated

---

43 Wright, 53.  
45 Ibid., 93.  
46 Cohen, 103.
relationship existed between the Society and its benefactors; for example, the Spanish crown was lukewarm, if not hostile, toward expansion efforts because the religious influence of the Jesuits felt like an arm of control reaching from Rome.\textsuperscript{47} However, this did not bar Charles V or Philip II from contributing financially toward the Roman College system.

Nadal served as a diplomatic figure for the growing Society; a large portion of his activity involved visiting every Jesuit community, often for weeks at a time, where he was responsible for dispersing and explaining the Constitutions of the Order and helping to establish schools, particularly in the Iberian Peninsula. S. Gil was founded in Ávila during his first visit to Spain in 1553-1555, and he returned to the peninsula multiple times between 1555 and 1572.\textsuperscript{48} It is remotely possible Nadal had contact with the young Victoria during one of his trips in the 1560s.

\textit{The Roman College System: The Roman College (1551)}

The Roman College opened on 22 February 1551; a sign over the door read “School of Grammar, Humanities, and Christian Doctrine, Free.”\textsuperscript{49} At first the institute only offered the lower school disciplines, but after a few years a full university curriculum was implemented, including the upper school programs of arts, philosophy, and theology. Ignatius intended for the Roman College to become a model for educational establishments throughout Europe, and thus he and his successors strove to recruit the best instructors, which in turn drew an international student body.\textsuperscript{50} At first the students were primarily novices of the Order and boarded there, but eventually the college expanded to include non-Jesuit aspirants to the clergy and lay students.

\textsuperscript{47} Cohen, 68-69.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 205.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 233.
The location moved periodically in the first several years, but settled permanently at the Piazza del Collegio Romano in 1560. The college became known for its grand public displays, such as academic festivities and processions for Corpus Christi, and its reputation spread further via high-profile visits from prominent figures such as politicians, prelates, and the pope himself.

The college served as the academic hub for the network of Jesuit colleges that catered to students from specific regions; these “national” colleges essentially served as residence halls for the Roman College. The German College, Roman Seminary, and English College maintained separate devotional practices, liturgical traditions, and public ceremonies, but all of the students attended lectures at the Roman College. Some of the confusion regarding the fluid relationship between Victoria and the German College, Roman College, and Roman Seminary stems from the organization of the extant archival records, as references to students and employees of each appear in various collections of documents, particularly in the German College and Roman Seminary’s archives.

Like many of the Order’s schools, the Roman College initially struggled financially. Cardinal Alessandro Farnese pledged his support, but never delivered; solvency was finally achieved when Francisco de Borja, the fourth Duke of Gandía, decided to join the order and made plans to disburse his wealth so that he might take his vow of poverty. In 1550 and 1551 he made a series of changes to his will, which included funds for the Roman College, and left a large initial sum at the Society’s disposal. Charles V contributed an additional 1,500 ducats annually from a royal pension that Borja held prior to joining the Order; this income was the
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most important sum the college received during its first five years.\textsuperscript{53} The institution received further assistance through the work of several Spanish Jesuits, the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand I, and Pope Pius IV.\textsuperscript{54}

\textit{The German College (1551)}\textsuperscript{55}

The German College was founded by Ignatius Loyola and Cardinal Giovanni Morone under a papal bull from Julius III; it was intended to serve as a residence for German students of the Roman College who would ideally return to their native lands to serve as clergy, conveying practices that provided a foretaste of Tridentine reform.\textsuperscript{56} Morone, a key player in the Council of Trent, was acclaimed for his efforts to strengthen the Catholic Church in Germany, which was reeling from the effects of the Protestant Reformation. Ignatius and later Jesuit officials sought patronage from numerous sources, including cardinals, members of noble and royal families, and the pope himself; Philip II of Spain and the cardinal of Augsburg, Otto Truchsess von Waldburg,


\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 135.

\textsuperscript{55} Volume I of Cardinal Andreas Steinhuber’s history of the German College, \textit{Geschichte des Kollegium Germanicum Hungaricum im Rom. Von Kardinal Andreas Steinhuber aus der Gesellschaft Jesu. Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Erster Band. Mit 25 Bildern auf 12 Tafeln} (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1906), covers its foundation, early supporters and students, and a number of people employed by the institution; much of his information was gleaned from early histories, such as Girolamo Nappi’s mid-seventeenth century manuscript and Cordara’s printed chronicle from 1770. Even though his direct discussion of Victoria is limited to a few sentences, Steinhuber remained the most important source on the composer’s position in the German College history for Victoria scholars during the first half of the twentieth century, including Henri Collet, F.X. Haberl, and Pedrell. Stevenson’s biography relies largely upon the work of Rafaele Casimiri, who published the first major studies of archival materials at the Roman Seminary and German College in the 1930s and 1940s; the rest of his material on this portion of Victoria’s life derives from Pedrell and other older secondary sources. Subsequent scholars have contributed much more thorough appraisals of the extant documents; the most valuable of these, particularly from a musical and liturgical standpoint, are studies by Jesuit fathers Thomas Culley and Frank Kennedy. More recent Spanish biographers, including Ana Sabe, tend to rely primarily on Culley and Steinhuber.

\textsuperscript{56} The initial proposal survives in a letter of 12 March 1552 from Polanco, Ignatius’s long-time secretary, to Don Juan de Borja, who served as a Spanish ambassador to the Austrian Habsburg court and later served the Empress Maria as majordomo. See García Villoslada, \textit{Storia del Collegio Romano}, 24.
were two of the foremost advocates in the first decades of the German College.\textsuperscript{57} Truchsess served as the institution’s official cardinal protector until his death in 1573. Among the students listed in Nappi’s \textit{Annali} through the close of the sixteenth century are a significant number of young men from prominent noble families, many of whom were family members of bishops, archbishops, and cardinals.

When the college opened with 24 students in October 1552, the student’s expenses were financed entirely by the pope and certain cardinals. Financial difficulties following Ignatius’s death resulted from individuals ignoring their pledges to the college. Diego Laínez, the second General of the Order, suggested admitting non-German students, who would be charged for room and board. These \textit{convittori} soon arrived from all over Europe, many from high ranks of nobility; a vast majority of them were Italians who did not intend to take orders.\textsuperscript{58} The German College also drew students from the families of prominent church officials and important banking and merchant lines, such as the Fuggers.\textsuperscript{59} Victoria was an exception, as he was among the fairly small group of non-Italian \textit{convittori}. Ultimately the German College nurtured over 7,000 student-priests, including Gregory XV, two dozen cardinals, at least 50 archbishops, 330 bishops, and numerous important cultural figures.\textsuperscript{60}

Pope Gregory XIII reorganized the financial structure of the institution in 1573; the new foundation featured a large endowment, providing for a much larger number of German seminarians, and allowed for a smaller number of German \textit{convittori}. This structure became the

\textsuperscript{57} Casimiri, “Il Vittoria,” 5. Steinhuber claims Philip II contributed to the college as early as 1574 (Steinhuber, 108). When the Roman College experienced financial difficulties, Ignatius solicited Philip II’s assistance in obtaining foundation funds from the Pope; he also called upon a number of Spanish Jesuits, Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand I, and Pope Pius IV for financial assistance (see Casimiri, \textit{Storia del Collegio Romano}, 134-5).

\textsuperscript{58} Ricardo García Villoslada, “Algunos documentos sobre la música en el antiguo seminario romano,” \textit{Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu} XXXI (1962): 112.

\textsuperscript{59} Steinhuber, 74.

\textsuperscript{60} García Villoslada, \textit{Storia del Collegio Romano}, 26. One cardinal who attended alongside Victoria and later became a contributor to the college was Cardinal Alessandrino, dedicatee of one of Victoria’s publications; their connection will be discussed further in Chapter Four.
model for the papal seminaries founded in the 1570s and 1580s, and for subsequent national colleges attached to the Roman College.61 Between 1563 and 1573 the college housed approximately 200 students, and only about 20 of these were German seminarians. The boarding costs paid by the convittori financed most of the college’s expenses, which meant that these students either had to be relatively wealthy or rely upon a patron.62 Cardinals and other “protectors” of the college who sent promising youths to live at the German College during their clerical training were expected to finance their education.63 In order to reestablish the German College’s function as an institution geared toward German-speaking students, the administration relocated the Italian and other non-German convittori to the Roman Seminary in the same year. The two institutions had already forged a close relationship, since the pupils all took their classes at the Roman College; prior to 17 October 1573, the convittori of the two schools were essentially regarded as one group.64

The separation of German and non-German students is the first point at which Tomás Luis de Victoria emerges in the records as the official maestro di cappella. According to Wilhelm Fusban’s seventeenth-century history of the institution, “Thomas Ludovicus Victoria, musical director in the German College at that time, set Psalm 136, Super flumina Babylonis, to the melodies of a sorrowful lamentation” on the occasion of the departure of the convittori from the college, an account that is affirmed by diaries in the College archives.65 This is also the first clear reference to an occasion for which Victoria wrote a particular piece of music; unfortunately, such references are scarce, even during the relatively well-documented Roman portion of his career.

61 O’Malley, The First Jesuits, 236.
62 Ibid., 235.
63 Ibid., 234.
64 Culley, Jesuits and Music, 41.
65 Ibid., 44.
The Roman Seminary (1564)

The Roman Seminary was founded in 1564 and officially opened in February 1565. Pius IV entrusted the administration of the seminary to the Jesuits, which a number of Roman clergy resented, as the institution was originally intended to serve prospective clergy of the Roman archdiocese, rather than international students or Jesuit novices. It served as a residence similar to the German and English Colleges, and students attended classes at the Roman College; in 1566 the seminary began accepting boarders to help finance the expenses of the Roman clerical students, a move parallel to the early efforts of the German College. The Roman Seminary’s initial location on the Plaza Pallavicini housed 55 clerical students, including four singers and a maestro di cappella. By 1576, the number of musicians employed by the institution grew to 28, which included the maestro and an unknown number of singers from either the Cappella Sistina or Cappella Giulia who received room and board, but no salary.

Like the other Roman Jesuit institutions, a large quantity of information regarding the Roman Seminary’s early years is drawn from Nappi’s history and the fairly sparse manuscript sources extant in the archives. Raffaele Casimiri was among the first to collate this data in a series of articles published in Note d’archivio. Accounts from the last third of the sixteenth century reveal a liturgical and musical tradition rivaled only by the German College in its excellence and scope; music formed an essential part of seminary life from its beginnings.

---

66 O’Malley, The First Jesuits, 236.
According to Kennedy, “even the German College…could not seriously compete with the seminary in the area of musical achievement until after its refoundation in 1573.”

Like the other Jesuit institutions, the Roman Seminary also took paying students who were not necessarily studying for the priesthood. These lay students originally lived at the German College until the separation of the German clerical students and *convittori* in 1573, which meant they likely shared meals, recreation time, and devotional practices. Since the German College and Roman Seminary maintained a close relationship, it is possible they shared a *maestro di cappella* until the German College hired an official music director at the re-foundation. There is also some evidence that large academic and musical functions for both the German College and Roman Seminary were occasionally held in a larger space at the Roman College, their educational nucleus.

Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina served as *maestro* of the Roman Seminary from 1566 until 1571. While he was in the employ of the seminary, two of his sons were enrolled as students. His sons and Victoria probably were at least acquainted, given that they would have attended lectures at the Roman College around the same time. Most biographers of Victoria assume that Victoria and Palestrina were close friends, or even that Victoria studied with Palestrina, but do not explain why this is plausible. It is extremely likely that Palestrina encountered the young Spaniard at some point, since students of the Roman institutions studied and made music together; however, no concrete evidence of their association survives.

---

70 García Villoslada, “Algunos documentos,” 112.
71 This idea is reinforced by Kennedy, “Jesuits and Music,” 131; the rehearsal and instruction times were set for after lunch and dinner, times at which the Roman Seminary students would be at their residence in the German College.
Victoria in Rome

Much speculation has been made regarding Victoria’s motives for relocating to Rome as a teenager. As the political and ecclesiastical center of the church, the Eternal City played host to thousands of international pilgrims, clerics, and students seeking not only an education, but also employment within the church. It is plausible that the young Victoria was sent to the city to prepare for an ecclesiastical career, rather than to solely seek fame and fortune as a musician. Victoria could have been recommended to the German College through family connections with the Jesuits, or by one of his relatives who lived in Italy, as suggested by Samuel Rubio. Ferreol Hernández believed his uncle Juan accompanied him on the journey to Rome; he thought the same uncle could have influenced Victoria’s decision to move, as he had been in Rome prior to 1545, perhaps for his own ecclesiastical studies.

Victoria arrived at the German College around age 17, and thus would have already received a reasonably extensive amount of musical training as a choirboy, an assumption that was supported by Casimiri, Haberl, and Pedrell, among others. Since Haberl accepted Fétis’s arbitrary birth year of 1540, he assumed Victoria arrived in Rome at age 24 or 26 as a fully formed composer, finished with his education, already ordained as a priest, and ready to seek employment as a maestro or singer. Pedrell agreed that Victoria must have been a known master by the time he arrived, likely because he accepted Steinhuber’s statement that the composer arrived in Rome in 1565. This bolstered his opinion that Victoria could have taken over Jacob de Kerle’s position as maestro di cappella to Cardinal Truchsess, as Kerle left the

---

74 Juan Luis de Victoria’s travel expenses were paid by his father, according to protocol documents examined by Hernández, Tomás Luis de Victoria, 86.
cardinal’s service in the same year. Pedrell also assumed that Victoria went to the German College as a paid singer rather than a student; this does not hold up under inquiry, since the College did not yet have an official musical program, nor did it employ singers until much later.

Though there is no way of knowing the full extent of the patron-dependent relationship between Victoria and Truchsess, Stevenson acknowledged that the cardinal visited Spain in March 1564, the year before the composer entered the German College. However, Truchsess remained primarily in Barcelona, so the chance of a meeting between the two is remote. It is more likely that their first contact was in Rome. Stevenson’s conjecture regarding the cardinal’s patronage was based on his presence in the city from at least 24 July 1568; Victoria could have entered his employ by the end of the year, and remained until around 1572. This scenario is plausible, since most students of the German College studied approximately three years, which aligns well if one considers Victoria’s matriculation in 1565. However, it is unlikely; the composer profusely thanked Truchsess for his patronage in the dedication to the 1572 motets, but did not refer to himself as the cardinal’s maestro, nor as maestro of the German College.

Victoria’s German College Education

Victoria entered the German College as a convitore sometime in 1565. Different sources cite varying dates, but most fall within the range 1563-1567, and the date of his departure as a student is unknown. Early biographers based their statements regarding Victoria’s matriculation upon less-than-reliable sources, as will be detailed below; however, a recently published autograph letter Victoria sent to the chapter of Jaén Cathedral unequivocally confirms his entry

---

76 Pedrell, *Tomás Luis de Victoria Abulense*, 42-44; Pedrell does not cite Steinhuber, but the majority of the information on Victoria is on p. 130 of Steinhuber’s history, where he does not explicitly state the year 1565.
78 Ibid., 13.
in 1565 (see below). His course of study has not been identified, but references to the composer after his student years do not suggest he completed a degree, as he is generally referred to as “maestro” or “presbiter,” but not as “bachiller,” “licenciado,” or another indicator of educational status.

**Letter to Jaén Cathedral, 18 December 1583.**

I have printed in this city of Rome a book of masses and some motets (where I have resided for eighteen years) and informed of the favors Your Lordship makes to similar work, I wanted to offer Your Lordship mine. May Our Lord keep these illustrious persons many years. From Rome, and on December 18, 1583.

Very distinguished Sirs,
Chaplain of Your Lordship,

Thomé Luis de Victoria

The most common range of matriculation dates is based upon various conflicting readings of Girolamo Nappi’s early- to mid-seventeenth century account of the activities of the German College, Roman College, and Roman Seminary, which includes data on the Roman Seminary’s maestri di cappella. According to Culley, Nappi stated that Victoria “came to the German College as a singer on the twenty-fifth of June, 1563.” In the same document, however, Nappi evidently included a listing of the convittori who studied at the college between 1565 and 1571 and noted Victoria’s presence in 1565, but indicated no exact date of arrival or departure. To amplify the confusion, another copy of Nappi’s document is extant in the German College’s archive, and this list of convittori indicates Victoria’s entrance in 1564, but it also
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80 Archivio Storico della Pontificia Università Gregoriana, MS. 2800.
81 Culley consulted the second copy in the archives of the German College (*Jesuits and Music*, 38-39), but I was unable to find an updated citation.
lacks precise dates of attendance.\textsuperscript{82} This conflicting information is impossible to rectify, since the original documents upon which Nappi based his account do not survive. Since Nappi compiled his chronicle much later (1640-1647), his information must not be relied upon as conclusive.

Culley accepted 1563 as the most likely matriculation year, which seems perfectly reasonable on the surface. The record of Victoria’s entrance as a \textit{convittori “per cantore”} in this year is found in the records of the Roman Seminary rather than the German College, but it is vital to remember that prior to October 1573 the foreign students of the two institutions were considered part of the same group; thus, both schools would have had access to the services of singers associated with either, so the existence of accurate information in the seminary’s archive is not terribly far-fetched, even if multiple conflicting dates appear in the two copies of Nappi’s \textit{Annali}.\textsuperscript{83} While 1563 is a plausible entry year for Victoria, one must consider the age requirement for entry to the German College. Students could only begin study between the ages of 15 and 21. If Victoria was born in late 1548, he probably did not enter the college on 25 June 1563, as he would not yet have reached age 15, though the rules could have been relaxed.

Earlier secondary sources suggest a wider range of dates, many of which must be discarded based upon the sources found in the archives of the German College and Roman Seminary. Steinhuber states that Victoria “was at the college for twelve years, first as a singer, then as \textit{maestro di cappella}, and that he left in 1578,” and thus concludes that he must have entered the college in 1566.\textsuperscript{84} Unfortunately, Steinhuber does not provide any support for his claim, and it is unlikely to be correct, as Victoria had certainly left the college before 1578. Haberl accepted the notion that Victoria spent twelve years either as a student or teacher and

\textsuperscript{82} Culley, \textit{Jesuits and Music}, 39.  
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid., 41. Culley’s full discussion of the Nappi documents and various readings of the lists of \textit{convittori} and \textit{maestri} of the German College and Roman Seminary is found on pp. 38-42.  
\textsuperscript{84} Steinhuber, 130.
maestro at the college, but was also unaware of the tenure of maestro Martini, who served from sometime in 1577 until the arrival of Annibale Stabile in 1578; thus, the 1566 date must be discarded if one is to believe the “twelve years” theory. Culley astutely observed that the information claimed by both Haberl and Steinhuber has been perpetuated by numerous subsequent scholars, including Pedrell, Collett, Otaño, and Mitjana. Casimiri based his date of 1565 upon one of Nappi’s lists and contended that the date made sense, considering the age requirements for entering ecclesiastical students. This date was also accepted by Stevenson without further explanation.

A small circle of Spanish biographers posit a possible entry date of 1567, based upon the convincing case brought forth by Ferreol Hernández. He concluded that Victoria’s uncle, Juan Luis de Victoria, accompanied his nephew to Rome, since his normally prolific signatures disappear from Ávila’s cathedral chapter records and protocol archives in 1567 and 1568. Hernández also quoted Nappi’s document, but his transcript indicated the date 25 June 1567, rather than 1563 or 1565, and he stated that other biographers had erroneously assumed the date as Victoria’s departure from the college. He claimed the 1567 date appears in a list of convittori from Vol. I, fol. 49 of Nappi’s Annali del Seminario Romano, but the list is incomplete. Some of the entries indicate arrival and departure dates, whereas the excerpt he included appears in fragmentary form. The 1567 date is occasionally interpreted as the departure date for the last three individuals, whereas Hernández understandably construed it as a matriculation date:

85 Haberl, 73; he clearly relied upon Steinhuber’s information, as he indicated Stabile directly followed Victoria in the position (130). Pedrell also discarded Haberl’s puzzling assumption that Victoria remained in the German College until 1583 (Pedrell, Tomás Luis de Victoria Abulense, 37).
86 Culley, Jesuits and Music, 42; Casimiri, “Il Vittoria,” 5.
87 Stevenson, “Tomás Luis de Victoria: Unique Spanish Genius,” 11; Sabe accepted the date simply because it was the one most people tend to accept (Sabe, Tomás Luis de Victoria, pasión por la música, 70).
88 Hernández, Tomás Luis de Victoria, 86.
Juan Ficarola, español, 6 Agosto – 22 Septiembre 1565.
Miguel Bonelli del Bosco, 9 de Julio – 5 Abril 1567.
Tomás Euanes, ingles, 25 de Junio de 1567.
Tomás de Vittorio \textit{[sic]}
Tomás de Cottamo.\textsuperscript{89}

Prior to the discovery of the Jaén letter, any of the various dates cited by readers of Nappi’s documents are reasonable when considered alongside other circumstantial and secondary evidence, though 1565 and 1567 are most plausible. In addition, Culley misread the date found in Vol. I, fol. 45 of Nappi’s \textit{Annali}. Plate I of \textit{Jesuits and Music} provides a facsimile of this list of \textit{maestri di cappella} of the Roman Seminary; while the ink is smudged in places, including the year of Victoria’s entry “per cantore,” it reads “1567,” not 1563, 1564, or 1565. If he arrived as a \textit{convittori} in 1567, Victoria would have been around 19 years old and still well within the age boundary for entering students, and this date would be supported by the lacunae in archival records pertaining to his uncle’s activity in Ávila. Moreover, if Victoria was working as a part-time musician outside of the college by 1569, he would have completed about two years of training in the Jesuit system, which would not be surprising for an environment in which many students only stayed two or three years.\textsuperscript{90}

\textbf{The Roman Colleges: Liturgy and Musical Activity}

Due to the dearth of archival materials related to the early years of the Roman College and its associated institutions, it is difficult to piece together a complete image of their liturgical

\textsuperscript{89} Hernández, \textit{Tomás Luis de Victoria}, 87-88.
\textsuperscript{90} See Casimiri’s “‘Disciplina musicae’” articles for numerous examples.
and musical activity; apart from constitutions, statutes, and similar official documents, little survived the suppression of the Society in 1773 and the loss of the Roman College library to the national system during the Italian unification.\textsuperscript{91} Fortunately, a number of miscellaneous documents, such as histories of the institutions, travel journals, and diaries composed by school officials, give some indication of the grand ceremony and atmosphere of the Roman schools. Music was employed at least in an unofficial capacity from the beginnings of all of the schools, particularly for devotional functions such as meetings of the Marian congregations. Academic defenses featured poetry and music from at least the late sixteenth century, and it is possible that award ceremonies included music at a much earlier date.\textsuperscript{92}

The music of official liturgical exercises focused upon the Mass, and eventually some of the Offices; Ignatius allowed the colleges to sing Vespers during Holy Week relatively early in the Society’s history.\textsuperscript{93} He preferred the simplicity and solemnity of chant, but gradually permitted the use of \textit{falsobordone} as a means of drawing people to the services, and it became the most common type of singing employed by the European Jesuit colleges, though no written examples survive in the Order’s archives.\textsuperscript{94}

Archival documents indicate that the Order’s Roman institutions eventually made extensive use of motets for academic, liturgical, and quasi-liturgical functions. This practice closely followed the trends in other Roman churches; by the 1560s motets were frequently featured in the Office, particularly in Vespers services, and the Jesuit-run churches inserted

\textsuperscript{91} Kennedy, “Jesuits and Music,” 11-12.
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid.,” 56. It is likely the Roman colleges followed similar practices as the college in Coimbra, Portugal, which included instrumental music in award ceremonies from at least 1558.
\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 26.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 24-26. \textit{Falsobordone} was a homophonic style of choral singing based on the psalm tones. It emerged during the fifteenth century and appealed to the Reformation-era church due to the clarity of text declamation. The \textit{cantus firmus} originally appeared in the top voice where it was easily heard, but by the 1570s the melody commonly migrated from voice to voice; by the 1580s it was either treated loosely or removed completely. For more on the style, see Murray C. Bradshaw, \textit{The Falsobordone. A Study in Renaissance and Baroque Music} (Neuhausen-Stuttgart: American Institute of Musicology, Hänssler-Verlag, 1978).
motets into the Mass by the last quarter of the century. Casimiri suggested that the custom of substituting a motet for the Marian antiphon at Vespers may explain the large volume of *Antiphonae ad Magnificati* produced during the late sixteenth century. Litanies for the saints or the Blessed Virgin were also common at devotional functions. It is unknown whether Victoria joined a Marian congregation as a student, but once he became responsible for the musical activity at the Roman Seminary and German College, his duties would have included providing music for the congregations’ activities. These factors would certainly explain Victoria’s propensity for setting Marian texts, as well as the choral litanies.

*The Development of a Liturgical Program at the German College*

Ignatius staunchly supported the programs of the German College, but was never acknowledged as an advocate for the arts; despite this, the institution became an internationally-famous musical center in the decades following his death in 1556. The existence of a distinguished musical tradition among Jesuit organizations of any type may seem extraordinary, as the Order historically maintained a cautious stance regarding music. According to the original constitutions of the Society of Jesus, members were not to sing the Office in choir, and the presence of instruments in official residences was forbidden. These guidelines were interpreted rather loosely immediately following Ignatius’s death and musical activity was never stringently suppressed. When Francisco de Borja became General of the Order in 1565, he officially sanctioned the performance of polyphonic masses on feast days, employment of instruments in

---

96 Ibid., 208.
98 Ibid., 15.
the liturgy, and a more prominent role for the organ.\textsuperscript{99} A large proportion of the Order’s music-making occurred in the over 400 colleges the Jesuits maintained by 1600.\textsuperscript{100} Apart from the German College, a handful of other Jesuit institutions placed importance on music early in their existence, and all were within Austrian Habsburg territories, including colleges at Munich, Graz, Vienna, Prague, Cologne, Mainz, Augsburg, and Dillingen.

Unfortunately, little information on liturgical practice prior to 1573 survives in the college archives. Much of the earliest information gleaned by Casimiri and Culley originates from letters and various histories of the first Jesuit activity in Rome, and most accounts in the secondary literature draw extensively upon the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century work of Steinhuber, who relied primarily on Nappi, Fusban, and similar sources. It appears that music first became a serious undertaking at the German College around 1573, though excellent singers were counted among even the earliest students; this seems to be the reason Ignatius eventually allowed Vespers to be sung on Sundays and other feasts. Musical activity was common among the \textit{convittori} before 1573, as references to the nightly singing of the \textit{Salve Regina} exist, as do mentions of performances that included both voices and instruments. A strong tradition of small congregations devoted to the Virgin Mary emerged within the college, and the meetings of these devotional societies frequently included incidental music for dramas, vernacular songs, pieces intended for meditation, and liturgical works.\textsuperscript{101}

A revised set of constitutions formed between 1564 and 1569 also supports the notion that music was extremely important prior to the “official” start of the liturgical program, and indicates the presence of a singing teacher in the college:

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{99} Roberta Freund Schwartz, “\textit{En busca de liberalidad}: Music and Musicians in the Courts of the Spanish Nobility, 1470-1640” (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, 2001), 461.
\textsuperscript{100} Culley, \textit{Jesuits and Music}, 16.
\textsuperscript{101} Ibid., 19-20.
\end{flushleft}
Let care be taken that there be practice in music for voices and instruments in the college, for the students who will take pleasure in it. And those who shall have a small start in it will be able to make further progress in it, provided that no teacher be brought into the college to instruct them except the teacher of singing, who, ordinarily, will be able to be kept in the college.  

The German College’s renown for liturgy ultimately was the result of the efforts of Michele Lauretano, who served as rector of the college from 1573 to 1587. Lauretano, a former choirboy at the Holy House of Loreto, wished to provide the seminarians with excellent training in liturgical practices, including singing, in order to send graduates back to German-speaking areas prepared to improve liturgical conditions in the region; the program proved effective, since reports in praise of the establishment’s music and liturgical education began to appear as early as 1577.

When Lauretano drafted its new constitutions in 1573, the college was situated at a temporary location where the reforms could not yet be implemented, as the site did not feature an adjacent church. However, on 9 January 1574 the pope presented the Palazzo di San Apollinare to the college as its permanent residence. The Church of San Apollinare was donated on 15 April 1575 at the request of Lauretano, and the earliest account of music performed there dates from Trinity Sunday of the same year. The papal bull that officially transferred ownership of the church also indicated which feasts were to be celebrated by the students, and the degree of solemnity to which each should be observed. The existence of a church on the college grounds meant that services could now be run by the students, rather than the five canons and three chaplains who had done so previously. All students were now obligated to participate in the services rather than worship; they sang the Epistles and responsories, and Lauretano’s guidelines 

---

102 Excerpted from translation in Culley, “The Influence of the German College,” 5.
103 Ibid., 21.
104 Casimiri, “Disciplina musice” (XVI I-2), 5.
105 Culley, Jesuits and Music, 27.
required that the entire Office be sung “or at least carefully said” on certain occasions. Other feasts and liturgical obligations were added to the list in 1580 and eventually all feasts were observed with as much singing as possible, either before or following orders given in a bull of 1 April 1584.

Victoria’s Service at the German College

Whatever the dates of his matriculation, Victoria was no longer a student by October 1571: a letter from vicar-general Jerónimo Nadal to Francisco de Borja, the third General of the Order, indicates that Victoria was teaching music to the convittori at the request of the rector, Sebastiano Romei. Romei had enlisted the composer’s services without Nadal’s consent, and his letter to Borja requested that the General decide whether to keep him in the employ of the college. Borja replied from Spain in December, giving his approval. His employment as an instructor provided Victoria with room and board, plus a monthly salary of one and a half scudi.

Most biographers accept that Victoria served as maestro, at least in some capacity, from 1573 to his departure. There is no clear archival corroboration for this date, though the information seems to stem from Nappi’s lengthy narrative of the events surrounding the separation of the German seminary students from the convittori, the occasion for which Victoria’s Super flumina babylonis was presumably written. In his description, Nappi referred to the composer as maestro of the seminary, though Casimiri took this as an inadvertent exchange
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106 Culley, Jesuits and Music, 27. These feasts were Easter, Pentecost, Christmas, St. Stephen, St. John the Evangelist, Ascension, Trinity, Corpus Christi, Circumcision, Epiphany, Thursday through Saturday of Holy Week, Nativity, and the Assumption, All Saints, the Feasts of Saints Peter and Paul, the Nativity of John the Baptist, St. Apollinare, and the Thursday after Passion Sunday (St. Apollinare was the stational church in Rome on that day).
107 Ibid., 28-29.
108 Ibid., 42-3. Stevenson says that the letter states that Victoria was “formerly in the seminary” (“Tomás Luis de Victoria,” 13).
of the words “college” and “seminary.” Pedrell claimed Victoria was elected maestro in 1573, based on information from Baini, which was corroborated by Steinhuber; however, Steinhuber makes no clear reference to an election year.

Victoria must have become the first official maestro di cappella of the German College upon the donation of the church of San Apollinare in 1575, when the official choir was formed and Lauretano’s liturgical plans were first implemented. Victoria was not at the head of the chapel during the preparation and printing of his first collection of motets in 1572, as he does not refer to himself as maestro of either the German College or Roman Seminary. He did not clearly indicate his position at the German College until the publication of his first book of masses in 1576. Victoria’s position as the first maestro of the college is further confirmed in a letter he sent to the rectors on 1 February 1606; a postscript in the composer’s hand reads “…yo fui el primer maestro de ese colegio.”

Casimiri was one of the earliest to contest the belief that Victoria moved to Rome in search of employment rather than for his education. He assumed that since he had seen records of his employment at Sta. Maria di Monserrato and elsewhere beginning in late 1568 and early 1569, Victoria must have remained a student for a little over three years. There are no references to his re-admission to the German College staff in 1571, so Casimiri assumed this meant he was newly employed by the institution, rather than returning after a hiatus. However, Casimiri erroneously stated that Victoria’s name disappeared from the German College records.
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toward the end of 1574, and various expense and salary records place him at the college through at least December 1576.\textsuperscript{116} It is certain that he left before 1578, as there is record of his successor at the German College from at least 20 September 1577. According to the constitutions, the \textit{maestro} was required to provide at least two months’ notice; thus, he likely left the college no later than late July 1577.\textsuperscript{117}

An undated and unsigned document from the period, evidently written to petition for a raise in salary for the \textit{maestro}, reveals Victoria as a valued employee of the college:

\begin{quote}
He is a person of the most trustworthy behavior, serious, and he knows how to speak Latin, which is necessary for someone who must teach these Germans. If he is allowed to leave, it will be difficult to find one like him. I believe that one \textit{scudo} per month, or at least something like it, could be added, since he is a person who has already served a long time, and very faithfully; and he says, finally, that he took some pains in order to serve here.\textsuperscript{118}
\end{quote}

Toward the end of the document, the writer hints at Victoria’s emerging business prowess, as the \textit{maestro} made it plain that he worked tirelessly and perhaps turned down other lucrative opportunities in order to remain in the employ of the German College. This effort was successful, as a signed receipt for three \textit{scudi} (rather than two) exists from May 1574.\textsuperscript{119} It is possible that Victoria requested a raise in order to make up for the departure of the Italian \textit{convittori}. Originally, the lay students were the only ones to receive musical training; these were the individuals who could afford to pay for lessons. The separation of the non-German students to the Roman Seminary in late 1573 would have reduced the \textit{maestro}’s income, likely significantly.\textsuperscript{120} Pedrell proudly stated that \textit{maestri} made 80 \textit{scudi}, plus room and board; this information was drawn from Steinhuber, but this number follows a discussion of \textit{maestri} active

\textsuperscript{116} Culley, \textit{Jesuits and Music}, 47.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., 36.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 44-5. Emphasis mine.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid., 45.
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 43, 45-6.
well after Victoria’s tenure. He was unclear regarding the period to which the sum pertained, so it must not be assumed that the composer ever earned this salary.  

Victoria’s sixteenth-century successors as maestro of the German College left a far more obscure legacy, and, as in the case of Victoria, records of their employment at the institution are imprecise. The second maestro of the college, Francesco Martini, was a priest from Neri’s congregation and likely served from sometime in 1577 to 1578. Following Martini’s tenure, Annibale Stabile presided over the choir loft, possibly from July 1578 until 1589 or 1590. Stabile’s successor, Stefano Fabri (the elder) remained in the position only a few months, from c. 1590 to 1591.

The leaders of the German College’s musical establishment must have been held in high esteem by their Roman contemporaries, as two of the last maestri of the sixteenth century left the institution to head the Cappella Giulia, and their dates of employment at the college are less ambiguous: Ruggiero Giovannelli led from April 1591 to March 1594, was briefly replaced by a “Maestro Paulo,” and Asprilio Pacelli served from 1595 to 2 March 1602, when he became maestro of the Cappella Giulia.

Duties of the Maestro di Cappella of the German College

Even before an official maestro di cappella position was approved, the college employed a singing teacher for the convittori. As the first maestro of the German College, Victoria would have directed liturgical performances for private services and for the collegiate church, according
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to the list of official obligations outlined by Culley. Apart from the official duties, he was to be an example of virtuous conduct for the students, though it was not required for him to be a priest. He was expected to follow all the regulations of the institution, including going to confession at least once per month, and more often if he were ordained, as priests were expected to celebrate Mass on a more frequent basis.

The maestro’s musical duties were divided between direction of performances, rehearsals, and instruction. Music was performed at Mass, some of the Offices, processions, meetings of the Marian congregations, and other private and public events, including ceremonies for the granting of degrees and other academic awards; these often included instrumental music, polyphony, chant, or a combination of the three. The college maintained rigorous rules regarding accepted types of music, even outside of the church: “Let him not have sung, nor keep in the house, love songs or impure songs; and in choir, let him see to it that, as regards both the singing and playing, nothing light or vain be had, but rather what is serious, religious and devotional.”

As part of the instructional duties of the maestro di cappella, Victoria would have taught all of the students to sing chant, focused on preparing incoming students for participation in the services at San Apollinare, and examined them periodically to ensure their satisfactory progress. Special events, including Sundays and solemn feasts, often required supplementary rehearsal time with the students, as many of them were weaker singers. Additionally, a select group of students formed the canto secondo, which also met daily to study chant and polyphony, counterpoint, and composition; the putti soprani, or choirboys, were included in this group. Unsurprisingly, due to the demands of the position, the maestro traditionally lived at the college,
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as did the *putti soprani*. Due to lack of documentation, it is impossible to prove or disprove the inclusion of *putti* during Victoria’s tenure, but he probably had choirboys at his disposal. They were certainly employed as a regular fixture of the polyphonic choir by the time of Stabile, as the earliest evidence of choirboys living on the college grounds dates from January 1583.

Since all students were required to participate in liturgical music making at the college, there were far more singers than could be used for every service, so they were split into three groups. The bulk of the students were divided into two choirs based upon their location of residence: one choir included those who lived in the part of the property closest to the church; the second was comprised of students who lived in a smaller building. The groups sang on a rotating basis, and everyone chosen for the *canto secondo* also sang in one of the others, depending upon where they lived, as these stronger singers served as support for less-skilled students. An additional choir was formed in 1575 to sing more complex polyphonic works, and these students were treated very well:

> In addition to these three choirs, there is the fourth, for music [*di Musica*], in which are those who have voice and art; and none of these is in some one of those three choirs. And as much care as is possible is taken to keep this choir in esteem, by putting priests and nobles in it, and by making it desirable. And occasionally, therefore, they have some privileges…And once or twice a year some feast is had for them in the vineyard…

At first the elite choir was comprised of only students; initial concrete evidence of salaried singers hired from outside the college is found in documentation kept by *maestro* Stabile, and some slightly earlier records. Those from 1576 and 1578 include 20 and 21 students in the ensemble. By 1592, there were 26 singers, 17 of whom were students. Prior to 1600, the college never employed more than seven or eight non-matriculating singers at a time. It is likely
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that the *maestro* felt it necessary to supplement the ensemble with outside musicians from time to time, even before they were regularly employed, a practice on record as early as 2 February 1578, when a few singers were brought in for the Feast of the Purification. Temporary singers may have been contracted on an extended basis as well: a payment record from December 1578 indicates that a Spanish soprano was issued three months’ salary, and an Italian bass was paid for two months’ work.\(^{132}\)

**Employment at the Roman Seminary (c. 1571-1573?)**

Victoria worked as *maestro* of the Roman Seminary for a brief, but unclear period; he certainly began sometime following Palestrina’s departure for the Cappella Giulia in September 1571, and is referred to “maestro of the seminary” in Nappi’s account of the separation of the German College *convittori* from the German seminarians in 1573. Due to the flexible nature of the relationship between the Jesuit institutions, Victoria logically could have taught the *convittori* of the German College beginning in 1571 while leading the musicians of the seminary, at least until the arrival of seminary *maestro* Pietro Paolo Lanza sometime in 1573.\(^{133}\) However, there is evidence that the seminary employed two *maestri*, at least from the period after the re-foundation of the German College. One would have lived at the seminary and taught the seminarians, while the other served as an assistant and was largely employed to teach the non-clerics.\(^{134}\) Kennedy’s examination of documents pertaining to both institutions led him to conclude that before 1573, they shared an instructor who taught the lay students, but this person was not necessarily referred to as *maestro di cappella*.\(^{135}\) Nadal’s reference to Victoria’s service as a music teacher in the
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German College thus could also apply to this situation: he may have served the Roman Seminary and *convittori* simultaneously.

The duties of the *maestri* at the Roman Seminary, at least post-1573, were extremely similar to those of the instructor at the German College; they taught lessons in plainchant and figured music for the seminarians, provided special music for feasts, award ceremonies, disputations, processions, Lenten and Forty Hours devotions, and the Marian congregations.\(^{136}\)

Performance practice seems nearly identical as well, as organ was used for feasts and the weekly polyphonic Marian litanies. All students were required to sing in the choir for Mass and Vespers on Sundays and feasts. Many of the polyphonic singers secured by the seminary were drawn from among the clerical students, and they frequently went on to sing in churches around the city or in the papal chapel.

*Ordination: 1575*

The rite of first tonsure often occurred shortly after passing the age of 14, which was the minimum age for the receipt of benefices; tonsure formally marked a boy’s intent to pursue the priestly vocation, and normally coincided with his formal Latin studies at a college or seminary.\(^{137}\) By the time of the twenty-third session of the Council of Trent (1563), which dealt primarily with reforms to the ordination process, candidates for tonsure must have taken the sacrament of Confirmation, been taught basic doctrine, and learned to read and write.\(^{138}\) Archival records examined by Casimiri indicate that some students received tonsure upon entry to the German College; he suggested the possibility that Victoria took the rite there. Sabe assumed that

\(^{136}\) Casimiri, “‘Disciplina musicae,’” XII/1, 4-8. The most significant sources of information on liturgical practices at the Roman Seminary are the series of articles by Raffaele Casimiri, cited above.
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Victoria spent time studying at the Roman Seminary, and argued that he must have received tonsure at one of the institutions.\textsuperscript{139} Unfortunately, no concrete evidence survives.

No matter where or when the clerical candidate first received the bishop’s blessing to seek ordination, entry to the minor orders required further written recommendations from the individual’s parish priest and head of his school, plus additional education; the student needed to at least understand Latin. Each rank in the orders, both major and minor, indicated an obligation to execute a specific set of responsibilities within the church. There were no age requirements or minimum waiting periods for receiving minor orders, which included porter, lector, exorcist, and acolyte, nor were they limited to unmarried men. Victoria received the orders of lector and exorcist on 6 and 13 March 1575, and it is not known when or whether he received the offices of porter or acolyte.\textsuperscript{140}

Entry into major orders involved a further, more extensive examination process. Written inquiries were made with the candidate’s home diocese regarding aspects such as his character, faith, upbringing, family origin, and education; once these were completed, he underwent an examination before the ordaining bishop and other assisting officials. Candidates were also obliged to prove they would be financially supported, generally via a permanent benefice or patrimonial title. Victoria received his first benefice from the parish of S. Andrés de Valdescapa, in diocese of León, in a papal brief from 28 January 1575.\textsuperscript{141}

Casimiri was among the first to recognize that Victoria’s educational and ordination path were relatively normal, apart from the fact that he took his orders in a single year.\textsuperscript{142} He took the major orders of subdeacon, deacon, and priest on 14, 25, and 28 August 1575, respectively.

\textsuperscript{139} Casimiri, “‘Il Vittoria,’” 32; Sabe, Tomás Luis de Victoria, 103.
\textsuperscript{140} Casimiri, “‘Il Vittoria,’” 33.
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\textsuperscript{142} Casimiri, “‘Il Vittoria,’” 32. Stevenson, for example: “Tomás Luis de Victoria,” 19.
According to Session 23 of the Council of Trent, the age requirements for holy orders were as follows: subdeacon, 22 years; deacon, 23 years; priest, 25 years. Most candidates were ordained as priests at the minimum age or shortly thereafter; Victoria was approximately 27. The Council recommended that candidates remain at the levels of subdeacon and deacon for at least a year each, and they were requested to wait a year between taking the minor orders and any of the major orders.

In a sense, elevation to the priesthood signified the conclusion of a young man’s education and entry into adult society, much like preparation for non-ecclesiastical careers, such as the completion of an artisan’s apprenticeship. If the ordaining official felt the candidate was ready to serve the church, he could waive the requirements at his discretion, provided that two major orders, or the minor orders and subdeacon were not taken in a single day. Victoria’s presiding bishop was Thomas Goldwell, who performed the public ceremonies at the English College’s church, S. Thomas of Canterbury. Normally a candidate was ordained by the bishop presiding over his hometown, but this was easily addressed through special permission from the “home” bishop. It is likely that these sorts of dispensations were granted quite frequently in Rome, since hundreds of seminarians flocked to the city from all over Europe to pursue ecclesiastical study. Victoria’s choice of church for his ordination seems rather odd; S. Thomas was on the same street as Sta. Maria di Monserrato, his first place of employment and one of the Spanish national churches. Casimiri suggested that he chose this church because it bore his name, and perhaps due to its proximity to Sta. Maria di Monserrato, so that his friends and
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countrymen could be there to support him.\textsuperscript{145} Another possible reason is that S. Thomas was the church attached to the Jesuits’ English College.

Thus, while Victoria’s ordination process may seem unusual, it was not unprecedented, given the fact that he was well over the minimum age for all of the major orders and had grown up in close relationship with the church. Perhaps his studies and employment kept him from seeking the priesthood immediately upon reaching the minimum ages; he could have taken those teaching and performance jobs in order to support himself while hearing theology lectures or seeking a first benefice, a common path for many clerics.\textsuperscript{146}

\textbf{Activity Outside of the Roman College System}

Much of the information regarding Victoria’s dates of employment at various institutions outside the Jesuit educational system remains unclear. While Casimiri and Culley remain the most reliable sources of information regarding Victoria’s activity at the Jesuit colleges in Rome, Noel O’Regan’s work fills in a number of gaps, particularly with regard to the two Spanish churches, S. Maria di Monserrato and S. Giacomo degli Spagnoli; the Spanish Archconfraternity of the Resurrection, which was connected to S. Giacomo; and the church of S. Girolamo della Carità, where Victoria was employed as a chaplain.\textsuperscript{147} O’Regan suggests the composer spent the years following his ordination, 1575-1577, as full-time \textit{moderator musicae} at the German College, but found no archival data to support this supposition.\textsuperscript{148} It is known for certain that
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Victoria left the college sometime in 1577, and eventually took a non-musical chaplaincy at the church of S. Girolamo della Carità, where he remained until 1585.

_Santa Maria di Monserrato (c. 1569-1575)_

Victoria was employed as organist and singer at Santa Maria di Monserrato, from at least June of 1569. Pay records examined by Casimiri explicitly mention him between then and February 1570, but it is impossible to discern other periods of consistent employment by the church. Casimiri, and thus Stevenson, assumed Victoria ceased association with the church sometime in 1574. His periodic payments for festive occasions dissipate in that year, but records indicate payments to an anonymous organist and singer between February 1570 and 31 August 1575; Victoria could have been this unnamed musician. Nevertheless, the arrangement would have been difficult to maintain for long, due to his increased duties in multiple locations, so his association with the church must have been sporadic during this period. If Victoria did continue to serve at Sta. Maria until August 1575, his completion of the ordination process in the same month and the recent donation of the church of S. Apollinare to the German College might explain his departure, as his duties as _maestro_ of the college would likely have increased significantly, perhaps on par with the work of a full-time chapelmaster.

Victoria probably served Sta. Maria di Monserrato as a part-time _maestro_; his duties involved playing for Sundays and feasts, leading plainchant, and organizing music for special occasions. He earned one _scudo_ per month when he was employed on a regular basis, which amounted to about one-third of a chaplain’s salary and less than a third of what was paid to later
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During Victoria’s tenure S. Maria did not maintain a full-time choir, but the chaplains were responsible for singing plainchant; many Roman chaplains were capable of singing polyphony as well. Payment records for outside singers begin in the early 1580s, and extant accounts indicate that the chaplains would have been responsible for any special music until that point.\textsuperscript{152}

\textit{San Giacomo degli Spagnoli and the Archconfraternity of the Resurrection (c. 1573 – c. 1584)}

Victoria’s association with San Giacomo degli Spagnoli was less formal than his relationship with S. Maria di Monserrato. Most of the payment records connecting Victoria to the church are for organizing music for the Corpus Christi processions between 1573 and 1580, which he seems to have done each year apart from 1578; other payments were made to the composer for collections of music and other services as a singer. In contrast to the records of Sta. Maria di Monserrato, very little survives with regard to Victoria’s duties during his likely tenure, though he was also involved with the confraternity attached to the church. Like Sta. Maria, S. Giacomo did not maintain a professional choir, but employed singers from around the city for special events, particularly Spaniards from the papal chapel and elsewhere; evidently S. Giacomo was respected enough to regularly engage the papal choir for Mass on the feast of St. James, and many of the singers were involved in the Vespers services as well.\textsuperscript{153}

Victoria and the other most prominent Spanish musician active in Rome during the second half of the sixteenth century, Francisco de Soto (1534-1619), were both heavily involved in the Spanish Archconfraternity of the Resurrection, an organization attached to S. Giacomo
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degli Spagnoli. Soto sang in the papal choir, and his services as a virtuoso castrato remained in great demand to the turn of the century; he also wrote and performed laudi spirituali for Neri’s Congregation of the Oratory. Once Victoria returned to Spain he remained in contact with Soto, who served as liaison to his publishers in Rome.

O’Regan’s work shed new light on Victoria’s activities at the Spanish Archconfraternity, including a broad portrait of the confraternity’s celebration of large-scale feasts, which were among the grandest in the city. Confraternities became essential organizations in Rome during the post-Tridentine period, and they functioned in a manner similar to the medieval guild system; some were founded to support members of particular trades, others catered to different nationalities, some were exclusive to the nobility, and others were accessible to anyone, regardless of trade, nationality, or social stature.\(^\text{154}\) A confraternity provided numerous benefits for its members, including spiritual support, opportunities for fellowship, an early form of health and life insurance, and offered essential social services that were beyond the capabilities of the Papal State. Indeed, the church encouraged the growth of the organizations, as their aims conveniently aligned with the Council of Trent’s emphasis on good works done by individuals, rather than by the church as an entity.\(^\text{155}\) Many confraternities focused on a specific charity in the manner of monastic orders, such as running hospitals or providing lodging, meals, and tour services to the thousands of pilgrims who flocked to Rome. The Archconfraternity of the Resurrection tended to the sick and imprisoned, particularly those from the Iberian Peninsula.

The Archconfraternity chose several major feasts to observe, including its namesake Feast of the Resurrection, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and Corpus Christi, and they elected
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to observe the Forty Hours Devotion semiannually. The tradition of the Forty Hours Devotion began in Milan during the sixteenth century; the vigil represented the 40 hours Christ spent entombed and featured the exposed Sacrament. The Spanish confraternity’s observations of the Forty Hours began and ended with a sung Mass and procession of the Sacrament during which litanies were sung. The primary musical feature in the Spanish observation of the Forty Hours was the performance of a *Salve Regina* each evening; on both occasions for which Victoria provided music, he was paid enough for up to eight singers. Victoria rarely set non-mass texts multiple times, but four settings of the *Salve Regina* survive, scored for five to eight voices. Based upon available data, O’Regan assumed the Masses were not High, thus only motets would have been sung by the choir; numerous motets by Victoria would be appropriate for the setting.

These practices reflect those common to most Roman churches and devotional societies. Most of the confraternity’s activities were contained in a meeting space adjacent to the church of S. Giacomo, but they also maintained a chapel within the church. The records for the church and confraternity survive together, and many of the same people appear in both, but accounts appear to have been maintained separately; it is clear that the confraternity organized and financed the celebrations on Easter Sunday and the two yearly observations of the Forty Hours Devotion, while the church accounts covered the remainder of the special events, including S. Giacomo’s patronal feast of St. James, the feast of St. Ildephonse, the Corpus Christi procession, and observation of significant political events, such as royal births. These activities often involved large public processions and always included music.
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S. Giacomo and the Archconfraternity of the Resurrection did not maintain full-time choirs during the sixteenth century, but hired musicians for special occasions. Daily operations were carried out by a team of chaplains. Victoria’s involvement is reflected by evidence of his participation in a variety of activities, concentrated most heavily during the years 1583 and 1584. O’Regan hesitated to explicitly state that Victoria ever formally joined the confraternity; however, records suggest he must have been at least briefly tied to the organization, since he was present at meetings to elect officers in 1583 and 1584 and participated as one of the four visitors to the sick in 1583. Victoria’s diligence in this task is evident in the Cuentas, which record over two dozen payments to the needy, all signed by the composer himself.\textsuperscript{159} Victoria’s association with the Archconfraternity either waned or completely ended in 1584; Soto began to receive and disburse similar payments, so it appears he must have taken over Victoria’s duties as caregiver.

Much like the Jesuit colleges in Rome, the confraternities viewed music as an effective tool for attracting attention; the organizations competed to put on the grandest spectacle on large-scale feast days. These often involved processions, which required hiring multiple choirs to sing along the route. The Spaniards staged opulent processions from at least the early 1570s; the German national church acknowledged that it could not compete with the spectacles at S. Giacomo, and eventually decided to postpone their Corpus Christi procession until the Castilian church finished theirs, as they wished to attract a respectable number of cardinals upon their departure from S. Giacomo.\textsuperscript{160}

It is during this period that the composer’s activities suggest his intent to retire to Spain. Victoria expressed his desire to return home to live a contemplative life in his 1583 print dedication to Philip II, and he gradually collected non-resident benefices during his Roman life.
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career, which would have made this move feasible; however, the process of securing stable income via benefices was far from uncommon for foreign clerics.161 O’Regan observed that around 1583, Victoria’s connections to the Spanish community in Rome become more evident, and he presumes this indicates his “nostalgia and desire to bring his extended sojourn in Italy to an end.”162

S. Girolamo della Carità and the Compagnia della Carità (c. 1578 – c. 1585)

Victoria was employed as a chaplain by the church of San Girolamo della Carità and joined the confraternity attached to the church, the Compagnia della Carità. O’Regan is the first to thoroughly explore the composer’s relationship with these two entities, and to acknowledge that they were technically separate from each other, much like the church of S. Giacomo degli Spagnoli and the Archconfraternity of the Resurrection. The Compagnia was founded for foreign noblemen by Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici, and in the 1550s membership expanded to non-Romans associated with the papal court, as well as foreign merchants; the confraternity became extremely popular with Tuscans and Spaniards after this point. In 1524 the founder, now Pope Clement VII, donated the church of S. Girolamo to the institution and requested that the church employ chaplains unaffiliated with any particular order.163 Most biographers, including Stevenson, accept Casimiri’s assertion that Victoria occupied one of these chaplaincies from 1578 until 1585; however, the records associated with Victoria are extremely unclear. Only the departure year can be confirmed, since confraternity meeting minutes indicate that a new church
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chaplain was elected to replace him on 7 May 1585. While he probably joined the confraternity either on 8 June 1578 or 21 December 1581, the first clear reference to Victoria as a chaplain of the church dates from a salary notice of January 1583. O’Regan suggests that he became a chaplain sometime after joining the confraternity.

The chaplains’ duties, as well as their strictly regulated lifestyle, closely parallel those followed at Descalzas Reales in Madrid; the priests were responsible for the daily Mass and Offices, solemn Masses on Sundays and other feasts, hearing confessions, and charitable work. Chaplains at S. Girolamo were paid six scudi per month, which was one of the highest paid chaplain’s salaries in Rome, and on par with the income of a high-profile maestro di cappella. The fragmented church records indicate little regarding music for special occasions, but it is evident that neither the church nor the confraternity employed a regular choir, though it did pay an organist. Since he would not have been burdened with the activities of a full-time maestro position, it is not surprising that these were some of Victoria’s most prolific years as regards composition and publication.

Contrary to popular belief, Victoria was never a member of St. Philip Neri’s Congregation of the Oratory. The Congregation was founded for secular priests in the 1550s and was originally housed at S. Girolamo della Carità, but its location transferred to a building next to S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini in 1574, and finally to S. Maria in Vallicella in 1577. Neri occupied a room in the chaplains’ quarters at S. Girolamo until 1583, so there may have been a short period of overlap in which the two may have become acquainted, but it is impossible to prove
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any spiritual mentorship on Neri’s part. In addition, had Victoria formally joined the Congregation of the Oratory, he would have been required to reside with its members. Early biographers likely associated Victoria with the Congregation and Neri because of Paolo Aringhi’s 1662 manuscript biography of Francisco de Soto, which claimed that Neri “hoped to receive Victoria into his community so that he might compose music for its spiritual exercises but that the composer had gone to Spain and not returned.” In subsequent versions, “hoped to receive” was changed to “had been received.”

Lack of Religious Affiliation

From his youth Victoria maintained a close relationship with the Society of Jesus, a bond that has heretofore been mentioned in the secondary biographical literature but not examined thoroughly; he never professed as a Jesuit, and several factors may explain his avoidance of ties to this and any other monastic, mendicant, or other religious order. The composer was ordained as a priest during his tenure as maestro of the German College, and he took those vows at the English College, another of the Roman institutions under the auspices of the Jesuit Order.

Since Victoria was educated at and employed by a Jesuit school it may seem surprising that he did not become a member of the Order, but this is easily explained by the Society’s stance toward music, particularly where its colleges and churches were concerned. According to period correspondence examined by Frank Kennedy, the Jesuit superiors maintained a position of extreme caution toward musical activity for at least the first hundred years of the Society’s existence. Ignatius initially sought to ban music entirely from professed houses; musical

---

168 Stevenson stated that “Victoria therefore lived on terms of daily intimacy with this remarkable spiritual leader during half a decade,” as he assumed he became a chaplain in 1578 (“Tomás Luis de Victoria,” 19).
170 Ibid. O’Regan views these later drafts as even less credible since they refer to the composer as “Giovanni Victoria.”
instruments were not allowed on the premises, and he obtained papal exemption from chanting the Divine Office. Jesuit fathers still were responsible for reciting the Office in private, but Ignatius’s rationale was that the traditional, inwardly-focused monastic work conflicted with the decidedly outward functions of the Order. Novices and prospective clergy attended Jesuit schools to be trained as missionaries and priests, not as musicians, and were taught to live in asceticism. The observance of the Mass and Offices were to reflect the austerity of the organization as well.

Some of the earliest leaders of the Society regarded music as frivolous and prone to promoting a sense of levity or sensuality unwelcome in Jesuit houses, but the organization maintained a pragmatic stance because music proved an essential tool for the attraction and edification of souls during an epoch in which the Catholic church desperately needed to preserve and grow its membership. In most cases Jesuit schools featured polyphony and falsobordone on important feasts and at public ceremonies. The colleges were instructed to maintain a sense of gravity and solemnity, and the music performed should conform to those standards. Since the faculties of the colleges were exclusively tied to the Order they were discouraged from musical involvement of any sort; schools hired non-Jesuit chapelmasters and singing teachers to avoid any conflict of interest. Therefore, Victoria’s decision to remain unaffiliated makes practical sense: if he professed, the decision would potentially limit his employment options. This rationalization seems even more plausible when considering his associations with various Roman churches and their adjacent confraternities, as many organizations barred members from involvement in the musical activity of the attached church, and Victoria seemed to offer his services quite freely.
Another possible reason for Victoria’s decision to remain unaffiliated with the Jesuit Order may be the lengthy process to which novices were subjected; a two-year novitiate followed the first vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience, and then the Order’s leadership would decide whether the candidate would continue training as a “scholastic” (one who joined the priesthood) or a lay brother. Scholastics then spent approximately three years studying philosophy, and another four years in theology, and these periods were interrupted by a period of service to the Society that generally involved teaching at one of the schools, performing spiritual exercises, and making a final set of vows to the Order.\(^\text{171}\)

Victoria’s decision was most likely driven by financial considerations; Jesuits were not allowed to take beneficed positions, including parish posts, because the steady income source went against the vow of poverty.\(^\text{172}\) By 1579 Victoria was collecting benefices in excess of 307 ducados annually (115,125 mrs), and continued to amass funds over the next twenty years.\(^\text{173}\) As will be discussed in Chapter Four, the composer also devoted much of his time to publication of his works, many of which were dedicated to wealthy and powerful figures who theoretically would have contributed financially; however, there is evidence suggesting Victoria also paid for some of them himself, indicating some financial stability on his part. Even if he did print at his own expense, Victoria marketed his prints well and likely saw a satisfying return on his investment.

\(^{171}\) Wright, *God’s Soldiers*, 49.
CHAPTER 3
FROM ROME TO MADRID: VICTORIA’S FINAL YEARS

Very little has been done to illuminate the final portion of Victoria’s career upon his return to Spain. He actively expressed a desire to “retire” at home as early as 1581, and increasingly sought the companionship of other Spaniards during much of his adult career in Rome. Reliance upon secondary sources for information regarding the composer’s Spanish career is problematic, as the date of his return and many of the details of his employment in Madrid are either unknown or difficult to clarify. Most contemporary biographers rely on Stevenson’s assessment of this period in Victoria’s life, which is largely based upon Pedrell, whose access to primary sources was limited. Based on a re-examination of these relatively scarce materials, it is now possible to determine that Victoria returned to Spain sometime in 1585 and subsequently gained employment in the Empress María’s household around 1587. Her household was adjacent to the cloistered areas of the Descalzas Reales convent, and the two entities seem to have maintained a flexible and close relationship with regard to liturgical practice. Victoria obtained one of the Empress’s endowed chaplaincies in 1603, if not earlier, and became convent organist around 1604; he remained in these posts until his death on 27 August 1611.¹ His death record indicates that he lived in a house among the collection of chaplains’ quarters on nearby Calle Arenal.

Victoria’s Return to Spain

On the surface, a return to Madrid seems an odd career move for an internationally famous composer such as Victoria; he had become well-respected as a maestro for the highly visible special occasions in Rome, amassed a collection of absentee benefices, and obtained a

¹ Parroquia de San Ginés, *Libro segundo de difuntos*, 93v-94r.
full-time chaplaincy with a salary equivalent to those of the top *maestro di cappella* positions in Rome. Victoria could have sought a post in the Sistine choir or the Cappella Giulia, or remained at one of the Jesuit institutions, but does not seem to have been interested in such high-profile musical posts. His motivations, outside of his claimed desire to live a quiet life in his native country, remain unclear; however, a number of elements emerge as potential motivators.

First, Victoria may have yearned to be closer to his family, and particularly his siblings. He spent his entire adult life in Italy, while much of his family remained in Ávila, Valladolid, and Madrid. Madrid was an obvious choice for his resettlement, due to the presence of the Habsburg court and its potential for patronage opportunities. In addition, six of his nine surviving siblings either lived in Madrid or at least did business there at some point. The two brothers who ran a bank, Antonio Suárez de Victoria and Juan Luis de Victoria, opened a branch in the capital after leaving Medina del Campo. Their two sisters, María Suárez de Victoria and María de la Cruz (Suárez de) Victoria, both died in Madrid. María de la Cruz lived in Valladolid with their guardian uncle until his death in 1602. Perhaps the most important connections between the Victoria family and the city of Madrid were those forged by another pair of brothers, Agustín Suárez de Victoria and Gregorio Suárez de Victoria. Gregorio was in the service of a court secretary; more significantly, Agustín obtained a position as one of the Empress María’s chaplains and moved to Madrid in 1585, after obtaining degrees at the University of Salamanca and serving a number of aristocrats.

A second possible motivator may have been his ties to the Jesuits: Victoria could have seen potential for employment in Madrid’s Jesuit community. The Order opened a college in the city in 1572, which grew steadily during the last three decades of the sixteenth century; in 1573, the Madrid Colegio de la Compañía de Jesus taught more than 300 students, and by 1598, the
number had grown to 750. The institution supported student devotional congregations along the lines of those active in Rome, and maintained a collegiate church, which took part in civic processions and regularly hosted the monarchs.

Like the Roman College, the Colegio employed prominent scholars and drew students from the upper echelons of society; among its alumni were important cultural figures such as Lope de Vega. The college fostered a vibrant devotional and creative atmosphere, where students and instructors alike were involved in public processions and daily Masses, theatrical productions, and poetry recitations. Unfortunately, very little survives to illuminate the liturgical and musical practices of the college during the period in question. It is clear that there was musical activity and that the royal chapel participated on occasions at which the monarch was present, such as the particularly opulent feast of St. Ignatius Loyola on 15 November 1609, a celebration of the saint’s beatification. During the days surrounding the feast the Jesuit provincial administrator was present, as were the monarchs, the papal nuncio, a multitude of prelates, and a large proportion of the royal court. During the first Vespers of the feast, Philip III’s Jesuit court preacher, Pedro de Ribadeneira, delivered the sermon, and a good deal of music was provided by the singers and instrumentalists of the Capilla Real: “The singers and instrumentalists of the Royal Chapel sang all of it [music] in four choirs with great solemnity; they sang very lovely villancicos of our holy Father, with new words and music...” A massive celebration in the streets followed, involving singers and instrumentalists from all over the city.

Upon the Empress María’s death, the college formally became known as the Colegio Imperial, as she bequeathed a sizeable proportion of her estate to the institution. In return, the

---

3 José Simón Díaz, *Relaciones breves de actos públicos celebrados en Madrid de 1541 a 1650* (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Madrileños, 1982), 70: “cantaronlas todos los cantores y ministirles de la Capilla real a 4 coros con toda solemnidad, cantaron mui lindos villancicos de nuestro santo Padre con letras y tonos nuevos...”
college hosted funeral services, and it is possible that Victoria’s expansion of his *Officium defunctorum* was intended for this event. No extant archival material connects Victoria with the Jesuit institutions in Madrid; however, the libraries and archives of the Society were partially dispersed at the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain in the eighteenth century, which may explain the dearth of information regarding the first hundred years of the Colegio Imperial’s existence and the corresponding lack of musical detail.  

Members of the Jesuit Order enjoyed close contact with the various Habsburg courts in Madrid. Philip II may not have bestowed particular favor upon the Order, but he did support their initial expansion into Spain during the 1560s, and in turn they supported his claims to the Portuguese throne. By the time the Jesuits came under intense scrutiny by the Inquisition in the late 1580s, the king had distanced himself from the organization but still maintained close relationships with individual members. Philip III employed a Jesuit preacher, and his queen brought Richard Haller, an influential Jesuit confessor, when she arrived from Germany. Haller never held any political position at court, but as the queen’s confessor he brought concerns of the Austrian Habsburgs to members of the bureaucracy and formed a close relationship with Philip III’s *limosnero* and *capellán mayor*, Don Diego de Guzmán, who served as *capellán mayor* at Descalzas Reales. Guzmán was also a member of the Jesuit Order; he worked closely with Haller and frequently confided in him.

---

4 This is supported by Nemesio Otaño, “Los últimos años de Victoria en Madrid,” *Revista Musical Ilustrada Ritmo*, Año XI, Núm. 141 (Dec. 1940): 105-06. He suggests that perhaps the Empress’s records were stored at the Colegio Imperial after her death, and that is why records regarding her personal chapel do not survive.


7 Ibid., 16-17.
Maria maintained close ties to Jesuit institutions in Austrian Habsburg lands and provided them with political and financial assistance. Furthermore, her *mayordomo mayor*, Juan de Borja, was the son of Don Francisco de Borja, the third General of the Society. Don Juan was educated by the Jesuits in Gandía and remained supportive of Jesuit efforts, as did his nephew, the Duke of Lerma. Nemesio Otaño suggested that Victoria may have made his connection with the Empress through his network of Jesuit friends and employers, and cited her affinity for Jesuit causes as a means through which Victoria gained employment in Madrid. This connection is quite plausible: given Victoria’s propensity to forge relationships with important persons and previous connections to the Jesuits, someone in the Order’s hierarchy could have easily recommended the composer for the position. Monarchs and church officials alike requested names from trusted colleagues when faced with the need to fill an empty post; for example, the papal nuncio in Madrid relied on Victoria to examine two potential candidates for a soprano post in the papal choir, and sent his recommendations along on 26 February 1587.

In addition to potential employment via the Jesuits, Victoria probably recognized the patronage potential of residency in the seat of the Habsburg court: not only was Madrid home to María’s small extension of the Imperial court of the family’s Austrian branch, but Philip II made his home there, as did the thousands of people associated with his household. Castilian nobility sought to exude a sense of liberality with their expenditures on art, music, architecture, and charity, as these things connoted power and influence. Philip II himself was a keen collector of

---

9 Otaño, 105-06.
art, books, and scientific instruments, and spent the bulk of his reign attending to personal building programs, including the vast monastery at El Escorial.

Finally, Victoria may have sought Madrid as a new home due to potential for “quiet” jobs, supplemented by royal or noble patronage. At the time of his return to Spain, the monarchy and nobility were actively involved in founding and supporting religious institutions as part of their cultivation of a pious image. Philip II founded and financially supported numerous institutions, including his flagship monastery at El Escorial, as well as Descalzas Reales. Philip III continued the trend of religious patronage, as did his privado, or royal favorite, who founded several religious establishments in his ducal seat of Lerma. Madrid was especially permeated by the presence of religious and charitable establishments representing nearly every order: between the court’s arrival in 1561 and Philip II’s death in 1598, 32 new institutions were founded, and the monarch was directly involved in many of these projects. 11 Philip II maintained a close hand in the administration of Descalzas Reales and often overrode the ayuntamiento’s objections to the foundation of new institutions; for example, he supported the foundation of Madrid’s Jesuit house in 1572 when some council members disapproved. 12 Religious houses and charities offered social services the city government and infrastructure were unable to handle. Institutions like Descalzas operated schools for orphaned girls, charity hospitals, and provided housing and food for the poor, as food shortages were frequent. All of these institutions hired chaplains out of necessity: the parishes of the city were overwhelmed, and the convents, churches, and chapels needed priests to fulfill their daily religious programs. This situation sounds similar to the atmosphere Victoria experienced in Rome, where thousands of people were in need of physical and spiritual edification. A chaplaincy along the lines of the one he occupied in Rome would

12 Ibid., 141.
seem a logical choice if one were to assume the Jesuit spirit of outward charity made a lasting impact on the composer.

Victoria’s Arrival in Spain: 1585

The date of Victoria’s departure for Madrid has long been a subject of contention; most recent biographers estimate his arrival in Madrid between 1585 and 1587, whereas the opinions of earlier scholars vary widely, based upon their access to archival materials. As stated above, the composer’s desire to return to Spain and live a quiet, contemplative life was expressed in the dedicatory epistle at the head of his 1583 print, the only volume he dedicated to Philip II. This dedication frequently emerges in discussion of Victoria’s apparent disregard for high-profile music positions upon his return to the Iberian Peninsula. A number of early scholars, working without the benefit of access to Spanish archival documents, assumed the composer remained in Rome until the 1590s, or even later. Three pieces of evidence were cited by Casimiri, Anglés, and Pedrell: the printed dedication to Victoria’s 1592 book of masses, allegedly signed in Rome on 13 November; references to a “lost” motet, Surge Debora, performed at the German College in July 1593; and a letter sent in January 1594 from Philip II to the Spanish ambassador in Rome, requesting 150 ducados in benefice money to be given to Victoria. The same documents have been cited by nearly every prominent biographer, including Stevenson, as evidence suggesting the composer made relatively frequent trips between Madrid and Rome.

The last concrete evidence of Victoria’s presence in Rome dates from the spring of 1585; most biographers claim that the composer departed for Madrid on 7 May.¹³ This date may be

¹³ For instance, Anglés (“Victoria, Tomás Luis de,” 2222), Casimiri (Raffaele Casimiri, “‘Il Vittoria’: Nuovi documenti per una biografia sincera de Tommaso Ludovico de Victoria,” Note d’archivio 11/2 (April-June 1934): 45), and Rubio (“A los 350 años,” 161) agree on this matter; Pedrell (and subsequently a number of those who cite him heavily) assumed he stayed in Rome until at least 1592, citing the dedication to his second book of masses
explained by evidence in the archives of his final place of Roman employment. On 30 April 1585 a “P. Victorius Hispanus” gave a green antependium to the church of S. Girolamo della Carità. Noel O’Regan suggests that this was his “parting gift” to the institution. Finally, confraternity meeting records indicate that a chaplain was elected to replace Victoria on 7 May 1585; thus, it is relatively safe to assume the composer had departed for Spain at this point, or at least made his plans clear.

When considering Victoria’s arrival date in Spain and his potential subsequent trips between Madrid and Rome, the state of travel during the early modern era must be addressed, as the process was complicated. Travel over modern land routes between the two cities spans a distance of over 1,200 miles of varied and rough terrain; the journey would have been arduous and costly during Victoria’s lifetime. One might encounter dangers, such as poor weather or bandits, and depending upon the state of affairs between Spain and France, military activity could impede travel, and the borders could be controlled extremely tightly. Most people were wary of traveling at night for these reasons, and there was no guarantee that a town’s gates would be open late at night, nor that there would be boarding houses or inns willing to accept new travelers. Some national or territorial borders maintained customs controls, and some did not; most travelers needed to endure the hassle of obtaining a “passport” permitting entry to their final destination, a document akin to a modern visa, and some countries required exit permits as well. Italian cities generally required a certificate of health obtained in the prior place of residence, and some travel necessitated a letter of recommendation from someone with the

(Felipe Pedrell, Tomás Luis de Victoria Abulense: Biografía, bibliografía significado estético de todas sus obras de arte polifónico-religioso (Valencia: Manuel Villar, 1918; Reprint, Valladolid: Editorial Maxtor, 2011), 79). Stevenson claimed that 1586 was the most likely year of Victoria’s return, and stated that he came into the employ of the Empress in that year (Robert M. Stevenson, “Tomás Luis de Victoria: Unique Spanish Genius,” Inter-American Music Review 12/1 (Fall/Winter 1991): 22).

15 Ibid., 412.
proper connections. Lodging could be expensive as well; however, clerics generally had an easier time locating lodging, as convents, monasteries, and other religious houses opened their doors to other servants of the church, often for free.

By the end of the sixteenth century, many travelers chose to make their journeys by stagecoach, horse, or hired private coach. Coaches routinely broke down, and the pace at which they traveled was sometimes just as slow as walking, depending upon the terrain. At their fastest, quality horses such as those used along the more efficient postal routes could cover anywhere from 45-100 miles per day, but this pace is unsustainable without frequent changes in mount. Unless a traveler was in a particular hurry, such distances were rare, and many stopped in various towns for longer than an overnight stay. Post horses and private coaches were the most expensive options, but a stagecoach ride was relatively cheap and accessible to most social classes.

Hans Khevenhüller’s diary provides enlightening information regarding travel during the late sixteenth century; for example, his work as Imperial ambassador took him into the German Habsburg territories during much of 1592 and 1593, and he frequently details the number of miles traveled per day. The highest mileages he estimates are in the mid-teens, and more often the numbers are less than ten, due to mountainous terrain and poor weather. His chronicle of the return trip to Madrid indicates that the topography and weather must have been friendlier, as it took from 13 April to 4 May 1593 to reach the capital from Barcelona: approximately three weeks. Along modern travel routes, the distance is about 385 miles; thus, the party averaged roughly 17 miles per day.

A swifter estimate of standard travel pace may be the Spanish mission system in the territory of California: the fathers requested that the chain of religious houses be placed no

---

further than a day’s journey apart, an average distance of 30 miles. If Victoria were to travel 1,200 miles by land, the journey would take at least 40 days, if not a full six weeks or longer. This was an undertaking that seems out of the realm of comfort—and possibility—for most people to consider on a frequent basis.\(^{18}\) If he traveled by sea, the journey would have been just as arduous, more dependent upon weather conditions, and perhaps more dangerous. For instance, during the late 1580s, Francisco Guerrero made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land; he sailed from Venice on 14 August 1588. He returned to Venice on 9 January 1589, remained in the city roughly six weeks to supervise forthcoming publications, then sailed from Genoa to Marseilles, a trip during which the ship was boarded by pirates on two occasions. After a brief stop at Montserrat upon his return to the Iberian Peninsula, Guerrero returned to his post at Seville by 9 August 1589.\(^{19}\) Thus, Guerrero’s return trip from Venice took approximately five months. Once Victoria was connected with the Empress’s extension of the Imperial court in Madrid, a similar trip, albeit between Madrid and Rome, might have been simplified due to the resources of the household; however, this was still an undertaking that would have required a significant time commitment.

Victoria’s presence in Madrid is first suggested by a reference in the *Libros de sacrístia* of Descalzas Reales, dated 15 January 1586. Alonso López, one of the senior chaplains of the convent, noted that he purchased three of Victoria’s prints. This is the earliest reference to Victoria in the convent’s records, and also the first record of payment to a specific composer:

I, Alonso López, chaplain of the royal chapel of the Most Serene Princess who is in glory, state that I received from said chest 20 *ducados in reales* that value 7,480 *maravedis*, which are to pay Tomé de Victoria, *maestro de capilla*, for three books: one of masses, one of motets, and one of the Office of Holy Week…they are for the service

\(^{18}\) For an excellent summary of travel conditions, see Maczak.  
of the chapel…I sign in my name and hand on 15 January 1586. The books are of polyphony.  

The items purchased by the convent correspond to volumes noted in the various inventories of the Descalzas music archive, and the prints were placed in the convent’s working collection. The mass book is most likely the 1583 edition; the motet collection and “oficio de la semana santa” are those printed in 1585, just prior to Victoria’s return to Spain. While it is not certain that the composer presented these works to the convent in person, it is plausible: if Victoria departed Rome at the beginning of May 1585, he could have reached Madrid as early as mid-June. The reference to Victoria as maestro de capilla cannot be explained, as there is no evidence of his employment at this point; however, he was frequently referred to as maestro or maestro de capilla in a variety of documents scattered across the Iberian Peninsula and Italy, regardless of his current employment situation. In fact, one capitular record from Toledo refers to the composer as “maestro de capilla de su santidad,” and another indicates that he was the king’s maestro, both of which seem to have been based on rumor. The language is similarly confusing when dealing with documents issued during his tenure as María’s chaplain and as organist of Descalzas Reales, where he is also frequently referred to as maestro de capilla even though there is no evidence that he ever held this title; perhaps this was a gesture of respect for the composer.

Further evidence suggesting Victoria’s presence in central Spain stems from capitular documents unearthed by Ferreol Hernández in Ávila. As of 3 March 1586, the chapter declared the organist’s position vacant, as Hernán Ruiz de Segura had left his duties without permission.

20 RB, Descalzas Reales MD/F/8, fol. 66r: “Digo yo alonso lopez capellan de la capilla rreal de la serenisima princesa que sea en gloria que rezebi de la dicha arca de los dichos beinte ducados En reales que balen siete mill y quatrocientos y ochenta mrs los quales son por [tem...] que pague a tome de bitoria maestro de capilla por tres libros uno de misas y otro de motetes y otro del oficio de la semana santa [...] son para el servicio de la dicha capilla…lo firme de mi nombre y mano A 15 de henero de 1586 los quales libros son de canto de organo.”

21 A further reference to these prints is Ibid., fol. 68v, which indicates that López paid for the binding of the volumes on 25 June 1586.

22 The Toledo document dated 12 Sept 1585 was copied by Francisco Barbieri in Apuntes biograficos de diversas personas, cartas y otros documentos, recopilados por Francisco A. Barbieri (BNE, MSS/14047/12) fol. 1r.
The chapter requested a new nomination within 30 days, and evidently did not obtain one; their difficulties in filling the position continued for months, as they received a recommendation from “Maestro” Victoria on 8 August 1586. While this does not prove the composer’s physical presence in Spain, it seems more likely that he would be prepared to evaluate and send a recommendation to Ávila from nearby, rather than from Rome. Musicians tended to travel from Spain to Rome in search of employment, rather than the reverse.

Victoria’s presence in Madrid is unequivocally proven by a letter he wrote to Giovanni Giovenale Ancina on 17 October 1586. The original is not extant, but a copy survives in the archives of the Congregation of the Oratory in Rome; the composer’s brother, Giovanni Matteo Ancina, most likely copied the contents before forwarding the letter to Giovenale. Giovenale Ancina penned the Latin epigram included at the head of Victoria’s 1585a motet collection, which was dedicated to the Duke of Savoy, and the two clearly forged a close relationship. Ancina was a highly educated man who initially came to Rome in 1574 as the Duke of Savoy’s ambassador; he became acquainted with S. Philip Neri in 1576 and joined the Congregation of the Oratory four years later. At the time of Victoria’s letter, Ancina had just been sent by Neri to assist at the newly formed house of the Oratorians in Naples. He emerges as a significant propagator of Counter-Reform ideals via his support of religious poetry and music, so Victoria’s mention of the reception of the 1585 collection, plus the connections to the Duchy of Savoy, are unsurprising.

24 Alfonso de Vicente, Tomás Luis de Victoria: Cartas (1582-1606). Edición, notas y un ensayo previo a cargo de Alfonso de Vicente (Madrid: Fundación Caja Madrid, 2008), 65.
This letter, which is by far the most personal of any of the surviving materials connected to the composer, expresses Victoria’s longing for the Eternal City, and in particular for the “sweet conversations” he enjoyed with the fathers of the Oratory. It also indicates that Victoria had been in Madrid long enough to receive a letter from Rome and then respond to it. While Victoria never joined the Congregation, this letter supports Padre Aringhi’s claim that Philip Neri intended to receive him as a member, perhaps to serve in some form as a resident composer, similar to Soto’s relationship with the institution. He stated that he wished to return to Rome in order to end his days there, which is a bit surprising, given his previous (and similar) claims regarding his homeland. The translation is as follows:

I have received the letter from Your Lordship with great contentment, knowing of your good health and the state of things in that holy house, which our Lord [may] conserve many years. I still [am here], by the grace of the Lord, and in fact miss the sweet conversation of the fathers, and I am not far from returning to that holy city to die in it, as Father Filippo promised a place for me. In this court, and in Spain, they have liked my books, and the King especially liked them, particularly his [book] and the Duke of Savoy’s and his daughter the Infanta’s; he read the dedication, which has pleased them all very much. And the Duke is very inclined to do great favors for your Lordship and for me.26

Victoria may have never returned to Rome, and perhaps at this point his spirits were low due to job woes or he simply wished to extend polite sentiments to a friend who did not understand why he chose to leave the city; in most of his correspondence, particularly after his return to Spain, the composer referenced his current employment situation, most often in the addition of the title “capellán de la emperatriz” below his signature. Even in his earliest letters sent from Rome in 1582 and 1583 to the chapters of Seville and Jaén, respectively, he purposely aligns himself with the recipient by referring to himself as “su capellán” or “capellán de Vuestra Señoría,” as he had obtained absentee titles from these churches by this point in his career. The letter to Ancina is the only case in which he did not imply some sort of financial connection to an

26 Original in Vicente, Tomás Luis de Victoria: Cartas, 63-64; translation mine.
institution or indication of his current employment status. Victoria had not yet obtained permanent employment in the Habsburg capital, as will be explained below, and perhaps this letter reflects his discouragement with the process.

**Potential Absences from Madrid: The Early 1590s**

Victoria may have traveled to Rome during the 1590s, a scenario that is plausible, but only supported by circumstantial evidence. One of the few documents that affirms the composer’s presence in Madrid during much of the 1590s is dated 4 March 1591, when he served as godfather at the baptism of his niece in the San Ginés parish. Three pieces of information have suggested to numerous Victoria scholars that the composer took either multiple trips back to Rome in the intervening years, or perhaps one long sojourn. First, there is the issue of the second book of masses, dedicated to the Archduke (then Cardinal) Albert of Austria, the Empress María’s favorite son. Biographers as early as Pedrell have frequently noted the date on the printed dedication, 13 November 1592, as evidence of Victoria’s presence in Rome, and assumed that the composer himself spent a significant amount of time in the city in order to prepare the edition for publication. Unfortunately, there is much scholars do not understand regarding the dedication process for a print, or patterns of publishing patronage; most formal dedication language seems rather formulaic and follows a pattern of laudatory writing common in humanistic circles, so it is impossible to assume the dedicatory epistle was penned by the composer himself. While a sizeable gap in protocol and Spanish capitular records would support this scenario, there is no irrefutable evidence that Victoria ever returned to Rome. He easily

---

28 This stance is supported by Stevenson, in an effort to emphasize the sense of freedom Victoria enjoyed while in the employ of the Empress (Stevenson, “Tomás Luis de Victoria,” 24).
could have relayed information via a proxy, such as Francisco de Soto, who frequently handled his legal and monetary affairs after his departure for Spain.

The second piece of evidence frequently used to prove Victoria’s presence in Rome comes from 18 July 1593. The diary of the German College rector includes an account of a celebration in the church of S. Apollinare in commemoration of a military victory over the Turks at the Croatian fortress of Sisech, of which word had reached Rome on 7 July. On this festive occasion a Te Deum was performed, and the college choir sang alongside outside singers during the Mass, which included a performance of a new motet written for the occasion. Casimiri, the source for many subsequent biographers, stated: “canto un nuovo mottetto di Vittoria, sopra le parole del libro de’ Giudici Surge Debora et loquere canticum,” a motet that does not survive in any of Victoria’s printed works, nor in manuscript sources. Casimiri cites the short turnaround time as evidence that Victoria must not have been in Madrid at this point; it would be impossible for the college to send a request from Rome, allot time for the composition of a brand new motet, then allow for its arrival back at the German College and preparations by the musicians. However, a letter Victoria wrote from Madrid disproves this notion: the composer sent prints to Jaén from the Habsburg capital on 20 July 1593, which indicates that he could not have been in Rome at that point.

Moreover, the wording of Casimiri’s paraphrase—and Stevenson’s subsequent translation—suggests a misreading of the account. Note Stevenson’s translation:

Outside singers were invited to sing at Mass, and very beautifully, etc. After dinner, before commencing Vespers, a solemn Te Deum was chanted. At Vespers (as at Mass in the morning), a new Victoria [or, victory] motet was sung, with text from the Book of

---

30 This point is supported by Stevenson. Some recent biographies include this information, including Ana María Sabe Andreu, Tomás Luis de Victoria, pasión por la música (Ávila: Diputación de Ávila, Institución Gran Duque de Alba, 2008), 151. However, she still assumes he wrote this motet.
Judges [5:12], *Surge Debora et loquere canticum*, which seemed to the cardinals present and all the rest who heard it very a propos.\(^{31}\)

The temptation to use the account as evidence of Victoria’s presence in the city, or at least of his continued strength of reputation, is understandable. However, I posit an alternative reading, based upon Stevenson’s parenthetical remark: this appears to be a misreading of the text, as it is more reasonable to assume the author heard a “victory motet” written in honor of a military victory, rather than a “new Victoria motet,” as the composer’s name and “victory” are rendered in the same spelling in Italian. The more likely scenario is that the current *maestro di cappella* of the German College, Ruggiero Giovannelli, wrote the new work; unfortunately, a *Surge Debora* by this composer does not survive either.

A final piece of information cited as proof of Victoria’s presence in Rome stems from a royal request by Philip II, to his ambassador in Rome, the Duke of Sesa, for a transfer of benefice money in excess of 150 *ducados* (56,250 *mrs*) in favor of the composer. Accounts of this document are frequently misread, as it is assumed that this was an expedited request for funding the composer’s expenses in Rome.\(^{32}\) Upon further scrutiny, it is clear this was a request for papal sanction of the transfer:

Duke-Cousin: On 11 December of last year I sent you a presentation of the bishopric of Cordoba by the Bishop of Calahorra, Don Pedro Portocarrero, with a charge of 12,800 *ducados* that I enjoined as pension, 12,400 that were understood as old, and 400 that were new charges; and within these 12,400 *ducados* in old pensions were included 150 belonging to Juan Martinez de la Fuente, cleric, as you have seen through the certification that was with it, signed by Francisco Goncalez. We have now learned that he was deceased, and now understand that at the time that you sent said revenues, it had already been some days since the said Juan Martinez had died, and I have to provide the said 150 *ducados*; and I indicated [assigned] them to Tome de Victoria, cleric-priest of the diocese of Ávila, chaplain of the Most Serene Empress, my dearly beloved sister, and I assigned and then sent this; and after you receive this petition to His Holiness in my name, be attentive to this, that these 150 *ducados* be passed in favor of said Thome de Victoria, from the fruits of said bishopric of Cordoba, for in this [made] by Don Pedro Portocarrero

---

\(^{31}\) Stevenson, “Tomás Luis de Victoria,” 35.

\(^{32}\) This assumption is made by Stevenson upon his reading of Pedrell (Stevenson, “Tomás Luis de Victoria,” 25).
the said Juan Martínez already deceased, and not knowing to stop the charges of those 150 *ducados* as I did; and in this that His Holiness would notice this, we send you consent of the said bishop so that these 150 *ducados* in pension are placed and charged anew from the fruits of his Church in favor of said Thome de Victoria, so that with this consent and mine that you will have for His Holiness, for the sake of getting this done, and dispatch his bulls in the manner in which you usually do in such cases…in Madrid, 21 January 1594. I, the King.33

This document is routinely cited to support claims that Victoria was a close friend and student of Palestrina; his death and funeral services occurred in early February 1594, shortly following this request by the king. The assumption that Victoria was present at Palestrina’s funeral seems to stem from Casimiri’s suggestion that it was a possibility, but not a fact.34

**The Composer in Context: The Habsburg Monarchs**

During these final decades of his life, Victoria clearly maintained his creative process, as a number of reprints emerged in foreign markets, and he published two collections of new works through the Imprenta Real in Madrid. The 1600a prints reflect the change in musical and aesthetic tastes at court after the ascension of Philip III in 1598; the predilections of the sovereign and his favorite, the Duke of Lerma, impacted the rest of elite society. In order to fully appreciate the position of Victoria and his music in the culture of late sixteenth-century Madrid,

33 AHP, Consejos 2141, fols. 236v-237r: “Duque primo a honce de Deziembre passado se os embio la presentacion del obispado de Cordova en el obispo de Calahorra Don Pedro portocarrero con cargo de 12U800 ducados que le impuse de pension los 12U400 que se entendio tenía vieja y 400 que cargue de nuevo y entre los dichos 12U400 ducados de pension vieja fueron puestos 150. de Juan Martinez de la fuente clerigo como lo avreys visto por la certificacion que fue con ella firmada de Francisco Gonçalez por nos averse entonçes que era muerto y por haverse entendido agora que al tiempo que se os embian los dichos recaudos havian ya algunos dias que el dicho Juan Martínez era falleçido me toca proveer los dichos 150 ducados y los he señalado a Tome de victoria clerigo presbítero de la diocesi de Avila capellan de la Serenissima emperatriz mi muy chara y muy amada hermana yo os en cargo y mandado que luego que recibayws esta supplique yo a su santidad en mi nombre tenga por bien atento a lo dicho que estos 150. ducados se pasen en favor del dicho Thome de victoria sobre los fructos del dicho obispado de Cordova pues quando [ ] para el al dicho Don Pedro Portocarrero era ya fallecido el dicho Juan Martinez y por no saber se dexe de cargar los entonçes como lo hize de los dichos 150 ducados y para que en esto que su Beatiutd reparase en esto se os embia aquí consentimiento del dicho obispo para que los dichos 150 ducados de pension sean pongan y carguen de nuevo sobre los fructos de su Iglesia en favor del dicho Thome de victoria para que con el dicho contentimiento y el mio que prestareys tenga su Beatiutd por bien de que esto se haga assi y se despachen las bulas dello en la forma que se suele hazer en casos semejantes…de Madrid a xxi de enero de 1594. Yo el Rey.”

34 Casimiri, “Il Vittoria,” 46. The burden of proof is also noted in Sabe, *Tomás Luís de Victoria*, 152.
one must become acquainted with the atmosphere of the city and court, and the roles of its key players. The Descalzas Reales convent was not an isolated institution, but was central to the activity of elite madrileño society and the royal court. The inhabitants of Descalzas Reales maintained intimate ties with the royal household, as the convent was home to powerful members of the Habsburg House, including Victoria’s employer, and thus served as an extension of the court. The households commingled on a daily basis; family members frequently visited in private and attended public religious or state ceremonies that involved the retinues of both courts; employees of the court and convent relied upon each other as substitutes and supplemental personnel for liturgical functions. Their contact certainly extended beyond the requirements of their posts; for instance, Victoria routinely called upon members of the Descalzas chapel or Capilla Real to witness documents or to serve as legal proxy.

_The Habsburg Monarchy_

The lines between religion, politics, and royal power were fluid at the Spanish royal court during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Political policy, of course, changed from ruler to ruler, as did the physical seat of power. In addition, the male Habsburg monarchs strove to project a balanced image of power and piety, manifested through varying degrees of accessibility to their subjects. A monarch who moved among his people seemed more human and relatable, and thus gained his subjects’ favor, but a certain degree of isolation could enhance the king’s image as an untouchable power, which some interpreted as worthy of respect.\(^{35}\) The women of the Habsburg family portrayed a traditional image of the ideal royal woman: one who

exuded a strong sense of virtue and religious devotion, as well as a maternal figure who
diligently took care of her family. The three Habsburg women active at court during Victoria’s
tenure in Madrid wielded a surprising amount of power, as they sought to protect and promote
the interests of the Austrian branch of the family in particular. Thus, there was not a clear line
between political strength and piety, nor was there an obvious division between the secular and
sacred; monarchs and nobility alike used religious events as a symbol of their power, and as a
means toward inspiring spiritual devotion among their subjects.

Moreover, spiritual advisors offered political advice, and court ministers attended
religious functions alongside the monarchs, which became a symbol of their own spiritual
devotion and a sign of favor with the crown. During the final decades of the sixteenth century,
spaces outside of the palace, including religious institutions such as Descalzas Reales and the
Jesuit Colegio Imperial, were increasingly used as an extension of the court; portions of the
king’s secular retinue regularly assisted at these more public functions. Public devotion became a
symbol of political strength, reflected through an increase in elaborate spectacle.

*The Reign of Philip II*

Philip II of Spain was born to Charles V and Isabel of Portugal in 1527. His sister, the
future Empress María of Austria, followed in 1528; their sister Juana was born in 1535. The
siblings likely lacked an affectionate home and true childhood, as was common among royalty;
their father, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, spent years away from Spanish lands and their
mother died when the children were young. Under these circumstances, Philip, María, and Juana
became very close as children and remained so for the rest of their lives.\(^\text{36}\) The three regularly

\(^{36}\) Kamen, 8.
communicated in writing when apart, and visited each other extremely frequently when residing at the same court.

Charles V made Philip regent of Spain after his first official tour of the peninsula in 1543 and his marriage to his cousin, María of Portugal. Philip’s bride died only two years later, but a son survived: the Infante Don Carlos. Philip married three more times: Mary Tudor of England (1554-58); Isabel de Valois, daughter of Henry II of France and Catherine de’ Medici (1559-1568); and doña Ana de Austria, the eldest child of Maximilian II and the Empress María. They were married 1570-1580 and had four sons and one daughter; apart from Philip III, their fourth son, all of the infantes died in childhood.

During Philip’s absence and in preparation for Charles’s abdication, the Archduke Maximilian II of the Austrian branch of the Habsburg family served as regent alongside Philip’s sister, María. Maximilian and María were married in Valladolid on 15 September 1548 and remained in Spain until their return to the imperial court at Vienna in 1552, and María served as regent in Madrid during Philip’s absence from 1558 to 1561. Juana served as Philip’s regent beginning in May 1554, when he left for England to begin preparations for his marriage to Mary Tudor. Philip left England in the late summer of 1555 in order to attend his father’s abdication ceremony in the Netherlands, which occurred on 25 October; the prince was officially proclaimed King of Spain on 28 March 1556. Charles V abdicated the imperial crown to his brother, Ferdinand, a few months before his death at Yuste in September 1558, thus ensuring that his sister, María, would be the next Holy Roman Empress.

As the newly crowned king, Philip II inherited a host of troubles from his father, including wars and religious tensions with France, England, the Netherlands, and the papacy, which largely continued for the rest of his reign. He also became burdened by crippling debt
from the wars, alongside the financial pressures of maintaining an enormous household. Unlike his father, Philip wanted very much to avoid further military action at this point, and was more concerned with maintaining Spain’s holdings rather than trying to expand them. The Castilian Cortes wanted the new king to return from England due to problems brewing at home, such as disastrous military activity in Northern Africa and alarmist reports of Jewish and *morisco* activity on the peninsula.\(^{37}\) After his marriage to Isabel de Valois in June 1559, the king left the governance of the Netherlands to his half-sister, Margaret of Parma, and returned to Spain. After their marriage was formalized in Guadalajara, the monarchs lived in Toledo from February 1560; however, Philip traveled frequently, even after the court made its permanent move to Madrid in 1561. Much of his reign was marked by long periods of peripatetic court life, similar to his father’s, although he stayed closer to his government: Philip generally remained within a few days’ journey from the capital. At the height of his power, the monarch spent eight to ten months of the year outside of Madrid, which meant he remained rather detached from the daily activities at court, as well as the cultural and political climate in the city.\(^{38}\)

Period accounts portray Philip II as a kind and even-tempered individual. He may not have appeared as warm and inviting to most people, but earned a reputation for his politeness and careful listening during audiences.\(^{39}\) Like many Castilian elites, the monarch’s only strong language was Castilian; he understood French and Italian, but Germans generally communicated in Latin.\(^{40}\) Philip emerged as a skilled politician with a reputation for a serious demeanor and a bit of an addiction to work, but the king clearly took some time for pleasure. Though frequently ill and riddled with gout, he was an avid hunter and fisherman who frequented his network of

\(^{37}\) Kamen, 73.
\(^{38}\) Sieber, 100-11.
\(^{39}\) Kamen, 221-23.
\(^{40}\) For example, one of the reasons Juan de Borja was chosen as ambassador to the Holy Roman Empire was due to his knowledge of Latin (Ibid., 220).
country palaces surrounding Madrid. Philip also spent large sums of money on intellectual and artistic patronage: he amassed huge collections of books on a variety of subjects, as well as artwork and relics. His travels reinforced his penchant for Flemish art, architecture, garden design, and music. He also maintained some elements of Burgundian ceremony and retained his father’s Flemish chapel; the monarchs of Spain maintained separate Flemish and Spanish chapels until the seventeenth century.

Much of Philip’s posthumous reputation, at least on a personal level, lies in his cultivation of a pious persona. Philip felt his power was a God-given responsibility, and that part of his duty to his people was to provide them with a sound moral model. He carried out the public acts of piety that were more or less expected of monarchs, such as attending daily Mass and participating in religious ceremonies. Ironically, he did not make these a priority until the later years of his reign, corresponding with his increased withdrawal from public life. Philip II’s household engaged in far less grand formality as the monarch aged; there were no more massive, staged entries into cities, and after the death of his son and heir Diego in 1582, he began to spend more time at El Escorial, particularly during major feasts. All of these factors contributed to Philip’s image as a reclusive king, detached from his people.

The last decade of Philip’s reign was marked by discontent in many of the realms, including Castile. One of the highly controversial moves, meant to boost funds for the crown’s military campaigns and help ease state debt, was the passage of the millones taxes by the Cortes of Castile in February 1589, which in fact only made the dire economic situation in Spain worse. The millones were the first taxes on essential food staples, such as wine, oil, and meat, and their

41 Kamen, 77.
42 Ibid., 232.
43 Ibid., 230-31, 248.
passage incited riots in Madrid. \(^\text{44}\) Philip at least empathized with the people, and attempted to set up relief for the poor, but many ended up relying on the charity of the numerous religious establishments in the city.

Philip knew discontent was brewing at court, as several senior ministers questioned his fitness to rule. \(^\text{45}\) By 1593 the king was in extremely poor health, and relied heavily on the assistance of a small circle of advisers. The monarch signed the last codicil of his will in August 1594, and authorized Prince Philip to sign documents in his name; by early 1597, his health had deteriorated to the point where he was unable to leave Madrid for several months. Accounts of Philip II’s death emphasize the “Christian” manner in which he bore his suffering, yet another way in which the king could serve as a model to his subjects; his final 53 days were spent at El Escorial, and his attendants were unable to move, clean, or touch the king, who was in excruciating pain. \(^\text{46}\) For many, his death in the early hours of 13 September 1598 must have come as a relief, but perhaps not to his heir, who suddenly had the worries of his father and grandfather placed upon his shoulders.

\textit{The Reign of Philip III}

Philip III was born in the royal Alcázar of Madrid on 14 April 1578. As the fourth son, he initially did not receive the same grooming for the crown as his elder brothers, which surely contributed to the generally negative portraits of this monarch. Most biographers rather unfairly conclude that he was a disappointment to his father; this is due in part because of their divergent

---

\(^\text{44}\) Kamen, 292.
\(^\text{45}\) Ibid., 277.
\(^\text{46}\) One example is Antonio Cervera de la Torre, \textit{Testimonio autentico y verdadero de las cosas notables que passaron en la dichosa muerte del Rey N.S. Felipe II que santa gloria aya: con translaciones nuevas de otras virtudes y casos singulares de su vida, que lleuan esta señal / avtor, sv capellan el licenciado frey don Antonio Ceruera de la Torre...} (Madrid: L. Sanchez, 1600).
management styles, and the fact that he was never expected to be king. In their reports to Philip II, the prince’s tutors emphasized his respectful, kind, and pious nature, perhaps to compensate for what modern scholars frequently view as a lack of academic talent. Philip III was a decent student and reasonably intelligent, but as prince he did not display any particular interest in political issues. He was quiet but good-natured, and preferred indoor entertainments such as dancing and playing the guitar, though he also indulged in one of his father’s favorite pastimes: hunting at the royal palaces in the vicinity of Madrid.

Prince Philip made friends easily and treated his staff well, but could be hard-headed and withdrawn, much like his father; his mentors recognized this and began to provide the prince with more opportunities to participate in public events during the last decade of his father’s life. Philip II did not bring the prince into the process of government until the age of 18, even though he had initiated Philip III’s sister, Isabel Clara Eugenia, at a younger age. The prince’s early activity with the Council of State is marked by what might be interpreted as either detachment or timidity; he chose to remain silent in most meetings, so Philip II appointed the prince’s mayordomo mayor, the household manager, to the Council in order to provide him with inside mentorship. The king maintained a close hand in his son’s education and political formation by placing his trusted officials in the prince’s household and on the Junta de Gobierno, which became an important ad hoc governing body that served as Philip III’s advisors during the 1590s.

Before his death, Philip II advised his son to choose his friends and counselors wisely, as he feared that a handful of noblemen attempted to befriend the prince merely to gain power, prestige, and wealth. Among those he distrusted was Don Francisco Gómez de Sandoval y Rojas, the Marquis of Denia, who later became the first Duke of Lerma. Don Francisco befriended the

---

47 Feros, 64-65.
48 Kamen, 305.
prince and eventually became his *caballerizo mayor*, the individual responsible for travel
arrangements for the princely household; he later added to this the duties of *sumiller de corps*,
which ensured that the Duke of Lerma was in the king’s presence almost constantly, and these
two positions eventually became more desirable than that of *mayordomo mayor*.49 While most
current appraisals of the duke portray him as a corrupt individual, hungry for power and wealth,
contemporary opinion suggests that he behaved as one of his social standing should: he was
refined, magnanimous, and a talented politician who made the best of his station at court.50

Pressure to perform must have been intense, as Philip III was heralded as a symbol of
hope for the monarchy at the outset of his reign; some hoped he would find a way to repair the
economic situation on the peninsula and strengthen the empire.51 However, when the king died in
late 1598, Philip III took the throne amid mounting discontent in Madrid. A wave of the plague
hit the city that autumn, and he was also faced with criticism of the bureaucratic structure, as
many were in favor of reducing its size in order to cut expenses, and others disapproved of Philip
II’s increased dependence on *juntas* during the final years of his life. Philip III did make reforms
to the government, particularly during his early reign: Philip and his *privado*, the Duke of Lerma,
sought to restore the power of the larger councils rather than working through informal *juntas*.
This effectively renewed the power of a larger circle of nobles, but the king relied upon his
*privado*, or royal favorite, for advice and assistance in carrying out the responsibilities of
government. He delegated much of the administration of the realm to the duke and other high-
ranking officials. Unfortunately, the new king reversed Philip II’s more tolerant policy regarding
religious freedoms, and spent a good deal of money and effort on the expulsion of the *moriscos*.

49 Glass, 36-37.
50 For more on the first Duke of Lerma’s rise and fall from power, as well as his patronage patterns, see Roberta
Freund Schwartz, “*En busca de liberalidad*: Music and Musicians in the Courts of the Spanish Nobility, 1470-1640”
(Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, 2001), Chapter Three.
51 Feros, 87.
Some argue that Philip III’s less lenient attitude toward Protestantism ultimately dragged Spain into the Thirty Years’ War; however, Philip III’s administration did succeed in achieving peace on two fronts: a truce with the Dutch in April 1609 and peace with James I of England in August 1604.\(^{52}\)

The Empress María of Austria and Sor Margarita de la Cruz: Intersection of Court and Cloister

The Empress María of Austria and her husband Maximilian II served as regents of Spain from their marriage in 1548 until their return to the Central European court in 1551. They retained close ties to the Spanish court by sending five of their sons to be educated in Philip II’s household, including Rudolf, heir to the Imperial crown; Archduke Ernst; Archduke Albert, María’s favorite son, who later became cardinal then renounced the title to marry the infanta Isabel Clara Eugenia and co-rule in the Netherlands; Archduke Maximilian; and Archduke Wenceslao.

Maximilian II served as Holy Roman Emperor from 1564 to his death in 1576. María’s direct ties to the Spanish crown helped facilitate relations between the two Habsburg houses during her time as Holy Roman Empress and beyond. The pair enjoyed mutual respect and trust as monarchs: Maximilian frequently sought María’s advice on political matters, an arrangement that did not suit his imperial heir, Rudolf II. The rocky relationship between Rudolf and his mother may be one possible motivation for María’s departure for Madrid in 1581. She did not approve of much of his behavior, as he was increasingly reclusive and somewhat reckless from a moral standpoint; conversely, he did not solicit or appreciate her advice on government affairs. Rudolf initially sought to keep María from leaving Central Europe, perhaps because she would

\(^{52}\) Kamen, 317-20.
enjoy the greater sense of independence she possessed while her husband lived. Nevertheless, Rudolf must have acknowledged his mother’s prowess at politics, as he relied upon her assistance in imperial matters after her return to Madrid.

Maria’s entourage arrived in the Spanish capital in February 1582. She employed a large retinue of servants and diplomats, including Don Juan de Borja, the son of San Francisco de Borja, and uncle of Francisco Gómez de Sandoval y Rojas, the future Duke of Lerma. Borja served as Spain’s ambassador to the imperial court and remained in Maria’s service as mayordomo mayor until her death in 1603. Borja actively participated in political affairs upon his return to Spain; Philip III frequently appointed him to juntas. The Empress employed a large number of individuals from all over Europe; a single, undated listing of her household survives, and it includes over 100 people. Her four chaplains at that writing were Doctor Agustín de Victoria, Tomás Luis de Victoria, Martín Perserio, and Bartolomé Leonardo. There are no personnel listed as musicians, and very little can be determined regarding the musical and liturgical activity of Maria’s household, though she hosted theatrical performances at which the monarchs and infantes were sometimes present.

Maria’s pious image was upheld even in death: on 26 February 1603, the Empress died holding the crucifix her daughter had used during her profession as a nun, and the sisters of Descalzas Reales honored her with ceremonies as though she were one of them. Maria was buried in the lower cloister of the convent, but her remains were removed to the choir in 1615; the monarchs and royal household attended the ceremony. Six of the king’s mayordomos carried her body to the choir, and the burial Mass was celebrated by Cardinal Bernardo de Rojas, the

---

53 Sánchez, 66.
54 Ibid., 122.
Archbishop of Toledo, “con grande música, y solemnidad.” Juan de la Palma’s description of the event refers to the two royal chapels singing together for the burial, which must mean the king’s chapel and the convent chapel joined forces. Palma indicated that during the performance of psalms, the nuns sang the verses, while the royal chapels provided the response.57

Retirement to a convent sounds rather isolated, but María’s activity proves otherwise, as she did not profess as a nun and thus remained uncloistered. Her rooms were adjacent to the cloistered portions of the convent, thus allowing her to move freely between the two and providing private access to the convent church. María’s apartments included the Salon de Reyes, where she received visitors and hosted entertainments; her personal oratorio, a modestly-sized and sparsely decorated space in which the Empress heard a daily Mass; and Juan de Borja’s quarters, which were later used to house the queen and infantes during overnight visits.

The fact that María remained uncloistered also allowed her freedom to travel. She made weekly visits to the queen at the Alcázar when the court was in Madrid, and frequently traveled beyond the city. For instance, the Empress’s party left Madrid less than a month after their arrival in order to make an extended visit to Philip II in Portugal, where he had just obtained the Portuguese crown. María also spent a good deal of time visiting the monarchs at their residences surrounding Madrid and visited the country homes of Juan de Borja and the Duke of Lerma. She also received visitors and gave audiences on a regular basis. When visiting dignitaries arrived in the court city, they commonly visited Descalzas Reales first, since her stature as the widow of a Holy Roman Emperor technically placed her above the Spanish monarch.58 Foreign dignitaries stopped in Madrid before visiting the relocated court in Valladolid as well; the Archduke

56 Palma, fols. 103r-v, 127r.
57 Ibid., fol. 246r.
58 For instance, this was the Archduchess María of Bavaria’s first stop in Madrid when she accompanied her daughter, Margarita de Austria, on her journey to marry Philip III (Palma, fol. 92v).
Maximilian visited his mother and sister at Descalzas Reales during late July 1601 before attending to business at the Spanish court in early August.\(^5^9\)

Court biographies and chronicles tended to portray the Empress as pious, somber, and generous. Some of this image seems to be based in truth, as the Empress did follow an extremely strict religious regimen while she resided at Descalzas, which took precedence over receiving mail or audiences—even with her own children.\(^6^0\) María visited and spent time in prayer with the nuns on a daily basis, and sometimes took meals with them. She also gave generously to charities and her favorite religious causes; for instance, a portion of her estate was donated to Descalzas Reales, while a majority went to augment the foundation of the Jesuit Colegio Imperial in Madrid. Her spending habits reflect those of many nobles during the period: she frequently over-spent her income, especially in support of religious institutions.

More candid sources of information, such as the diaries of the imperial ambassador to Spain, Hans Khevenhüller, and the personal correspondence between the Duke of Lerma and Don Juan de Borja, indicate she was far from meek and passive.\(^6^1\) Khevenhüller in particular painted a portrait of an intelligent woman with an acute political sense who thoroughly understood the workings of the Spanish and Austrian political systems.\(^6^2\) As a result, government officials and family members heeded her advice.

---

\(^5^9\) Cabrera de Córdoba, *Relaciones*, 79. The *relaciones* mention a number of such instances.

\(^6^0\) When her son, the Archduke Maximilian, visited unexpectedly in 1601, he arrived at Descalzas before she had received the Eucharist and was obliged to wait for hours (Sánchez, 69).

\(^6^1\) The chief sources of primary information on the Empress María are Khevenhüller; Juan Carrillo’s history of Descalzas; Juan de la Palma’s biography of sor Margarita de la Cruz; and a collection of correspondence between the Duke of Lerma and Don Juan de Borja, now housed at the British Library. A particularly noteworthy assessment of the personalities and roles of the three Habsburg women active at court during the reign of Philip III is Magdalena Sánchez’s *The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun*.

\(^6^2\) Sánchez, 94.
The Empress persistently fought for the causes in which she believed most, including the welfare of her children and the empire in Central Europe.\textsuperscript{63} The Empress knew that Don Juan de Borja and the Duke of Lerma corresponded on a frequent basis, so she routinely relayed requests to Philip III; she recognized that the best way to get anything done was to pester Lerma and Borja until they tired of her requests and conceded.\textsuperscript{64} A great deal of tension built at court at the outset of Philip III’s reign, particularly between the Duke of Lerma and the Habsburg women. Lerma made it increasingly difficult for anyone to access the king’s ear, a circumstance exacerbated by Philip III’s introverted nature. Nevertheless, the Empress and the queen were able to use their familial ties as leverage.\textsuperscript{65}

The Archduchess Margarita de Austria was the youngest surviving child of María and Maximilian; she was born in Vienna on 25 January 1567. María habitually took her children along while she attended to the poor at the Viennese court, occasions that evidently drew Margarita toward charitable activities as an adult.\textsuperscript{66} Her mother maintained a close interest in the education of all of her children, especially their religious upbringing, since she wished for them to maintain strong ties to Catholic reform in a divided region. Both Khevenhüller and Palma suggest that one of the primary motivations for María’s return to Madrid was to install her daughter at Descalzas Reales. Palma’s biography places particular emphasis on Margarita’s devotion to her faith by relaying the tale of her pledge to offer herself to God at Montserrat during the imperial sojourn to Madrid, and by spilling a good deal of ink dramatizing the rumored marriage proposal from Philip II. Nothing has ever completely confirmed the claims, but it is possible there was a proposal: Philip’s third son had just died and Prince Philip was a

\textsuperscript{63} Sánchez, 86-87.  
\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., 47-48.  
\textsuperscript{65} Use of the language of familial duty was common—and effective—among the Habsburgs. See Sánchez, Chapter Five.  
\textsuperscript{66} Palma, fol. 12r.
sickly child, so he undoubtedly feared there would be no secure succession. Evidently, the
discussion in which Margarita refused Philip II’s proposal occurred at Descalzas Reales after the
royal and imperial entourages returned from Portugal.\textsuperscript{67}

Margarita’s official entry to the novitiate occurred on 25 January 1584: her seventeenth
birthday.\textsuperscript{68} She took the name Margarita de la Cruz, and forbade her fellow nuns from offering
deferential language or treatment. Following her mother’s death, Margarita was obliged to
maintain a delicate balance between her sacred obligations and secular duties. Though she had
been a nun for nearly twenty years, she was still an imperial \textit{infanta} to whom many looked for
support and guidance. Although she took vows and wished to be treated as an equal of the other
sisters, Margarita retained certain privileges. She slept in a private cell and was one of the
beneficiaries of her mother’s will, which provided her with a monthly stipend for household
expenses as she stepped into some of the courtly functions previously filled by María. A number
of her mother’s advisors wanted Margarita to take over the Empress’s quarters and thus occupy a
similar position of court authority. She ultimately refused, but did give audiences to ambassadors
and other dignitaries in the royal apartments.\textsuperscript{69} Margarita mainly used her \textit{mayordomos} and
Khevenhüller to relay requests between the Spanish and Austrian courts, and she corresponded
with Isabel Clara Eugenia and Archduke Albert.\textsuperscript{70} Philip III also visited her frequently; on those
occasions, they evidently spoke candidly regarding political matters.

Margarita ultimately became a symbol of deep spirituality for the House of Habsburg; she wrote a prayer book that was published in 1622, and it followed the Franciscan tradition of

\textsuperscript{67} Palma, fol. 50r.\textsuperscript{68} A detailed description of the events is in Palma, fols. 58r-62r.\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., fols. 110r-v.\textsuperscript{70} Sánchez, 52-53.
mystical literature centered on the Passion of Christ. The biography written by Palma praises her almost excessively, and is an example of the literary effort toward her beatification, a process that was begun but never brought to fruition.

Juana, Princess of Portugal

Maria and Philip II’s sister, Juana, maintained a strong political—and pious—presence at court in Madrid. She served as regent from 1554 to 1559, following a marriage of less than two years to the Portuguese crown prince João Manuel, son of João III. The Princess of Portugal found herself widowed at the age of nineteen when the prince died on 2 January 1554, and she never remarried. Their son Sebastián was born eighteen days later; he died young and left no issue. Court chroniclers routinely portrayed the Princess of Portugal as serious and saintly; though she was well-read, loved music, and served as a formidable regent, she was most frequently revered as an example of virtue and humility. At the Spanish court Juana served as religious guide to the Habsburg women, and in particular, as a pious model for the courts of Isabel de Valois and Ana de Austria, the third and fourth wives of Philip II. She also managed the education of Philip II’s wives and children. Juana is most famously noted for founding the Descalzas Reales convent as a retirement and burial space.

The Court in Madrid

Madrid became the official capital of the Habsburg monarchy in 1561. It was a fairly small but prosperous agricultural community; Philip II and his government likely chose the city

72 Juan Carrillo, Relacion historica de la Real Fundacion del Monasterio de las Descalzas de Santa Clara de la villa de Madrid, con...las vidas de la Princesa de Portugal doña Juana de Austria y su fundadora y de la M.C. de la Emperatriz Maria, su hermana (Madrid: Luis Sánchez, impresor del Rey N.S., 1616).
as the seat of government due to its proximity to the proposed site for the monastery at El Escorial and the monarch’s favorite private retreats. The town and its surrounding countryside was capable of providing plenty of fresh air, food, and water for the court, was viewed as more spacious than Valladolid, and was relatively safe. Madrid was not an important town before the court arrived; it did not appear on maps of major trade routes on the peninsula, such as the span from Barcelona to Lisbon, as nearby Toledo had long been established as an important hub for communications and commerce.

A sizeable portion of the court was unhappy in Madrid, as there was an inadequate amount of housing, and the population grew faster than anyone expected. There was a decent palace in place that had been renovated by Charles V, but otherwise the town had little to offer its new inhabitants in terms of grand architecture, ceremonial space, and infrastructure. There was no university, cathedral, or bishopric tied to the city, but there were a number of religious houses. However, merchants quickly responded to the court’s need for goods and services: the first printer’s shop opened in 1566, the first permanent theater was established in 1568, and the city was home to a strong banking industry as well. Foreign merchants entered the market by the early 1570s, and goods were imported from all over the Spanish empire; the royal presence attracted tapestry makers, artists, and other artisans during the 1570s.

At first the court and city governments existed side by side, since Philip II did not see any need to involve himself with the civic governance already in place. The Ayuntamiento had long been responsible for making infrastructure improvements and for arranging public festivities and

---

73 Sieber, 103-04.
74 Ibid., 44.
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76 Sieber, 222, 224.
cere monies. However, Madrid grew rapidly during the last four decades of the century, which caused numerous problems; by the 1580s the population had outgrown its natural resources, leading to widespread food shortages and increased prices on foodstuffs, filthy street conditions, water contamination, and an increase in crime. At this point Philip II admitted that he would move the court if necessary, but eventually his government became more closely involved with improvements to infrastructure. More space was needed for housing and public functions, and the expenses went beyond the means of the municipal government. The Plaza Mayor served as the primary location for ceremonial functions, but the Ayuntamiento began construction of an additional plaza in front of the Descalzas Reales convent during the late 1560s, which at least partially addressed the need for more space.

The use of space outside the Alcázar emphasized the flexible nature of the court’s physical boundaries, as official and private functions were frequently held at churches, convents, and residences outside the palace grounds. For instance, the church of San Gerónimo traditionally hosted a number of important state ceremonies and liturgical functions, such as juramentos to the heir apparent and funerals for the monarchs. The Descalzas Reales convent functioned as an essential extension of the court, since members of the Austrian Habsburg family resided there; the royal family frequently attended public religious functions at the convent, and officials from all over Europe stopped at the convent to pay their respects to the Empress. The monarchs also spent business and leisure time at the homes of the nobility. Philip III regularly took his noon meal at the home of the Duke of Lerma, and held afternoon audiences there.
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80 For period examples of Descalzas Reales’s use as public and royal ceremonial space, see Juan de la Palma, Vida de la serenissima Infanta Sor Margarita de la Cruz, Religiosa Descalza de Santa Clara (Seville: Nicolás Rodríguez de Abrego, 1653).
Prior to the court’s departure, the Ayuntamiento proposed an extensive road construction project in order to connect several landmarks and provide unobstructed processional routes for the monarchs and religious institutions; many of these were completed in the early 1590s. These improvements eased traffic flow and assisted the government in the creation of a majestic image, but ultimately they were not enough to entice the court into staying, as Madrid was hit especially hard by drought, severe winter storms, and pestilence during the 1590s. Philip III decided to escape Madrid’s problems by relocating the court to Valladolid in 1601. Unfortunately, the court’s departure meant further economic crisis for many of those left behind in Madrid: a number of merchants and tradesmen left because their businesses suffered.

Retreat to Valladolid: 1601-1606

Court relaciones from the first two years of Philip III’s reign already reflect rumors of a move to Valladolid; the royal couple had remained outside Madrid for most—if not all—of the period in question. Philip III appointed a council to scout potential transfer sites, and they ultimately chose Valladolid. The monarch officially ordered the move on 10 January 1601, but it was not completed until late February. The site already had infrastructure in place, since many nobles remained there and it had served as a seat of government in the past. In addition, Valladolid was close to the Duke of Lerma’s estates, to which he and the king retired quite frequently. The council recommended moving only persons holding official palace positions, requiring nobles to live in their own homes, and transferring the councils elsewhere. Philip
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ultimately allowed the councils to remain at court, but they were to be housed separately from the palace; he also attempted to limit court residents, which only worked temporarily.  

Numerous period accounts and subsequent biographers have tied the move of the court to the Duke of Lerma’s *privanza*; the duke was already working to place his *criados* and family members into positions of power at court. He may have felt threatened by the presence of the Empress María in Madrid, as Philip remained close to her and sought her advice on a frequent basis; Lerma and the Empress disagreed on a variety of political policies, particularly on matters of Spanish involvement in Austrian Habsburg affairs. The pro-Austrian agenda also placed the duke at odds with the queen, a member of the Styrian branch of the Austrian Habsburg family, and also with María’s daughter, sor Margarita de la Cruz. María in particular served as a powerful conduit through which members of the Austrian branch of the family sought to further their interests in Central Europe, and Lerma’s circle did not favor diverting precious local resources to causes abroad.

Ultimately, the government saw a repeat of the conditions that drove the court away from Madrid: Valladolid quickly became overcrowded and the monarchy and nobility alike could not financially sustain their lavish lifestyle. As early as 1602, a move back to Madrid was being considered among some circles; the Duke of Lerma began purchasing properties in and around the city in 1603, as he had done in Valladolid prior to the court’s move there. Moreover, during the court’s tenure in Valladolid the city of Madrid agreed to make further improvements to the city’s infrastructure, and imposed taxes to finance renovations of the palace. In January 1606
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the court began official procedure for the transfer back to Madrid. By this point, the monarchs had spent very little of their reign in the city.⁸⁸

The return of the court to Madrid enhanced the state of the city in a number of ways. When the government returned, the Ayuntamiento poured vast sums of money into building projects, and artisans and artists returned. Festivals were now controlled by both civic and court government, as the lines between the two became blurred; the city became an extension of the court, as had also occurred in Valladolid.⁸⁹ The local economy boomed for a time, since the population of Madrid exploded once again. The city imposed commodity taxes (sisas) that were paid by all residents apart from the religious community, and these funded both the building projects and opulent festivals, though the Ayuntamiento and the crown still spent far beyond their means.⁹⁰

*Court Size and Structure*

Philip II spent far less of his life traveling outside the Spanish lands than his father had; however, he did take several extended journeys, during which he appointed siblings or other relatives as regents, and his experiences and the regencies of his relatives affected the makeup of his court. For example, the young prince took his first extended trip to Northern Europe between October 1548 and July 1551 in order to prepare to inherit the imperial crown. In anticipation of this transition, Charles V reorganized the prince’s household and the Spanish court and chapel according to Burgundian protocol, a setup that was far more elaborate and required a much larger
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⁹⁰ Ibid., 150-51.
staff than the traditional Castilian structure. This meant Philip’s relatively small household as heir grew from around 110 to over 200, not including his guards. 91

The royal household Philip II inherited from his father was massive, since it combined his Castilian court with the governmental structure of the Northern Empire. Once Charles V mandated Burgundian protocol at the Spanish court, its size and complexity made it too unwieldy to travel with a full retinue on a regular basis. As a part of Castilian government tradition the monarchs were expected to be mobile enough to move about their possessions, thus projecting visibility and approachability among their subjects.

Regents frequently chose a city to become the center of government, but did not remain there on a fixed basis; for instance, Ferdinand and Isabel chose Valladolid as their seat of power, and a large number of the nobility remained there throughout the absences of Charles V and Philip II, as the regency government was there. Valladolid became an attractive location for anyone with ambition; thus, the city became overcrowded by noblemen with extravagant lifestyles, as well as highly educated men employed by the university and bureaucracy. 92 This overcrowding led Philip II to move his immediate household to Toledo upon his return to Spain, though Toledo proved to become just as crowded, as people were attracted to the royal court like moths to a flame. Claudia Sieber suggests that Philip intentionally chose Madrid as a new capital chiefly because of its size and relative insignificance; perhaps he meant to drive away some of the courtiers. 93 Indeed, the move to Madrid, combined with the monarch’s increased withdrawal from the public spotlight, seemed to have worked to reduce the size and grandeur of the court, as noted by a Venetian visitor during the 1570s:
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The court is now very small with only the royal household and members of the councils in residence. Many individual noblemen who used to be at court, seeing that the king so often lives as a recluse and is stingy with public audiences, have gone home, saying that they cannot support the costs of court life from which they garner neither sustenance nor entertainment.\(^94\)

By the time Philip died, the fusion of the Burgundian and Castilian households was largely complete, but the Casa de Borgoña was the larger and more important of the two. The ceremonies of Burgundian protocol dominated court and chapel procedure, though elements were employed unevenly. In reality, the court’s practices borrowed freely from customs in France, Burgundy, Bohemia, and other realms, and practices varied from monarch to monarch.\(^95\)

The household of Philip II and his successors comprised six branches: casa, cámara, caballeriza, guarda, caza, and the capilla real.\(^96\) At the head of the whole operation was the mayordomo mayor, or Lord High Steward, and each branch was led by a member of the nobility. A nobleman’s place within the royal household indicated his level of intimacy with the monarch; officers such as the mayordomo mayor, sumiller de corps, and caballerizo mayor tended to the king’s needs in his most private moments, and thus their presence was interpreted as the utmost in prestige and trust.\(^97\) These figures participated in court ceremonies, including the procession to the royal chapel on Sundays, and their physical placement in relation to the king also served as an outward sign of respect. Access to the king, no matter how menial the position, indicated power.
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Court Ceremonies and Culture

Court entertainments and religious ceremonies increased in opulence during the reign of Philip III. Philip II may not have liked the large court that grew up around his household in Madrid, but he did take pleasure in entertainment, such as music and dance; theater flourished despite the monarch’s aversion to it. The social atmosphere at Philip II’s court was largely influenced by the more modern tastes of his queens and his sisters, María and Juana, since the monarch spent so much of his time attending to affairs of state. As early the marriage of Maximilian II and María in 1548, court entertainment reflected Italian influence: several nobles at the court in Valladolid arranged the performance of a comedy by Ariosto, which a court chronicler described as presented “in the Roman style, with all the apparatus of theater and scenery that the Romans are accustomed to presenting, something very regal and sumptuous.”

The Empress María’s tastes still reflected an interest in Italian arts upon her return to Madrid over thirty years later; she hosted a production of La fábula de Dafne, an adaptation of Ovid’s interpretation of the myth of Daphne, in her quarters at Descalzas Reales during the 1590s. Some of Philip II’s musicians took part in the performance, which featured an Italianate text, secular song, and dance. This particular event is an excellent example of the fluid nature of the relationship of the various courts in Madrid. Musicians intermingled freely, much as they did in Rome. Once Philip retreated to El Escorial, his courtiers took it upon themselves to arrange their own entertainment in circumstances similar to the production staged by María.

98 Lopes Don, 39-40.
In contrast to his somewhat unenthusiastic engagement with secular entertainments, Philip II did exhibit a keen interest in the music of the chapels of the royal household. The personnel rosters for his Flemish and Spanish chapels indicate his appreciation for the art; he employed a vast number of musicians over the course of his reign and sought the finest performers from all over Europe. Where polyphony was concerned, his tastes tended toward the music of older Franco-Flemish masters; for instance, the royal collections favor the works of Josquin and his peers, as well as those of Philip’s maestros de capilla, all of whom were Franco-Flemish. This trend is replicated in church and noble court repertories from the period as well. A penchant for Flemish music makes sense: Charles V received his musical education in the Low Countries, and music at the Spanish court was influenced in particular by the residency of the household of Philip the Fair and Juana la loca. Nonetheless, it is unreasonable to assume that Italian influence was non-existent, especially during the reigns of Philip II and Philip III: musicians and clerics traveled frequently between Spain and Rome, and certainly served as one of the conduits through which Italian trends were introduced to the Iberian Peninsula, as did the Spanish territories of Naples and Sicily.

At El Escorial Philip was far more concerned with the proper execution of plainchant, though actual practice indicates that polyphonic works were performed on major feasts, in the presence—and with the approval—of the king, frequently involving the capilla real. One example is the celebration of the feast of S. Lorenzo on 10 August 1586; the basilica was completed in time for the feast, which was celebrated in grand fashion. The capilla real sang
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polyphony and the performance involved *bajones, cornetas,* and organ accompaniment.¹⁰³

Performances at the Alcázar in Madrid featured *ministriles* as well. Philip II hired his first *maestro de ministriles* in 1588, a *cornetista* named Juan Bautista Medina.¹⁰⁴ The Habsburg monarchs participated in public processions, particularly during Holy Week and Corpus Christi, and these were executed on a massive scale. Even the more “private” procession from the king’s quarters in the Alcázar to the royal chapel on Sundays warranted a retinue of approximately 100 people, arranged according to level of prestige among the court hierarchy.¹⁰⁵

Philip III’s court practices were largely shaped by the Duke of Lerma, who became one of the most important artistic patrons of his time and ushered in an era in which the top figures at the Spanish court shaped cultural and artistic trends on the peninsula through their patronage.¹⁰⁶ No matter what the Duke’s intentions were, he ultimately succeeded in cultivating an image of opulence and grandeur for the monarchy (and by proxy, himself). During the years at Valladolid, the Duke organized frequent festivals and entertainments, which drove up expenses significantly but also attracted attention, since grand celebrations waned during the final decades of Philip II’s reign. Lerma launched massive building programs and purchased existing properties for ceremonial and entertainment purposes, and increased the number of courtiers participating in official celebrations. The duke’s patronage of the visual arts and his architectural tastes reflect the influence of Italian—particularly Venetian—style, though he also relied upon many of Philip II’s former architects and court artists for large projects.¹⁰⁷ Lavish spending was a part of court culture during the late sixteenth century; the Duke of Lerma was fabulously wealthy, yet still
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died with over 400,000 *ducados* (150 million *mrs*) in debt due to his building programs and artistic pursuits.\textsuperscript{108} The monarchs regularly rewarded nobles, clerics, artists, and musicians with *mercedes* that exceeded the household budget, but promoted an image of generosity and power.

As Patricia Lopes Don states, “not surprisingly, it was precisely during the first few years of Philip III’s reign that royal festivities were remembered at the Spanish Habsburg court as their most elaborate and sophisticated.”\textsuperscript{109} The first of the events largely orchestrated by the Duke of Lerma was the extended journey and accompanying celebrations of the marriage between Philip III and doña Margarita of Austria, which occurred during most of 1599. The official journey to receive the new queen in Valencia began in May 1599 and culminated in her grand entrance to Madrid on 24 October, an opulent procession that involved months of city-wide improvements, architectural design, and artistic activity.\textsuperscript{110}

When the future Philip IV was born in 1605 in Valladolid, the royal chapel participated in the celebrations with performances of elaborate polychoral music, which accompanied a masque. No music survives from the occasion, but it was penned by Juan de Namur, a protégé of Philippe Rogier, Philip II’s last *maestro de capilla*, who wrote music meant to enhance the “majestic” image of the court.\textsuperscript{111} An elaborate *máscara* was held on 16 June 1605, for which an unusually detailed *relación* survives; the *capilla real* performed in two choirs, and the king’s *ministriles* were involved as well.\textsuperscript{112} The monarchy came to heavily support music and theater, among other arts, and this spirit extended beyond the years at Valladolid and back to the court in Madrid.

\textsuperscript{108} Lopes Don, 111-12.
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 19.
\textsuperscript{10} For a detailed discussion of this event and the preparations it entailed, see Virginia Tovar Martín, “La entrada triunfal en Madrid de doña Margarita de Austria (24 de octubre de 1599),” *Archivo Español de Arte*, 244 (1988): 385-404.
\textsuperscript{111} Another example is Gombert. See Stein, 186.
\textsuperscript{112} Cabrera de Córdoba, *Relaciones*, 251-52.
Philip III’s musical tastes tended toward secular genres, instrumental music, and the villancico, rather than liturgical works. Nevertheless, Philip invested significant resources into the royal chapel, though it does bear the mark of the Duke of Lerma. Even the makeup of the chapel reflected the tastes of the duke; Mateo Romero was appointed maestro of the Flemish chapel in 1598, and a number of Spanish musicians were hired to slowly replace Flemish singers. The duke personally employed a majority of Spanish musicians as well. The court gradually hired more instrumentalists; Lerma repeatedly recruited string players from Milan and other Italian territories.

Philip III and the Duke of Lerma both earned a reputation for religious devotion; they each spent considerable sums on the foundation of convents and other institutions, and staged impressive events on major feasts. The Habsburg monarchs also made a habit of visiting religious spaces in Madrid, such as the parish churches of San Gil and San Juan, as well as the royal convents. In the months following his accession, Philip III and the highest-ranking members of his household heard Mass at Descalzas Reales, where he visited the Empress and sor Margarita almost on a daily basis. This pattern ceased almost completely during 1599 and 1600, and visits were infrequent during the court’s removal to Valladolid. While the monarchs traveled, the infantes generally stayed at Descalzas with their Austrian relatives rather than at the palace, and the queen often resided there during the king’s extended absences. The church of San Gerónimo, next to the Retiro palace, became the site of the accession ceremonies for crown

113 Noone, 111-12.
princes and funerary honors for members of the royal family. Many of these institutions served as stops along processional routes, which increased their prestige further. Descalzas in particular was heavily involved in Corpus Christi and Easter events, and occasionally hosted royally sponsored baptisms of converts to Catholicism; for instance, during Lent in 1609, a Moor and a Turk were baptized in the presence of the monarchs.

*Court Religious Practices: the Capilla Real*

When his wife died in 1539, Charles V divided the Spanish chapel. One half served as a chapel for the *infantas* María and Juana, and the other half became Prince Philip’s personal chapel. After the *infantas* married, their chapel dispersed; some stayed in their service, while others migrated to Philip II’s chapel. Philip II maintained both the Spanish and Flemish chapels once he ascended the throne, and the two slowly integrated. The first “Spanish” *maestro* of the *capilla flamenco* was Mateo Romero, appointed at the beginning of Philip III’s reign. Romero was Belgian, but grew up at court after his recruitment as a choirboy under Philippe Rogier. An assistant to the *maestro*, Gabriel Días, does not appear in court records until 1606. The name “Flemish Chapel” disappeared from use during the first decades of the seventeenth century, and the musicians of the court simply became known as the *Capilla Real*.

Court life increasingly revolved around religious observances during the reign of Charles V, culminating in the practices of the households of Philip II and Philip III. Ferdinand and Isabel obtained permission to celebrate most of the sacraments in the royal chapel in 1474, alongside the right of chapel members to execute these sacraments at any church while traveling with the household; later monarchs expanded upon those entitlements by obtaining the privilege of
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celebrating more Masses in the chapel, and all of this meant the royal establishment could function largely outside the traditional parish system. The royal family was exempt, but courtiers and servants living in and around the palace were obliged to complete their spiritual obligations at the local parish church. However, actual practice suggests that the palace chapel and private oratories were used regularly for baptisms, weddings, confirmations, and even consecration of bishops.

As with the secular members of the monarch’s household, a chapel member’s proximity to the ruler indicated his level of prestige and the king frequently relied upon these individuals for advice; thus, they could wield a great deal of power at court, as they had access to one or both monarchs in some of their most private moments. For instance, the capellán mayor attended to the king’s spiritual needs on a daily basis. One of most prominent figures in Philip III’s chapel, Don Diego de Guzmán, enjoyed a particularly close relationship with the monarchs, and is a good example of a cleric who successfully worked his way to the top of the chapel. Don Diego commenced his court career as a chaplain to Philip II. With the assistance of the Empress, he eventually ascended to capellán mayor of Descalzas Reales (1602), then Philip III appointed him limosnero mayor (almoner) and capellán mayor of the royal chapel, as well as tutor to the infantas (1608). He retained his position at Descalzas while serving at the palace, and still signed documents for the convent as late as 1611. As a part of his duties as head chaplain, Guzmán said the early morning Mass in the king or queen’s private oratory; he was the only person allowed to speak to the monarch there. A capellán mayor was also present during grave illnesses or royal births, in case he was needed to administer last rites. He also offered a blessing for the
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monarch’s midday meal and following the meal, Guzmán frequently conferred with the king regarding chapel matters, such as personnel appointments and preparations for feast days.

Guzmán’s activity at court reflects the hazy boundaries between secular and sacred in the Habsburg households. He routinely remained in Philip’s presence as he gave afternoon and evening audiences to courtiers and ambassadors. Clerics connected to the royal family frequently carried news between members of the household as well; when the Infante Fernando was born on 16 May 1609, Guzmán relayed the news to Philip III, then the capilla celebrated with a Te Deum and Mass in the royal chapel.\textsuperscript{122} Philip II and Philip III also relied upon their head chaplains and confessors for advice on political matters. Guzmán’s influence in that regard is reflected by the fact that he was appointed to official positions on a couple of royal councils. Faithful service was frequently rewarded through honorific ecclesiastical titles, with which came significant pensions: Guzmán was the first of a long line of capellanes mayores to hold the post of Archbishop of Tyre and Patriarch of the Indies, and was appointed Archbishop of Seville.

\textit{Blurred Lines: Court Activity Beyond the Palace}

Conversely, secular court officials attended to religious duties alongside the monarchs. The Duke of Lerma, the papal nuncio, and the Venetian ambassador were among the handful of top-ranking officials who accompanied Philip III to private services in the royal chapel and to everyday activities outside the Alcázar. Thus, their proximity to the monarch extended their roles beyond pure activity of government and into the king’s devotional life, which was of course just as public of a statement of Philip’s trust and respect for these men.\textsuperscript{123} On the occasion of the baptism of the first \textit{infanta} at the church of San Pablo in Valladolid on 12 October 1601, most of

\textsuperscript{122} For more on the role of the \textit{capellán mayor}, see Glass, 106-21.
\textsuperscript{123} Sánchez, 13.
the court was involved in a procession to the church, accompanied by the king’s *ministriles*; later, the singers divided into choirs to perform a variety of music.\textsuperscript{124} The monarchs gradually developed a pattern of attendance on various feast days as well. For instance, they spent New Year’s Day with the Jesuits at their Madrid church, and were extensively involved in Corpus Christi processions at Descalzas, instances in which the royal chapel was generally involved.

Daily affairs outside the palace were not as complex, nor did they involve as many personnel. After the monarchs finished their private morning Masses, they generally attended a Mass “in public” at one of Madrid’s religious establishments; Philip III and doña Margarita most frequently chose Descalzas Reales. Upon the court’s return to Madrid in 1606, the Duke of Lerma purchased several properties surrounding the convent, including a home for himself, and the monarch regularly took his midday meal there while the queen spent the bulk of the day with the Empress and/or *sor* Margarita. The king frequently returned to spend the evening at the convent in the company of the queen and *infantes*. The queen received papal dispensation to enter the cloistered areas of any convent, so she spent significant amounts of time conversing, eating, and praying with the nuns, and the children were allowed into the cloister as well. The *infantes* spent a significant amount of time at Descalzas Reales, particularly after their mother’s death; Margarita de la Cruz looked after them carefully as a surrogate mother figure.\textsuperscript{125}

Situations such as private meals allowed informal access to the monarchs. As a result, a good deal of political negotiation between the king’s principal advisors occurred in these relaxed situations, either at Descalzas Reales or the Duke of Lerma’s home. Similarly, *juntas* met in private settings, as they were not officially recognized councils; a number of these meetings


\textsuperscript{125} Palma, 125v.
occurred at Juan de Borja’s country home, Lerma’s house, or one of the royal palaces outside of Madrid. Such situations allowed María to visit with the king and his officials in an informal manner, as she frequented Borja’s home and the royal residences. Philip III relied heavily on the Empress in the months following his father’s death; for instance, in October 1598 he visited on a daily basis. These visits waned once his marriage to doña Margarita de Austria was finalized, and especially during the court’s residence at Valladolid.

The Descalzas Reales Convent

Function of Descalzas Reales as an Extension of the Court

As mentioned above, the Descalzas Reales convent hosted a variety of royal and public functions, and thus served as an extension of the royal chapel. Relaciones confirm that the capilla was recruited to augment the musical personnel of the convent on some of these occasions, such the arrival of Philip II and María’s party upon their return from Portugal in 1583, as well as the re-burial of the Empress in 1615. However, it was previously only assumed that María’s personal chapel was involved with the liturgical functions at Descalzas, and this may now be confirmed through entries in the Libro de sacristía kept by the sacristan of the convent. The sacristan was responsible for the upkeep of the church, as well as the ornaments and liturgical garb worn by officiants. The music books were housed in the sacristy with these items, as was the locked chest that held the money allotted for liturgical expenses. The Libro de sacristía contains frequent references to payments to extra musicians and clergy for special events; the bulk of the special expenses center around the feasts of Corpus Christi and Christmas.
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126 Sánchez, 31.
127 Various relaciones recount the instances in which the king or queen visited the convent, and numerous examples are included in Cabrera de Córdoba’s Relaciones.
The first concrete confirmation of María’s household involvement in the affairs of the convent dates from not long after her arrival in Spain: the Libro de sacristía entry for 4 July 1582 indicates that her chaplains, among others, assisted during Corpus Christi celebrations were paid a total of 11,968 maravedís for their services during the octave of the feast. Additionally, a payment of 1,496 maravedís was made to “Flecha, capellan de la Enperatriz [sic]” in January 1583, as he had assisted at Christmas and unspecified feasts. This refers to Mateo Flecha “el joven” who first served as a singer in the chapel of the infantas María and Juana from 1543. After he left the royal household and joined the Carmelite order in 1552, Flecha traveled to the Viennese court, where he served as one of María’s chaplains and a musician in her household from 1568. He spent some time in Spain after her court moved to Madrid, but retired from public service in 1601.

The boundaries between the Empress María’s court and the personnel of Descalzas were blurred further when members of her household also assumed official positions at the convent, thus serving in dual capacities; for example, Mateo Moreno, a sacristan of the convent, described himself as “capellan de su magestad de la Enperatriz [sic] y sacristan mayor de la capilla Real de su alteza” as early as September 1583. In this case, “capilla real” refers to the chapel of Descalzas Reales, as it was designated a royal chapel at its foundation.

The Foundation of Descalzas Reales

There are only two true Spanish precedents for the foundation of a royal convent. The first is Santa María la Real de las Huelgas in Burgos, established by Alfonso VIII and Eleanor of
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128 RB, MD/F/8, Libro de cuentas de la sacristía de monasterio de las Descalas Reales, años 1575-1614, fol. 38v.
129 Ibid., fol. 42r.
131 RB, MD/F/8, fol. 52r.
England in 1186; the house was intended to serve as a resting place for Castilian kings. The second, Santa María la Real de Tordesillas, was established in the 1390s as a pantheon for Pedro I and Blanca de Borbón and their family. In establishing Descalzas Reales as her final resting place, Juana was not only following established tradition, but also creating a haven for other royal and noble women, and forming something of a female counterpart to Philip II’s project at El Escorial. Other Habsburg family members had already set a standard of outward devotion by “retiring” to convents or monasteries; Charles V, for instance, spent his last days at a monastery in Yuste, and Philip II perpetuated the pattern at Escorial decades later.

Under the nurture of the Habsburgs, Descalzas became a haven for noble women, including illegitimate daughters of Austrian and Spanish Habsburgs such as Ana Dorotea de Austria, the daughter of Holy Roman Emperor Rudolf II. These women were regarded as spiritual guardians of the line who spent their lives in prayer for their family members and their political endeavors. The foundation statutes, first drawn up by Juana, then augmented and altered by Philip II, the Empress María, and Philip III, mandated perpetual intercession for the souls of the Habsburgs via a series of Requiem Masses. The spirit of austere life adopted by Juana and María fell neatly in line with Habsburg support of Catholic reform, though each remained closely involved with court activities, and offered support and political advice to their brother. Philip III leaned on María and her daughter for guidance, and they became a conduit through which the Austrian Habsburgs brought their petitions to court.

132 Chinchilla, 25.
133 A copy of the foundation documents, including Philip II’s additions, is AHN, Consejos 2143, fols. 196r-239r. Another is extant in the archives of the convent, now accessible on microfilm at the Archivo General del Palacio, Madrid: AMDR, Caja 1/11, fols. 1r-62v.
134 Ruiz Gómez, 32.
Descalzas Reales is a treasure trove of art: royal portraits, a priceless set of Rubens tapestries, and hundreds of relics are in the convent’s collections. Relics and artwork were frequently brought as dowries by professing noblewomen. For instance, the Empress María’s daughter, Margarita de la Cruz, wore a number of exquisite pieces of jewelry to her profession ceremony. Part of the ritual entailed removal of all of her outward adornments and vestment in the rough garb of a nun; the jewelry then belonged to the convent, and was used to augment its finances. Other works of art were donated by members of the royal family and court, including Queen Margarita, the Archduke Albert, and the Duke of Lerma. One piece, a large ivory crucifix, was owned by San Francisco de Borja, and now perches atop the lectern in the choir.

Juana began work on the foundation for her royal convent shortly following her regency. Its origins lay in Gandía, the ducal seat of her spiritual mentor, Francisco de Borja: seven nuns from the convent of Santa Clara in that city formed the first community at Descalzas Reales. According to the history of Descalzas penned by Juan Carrillo, one of the convent’s early seventeenth-century confessors, the confessor of Santa Clara de Gandía saw a vision during prayer, which indicated that the nuns of his convent would subsequently found seven other religious houses. The seventh was the Monasterio de la Madre de Dios de la Consolación, colloquially referred to as Las Descalzas Reales (“the Barefoot Royals”). Juana’s statement at the start of the foundation document indicates that the community that became Descalzas Reales

---

136 This event is extensively covered in Palma’s biography of Margarita, 58r-62r.
137 For a listing of the convent’s art and overview of the floorplan, see Ana García Sanz and María Leticia Sánchez Hernández, The Convents of Las Descalzas and La Encarnación (Madrid: Patrimonio Nacional, 2006).
138 Juan Carrillo, Relacion historica de la Real Fundacion del Monasterio de las Descalzas de Santa Clara de la villa de Madrid, con...las vidas de la Princesa de Portugal doña Juana de Austria y su fundadora y de la M.C. de la Emperatriz Maria, su hermana (Madrid: Luis Sánchez, impresor del Rey N.S., 1616), 17v-18r.
was formed in 1554; however, there is no clear indication that it was associated with the Princess of Portugal at this point.\footnote{AHN, Consejos 2143, fol. 196v.}

The first abbess of Descalzas Reales was Francisca de Jesús, Francisco de Borja’s aunt, and another of the founding members was María de Jesús, Francisca’s cousin and daughter of the Marquis de Denia.\footnote{This was the family title of Francisco Gómez de Sandoval y Roja, later elevated to Duke of Lerma.} The community initially settled in Valladolid in September 1557; a handful of sisters died there, including the abbess, but seven others took the habit before Juana transferred the convent to Madrid in 1559.

The palace in which the Princess of Portugal chose to permanently house her convent hosted the births of Juana and María, and thus became permanently associated with the Habsburg line; in a sense, Juana thus followed a centuries-old tradition by returning to the “domestic seat” of the house after she was widowed, a practice that was meant to enhance a woman’s image of decorum.\footnote{Ruiz Gómez, 32.} The structure was erected in the fifteenth century, and by the early sixteenth century it belonged to Don Alonso Gutiérrez, a criado of Charles V’s court. Juana purchased the palace from Gutiérrez’s estate in 1555, and the re-design began in 1556. Construction to renovate the existing church commenced in 1564; Juana, María, and Philip II had all been baptized in the church, but it had fallen into disrepair. The translation of the sacraments to the renovated space occurred in a grand ceremony on the feast of the Conception of the Virgin, 8 December 1564. The procession involved the entire royal court, including Philip II, crown prince Don Carlos, and the two sons of María who resided at court, the Archdukes Rudolf and Ernst.\footnote{Carrillo, fol. 25v.}

Juana did not live to see the project’s completion; she died in September 1573, before the renovations concluded. Her burial chapel to the right of the main altar of the church was
constructed in the year following her death, and the work is attributed to three of the architects who worked on El Escorial: Juan de Herrera, Jacome Trazzo, and Pompeo Leoni. Leoni also created the sculpture for the princess’s tomb, which depicts her kneeling in prayer. This posture was chosen for images of many Habsburgs as a way to project humility and piety.\textsuperscript{143} The two other chapels were named in honor of Juana’s husband and son: the chapels of S. Juan Bautista and S. Sebastián. Juan Pantoja de la Cruz’s portraits of Juana and María adorned the presbytery; unfortunately, these paintings, the altarpiece, organs, and much of the interior of the church were destroyed in a fire on 15 October 1862.\textsuperscript{144}

\textit{The Structure of Descalzas Reales: Foundation Documents, Chapel Responsibilities, Personnel}

The seminal musicological study of Descalzas Reales is Janet Hathaway’s dissertation on the activity of the convent, c. 1620-1700; music and primary source materials from earlier in the convent’s history are far scarcer.\textsuperscript{145} She thoroughly examines the daily life of the nuns and their participation in the liturgy and extra-liturgical music making; the use of villancicos for special occasions; and the role of Descalzas in royal and public ceremonies. Less attention is given to the structure of the organization and the male musicians associated with the convent, and little has been done to thoroughly address the environment in which Victoria was active.

The original foundation documents for the convent were signed by Juana in 1572. She worked through the Vatican bureaucratic process with the aid of Cardinal Alessandrino (Michele Bonelli), who happened to be in Spain at the time; he traveled as a legate to Spain and Portugal

\textsuperscript{143} Ruiz Gómez, 35.
\textsuperscript{144} Though the organ itself does not survive, a detailed description of its stops is AGP, AMDR Caja 39/11, fols. 1r-2r. For more detailed information on the convent’s design, see Elías Tormo, \textit{En las Descalzas Reales de Madrid: Estudios históricos, iconográficos, y artísticos}, Vols. 1 and 4 (Madrid: Junta de Iconografía Nacional, 1917).
\textsuperscript{145} Janet Hathaway, “Cloister, Court and City: Musical Activity of the Monasterio de las Descalzas Reales (Madrid), ca. 1620-1700” (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2005).
on 18 June 1571, accompanied by Francisco de Borja. Alessandrino signed a petition for papal approval of the documents in Madrid on 6 November 1571. Extant copies reflect the full text of Juana’s initial foundation, as well as the changes made by Philip II and Philip III, which were primarily personnel related. The first posthumous changes were made under Philip II and approved by Gregory XIII, and Philip III’s adjustments were affirmed by Clement VIII. Philip III also supported changes made by the Empress María, which did not enter the official foundation documents since she offered a separate foundation in her own name.

The extensive foundation document contains what one might expect of an organization’s operating constitution: personnel structure, rules for daily conduct of the staff, salary information, and an outline of duties. The convent was designed to house thirty-three nuns of noble or hidalgo families, women of high moral character and respected lineage whose limpieza de sangre could be proven through an investigation. A similar process was executed during the selection of chaplains as well: the capellán mayor selected a chaplain to travel to the candidate’s hometown and make inquiries. Juana restricted the living space and the number of seats in the choir in order to assure that the limit would be followed. Her reasoning was that nuns following the First Rule of Santa Clara were obliged to live on donations, and larger numbers would make the arrangement more difficult.

The number of professed nuns did not include the girls educated at the convent; seven girls were raised there as novices who would later join the order. Juana’s foundation also supported three beatas and three female servants to attend them. These women received rations of food, and were expected to follow the rules of the house. Beatas did not profess as nuns, but garnered reputations as holy women, often renowned for their mystical

146 AHN, Consejos 2143, fol. 198v.
147 Ibid., fols. 237v-239v.
148 Ibid., fol. 199r.
experiences and potent prayers. Powerful men, including the king, relied upon their counsel. The founder also stipulated that the nuns were to confess to Franciscans who lived outside the convent.

**Convent Staff**

At the beginning of the document, Juana explicitly stated that one of her primary purposes for founding the Descalzas Reales was to aid in bringing salvation to the souls of her family members. Much of the work the convent did was in the daily Offices and Masses, plus specially dedicated services and prayers for the souls of the royal family. The First Rule of St Clare forbade the nuns from singing the Office, and the foundation document implicitly confirms this, as are no references to the nuns singing at all. They were not prohibited from all music making; however, period accounts suggest that they participated in chant on select occasions, such as the entrance rites for novices, and played and sang in the cloister. When chaplains and other males were present at liturgical functions, they participated from behind a grille separating the choir from the rest of the church.

The convent employed a retinue of chaplains to fulfill most of the obligations stipulated in the foundation. Mass and Vespers on most feasts were to be celebrated with polyphony, as were many of the quasi-liturgical functions. Juana’s original foundation called for a *capellán mayor* and four *capellanes de voz* who sang for these functions and performed other clerical duties; each earned 200 *ducados* per year (75,000 *mrs*; see Table 3-1 for a listing of personnel and salaries). Philip II augmented this number to twelve who each made 400 *ducados* per year (150,000 *mrs*), while the *capellán mayor* earned 800 *ducados* (300,000 *mrs*). Philip III reduced
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149 Sánchez, 138.
150 AHN, Consejos 2143, fol. 198r.
151 Hathaway, 86-89.
this number to nine; however, he explicitly stated the voice distribution he required: two triples, two contrabajos, two tenores, two contraltos, and a maestro de capilla. Philip III rescinded his decision in 1613, reinstated his father’s three endowed chaplaincies in his own name, and added another salaried priest.

Head chaplains were fully ordained priests, at least forty years old, and were expected to maintain a reputation of honesty and virtue. Furthermore, the candidate should be reasonably well educated: he ought to be thoroughly acquainted with the Mass and Office liturgies, know Latin, and have studied theology or canon law for at least two to three years. Other chaplains were not required to study theology or canon law and had to be thirty years old, but were additionally required to have a good voice and be able to sing plainchant and polyphony. Candidates were thoroughly examined by the capellán mayor and two senior chaplains, as well as the maestro de capilla, and their names were then submitted to the crown for official approval.

Chaplains followed a relatively strict set of conduct guidelines; they lived in a communal home, the number of criados they were allowed to bring into the house was limited, a curfew was enforced, and they were required to take meals and sleep in the house unless otherwise authorized. The foundation allowed for a cook and two servants, who assisted in the chaplains’ kitchen. Procedures for absences were relatively flexible: a chaplain was not allowed absences of more than one month per year unless approved otherwise, and he was obliged to obtain his own substitute(s) and pay them out of his own salary. If an absence extended to more than six months due to illness, the convent reserved the right to replace the chaplain. They were
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152 AHN, Consejos 2143, fols. 203r-v.
153 Hathaway, 46.
154 AHN, Consejos 2143, fol. 205v.
155 Ibid., fols. 206r-v. Philip II had the age boundary changed to 25; see RB, Descalzas Reales MD/B/4, Real fundación de la Capilla y Monasterio de Religiosas Franciscas Descalzas de la Primera Regla de Santa Clara... (Madrid: Francisco Xavier Garcia, 1769), 26.
156 AHN, Consejos 2143, fols. 208v-209v.
prohibited from singing as a cohesive chapel outside of convent functions, but individual activity was permissible.\textsuperscript{157}

Table 3-1. Chapel Positions During Victoria's Madrid Career.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Amendment</th>
<th>Patron</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Philip II</td>
<td>12 Chaplaincies:\textsuperscript{158}</td>
<td>400 ducados each (150,000 mrs)\textsuperscript{159}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 3 tiple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 3 contralto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 3 tenore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 3 contrabajo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capellán mayor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacristan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 mozos de coro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 acolytes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 capellanes de altar\textsuperscript{160}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organist (not a chaplaincy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581, 1589, 1591</td>
<td>Empress Maria</td>
<td>3 capellanes de altar\textsuperscript{160}</td>
<td>400 ducados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Philip III</td>
<td>9 Chaplaincies:</td>
<td>400 ducados each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 2 tiple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 2 contralto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 2 tenore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 2 contrabajo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maestro de capilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capellán mayor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacristan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 mozos de coro\textsuperscript{161}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 acolytes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bajonista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 capellanes de altar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Philip III</td>
<td>Recently vacated contrabajo chaplaincy re-dedicated as official maestro de capilla post.\textsuperscript{163}</td>
<td>400 ducados</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{157} AHN, Consejos 2143, fol. 215r.
\textsuperscript{158} One served as maestro de capilla.
\textsuperscript{159} Philip II doubled the original salaries of the capellanes and capellán mayor.
\textsuperscript{160} Separate from official chapel; not musical positions.
\textsuperscript{161} RB, Descalzas Reales MD/B/4, 22.
\textsuperscript{162} The salary for the organist and bajonista was augmented to 75,000 mrs on 12 July 1606, following Victoria’s petition to Philip III (AHN, Consejos 253, fols. 34r-v); this sum elevated the instrumentalists’ salaries to half that of the chaplains.
\textsuperscript{163} AHN, Consejos 2145, fols. 71v-72v.
The chaplains of the convent also served the attached Hospital de la Misericordia, which Juana founded as a charity extension of Descalzas Reales. The hospital tended to approximately a dozen impoverished priests and occasionally nobility who had come upon difficult financial straits. The chaplains held a yearly election to select a rector for the Misericordia from among themselves; this person was responsible for saying or organizing Mass on feast days, hearing confessions, and providing the sacraments to the hospital’s residents.164

The foundation called for two additional clerics who served as substitutes and supported the *capellanes de voz* on certain occasions; these *capellanes de altar* augmented the chapel by serving as deacon and subdeacon on special feasts and helped the chaplains cover the required liturgy when they had too many obligations to fulfill or were ill. They also performed the early morning Mass during the six colder months of the year in order to preserve the musicians’ voices.165 These clerics were considered salaried chaplains, but did not function as a full-time part of the standing chapel of singers. The *capellán mayor* was to select priests “de buenas vozes,” meaning they could sing chant; perhaps they sang polyphony on feast days as well.

The chapel staff also included four choirboys and two acolytes. Each received 50 *ducados* (18,750 *mrs*) per year, plus clothing for service in the church. The *maestro de capilla* was required to train them to read and sing plainchant and polyphony, and to instruct them in counterpoint.166 The acolytes were altar boys whose supervision fell under the purview of the sacristan; these boys were between the ages of 12 and 18, and once they reached 18, the convent dismissed them with 20 *ducados* (7,500 *mrs*) and assistance in procuring other employment. Like
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164 AHN, Consejos 2143, fol. 235r.
165 Ibid., fol. 204r.
166 Ibid., fol. 204v.
the choirboys and acolytes, the sacristan was also required to be able to sing chant and polyphony, in addition to his duties as the keeper of the objects used in the liturgy.\footnote{AHN, Consejos 2143, fols. 231v-232v.}

The number of total voices available for chapel performances clearly exceeded the number indicated by the endowed chaplaincies; in the time of Philip II, this meant there were 12 chaplains and four choirboys, the sacristan, two clerics, and two acolytes—a total of 20 singers. Philip III required two tiples, two contraltos, two tenores, and two contrabajos, which means the chapel could have performed balanced double-choir works with one person on each part. However, the maestro also had the high voices of six boys, plus the sacristan and priests, whose voice parts are not stipulated. Depending upon the voicings, doublings, and use of instruments as either substitutes for voices or as reinforcements, the boys could have augmented the chaplains’ choirs to create a third choir. Thus, the Descalzas Reales chapel was easily capable of performing the expansive polychoral literature of the seventeenth century, characteristic of Philip III’s court and of Victoria’s 1600a publication.

The professional chapel at Descalzas was rounded out by a maestro de capilla and two full-time instrumentalists. Prior to Philip III’s alterations in 1601, there was no official maestro de capilla; overall chapel leadership fell to the capellán mayor, but the chaplains periodically elected a maestro from among them. Evidently a maestro de capilla did not always sing, as Philip III’s changes indicated that it was preferable if a maestro had a good voice, but not absolutely essential. Since the arrangement was relatively fluid and personnel records are scarce, it is difficult to clearly piece together a listing of maestros before and during Victoria’s tenure. Most Victoria scholars, including Stevenson and Rubio, assumed that Victoria was at least an unofficial maestro at Descalzas, but this assumption is problematic, as will be explored below.
Two salaried instrumental positions were included in the foundation: an organist and a bajón player, both of whom received 40,000 maravedís in salary.\textsuperscript{168} The royal patron chose the chaplains and their leader, but the chaplains themselves were responsible for the selection of the bajonista, as is indicated by the statutes, which also provides insight regarding the instrument’s function in the liturgy:

> We order and command that there is a salaried bajón player serving the chapel every day that there is music, and [to] help the choir and chaplains with his instrument; and therefore we shall give a salary of 40,000 maravedís per year; being examined by the chapel master and musicians, and received by the head chaplain to the content and satisfaction of the convent and Abbess.\textsuperscript{169}

The bajón supported the vocalists, likely by doubling the melody in chant or perhaps by providing support to the bass line in performances of fabordón and polyphony, an arrangement common in Spanish chapels of the period.\textsuperscript{170}

Descalzas Reales employed two organists throughout much of the seventeenth century, as the liturgical requirements of the chapel became too great for a single person to handle.\textsuperscript{171} However, only one post was included in the foundation statutes. The practice of hiring an assistant was certainly in place by the time Victoria took the position around 1604. When Philip III granted him the right to select his successor in July 1611, the composer stated that his protégé, Bernardo Pérez de Medrano, had been working with him throughout his tenure.\textsuperscript{172} The full-time organist position was unusual, since it eventually became a chaplaincy rather than a simple instrumentalist’s post that did not require the holder to be a cleric; one of the Empress Maria’s endowed positions was re-dedicated to the organist in 1674, perhaps as a way to codify

\textsuperscript{168} *Bajón* is the Spanish term for the dulcian, a predecessor to the modern bassoon.

\textsuperscript{169} AHN, Consejos 2143, fol. 205r: “mandamos y ordenamos que aya un baxon asalariado que sirva la dicha Capilla todos los dias que huiiere musica y ayde al coro y capellan con su Instrumento y por ello se le de de salario cada un año quarenta mil maravedis siendo examinado por el Maestro de Capilla y musicos y sea recibido por el capellan mayor a contento y satisfaçion del convento y Abadesa.”

\textsuperscript{170} Hathaway, 60.

\textsuperscript{171} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{172} AHN, Consejos 2143, fols. 253r-ff.
unofficial practice. It is possible that this tradition reached as far back as Victoria, since he served as organist and held one of María’s endowed chaplaincies.

Ministriles were hired for special occasions as early as the 1580s, though their exact functions are unknown; most of the references to payments of outside instrumentalists surround the feasts of Easter, Corpus Christi, and Christmas. The vast majority of accounts of instrumental music-making date from well after Victoria’s death, though by the late sixteenth century, vihuelists and other string players were hired for Corpus Christi. Early versions of the foundation documents only refer to organ and bajón, but other instruments such as bajoncillo, chirimías, corneta, and harp are mentioned in accounts from the 1640s and beyond.

The convent’s finances were tightly controlled; a non-resident mayordomo was responsible for depositing the foundation’s monetary allowances into a chest at the monastery of San Gerónimo, and the senior chaplains of Descalzas and the rector of San Gerónimo had the keys. The chaplains selected one from among their number to record expenses for the year, alongside the sacristan. This official assisted with the distribution of salaries every four months (tercios) and disbursement of payments for ordinary and extraordinary expenses.

Chapel Personnel During Victoria’s Madrid Career

Since financial records for the convent are scarce, reconstruction of the Descalzas chapel personnel during Victoria’s lifetime is no simple task. There is no extant Libro de asientos, which would contain extensive employment records; likewise, no records of official examinations of candidates survive. Extant personnel information has been drawn from the

---

173 Hathaway, 60-61.
174 Ibid., 56-57.
175 AHN, Consejos 2143, fols. 225v-228r.
176 Hathaway, 62.
two sets of documents that contain most of the extant financial records for this period: the *Libro de sacristía*, and the *Libros de iglesia*. A relatively complete listing of personnel follows in Tables 3-2 through 3-6. This information is newly collated and presented in unprecedented detail. Prior studies of the Descalzas Reales personnel focus on periods later than Victoria, and rely on secondary sources and/or incomplete bodies of primary data, such as the *Libro de sacristía*; all exclude the *capellanes mayores* and *sacristanes*.¹⁷⁷ The tables provide new information on some of the individuals, primarily gleaned from the *Libros de iglesia*.

Table 3-2. *Capellanes mayores* During Victoria's Madrid Career.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Gil de Albornoz</td>
<td>by Jan 1582¹⁷⁸ – at least 14 October 1587¹⁷⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenciado Luis de Alcázar de Cano</td>
<td>c. 14 October 1587 – at least 6 April 1588¹⁸⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor Don Alvaro de Carvajal</td>
<td>2 Mar 1588¹⁸¹ – before 12 April 1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Pedro de Luna</td>
<td>12 April 1599¹⁸² – at least 1 Aug 1601¹⁸³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Diego de Guzmán</td>
<td>1 July 1602¹⁸⁴ – 20 Oct 1609¹⁸⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Alonso Messia/Mejia de Tovar</td>
<td>20 Oct 1609¹⁸⁶ – before 24 Aug 1612¹⁸⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁷⁷ For instance, Hathaway’s dissertation covers the period directly following Victoria’s death. Another significant source of information that deals primarily with musicians of the late seventeenth through nineteenth centuries, is José Subirá, “La música en la Capilla y Monasterio de las Descalzas Reales de Madrid,” *Anuario musical* 12 (1957): 147-66. Alfonso de Vicente included a spare, incomplete listing of the musicians employed by Descalzas Reales from 1574-1633; however, he exclusively cites secondary sources. See Alfonso de Vicente, “El entorno femenino de la dinastía: el complejo conventual de las Descalzas Reales (1574-1633),” in *Tomás Luis de Victoria y la cultura musical en la España de Felipe III*, Alfonso de Vicente and Pilar Tomás, eds. (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Europa Hispánica y Machado Libros, 2012), 204-05.

¹⁷⁸ First mention as *capellán mayor* is RB, Descalzas Reales MD/F/8, fol. 38r; he was a chaplain by 1580.

¹⁷⁹ Final mention in the position (Ibid., fols. 77v-78r); position was vacant by December 1587, as Luis de Alcázar served temporarily from at least this point (Ibid., fol. 78r); Albornóz’s death is confirmed in a statement signed by Alcázar 4 Feb 1588 (Ibid., fols. 78v-79v).

¹⁸⁰ Appointed upon his predecessor’s death (AHN, Consejos 2140, fol. 317r). Carvajal later promoted to a chaplain of the king’s household and *limosnero mayor* (AHN, Consejos 2142, fol. 333v).

¹⁸¹ AHN, Consejos 2142, fol. 333v. Luna received papal dispensation to fill the post, as he had not studied the required years of canon law or theology in order to be eligible for the post; the reasoning in the king’s petition was that it was more important to have a person of virtue in the position than a person of letters (Ibid., fols. 331v-332r).

¹⁸² Final mention in the *Libro de sacristía* (RB, Descalzas Reales MD/F/8, fol. 166r).

¹⁸³ Pedro de Luna vacated this post to take a position as chaplain in the Capilla de los Reyes Nuevos in Toledo by the time Guzmán was appointed (AHN, Consejos 2143, fol. 173v).

¹⁸⁴ At this point, Guzmán held the post concurrently with his positions as *limosnero* and *capellán mayor* to the king; since he was not supposed to hold any other post that required residence, he requested replacement at Descalzas on 8 October 1609 (AHN, Consejos 2145, fols. 358r-359r).

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., fol. 363v.
Table 3-3. Sacristanes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel López</td>
<td>Active c. 1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mateo Moreno</td>
<td>24 July 1576 – late 1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benito García</td>
<td>Active c. 1578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás de Salcedo</td>
<td>Active c. 1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Lozano</td>
<td>c. 1583 – 26 August 1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Berroçano</td>
<td>27 August 1591 – 1st half of 1613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garva Garrido</td>
<td>Active 7 Feb 1604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-4. Maestros de capilla. 190

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hieronymo Campos[193]</td>
<td>by Feb 1581[194] – at least 9 June 1582[195]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Ortega</td>
<td>from at least 16 Nov 1583[196]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian de Bonifaz</td>
<td>sometime after Ortega – before 2 Dec 1587[197]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Vechio/Bochio</td>
<td>from at least 2 Dec 1587[198]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Montero</td>
<td>after 17 Jan 1600[199] – before 26 March 1604[200]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Fernández de Alameda</td>
<td>by 26 March 1604 – until Paez de Avila[201]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Páez de Ávila</td>
<td>16 Nov 1607[202] – before 2 May 1613? [203]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

187 Date of Don Gabriel de Trezo Paniagua’s appointment; Mejia had been promoted to the bishopric of Mondoñedo (AHN, Consejos 2146, Libro de iglesia 9º, fols. 60r-61r).
188 In his final entry, Moreno refers to himself as “capellan de su magestad de la enperatriz y sacristan”
189 Signed off on records for July-Dec 1603.
190 A previous listing of maestros at Descalzas during this period is Angel Miguel Olmos, “Aportaciones a la temprana historia musical de la capilla de las Descalzas Reales de Madrid (1576-1618),” Revista de Musicología 26/2 (Dec 2003): 445. His listings rely only on the Libro de sacristía.
191 RB, Descalzas Reales MD/F/8, fol. 26r.
192 Ginés de Piñeda was appointed to fill his contralto chaplaincy on this date (AHN, Consejos 2140, fol. 133r).
193 This is an individual heretofore unknown as an employee of Descalzas Reales.
194 First signature as maestro, is RB, Descalzas Reales MD/F/8, fol. 32v.
195 Final signature in the same volume; Ibid., fols. 37v-38r.
196 Only mention as maestro the second time; Ibid., fol. 51v.
197 Served as chaplain between at least 1587 and 1611; the only mention of his service as maestro is in the music inventory from 2 Dec 1587, in which he is named as the former maestro who took care of the music collection and signed off on the inventory document (Ibid., fol. 256r).
198 See n. 176. Vechio was appointed to a tenor chaplaincy on 7 Mar 1586 (AHN, Consejos 2140, fol. 253r).
199 Montero was a senior chaplain by this date (RB, Descalzas Reales MD/F/8, fol. 156v).
200 He is mentioned as former maestro on 30 March 1604 (Ibid., fol. 175v); his replacement by Antonio Fernandez de Alameda is confirmed in a statement at the head of the music inventory from 26 March 1604 (Ibid., fols. 256v-257v); Montero retained his position as a senior chaplain until at least 2 May 1613 (Ibid., fol. 230v).
201 Fernández de Alameda was a chaplain at Descalzas from at least 11 Aug 1579 (AHN, Consejos 2140, fols. 79r-v); retained a position as chaplain after the appointment of Páez de Ávila, as confirmed by his participation in the inventory of items purchased between 26 March 1604 and 8 April 1608 (RB, Descalzas Reales MD/F/8, fol. 259r) and his last signature as a senior chaplain, 16 May 1614 (Ibid., fol. 237r).
202 He completed the competition process for the maestro de capilla position while holding the maestro post at the collegial church in Antequera (AHN, Consejos 2145, fols. 75r-67r).
203 Final mention is as senior chaplain, not as maestro (RB, Descalzas Reales MD/F/8, fol. 230v).
### Table 3-5. Instrumentalists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position(s)</th>
<th>First Record</th>
<th>Last Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Nuñez</td>
<td>Organist</td>
<td>c. 1577&lt;sup&gt;204&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Martínez</td>
<td>Organist/Organ Tuner</td>
<td>20 Oct 1581&lt;sup&gt;205&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>May/June 1584&lt;sup&gt;206&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria</td>
<td>Organist</td>
<td>c. 1604&lt;sup&gt;207&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>d. [28] Aug 1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardo Pérez de Medrano</td>
<td>Assistant/Substitute Organist</td>
<td>c. 1604&lt;sup&gt;208&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2 July 1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonso del Cerro</td>
<td>Bajonista</td>
<td>12 July 1606&lt;sup&gt;209&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3-6. Chaplains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position(s)</th>
<th>First Record</th>
<th>Last Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luis de Alcazar de Cano</td>
<td>Capellán</td>
<td>2 May 1576</td>
<td>6 April 1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Mendez de Campo</td>
<td>Contralto</td>
<td>23 Jan 1577</td>
<td>d. before 27 May 1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristóbal Ibañez</td>
<td>Contrabajo</td>
<td>23 Jan 1577</td>
<td>d. before 28 Oct 1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonso Lopez</td>
<td>Tiple or Tenor&lt;sup&gt;210&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>16 May 1614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro de Aragües</td>
<td>Contrabajo</td>
<td>Appointed 22 Jan 1578</td>
<td>7 Nov 1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Fernandez de Alameda</td>
<td>Tiple or Tenor</td>
<td>11 August 1579</td>
<td>16 May 1614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gil de Albornoz</td>
<td>Capellán</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>d. by 4 Feb 1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Aragües</td>
<td>Capellán</td>
<td>January 1582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicasio Usarte</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>June 1582&lt;sup&gt;211&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Corneta</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>June 1582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerónimo de Sepúlveda</td>
<td>Capellán?</td>
<td>9 June 1582&lt;sup&gt;212&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10 Jan 1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Gomez Patiño</td>
<td>Capellán?</td>
<td>4 July 1582&lt;sup&gt;213&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10 Jan 1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cipriano</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10 Jan 1583&lt;sup&gt;214&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Gomez de Rigo</td>
<td>Capellán?</td>
<td>1582&lt;sup&gt;215&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel de Ayançu</td>
<td>Contralto</td>
<td>Appointed 25 Jan 1584</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matheo Sanctos</td>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>Appointed 25 Jan 1584</td>
<td>d. by 7 Mar 1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonso de la Cueva</td>
<td>Tiple</td>
<td>Appointed 8 Mar 1584</td>
<td>10 May 1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Ruiz Chamuscado</td>
<td>Contralto</td>
<td>Appointed 23 Aug 1584</td>
<td>Before 1 Nov 1587&lt;sup&gt;217&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Ruiz de Santorcaz</td>
<td>Contrabajo</td>
<td>At least 26 June 1586</td>
<td>18 May 1604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>204</sup> Record of 1 June 1579 indicates he had been there at least two years.

<sup>205</sup> He indicated in his petition that he had served for an unspecified time without sufficient salary.

<sup>206</sup> These were the last times he was paid for tuning the organ (RB, Descalzas Reales MD/F/8, fol. 57r).

<sup>207</sup> Victoria served as organist for two years before petitioning for a raise (AHN, Consejos 253, fols. 34r-v).

<sup>208</sup> In the document naming Pérez as successor on 2 July 1611, Victoria indicated that he served with him for seven years (Ibid., fols. 116r-117v).

<sup>209</sup> Awarded the same raise as Victoria on this date (Ibid., fol. 38v).

<sup>210</sup> At times he seemed to function as a capellán mayor or maestro de capilla, as he distributed payment to musicians and others who assisted with concert functions.

<sup>211</sup> Usarte and Corneta were paid for unknown services in June 1582 (RB, Descalzas Reales MD/F/8, fol. 37v).

<sup>212</sup> Assistance as deacon and other unknown capacities on selected feasts (Ibid., 37v-38r, 41v).

<sup>213</sup> Probably the Patiño paid for assisting with the Octave of Corpus Christi (Ibid., 38v).

<sup>214</sup> Function/position unknown; it seems likely this “Cipriano” was a member of the Empress’s retinue, as he is listed alongside Mateo Flecha (Ibid., 41v-42r).

<sup>215</sup> Served as deacon during 1582; payment noted 10 Jan 1583 (Ibid.).

<sup>216</sup> Replaced Ginés de Piñeda, who died (AHN, Consejos 2140, fol. 201r).

<sup>217</sup> Replacement for Juan Vara, who died (Ibid.).

<sup>218</sup> Ibid., fol. 205r.

<sup>219</sup> Replacement for Martín de Tejada (Ibid., fol. 216r).

<sup>220</sup> He had been promoted to an unknown post elsewhere (Ibid., fol. 300v).
A single complete listing of the convent’s musical personnel survives from Victoria’s Madrid career, and is heretofore unpublished. It is located in a printed version of the Descalzas foundation documents; the *capellanes* took part in negotiations to amend the foundation at the beginning of Philip III’s reign, as reflected by a document signed by them on 9 Jan 1603. Since Philip III mandated two singers per voice part, a *capellán mayor*, and a *maestro de capilla* by this point, some reconstruction of the performing forces may be done. Some of their assignments are known through other sources, while others invite multiple possibilities that would round out the voice balance.

- Diego de Guzmán (*capellán mayor*)
- Antonio Fernández de Alameda (*tiple, tenor, or maestro*)
- Francisco Montero (*tiple, tenor, or maestro*)
- Alonso de la Cueva (*tiple*)
- Alonso López (*tiple or tenor*)
- Pedro Sanchez (*tenor*)
- Julian Bonifaz (*contralto*)
- Sebastian Ximenez (*contralto*)
- Juan Pérez (*contrabajo*)
- Juan Ruiz (*contrabajo*)

---

221 Replacement for Mattheo Sanctos, who had died (AHN, Consejos 2140, fol. 253r).
222 Replaced Diego Mendez, who died (Ibid., fol. 257v).
223 Replaced Cristóbal Ibañez, who died (Ibid., fol. 392r).
224 Position re-dedicated as official *maestro de capilla* post upon his death (AHN, Consejos 2145, fols. 71v-72v).
225 Filled vacancy left by a Don Martín García (AHN, Consejos 2141, fol. 161v).
226 The first seven signed the document in person; Juan Pérez and Juan Ruiz were unable to attend due to illness (RB, Descalzas Reales MD/B/4, 115).
Chapel Duties and Liturgy

Chaplains and their supporting staff were responsible for at least two daily Masses, which were normally executed in plainchant: the Misa prima, and the misa cantada conventual, both of which the nuns heard; the conventual Mass was chanted by a single priest. They followed a weekly rotation to determine who would celebrate which Masses, and the ones who were not on first Mass or conventual Mass duty were obligated to say two additional Masses during the week: one in honor of S. Juan Bautista, and the other for S. Sebastián, the namesakes of Juana’s husband and child. On alternating weeks, these were replaced with a Mass in honor of La Señora de las Llagas and the Conception of the Virgin. The chapel also performed funerary rites for the monarchs, and offered Requiems on the anniversary of the founders’ deaths. All chaplains, plus the salaried priests, assisted with Vespers on most feast days and Sundays, Matins on Christmas, and the profession rites of nuns, and the abbess retained the right to request additional polyphony. The calendar expanded with each augmentation to the foundation, and thus reflects a robust performance schedule for the chaplains (Table 3-7). The Descalzas chapel was responsible for the largest number of feasts out of the three royal convents in Madrid. These increased in number and complexity over the course of the first half of the seventeenth century, and the adjustment of the chaplaincy endowments reflects the trend.

---

227 AHN, Consejos 2143, fols. 215v-217r.
228 Ibid., fol. 217r.
229 Hathaway, 24.
Table 3-7. Feast Days Observed with Polyphony at Descalzas Reales (by 1602).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Level of Solemnity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>1: Circumcision</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6: Epiphany</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20: St. Sebastian</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21: St. Agnes</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23: St. Ildephonsus</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25: Conversion of St. Paul</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>2: Purification</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5: St. Agatha</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>19: St. Joseph</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25: Annunciation of the Virgin</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lent (Moveable)</td>
<td>Monday, Wednesday, Saturday of the first week of Lent</td>
<td>Servicio de Completas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Holy Week: Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Passions, Tenebrae Good Friday Procession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>3: Invention of the Cross</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6: San Juan Ante Portam Latinam (St. John Before the Latin Gate)</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8: St. Michael</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>13: St Anthony</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24: St. John the Baptist</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>2: Visitation</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20: St. Margaret</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22: St. Mary Magdalene</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25: St. James</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26: St. Anne</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>5: Our Lady of the Snows</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6: Transfiguration</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15: Assumption</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12: St. Clare</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28: St Augustine</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29: Beheading of St. John the Baptist</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>8: Nativity of the Virgin</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?: San Victor</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29: St. Michael, the Archangel</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>4: St. Francis of Assisi</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21: St. Ursula and the 11,000 Virgins</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1: All Saints</td>
<td>Matins for the Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: All Souls</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21: Presentation of the Virgin</td>
<td>Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>8: Conception of the Virgin</td>
<td>Matins, Mass, Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25: Christmas</td>
<td>Daily Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moveable</td>
<td>Easter (including processions)</td>
<td>Matins, Mass, Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holy Week (starting with Palm Sunday)</td>
<td>Daily Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corpus Christi and Octave</td>
<td>Daily Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pentecost</td>
<td>Daily Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinity Sunday</td>
<td>Daily Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entries and professions of nuns</td>
<td>Daily Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anything else the abbess requested</td>
<td>Daily Mass and Vespers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Habsburg patrons placed particular emphasis on the solemn execution of the liturgy for eucharistically focused observations, such as the Holy Week Offices, Easter, and Corpus Christi, and authorized hiring of extra personnel for the occasions. For instance, they mandated the hiring of extra singers, at least twelve priests, and ministriles for the Easter Sunday procession, High Mass, and Vespers, though ministriles are only explicitly requested for the processions. On the convent’s patronal feast day, Nuestra Señora de la Assumpción, the capellán mayor was to bring 12 clerics, plus singers, to minister at Vespers and Mass; the same applied to the fiestas of San Juan Bautista, San Sebastián, and Las Once Mil Virgenes. Guest clerics were paid three ducados each (1,125 mrs), and ministriles earned six ducados (2,250 mrs), which were divided among the group. The chaplains also sang a Requiem every Monday for which the nuns provided a sung response, and a yearly Office for the Dead on the anniversary of Juana’s death.

Juan Carrillo, one of the convent’s confessors, recorded a particularly detailed account of the elaborate decorations and music prepared for the Corpus Christi festivities from 1615. Though the description dates from four years after Victoria’s death and pertains only to events held on the convent property, celebrations during the composer’s lifetime must have been similar. The events on the day of the feast, plus its octave, were opulent, and likely exhausting for the musicians and clerics involved:

The day of the Blessed Sacrament commenced with much music at six o’clock in the morning, and they did not stop singing with the organ and various instruments until nine o’clock, when they played the High Mass, which was sung in two and three choirs. After the daily Epistle reading, a new villancico is sung. There is a daily sermon by the greatest preachers of the court. They say 70 or 80 Misas rezadas every day, for which each [of them] receives two reales. There is a fiesta every day, with harps, vihuelas, and other various instruments, and songs of the Blessed Sacrament until Vespers, all of which is said [performed] with music. At seven in the evening the Salve is sung very solemnly, then after it a villancico, for which all of the altar candles are lit…they make a procession

---

230 RB, Descalzas Reales MD/B/4, 74.
after Vespers, with as much solemnity, music, and singing as can be mustered…their villancico is sung at every altar, and the procession lasts almost two hours…

Carrillo mentions that Vespers began with the ministriles and the entire capilla, augmented by eight of the king’s finest singers; they opened the service with music for two and three choirs.

The Empress María’s Foundation

Numerous biographers assume that Victoria occupied one of the chaplaincies tied to Descalzas Reales proper, which commanded a yearly salary of 200 ducados (75,000 mrs), but this is not the case; he most likely inherited one of María’s three endowed chaplaincies at her death, and these were probably not assigned the same duties as the capellanes de voz or capellanes de altar associated with Juana’s foundation, and certainly were not an official part of the Descalzas chapel until after the composer’s death. Moreover, no extant lists of endowed personnel survive, nor do the financial records for the Empress’s household.

The Empress endowed an extensive list of additional Masses in her will; those that appear in all versions of the document, including her earliest testament from 1581, are two Requiem Masses on non-feast days. María endowed capellanes de altar, which were clearly intended to provide the personnel for these extra services, though they are not explicitly mentioned until her testament from 1594. Their duties were not clearly outlined during her life, but were clarified somewhat after lengthy processes administrated by the executors of her will. The Empress’s chaplaincies were not completely integrated with the regular retinue until 1644.

María’s endowed posts were confirmed by the Archduke Albert in 1614, along with their salary of 400 ducados (150,000 mrs), though a later amendment coinciding with lawsuits

---

231 Paraphrase and translation of Carrillo, fols. 37r-38r.
232 Ibid., fol. 37r.
233 Hathaway, 49.
between Descalzas and the Colegio Imperial regarding distribution of the Empress’s estate resulted in a reduction of the salary to 300 ducados (112,500 mrs).\textsuperscript{234} The Empress also allotted 1,000 ducados (375,000 mrs) annually for a sung Mass and Vespers on a number of feasts, though polyphony is not explicitly specified (see Table 3-8).

In addition to the feasts in honor of saints, María allotted 100 ducados (37,500 mrs) from the 1,000 to renew the Sacraments at the beginning of each year, 100 ducados for singing the Completas services on Wednesday and Saturday of the first week of Lent, and 300 ducados (112,500 mrs) were reserved for the Octave of Corpus Christi, in order to remunerate extra personnel hired for the occasion. The 1594 testament includes a brief listing of other Masses she wished to be said using a portion of the same 1,000 ducados: Las Llagas, Nuestra Señora, and Los Angeles. She also asked that the chapel perform an Office for the Dead, plus Vespers, Matins, Lauds, and Requiem Mass on a monthly basis, in addition to the anniversary of her death and the Feast of All Saints.\textsuperscript{235}

\textsuperscript{234} A print copy of most of Maria’s collected testaments, codicils, and other amendments is RB, Descalzas Reales MD/B/8: Fundación y dotación que la Magestad Cesarea de la Emperatriz doña Maria... (Madrid: 1626). Hathaway states that these chaplaincies were established in 1581, 1589, and 1591, as indicated in Paulino Capdepón Verdú, La música en el Monasterio de las Descalzas Reales de Madrid (Siglo XVIII) (Madrid: Fundación Caja Madrid y Editorial Alpuerto S.A., 1999), 98; however, she does not provide further information, such as salary. Corresponding information may be found in AGP, Sec. Patr. (Descalzas), 7141/1.

\textsuperscript{235} RB, Descalzas Reales MD/B/8, fol. 22v.
Table 3-8. Feasts Endowed by the Empress María.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Feast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>St. Valerio&lt;sup&gt;237&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June</td>
<td>St. Anthony of Padua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 August</td>
<td>St. Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 September</td>
<td>St. Wenceslaus&lt;sup&gt;238&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 October</td>
<td>11,000 Virgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 November</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 November</td>
<td>St. Isabel of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 November</td>
<td>St. Cecilia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 November</td>
<td>St. Catherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 December</td>
<td>Conception of the Virgin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 December</td>
<td>St. Leopold&lt;sup&gt;239&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 December</td>
<td>St. John the Evangelist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Victoria as “Capellán de la Emperatriz” and Organist

Victoria served as one of the Empress María’s private chaplains, but never in one of the chaplaincies tied to the foundation of Descalzas Reales. This is at least circumstantially supported by the fact that he resided on Calle Arenal, rather than in the official chaplains’ compound adjacent to the convent. Perhaps he lived in one of the numerous properties occupied by the Empress’s household and other court officials who purchased homes near the convent.

There is no concrete record of Victoria’s appointment as a chaplain in the Empress María’s household; however, two documents provide some general confirmation of his entry into her service and subsequent employment as organist at Descalzas Reales. Both are from the last

---

<sup>236</sup> Celebrations printed in bold indicate feasts already included in the convent calendar.
<sup>237</sup> This must have been an uncommon feast in Spain; she noted that it was in January. There are three saints named Valerius whose feasts fall in January. 16 January is the feast of St. Valerius (d. 453) was a hermit and bishop who spent much of his life near Sorrento, Italy. St. Valerius of Saragossa (d. 315) was the bishop of Saragossa and is the city’s patron saint; his feast day is 22 January. The third, St. Valerius of Trèves (d. 320), was a bishop in Germany and some of his relics were transferred to Prague in the tenth century. His feast day is 29 January. Of the three, the latter two make the most sense as objects of María’s veneration, simply due to their geographic situation.
<sup>238</sup> María noted that this feast occurs one day prior to St. Michael the Archangel.
<sup>239</sup> Presumably this is the Margrave Leopold III (1073-1136) who officially became the patron saint of Austria in 1663. However, if this is the case, the date indicated by the Empress is in error: St. Leopold’s feast day is 15 November.
few years of his life; the first is Philip III’s official approval of a raise for Victoria and anyone
who followed in the organist’s post, dated 12 July 1606:

Because of the declaration and additions made in the year 1601 to the statutes authorized
by the Most Serene Infanta, doña Juana de Castilla, Princess of Portugal, who is in glory,
my beloved aunt, who founded and endowed the convent, church, and chapel of Las
Descalzas in the city of Madrid, ordered and mandated, among other things, that we had
an organ for the service of the church, and an organist of skill and competence to whom
should be given as salary 40,000 maravedís each year, and at more length is this
contained in said statement and additions; and now I have been informed that said salary
is very meager, and that it is not enough to keep the person who has ministered in said
chapel by serving at the organ, so suited to an increase, and that Tome de Vitoria who at
present has served for two years at this salary and has served many in this chapel, and
that for him and for adequate music and organ, one may find much more [higher pay]
elsewhere…hereby as patron of this convent and chapel, I have increased for good to said
Tome de Vitoria 35,000 maravedís above these 40,000 maravedís, in total 75,000
maravedís, and command that the head chaplain of this chapel, by virtue of this my
cédula, without any other collection, provide and order that Tome de Vitoria is paid the
said 35,000 maravedís of this enhancement yearly from 1 January of this year, 1606,
forward, for all the time that he serves in this chapel and at its organ…and this extends to
the persons who will serve after, who are suitable for the authority and service of this
church and chapel…dated in Madrid on 12 July 1606. I, the King.240

The composer stated that he had served as organist for two years, at the rate of 40,000
maravedís per year; thus, he must have entered the post sometime in 1604, or perhaps in the
months following the Empress’s death in February 1603. Victoria also stated that he had served
in the chapel for many years before becoming organist, though he did not specify in what

240 AHN, Consejos 253, fols. 34r-v: “Por quanto por la declaracion y adiciones que hize el año de mil y seycientos y
uno a la scritura que otorgo la Serenisima Infanta de Castilla Doña Juana Princesa de Portugal mi muy amada tia que
aya gloria por la qual fundo y docto el monasterio Iglesia y Capilla de las descalzas de la villa de Madrid, ordene y
mande entre otras cosas huviese un organo para servicio de la dicho Yglesia y con organista de habilidad y
suficiencia a quien se disen de salario quarenta mil maravedis cada año segun que mas largamente se contiene en la
dicha declaracion y adiciones, y agora e sido informado que el dicho salario es muy tenue, y que no es vastante para
tener con el la persona que la dicho Capilla a menester para servir el organo por lo qual convenia acrecentarle y que
Tome de Vitoria que al presente le sirve lo a hecho dos años con el dicho salario y ha servido otros muchos en la
dicha Capilla, y que por su persona y suficiencia de musica y organo hallara mucho mas en otras partes…por la
presente como patron del dicho monasterio y Capilla e tenido y tengo por bien acrecentar al dicho Tome de Vitoria
treynta y cinco mil maravedis cada año sobre los dichos quarenta mil que por todos sean setenta y cinco mil
maravedis, y mando al Capellan mayor ques ofuere de la dicho Capilla que en virtud desta mi cedula sin otro
reaudo alguno provea y ordene se paguen al dicho Tome de Vitoria los dichos treynta y cinco mil maravedis deste
acrecentamiento en cada un año desde primero de enero deste de mil y seycientos y seys en adelante todo el tiempo
que sirviere en la dicho Capilla el organo della…y se haga con los que adelante sirvieren el dicho organo siendo
personas, qual conviene para la autoridad y servició de la dicho Iglesia y Capilla…fecha en Madrid, a Doze de Julio
de mil y seysçientos y seys años yo el Rey.”
capacity. Philip III honored his years of service by granting the request for a raise to 75,000 maravedís, which was extended to the bajonista as well: Alonso del Cerro received a raise on the same date. The 1604 date is supported at least circumstantially by two early twentieth-century archival notes in the Descalzas Reales collection pertaining to the construction of a new organ in the convent church. The first reads:

The maestro Victoria signed as witness the contract to build an organ for Las Descalzas Reales with the King’s organ-builder. Victoria served as organist from 1604 with a salary of 40,000 maravedís per year; it is deduced therefore that he was the first organist of Descalzas Reales. The signing of the contract for the organ was 19 August 1604.

The second writer confirms this information, and notes that the organ contract was between Victoria and Hans Brevos, the royal organ builder; the archivist also stated that Victoria was the first organist to serve in the post after the construction of the organ. Unfortunately, this contract does not survive.

The second document in the Libro de iglesia pertaining to Victoria’s service in Madrid dates from the last weeks of the composer’s life (2 July 1611). The king granted his request to name a successor as organist at Descalzas; the opening of the statement reiterates much of the material from the document granting Victoria a raise in salary, but the excerpted language below reveals more information regarding the composer’s employment history.

The said Thome de Vitoria has related to me that he has served 24 years as chaplain of the Empress my lady and grandmother, of holy glory in her life and after her death, in one of the three chaplaincies she left in this convent, and in other services to this convent for 17 years as maestro de capilla without interest, and seven of these he served at the organ with satisfaction…as compensation for his services he names the organist of the chapel after his death: Bernardo Pérez de Medrano, who has served in [the chapel] on

241 AHN, Consejos 253, 38v.
242 AGP, AMDR Caja 16/18, fol. 22v: “El maestro Victoria firma como testigo el contrato de construcción de un órgano para las Descalzas Reales con el organero del Rey. Victoria ejerce el cargo de organista desde 1604 con el sueldo de 40,000 maravedís por año; se saca en consecuencia que fué el primer organista de las Descalzas Reales. La firma del contrato del órgano es del 19 de Agosto 1604.”
243 Ibid., fol. 47r.
occasions and when needed for seven years now, with much help and punctuality, and with the satisfaction of the chapel...244

Victoria states that he served as chaplain to the Empress for 24 years. If he was employed continuously, this disproves the notion that he traveled to Rome in the early 1590s. He confirms that he inherited one of the three endowed posts at Descalzas upon her death, and those years are included in the number he claimed. If this statement true, it confirms the nearly universal assumption that Victoria entered the Empress’s service in 1587, or perhaps late 1586. He also affirms that he had served as organist for seven years.

The most problematic assumption of many biographers relates to his service as an employee of Descalzas Reales itself, since he maintained that he served as maestro de capilla for 17 years “sin interés ninguno.” The confusion is compounded by the fact that a number of documents in capitular archives scattered across Spain refer to the composer as maestro of Descalzas, including a letter read to the chapter of Burgos in 1593; however, he is erroneously referred to in a later record as maestro of the cathedral at Ávila.245 Others include records in the actas capitulares of León (1593) and Plasencia (1608).246 There is no confirmation of these statements in any of the Descalzas Reales records; Table 3-4 above contains all of the known maestro’s names, though none of the extant information provides starting and ending dates for any of them. Victoria’s name only appears in the Libro de sacristía a handful of times, and all of the references pertain to payments for prints he sold to the convent, rather than his activity as a

244 AHN, Consejos 253, fols. 116r-117v: “El dicho Thome de Vitoria me ha hecho relation que el havia veynte y quatro años servia de Capellan a la Emperatriz mi señora y Abuela que santa gloria aya en su vida y despues que falleció en una de las tres capellanias que dexo en el dicho monasterio y que demas desto sirvicio en la Capilla del diez y siete años de Maestro de Capilla sin ynteres ninguno y de siete a esta parte sirve de organo della con satisfacion […] en remuneracion de sus servicios de nombrar para despues de sus dias por organista de la dicha Capilla a Bernardo Perez de Medrano que ha servido en ella en las ocasiones y necesidades que le han ofrecido de siete anos a esta parte con mucho ayuda y puntualidad y con satisfacion de la capilla…”
246 Ibid., 448.
senior chaplain. Maestros regularly withdrew money from the coffers to pay ministriles and outside clerics on special occasions, and Victoria never did this. It is possible that he served as an unofficial maestro at one (or multiple) points, but nothing can be confirmed. It seems more likely that Victoria had served as the Empress’s maestro. She maintained a chapel of unknown size and makeup, but it is known that she heard a daily Mass in her private oratorio and members of her household supplemented the convent personnel for special occasions, as did the capilla real.

At any rate, it is clear Victoria maintained some sort of connection to the music performed at Descalzas Reales, at least where repertoire is concerned; according to inventories of the chapel’s music collection from 1587, 1604, and 1608, the convent owned most of his printed collections (1572, 1576, 1581a and 1581b, 1585a and 1585b, 1592, 1600a, and 1605).\footnote{The originals are RB, Descalzas Reales MD/B/8, fols. 251r-261r; a list of prints and transcripts of the inventories are published in Alfonso de Vicente, “El entorno femenino de la dinastía: el complejo conventual de las Descalzas Reales (1574-1633).” In Alfonso de Vicente and Pilar Tomás, eds., Tomás Luis de Victoria y la cultura musical en la España de Felipe III (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Europa Hispánica y Machado Libros, 2012), 197-246. The observations above are new to this dissertation.}
The Officium Hebdomadae Sanctae of 1585 is extant, and markings within strongly suggest the composer’s involvement in performances of the Holy Week music: snippets of fabordón and accompanying Latin texts are written into the print on fols. 34v and 35r, in what appears to be Victoria’s hand.\footnote{RB, Descalzas Reales MD/A/170, 76-77.} Out of the other identifiable items, the works of Palestrina make a significant showing, as seven collections were in regular use.

The convent’s repertoire favored Spanish composers such as Morales, Guerrero, Navarro, and Lobo; these and the Victoria works were in the active collections, while the works of older Franco-Flemish composers including Josquin, Carpentras, Gombert, and Arcadelt, were in storage. Other than the 1600a prints by Victoria and the large-scale works included in earlier collections, most of the identified works are not polychoral and the vast majority are for six or
fewer voices, including the Palestrina collections of masses. Unidentified manuscripts included works by Victoria as well, including a lost Salve Regina for 16 voices; the same manuscript contained an eight-voice set of Lamentations by Phinot, an early adopter of the polychoral idiom who influenced the next generation, including Palestrina, Victoria, and Lassus. Thus, it is unlikely that polychoral works were performed on a regular basis during the composer’s lifetime, but certainly were for special occasions, such as the Corpus Christi celebration noted above. The contents of Victoria’s 1600a publication reflect the convent’s emphasis on large-scale observance of the liturgies for Easter and Corpus Christi. Apart from sacred Latin works, the convent’s music holdings suggest an atmosphere of lively music-making, even if the exact repertoire cannot be identified: the inventories include a number of collections containing madrigals, ensaladas, and villancicos. The mixture of Spanish, Franco-Flemish, and Italian repertoires also reflects tastes ubiquitous throughout the Spanish empire.

Due to the dearth of extant information on the Empress’s household structure and function, it is impossible to reconstruct Victoria’s daily duties as chaplain, both before and after her death. It is nearly as difficult to ascertain his daily routine as organist at Descalzas; he certainly played for Mass and Vespers on Sundays and other feasts, and probably for special paraliturgical functions as well, but it is unknown how frequently the organist and bajonista participated in everyday liturgical functions. No matter what his employment obligations were, they clearly afforded him time for composition and publication of his music, though he produced at a much slower rate than when he was at his creative peak in the 1580s in Rome. He maintained a robust process of marketing his publications, and particularly the 1600a prints, which will be discussed further in Chapters Four and Five. While the Empress lived, Victoria probably spent some time traveling with her household, though she rarely journeyed beyond the

\[249\] RB, Descalzas Reales MD/B/8, fol. 258v.
countryside surrounding Madrid. Since he did not occupy one of the official Descalzas chaplaincies, he may have enjoyed some flexibility for time off and travel.

The Composer’s Business Dealings and Social Circle

Legal and personal documents pertaining to Victoria reveal much regarding his financial situation, business endeavors, and personal associations, and thus humanize the world of a musician in Madrid at the turn of the seventeenth century. I examined the composer’s collected letters in facsimile, alongside notarial records and notices in the royal *Libros de iglesia*. Most of these documents have been at least mentioned in previous surveys of Victoria’s life, but never assessed as a cohesive unit, nor has there been much inquiry into the identities of the individuals named therein. A deeper look at the documents reveals far more about the composer’s world than simply his income; for a summary, see Appendix A.

The extant letters penned by Victoria are overwhelmingly business-like. Most accompanied publications sent to cathedral chapters or courts or were subsequent inquiries about these prints. He usually requested a reward to help offset printing costs, and occasionally highlighted the repertoire contained within the publications. The only correspondence of a personal nature that survives is the letter to Giovenale Ancina; other letters addressed to specific persons were directed toward powerful patrons, or potential ones.

The protocol records that bear the composer’s signature comprise a variety of types of legal documents, bear witness to diversified sources of income, and reveal the prominence of the company he kept. Most of the records are *cartas de poder*, in which Victoria granted power of attorney to another to collect income in his name. Some are for absentee benefices obtained through the papacy and crown, and others are for investments (*préstamos* or *juros*), essentially
loans to the crown, which were against government land; these brought in income from consumable goods produced on the land, such as wheat, barley, wine, and livestock.

The documents also reflect the fluidity with which assets were traded, sold, and mortgaged. For instance, Victoria collected a benefice from Toledo that Martín Perserio ceded to him, perhaps to cover a debt. A far more complicated example of the reverse arrangement is a loan of 720 ducados (270,000 mrs) Victoria obtained from doña Isabel Día y Poe, a criada in the Empress María’s service, on 1 January 1605. In order to ensure that the debt would be paid in the event of his death within six years of the contract date, Victoria mortgaged several of his benefices and loan incomes, including 120 ducados (45,000 mrs) in salary from the convent and 200 ducados (75,000 mrs) in perquisites from the Descalzas foundation—in total, 990 ducados (371,250 mrs). Alonso López, a long-time employee of Descalzas Reales, served as guarantor on the loan, and mortgaged 100 ducados (37,500 mrs) of his own income from the Descalzas foundation funds. When the date is taken into consideration, it is plausible that Victoria could have required such a large sum in order to finance his final publication, which was printed in the same year. Nothing similar exists near the contract or publication date of the 1600a collection, but the volume of letters soliciting rewards for the volumes suggest that he intended to recoup his costs after the fact.

Victoria entrusted his financial affairs to a small number of persons on a regular basis; this microcosm is perhaps reflective of the makeup of his social circle in Madrid, as well as the spirit of partnership among members of the courtly communities in the city. Naturally, his own family members are represented. His brother, Antonio Suárez de Victoria, collected 100 ducados rewarded to the composer for some prints he sent to the Archduke Albert; the payment was sent through Juan Carrillo, a chaplain in the king’s service. He also authorized his sister, María de la

Cruz y Victoria, to collect his income on a loan he made to Valdescapas (in the bishopric of León), and the poder was valid for ten years.

As in Rome, the members of the musical and ecclesiastical communities in Madrid were closely knit. Institutions worked together for court events and individuals thus made frequent contact across households. Figures with whom Victoria associated included members of the Empress’s household, employees of Descalzas Reales, and persons in royal employ. Martín Perserio was a fellow chaplain to the Empress and served alongside Victoria at Descalzas Reales after María’s death. Another individual who associated with the composer was Juan Bautista de Medina, Philip III’s maestro de ministriles, who signed as a witness when Victoria collected 100 pesos for books he sent to Lima, Peru. The connection is unsurprising, given the frequency with which the various imperial and royal households commingled. Another significant connection between Victoria and the royal household was Luis de Onguero, who served as a chaplain at Descalzas Reales prior to his promotion to the royal chapel; he appears as a capellán y cantor in lists of the capilla real personnel from the 1590s.251 Onguero ceded a Toledan benefice to Victoria, and Victoria also gave him poder en causa propia to collect his rents from the bishopric of Córdoba.

A frequent witness to the composer’s notarial documents was Juan Bernardo. His occupation is never indicated in the records, but there are two possibilities: a Juan Bernardo served as contador for Descalzas Reales, and another was a member of the Congregación de la Anunciata at the Jesuit Imperial College.252 Victoria had frequent dealings with a Juan de Arce as well; his identity is equally unclear, but it is possible this is another Jesuit who was somehow connected to the royal court, like Don Diego de Guzmán, one of the capellanes mayores under

---

252 Simón Díaz, Historia del Colegio Imperial, 510.
whom Victoria served at Descalzas. A Juan de Arce was prefect of the Congregación de la Anunciata between 1604 and 1605 and listed as a member of the Society in Colegio Imperial records from 1593. He is listed a resident of Madrid and a witness in two of Victoria’s cartas de poder from 1598, before the court removed to Valladolid. Victoria in turn operated as his proxy after Arce became a resident of Valladolid. He sold a deed of sale, cession, and transfer to Martin Perserio on 9 December 1605; the income in question was from a number of rental properties in Madrid. In the same document of sale, Perserio tied the income to his own endowed chaplaincy. Arce was listed as a resident of the city of Valladolid, but his occupation is not indicated. It is possible this is licenciado Juan de Arce Solórzano, a secretary to the Bishop of Córdoba who authored Tragedias de amor and a number of religious works, including Historia evangelica de la Vida, Milagros y muerte de Cristo, published by the Imprenta Real.

Most of Victoria’s known proxies lived in Madrid, Valladolid, or the cities in which he held benefices. One that stands out is his partnership with Francisco de Soto, who resided in Rome. In letters to institutions or courts outside of Spain, Victoria suggested that the recipient forward any remuneration for prints through Soto. Soto served as proxy during printing projects that were done in Rome following Victoria’s return to Spain, as evidenced by the outline the composer sent alongside a manuscript intended for the press; the collection never reached publication, but Victoria authorized Soto as editor during the printing process. These revelations seem to discount the necessity of Victoria’s presence in Rome during the preparations for his 1592 collection, or any need to return to the city at all.

253 Simón Díaz, Historia del Colegio Imperial, 543.
254 Hugo Albert Rennert, The Spanish Pastoral Romances (Philadelphia: Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Department of Romantic Languages and Literatures, 1912), 159; Juan de Arce Solórzano, Tragedias de amor, de gustoso y apacible entretenimiento de historias, fabulas, entredadas marañas, cantares, bayles, ingenuosas moralidades del enamorado Acrisio, y su Zagala Lucidora. Compuesto por el Licenciado Iuan Arze Solorzeno (Madrid: Juan de la Cuesta, 1607), and Historia evangelica de la vida, Milagros y muerte de Christo, nuestro Dios y Maestro (Madrid: Imprenta Real, 1605).
Victoria’s final printed collection was the *Officium defunctorum* of 1605, a collection of funerary music in six voices written in honor of his recently deceased employer, María; the composer dedicated the work to Margarita de la Cruz, and the dedication includes an eclogue penned by Martín Perserio. This collection could have been written for exequies held at Descalzas Reales directly following her death in February 1603 but this seems unlikely, as Victoria would have needed to produce a complete Office for the Dead, plus an expansion of his earlier Requiem for four voices on short notice. It is more likely the works were first performed for the honors held at the Colegio Imperial on 21 April 1603; the Mass and Vespers included “muy buena música de canto de órgano,” but a composer is not named in the official account.²⁵⁵ María and Juana both requested Requiem Masses to be observed in their honor on the anniversary of their deaths, and it makes sense that Victoria would produce a collection intended for recurrent use at Descalzas Reales. The performing forces are reduced from those in the 1600a collection, thus rendering the *Officium defunctorum* a practical solution for the *capilla*.

In summation, Victoria spent the final decades of his life surrounded by influential individuals and retained ties to a closely knit community of musicians and clerics, as he had in Rome. While his daily activities may not be known with certainty, it is clear that he maintained an active schedule, based upon circumstantial evidence from convent records, his legal documents, publishing and marketing activity, and accounts of court events. Thus, the environment in which he found himself upon his departure from Rome was in many ways similar; he simply traded one seat of temporal and spiritual power for another.

²⁵⁵ Anonymous, *Libro de las honras que hizo el Colegio de la compañía de Jesús de Madrid, a la M.C. de la Emperatriz doña María de Austria, fundadora del dicho Colegio, que se celebraron a 21. de Abril de 1603. Dirigido a la Serenísima infanta Soror Margarita de la Cruz, monja de la orden de Santa Clara en el Sagrada monesterio de las Descalças de Madrid* (Madrid: Luis Sánchez, 1603), fol. 20v.
CHAPTER 4
VICTORIA THE BUSINESSMAN: PRINT CULTURE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY AND THE COMPOSER’S ROLE IN ITALIAN AND SPANISH CONTEXTS

A fresh interpretation of sources reveals a significant, yet neglected facet of Victoria’s personality: his prowess at marketing himself through prudent social and business connections. Scholars of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-centuries tended to underestimate his financial success, but upon examination of his uncanny networking skills, a clearer picture of his association with the most prominent nobility, clergy, and businessmen of the period becomes apparent, as does a deeper understanding of printing practices and of the trade in Spain in particular.

Overview of Printing History

The first great printers came from Germany, Paris, and the Low Countries, and many of these settled in various cities in Italy. The technology spread from the Rhine Valley to Rome by about 1467, to Venice by 1469, and to Paris around 1470. Printers made their way to Spain shortly thereafter; a press was active in Segovia by 1472, and in Barcelona the following year. Numerous craftsmen who learned the trade in major commercial centers such as Venice and Cologne returned to their home countries to found their own presses. As a result, the early book trade, design, and techniques reflected a good deal of uniformity.¹

Predictably, printing operations were concentrated in locations along major European trade routes. In the early years Rome emerged as a potential leader in the print trade, but Venice soon took the lead; secondary in importance were Florence and Milan. By the beginning of the

sixteenth century the foremost printing centers were Paris, Venice, and Lyons due to favorable economic, intellectual, and political conditions. Paris had an influential university and was an administrative center, Venice served as a substantial trade hub connecting the Eastern world to Europe, and Lyons was home to one of the most important trade fairs for the book industry, which operated four times per year. Other large centers that became important during the sixteenth century include Strasbourg, Nuremburg, Basel, Cologne, and Antwerp.²

By the close of the fifteenth century, over 150 printers had been active in Venice at some point, and approximately 4,000 editions had been published.³ However, by this point, Venice had declined slightly in importance, as had Lyons; Antwerp replaced Venice’s central function in the book trade, and the German fairs at Frankfurt and Leipzig played a dominant role in the international circulation of books.⁴ Smaller print centers emerged in order to meet local needs, rather than to produce works for a widespread audience; among the items commonly produced were pamphlets, administrative documents, and religious works. Owners of smaller printing operations likely served as seller, bookbinder, and as a general merchant in order to secure a steady flow of income. Even if there was no printer in town, most populations at least had access to a local bookshop.⁵

The Mechanics of a Printing Operation

The Print Revolution of the Renaissance began with the invention of moveable type at Mainz in the mid-fifteenth century. Evidence exists of printing experiments slightly earlier than Gutenberg’s Bible (1455), but most seem to originate from Gutenberg’s shop. Some claims have

² Hellinga, 213.
⁵ Ibid.
been made that the Dutch inventor Laurens Coster invented moveable type, rather than Gutenberg; however, Gutenberg was generally accepted as its inventor in fifteenth century sources. It is quite logical to credit the German craftsman with the first viable system of printing, as he brought together a number of individually perfected elements in order to produce a revolutionary piece of technology, including reliable press machinery, oil-based inks, techniques for accurately casting large quantities of type, and a fairly durable metal alloy.\(^6\)

The first printed books reflect the styles of regionally produced manuscripts, as type sets were cast in the prevailing scribal hands of the locale. Types in Latin developed in a number of international designs: in Germany, Gothic types dominated; in Venice, a “rotunda” style; and in Rome, a standard roman type was pioneered by Jenson, similar in style to humanist scripts of the period.\(^7\) In general, Italian trends of the Renaissance influenced virtually every corner of European society, so it is natural that the more modern-looking types such as roman and italic became more popular than Gothic. Additionally, the typically Italian use of more white space on the page, geometric designs achieved through centering, and illustrations bearing hallmarks of classical influences became common outside of Italy.\(^8\)

Book production was a meticulous process that required the expertise of multiple tradesmen skilled in remarkably specific areas. The earliest printers served as compositor, type-setter, editor, binder, and bookseller, but gradually these functions became the work of dedicated craftsmen.\(^9\) Jobs that were especially unusual to find in a printer’s shop were type design, punch-cutting, and type-founding, as these were considered particularly specialized skills.\(^10\)

---

\(^6\) Levarie, 80-81.
\(^7\) Hellinga, 209.
\(^8\) Shaw, 220.
\(^9\) Ibid., 222.
\(^10\) Hellinga, 211.
Gutenberg’s process of manufacturing type was improved upon by Nicolas Jenson, a printer active in Venice during the 1470s; unlike Gutenberg’s, his method involving the use of steel punches and matrices enabled printers to use type sets that were capable of withstanding years of intense use. Jenson likely produced his first type in Mainz, and the first evidence of its use is from 1549. Printers eventually purchased type sets from specialized craftsmen, as it became a separate trade. Similarly, a printer also had to factor in costs for illustrations, which were first borrowed from the older tradition of wood-block printing; copperplate engravings became popular by the middle of the sixteenth century, and largely replaced woodcuts by the end of the century.

A printing house worked with a limited amount of type, and needs for a particular print run were predicted during the process of “casting off,” where a compositor would determine an approximate number of letters needed on a sheet. These individuals ensured the text would fit into the space allotted by using spelling variations, abbreviations, and occasionally, variations on the text. Though intellectual substance was important to the author, a printer generally conceived of a book’s content as secondary to its structure.

Title pages emerged in the sixteenth century; this was done partly to protect the first page of the text, but was also intended as advertisement for the printing house, author, and patron. Page numbering did not become common until the early sixteenth century, when indices began to appear at the beginning or end of scholarly books. In more expensive volumes, the title

---
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pages were elaborately decorated with art, and in many cases, the text almost became secondary to the artwork.\textsuperscript{15}

Paper production was another trade separate from the printing process. Printers either purchased in large quantities from local mills, or imported their stock from other regions. Paper was made from rags that were first reduced to a pulp, then poured onto a wire frame in thin sheets and slowly dried. The first European papers were manufactured by the Moors in Spain; by about 1154 a paper mill was active in Játiva, and others were later established in Valencia and Toledo.\textsuperscript{16} From Spain, the technology spread first into Italy, then into Germany, France, the Netherlands, and England. Printers bought paper supplies from mills in varying locations; however, much of the highest-quality paper of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was produced in Italy. The earliest books were produced in the larger (and more expensive) folio or quarto formats. As the potential consumer base grew, pressure mounted for printers to offer lower priced volumes. As a result, octavo and smaller sizes increased in popularity, because less paper was required to produce a single copy.\textsuperscript{17}

The art of book binding, particularly techniques of leatherwork, enameling, and gilding, traveled into Europe from Northern Africa and quickly became a trade separate from printing.\textsuperscript{18} The pages were bound and decorated after purchase to suit an individual customer’s tastes and budget, and it appears these arrangements were made through separate sales agents.\textsuperscript{19} The earliest European bindings were primarily functional; wooden boards fastened by clasps kept the parchment inside from buckling. Moorish influence on binding was strongest in Venice from the

\textsuperscript{15} Aldis, 119.
\textsuperscript{17} Shaw, 221-22.
\textsuperscript{19} Hellinga, 217.
mid-fifteenth century, but Italian domination of the art did not survive the first few decades of the sixteenth century; by then Paris had become the primary center for fine bookbinding.20

In summary, printing required a considerable amount of time and monetary investment on the part of the printer: an ample amount of space was required to house presses, printing materials, and finished projects; the firm needed to forge strong commercial connections to ensure their books were distributed and sold in a timely fashion; and a substantial amount of money had to be invested for equipment and materials. As a result of these risks, printers in the first decades tended to leave the business after relatively short periods. Only an estimated 10% of the approximately 350 printers active before 1480 lasted more than ten years, and most operations were quite small.21 The most famous German printer of the early years was an exception: Anton Koberger of Nuremberg ran 24 presses and employed over 100 workers by the end of the fifteenth century, and maintained an enormous trade operation in Paris, Milan, Florence, Bologna, Venice, Lyons, Vienna, Krakow, and a number of German cities.22

Most books produced in the first century of printing were editions of older works that already would have been familiar in manuscript form; it was easiest for those in the trade to rely on steady sales of established genres, such as Bibles, grammar texts, and prayer books, rather than risking time and money on newly written works.23 Some fifteenth-century printers specialized in various genres, such as university curricula, textbooks, liturgical items, practical instruction books (i.e., grammar books), and historical works. One of the most popular genres was Latin and vernacular grammar books; by the beginning of the sixteenth century, it was common for printers to produce as many as 1,000 copies in these genres. A renewal of interest in

20 Hellinga, 105.
21 Levarie, 85.
22 Ibid., 103.
the lives of the church fathers and original Biblical languages led to the production of lavish and large folio-format volumes on the subjects, with extensive commentaries. Since these were expensive to produce and intended for a more learned audience, print runs were considerably smaller.\textsuperscript{24} These types of jobs were funded primarily by the printing house. Many new books were printed at the cost of the author, a patron, or both, since most printers were unwilling to risk large sums of money on an unknown author or title. Occasionally a printer covered upfront costs and sometimes provided the author with copies to give away, but only if that author were particularly famous.

The printer’s investment promoted a more acute awareness of accuracy during the proofing and production process, since reprinting to correct mistakes would be costly and time-consuming.\textsuperscript{25} The larger, more famous houses occasionally employed local scholars to proofread texts and involved the author in the process; however, in some less reputable situations, the author maintained no control over their work once in the hands of the printer. At first, the authors themselves had few rights; they technically owned the copyright to their work until they transferred the only existing copy to the printer. The printer theoretically could reprint a popular volume numerous times without the author’s knowledge and turn a sizeable profit.\textsuperscript{26}

Complaints of negligence by frustrated authors were addressed to some extent by the early sixteenth century: legal protection for their work was manifest in the issuance of “privileges,” which unfortunately protected the printer, rather than the author, against fraudulent reprints.\textsuperscript{27} Privileges were first dispersed by the Venetian Senate, and the practice slowly spread to other parts of Italy and into Germany. In Paris, the first regulations fell under the jurisdiction
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of the university; a committee of appointees oversaw the French book trade. Both author and printer were issued privileges by a court, and sometimes these licenses indicated the retail price for a single copy. In 1557, the Stationers’ Company in London was given power to regulate the book trade in British lands; individuals were required to pay a fee in order to have their work listed as protected from unauthorized reprinting.\textsuperscript{28} Systems set up by the state and religious entities in a number of countries were responsible for supplying the required license before a work could be published. In Spain, a preliminary manuscript underwent scrutiny before a committee to ensure religious conformity.

Early printers had difficulty determining the ideal number of copies to publish, since they were providing goods for a new market. As a result, many printed more than could easily be sold, and they soon found it necessary to make wholesale arrangements with both distributors and fellow printers in distant locations. For example, between about 1467 and 1473, Conrad Sweynheym and Arnold Pannartz had done 56 editions in Rome, predominantly in runs of 275, and found themselves significantly overstocked.\textsuperscript{29} The earliest print runs were fairly small by sixteenth-century standards: 275-300 copies were normal until the closing decade of the fifteenth century. Norma Levarie suggests that those early runs may have averaged between as little as 100 to 300 copies, as the first type sets produced were cast in softer metal, and likely would need to be re-cast after such a run.\textsuperscript{30} In the 1490s, 600 was an average number; one exception is Hartmann Scheidel’s \textit{Liber chronicarum} (Nuremberg: Anton Koberger, 1493), of which 1,400 copies of the Latin version were made, and there was an initial German-language run of about half that number.\textsuperscript{31} For musical editions, the estimates vary rather widely, as they do in other

\textsuperscript{28} Shaw, 227.
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\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 76.
\textsuperscript{31} Hellinga, 213.
genres; thus, Hans Lenneberg’s presumption that anywhere from 500 to 2,000 copies was “normal” is not particularly far-fetched, particularly when the few extant contracts are considered.³²

Approximately 70% of incunabula were printed in Latin; there were few newly-written works in vernacular, as most printers tended to print vernacular works already known in manuscript.³³ Latin prints of standard works by the great scholars of the Middle Ages were popular, as were commentaries designed to accompany them. In addition, religious works served as a primary staple for many printing houses. Until the reforms of the Council of Trent, Books of Hours unique to each diocese were in demand; the Council attempted to provide standardized texts, such as the Tridentine Missal (1570), but was not entirely successful in purging the liturgy of regional variants.³⁴

Some of the important dynasties of the Renaissance printing trade were renowned for their scholarly approach to production and editing; these include Manuzio, Estienne, and Plantin. In particular, the Antwerp printer Christophe Plantin (c. 1520-1589) positioned himself as friend and business partner to many powerful individuals, including Philip II of Spain. He was given the exclusive privilege of producing liturgical books for the Spanish territories, including the Spanish Netherlands and the New World, following the Council of Trent. At the height of his activity as a printer, Plantin ran 16 presses and employed 150 people—his was one of the largest workshops of the sixteenth century.³⁵

³³ Hellinga, 212, 216.
³⁴ Shaw, 221.
³⁵ Ibid., 224-26.
History of Printing in Spain

Numerous assumptions have been hastily made regarding technological, cultural, and artistic advances in Spain over the centuries, and the area of printing is not exempt from this treatment. At first glance, the trade appears to lag behind the rest of Europe during the Renaissance; however, based upon the observations detailed below, it is reasonable to suggest that Iberian printers simply did not need to build massive business empires akin to those in Venice, Paris, or Antwerp. Spanish presses catered almost exclusively to voids that needed to be filled to fit regional tastes. Internationally popular genres were easily imported from larger print centers such as Venice, despite the common supposition that the Iberian Peninsula was somehow isolated from the rest of the continent. In the sphere of music printing, it is thus fitting that the first books of music were largely produced to accommodate local liturgies. The first collections of polyphony printed in Spain were vihuela intabulations meant to fulfill an entirely domestic need, as opposed to prints of pan-European polyphony that was already widely accessible in manuscript and readily available via high-quality editions from large Italian firms who specialized in music. Lenneberg’s observations regarding the appearance of prints in church archives across Europe certainly support the idea of a robust manuscript transmission of polyphony, even when using prints as source material:

While most early publications were too small to be read by several singers (around a lectern) from a single copy, multiple copies of printed music are never found in archives of churches and courts. We might surmise that, at the very least, printed materials were used as exemplars rather than for performance and that copies were made from them.36

Due to these and a number of factors to be detailed below, the print industry developed more slowly in Spain; by the time presses appeared, there were operational houses in over 40 cities in

36 Lenneberg, 17.
Europe, and many of them had been active for over a decade. According to Alexander Wilkinson, approximately 19,800 items were printed in Spain between 1472 and 1600. Of the items he cataloged, around 25 percent are not extant in libraries on the Peninsula. A rough estimate of the number of volumes manufactured each year during this period may be hazarded: until the 1490s, less than 50 items were produced on Spanish presses per year, but as the technology began to spread, those numbers increased to more than 100 by the early sixteenth century, a number still dwarfed by those in Italian markets.

The first printers in Spanish cities were German and Polish, and these craftsmen worked primarily with Italian materials, including type sets, presses, and paper. For example, the earliest record of Spanish print activity comes from 1473; three German printers were sent to Valencia by a leading German export firm that maintained a factory there. Lambert Palmart remained in the city, but John of Salzburg and Paul Hurus relocated to Barcelona in 1475. Hurus eventually settled in Saragossa, where his firm remained unrivalled for 75 years. He became known for producing fine translations of foreign works that featured numerous woodcuts and elaborate initials. Most of the woodcuts are originals, as there were very few Spanish illustrators during the fifteenth century. Another prominent early figure was Friedrich Biel of Basel (Fadrique Aleman de Basilea), who ran a printing house for over 30 years in Burgos, beginning in 1485; he

---

38 Alexander S. Wilkinson, *Iberian Books: Books Published in Spanish or Portuguese or on the Iberian Peninsula before 1601* (Leiden and Boston: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), xv. Wilkinson’s extensive catalog—and the accompanying essay in which he analyzed the trends of the region—are relied upon heavily in this discussion. For more detailed information on Spanish printing practices during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see the following: Julián Martín Abad, *Los primeros tiempos de la Imprenta en España (c. 1471-1520)* (Madrid: Ediciones del Laberinto, S.L., 2003); María Marsá, *La Imprenta en los Siglos de Oro (1520-1700)* (Madrid: Ediciones del Laberinto, S.L., 2001); Manuel José Pedraza Gracia, *El libro español del Renacimiento: La “vida” del libro en las Fuentes documentales contemporaneas* (Madrid: Arco/Libros, S.L., 2008).
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too was renowned for his fine craftsmanship and turned out editions in a variety of genres, including religious works, legal documents, and romances.\(^\text{41}\)

By the end of the fifteenth century, printing operations had emerged in 25-30 towns all over Spain, particularly in commercial and university areas such as Salamanca, and at least 14 of the tradesmen were German. Unlike most countries, Spain never developed one or two dominant printing centers; Levarie suggests that this is due to the fact that Spain was not united under a single crown until the sixteenth century.\(^\text{42}\) Centuries of regional independence contributed to the emergence of a number of smaller, diverse local centers. Printing operations were quite small in comparison to their foreign counterparts: the Cromberger firm in Seville, the largest in Spain, ran four presses at its height, compared to Anton Koberger’s 24 presses in Nuremberg.\(^\text{43}\) Print runs tended to be much smaller as well. A standard run in Venice and other Italian cities was 1,000, and more if the work was a popular or previously established text; smaller runs simply were not profitable unless costs for materials were low or a patron subsidized the printing.\(^\text{44}\) Most commonly, Spanish presses produced runs of 300, 500, or 750, though exceptionally large numbers of copies were made of vihuela books (1,000+).\(^\text{45}\)

A steep drop in output occurs toward the end of the first decade of the sixteenth century, followed by another sharp increase and period of particular volatility during the 1520s. Numbers remain relatively static through the 1540s (between 100 and 150 per year), then Wilkinson observes a 37% increase in output through 1550. Until the 1570s, production again remains

\(\text{41}\) Levarie, 165.
\(\text{42}\) Ibid., 163.
\(\text{43}\) Restrepo, 288.
stable (roughly 200-250 volumes per year), then increases relatively steadily through the end of the century. In 1598, 1599, and 1600, Spanish presses produced more than 350 works per year.\footnote{Wilkinson, xv.}

Wilkinson provides several plausible explanations for the shifts in activity during the sixteenth century. The patterns of activity in the industry in Spain reflect a number of trends, all of which may also be observed in other parts of Europe, including population growth, increased literacy rates, and large-scale economic shifts. The wild fluctuations of the 1520s may have been prompted by mass migration to the New World, the Comuneros Revolt (1520-22), and a devastating fire at Medina del Campo in the late 1520s. Medina del Campo was the site of a large, semi-annual book fair, and theoretically such an event would have decimated both the available supply of printing materials and completed works. Spain’s economic climate during the 1550s and 1560s surely affected book production as well: a major recession began around 1556, when Philip II inherited the massive war debt of his father’s administration, triggering uncontrolled inflation. In 1557 and 1560 the Crown declared state bankruptcy, and as an attempt to fix his shattered economy, Philip imposed new taxes and increased rates on old ones. Economic recovery took decades, and the book industry did not begin to recuperate until c. 1585, when Wilkinson observes a sharp increase in production.\footnote{Ibid., xv-xvi.}

Spanish trends tend to reflect a pattern more similar to the German publishing industry than that of France or Italy: a large number of houses were scattered in the larger population centers all over the peninsula, rather than in one or two significant urban areas. Before 1601, there were approximately a dozen significant printing cities in Spain, where at least three quarters of books in Spanish or Portuguese were produced. Until the early 1550s, Seville was the most important publishing center due to the Cromberger firm, and from the 1550s to 1580s, the
university town of Salamanca dominated the domestic industry. In the last two decades of the century, Madrid rose to prominence; after the royal court transferred to the city under Philip II in 1561, it gradually grew from a small provincial town into a significant artistic and intellectual center. The city was unusually small to be considered a major source of cultural influence. The population reached approximately 37,000 by 1597, one-fourth the size of Seville. Philip III moved the capital from Madrid to Valladolid from 1601 to 1606, which is reflected by a boom in Valladolid’s printing industry during those years.

One factor contributing to sluggish growth in local book production is what Wilkinson calls the “Antwerp Period” (c. 1541-1558). At that time the majority of works printed in the Spanish language were produced outside of the peninsula, and he suggests this is largely due to “more sophisticated imports” entering Spain. Overall, Spanish presses primarily produced works for the local market; books were easily imported from the large international centers, and aside from shipments to the New World, Spain did not widely export printed materials in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The only significant contributor to vernacular print production was Antwerp, though the city’s firms were only responsible for approximately 11% of all extant books in Spanish; a few works were produced in Venice, Paris, Lyons, Rome, Brussels, Toulouse, Milan, London, and Turin, nearly all of which were significant print centers. Of the works produced in Antwerp, it is impossible to discern how many were intended for export to Iberian markets, or for use within the Spanish Netherlands. Unlike the rest of Europe—with the exception of Britain—works in the vernacular dominated the Spanish market; from the 1530s to
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1600, just below 30% of works produced in Spain were in Latin. Wilkinson suggests that most Latin works were imported and perhaps commissioned from foreign printers especially for Iberian markets.

Early Spanish printing resembled France’s in one way: the first few books featured roman type, but were largely replaced by a rounded gothic font. Typefaces that were standard elsewhere in Europe took on a more “Spanish” appearance, as it seems that localized manuscript styles were particularly enduring:

The special decorative sense of Spain prevails: heavy mass in a limited area played against decorative detail. The dark mass may be provided by black-ground initials or borders, by a few words of heavy type, by sharp areas of pure black in a woodcut. The detail may be supplied by the type itself, often beautifully decorative. A special characteristic of early Spanish books is the large woodcut title page, often an armorial design—again, in a sense, the large effect played against the balance of the book.

The Gothic qualities, along with an extremely high level of craftsmanship and quality of materials, lasted longer than anywhere else in Europe, at least until 1530. During the first quarter of the century, heavy woodcut illustrations and initials were still common, and particular attention was given to producing elaborate title pages; this practice ebbed over the course of the following decades as printers began to include more information on the title page.

By around 1540, the quality of Spanish books had begun to decline; though there was a considerable increase in the number of printers active in Spain, many were not thoroughly trained, and most regions lacked a reliable supply of high-quality paper. Cruickshank also implies that poorer quality paper, type, and presswork emanated from Spanish presses than anywhere else at the close of the sixteenth century. From the 1540s, printing styles from other
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countries influenced Spanish output more strongly, particularly trends from Italy and the Netherlands. Once Philip II established his court in Madrid, local presses were equipped with roman type, and the cosmopolitan tastes of the court soon reigned supreme.\textsuperscript{59}

Unlike the rest of Europe, Spanish privileges were not issued to the publisher, but rather, to the author, who thus retained ownership of their intellectual property. The original manuscript was subject to inspection by a royal council, who confirmed its adherence to imperial laws. A license was then issued by royal decree; the document authorized printing, usually stated the locations to which the license applied and stated the official sale price of the book, and declared penalties for infringement.\textsuperscript{60} Once permission was obtained, the rest of the publication process was in the hands of the author: he or she then had to form an agreement with a printer, supervise the editing and printing process, and arrange for distribution of the finished product.

Once an order was complete, the finished product was distributed for sale, and those methods were similar in Italy and Spain. Italian printers maintained associations with wholesalers across Europe and disseminated volumes at regional book fairs, for which simple catalogues were produced in leaflet form. While the Spanish printing industry may not have been large, printers and merchants forged similar connections. Books were imported in large volumes for reasonable prices, thus negating demand for prolific printing in Spain, apart from fulfilling the need for specialized local genres.

\textit{Music Printing in Spain, 1492-1610}

Liturgical works containing chant were produced on Spanish presses from the dawn of print activity on the peninsula, but the first collections of vocal polyphony antedate their Italian
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predecessors by several decades. Juan Vásquez’s book of villancicos (Osuna, 1551) was the first vocal collection to be printed in Spain; the Venetian Ottaviano Petrucci published *Odhecaton A* in 1501. According to data compiled by Margarita Restrepo, a total of 48 collections containing polyphonic music were printed in Spain between 1492 and 1610.\(^{61}\) Theoretical treatises account for 22 of the works, 17 were vocal collections, and nine were intabulations intended for harp, keyboard, or vihuela. Half of the total treatise output comprises the first 11 Spanish works to contain polyphony; the first contrapuntal examples were included in a work from 1492, and the production of treatises slowed significantly by 1535. The first purely musical offering was Luis Milán’s famous collection of vihuela intabulations, *El maestro* (Valencia, 1536). All of the instrumental collections were printed between 1536 and 1578. In contrast to the production rate of theoretical or instrumental works, the publication of vocal music increased substantially at the turn of the seventeenth century. Prior to 1598, eight vocal collections had been printed in Osuna, Seville, and Barcelona (one, three, and four, respectively). In merely twelve years, nine more emerged. Juan Flamenco oversaw four prints by the Imprenta Real between 1598 and 1605, including Victoria’s final two collections, and five were printed by the Taberniel firm in Salamanca between 1607 and 1610.

*Contracts for Polyphonic Works*

Six printing contracts for Renaissance polyphony produced in Spain survive, and the documents pertaining to Victoria’s 1600a collection are among them. The other composers

---

\(^{61}\) See Restrepo, 324-30 for a complete listing of collections. For the purposes of the current study, reference will only be made to data from 1492 until the emergence of the last polyphonic print produced before Victoria’s death; Restrepo’s data extends through 1630.
The agreements vary in clarity and level of detail, but some general characteristics may be compared. Large print runs of the instrumental volumes were made, and these numbers closely parallel the runs of the most popular non-musical works of the period; Cabezón requested 1,225 copies; of Daza’s book, 1,500 copies were made; Fuenllana’s contract called for 1,000; and 1,500 were requested by Santa María. Guerrero’s vocal book falls within the norms of run size for the period at 750, but Victoria requested an extremely small print run of 200. Additionally, the length of production varied due to tasks such as typesetting and proofing. Some contracts provided for a production time of as little as four weeks (Daza), while others took months; Cabezón’s collection took 104 weeks to reach print. Details on Victoria’s collection are unavailable, though the initial contract was signed on 1 October 1598 and the volumes were produced in 1600.

It appears the composers were entirely responsible for securing funding for their projects; costs diverged widely, but always represented a significant investment for the average working musician. Estimates of total costs range from 85,000 maravedís (in Victoria’s case) to over 250,000 maravedís (Santa María). Because of the significant capital outlay involved, most print jobs were financed through a series of installments, usually ranging from two to four. Most commonly, an author would make payments at the beginning, middle, and end of production. Victoria and Fuenllana each made an additional payment when the contract was signed. These arrangements allowed composers time to secure funding from various sources; unfortunately, no
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significant records of the process exist. Some individuals, such as Guerrero, obtained loans from employers or received contributions from private benefactors, including dedicatees. Some contracts, such as Daza’s, allowed the composer to sell a portion of the finished copies before the final payment was made.  

Most agreements ensured quality of the finished product; for example, Fuenllana’s volume was to be completed between the date of the contract, 29 March 1554, and July of the same year, and since the initial copies did not meet the standards of his agent, the printer was required to reprint the entire run at his own expense, which took until October. Other deals stipulated that the composer was responsible for accuracy, as in the cases of Daza and Santa María, who were both required to submit signed proofs throughout the printing process. In these instances, the printer guaranteed quality of printing, but not accuracy of content.

**Victoria the Businessman**

Victoria seemed to have lived a charmed professional life. He had no trouble securing employment upon completion of his education in Rome, and later served as a chaplain to the Empress María and organist of Descalzas Reales. While working at a small royal convent might seem an unusual decision when Victoria was pursued by the largest churches in Spain, this position provided the type of freedom he needed to conduct business outside of his duties to the Empress and the convent, and he received a generous salary and housing. Victoria also enjoyed a number of lucrative Spanish benefices, many of which were bestowed upon him while he still

---

68 Restrepo, 312.
69 Ibid., 309-11.
70 Ibid., 313.
lived in Rome; in short, the composer was not the starving, obscure, and unappreciated artist portrayed by early scholars.\textsuperscript{71}

Victoria’s Engagement with the Spanish Market

The author was also responsible for the distribution of a portion of the finished product, and Victoria was a particularly enterprising salesman; he routinely sent books to churches throughout Spain and its dominions. All of his extant letters accompanied copies of prints, mentioned prints that had been sent, or served as a reminder to the institution that he had not been honored for a reward for prints sent.\textsuperscript{72} Documents related to the 1600a collection provide the clearest window into his marketing practices. Victoria paid 85,000 maravedís for the tiny 200-copy run—almost a quarter of his estimated yearly income—so he was obliged to sell each set for approximately 425 maravedís in order to recoup his investment.\textsuperscript{73}

In 1601, Victoria disbursed a number of form letters alongside copies of the 1600a prints. In a letter to Jaén Cathedral (transcribed below), Victoria emphasized the unique polychoral scoring and separate organ accompaniment, and indicated that instruments could easily be substituted for voice. A letter to Salamanca Cathedral is nearly an exact copy, but written in the composer’s hand; at the top, a note in another hand indicates that the composer was sent six

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{71} Pedrell was among those who lamented Victoria’s supposed obscurity at the end of his life. He agreed with Rafael Mitjana, who stated that “it is thus proved that the illustrious maestro abulense had to content himself during the last years of his life with a modest and subordinate place, meanly salaried, as organist of Descalzas Reales; just as the religious sphere did not recognize him as a rival among the composers of his time, not only in Spain but the entire world. This ingratitude is ever odious…perhaps such troubles hastened the end of his days” (“Queda, pues, probado que el insigne maestro abulense hubo de contentarse durante las postrimerías de su vida con el puesto modesto y subalterno, mezquintamente asalariado, de organista de las Descalzas Reales, precisamente cuando dentro del género religioso no reconocía rival entre los compositores de su tiempo, no solo de España sino en el mundo entero. La ingratitud es siempre odiosa…Quizá tales sinsabores apresuraron el término de sus días”). Felipe Pedrell, \textit{Tomás Luis de Victoria Abulense: Biografía, bibliografía significado estético de todas sus obras de arte polifónico-religioso} (Valencia: Manuel Villar, 1918. Reprint, Valladolid: Editorial Maxtor, 2011), 164.
\item \textsuperscript{72} It is unknown whether Victoria’s methods were unusual; unsolicited distribution of prints is an aspect of late Renaissance publishing practice that has not been explored in detail.
\item \textsuperscript{73} Ana María Sabe Andreu estimates his income at 1,017 ducados (381,375 maravedís) in \textit{Tomás Luis de Victoria, pasión por la música} (Ávila: Diputación Provincial de Ávila, Institución Gran Duque de Alba, 2008), 182.
\end{itemize}
ducados for the volumes (2,250 mrs). The largest and wealthiest institutions could reward respected composers with much larger sums. For instance, Toledo’s capitular records indicate that Victoria was paid 12,000 mrs for the 1600a collection—a huge amount, as most payments from Toledo’s coffers during the period ranged between 3,000 and 6,000 mrs.

Letter to Jaén Cathedral.

[copyist’s hand] Distinguished Sirs:

I have had printed these books of masses, Magnificats, psalms, Salves, and other things, for two and three choirs with organ; that particular book, which to the glory of God our Lord a book like this for organists has not come out in Spain or Italy, where there is no arrangement of four voices that will only double a choir. Also the masses and Magnificats can be done by voices, organ, and instruments. I brought these prints to Spain and paid the costs. I beg your Lordship receive my pleasure and test these books I send, and I give thanks for any help, which I will acknowledge my whole life. May the Lord prosper your Lordship as I desire. Madrid, 10 February 1601.

[Victoria’s hand] Thomé de Victoria

Victoria’s Printing Habits: Firms and Locations

Crucial to Victoria’s success was the fact that he published the majority of his works, most of which were released in massive markets. Seven of his 15 verified collections were printed by the Gardano firms in Venice and Rome, one of the largest and most successful music printing houses of the late Renaissance, alongside the Scotto and Vincenti presses. Two of his publications were produced on the Roman presses of Francesco Zanetto, and another by the Roman printer, Francesco Coattino; both were reputable houses known for quality music printing, and were close allies of the Gardanos. A 1600 reprint of Victoria’s first book of hymns

76 Transcribed and translated from facsimile. Vicente, Tomás Luis de Victoria: Cartas, 85-86.
77 For a complete listing of the composer’s publications, see Table 4-1 below; Appendix C provides a complete listing of individual works and the collections in which they appear.
was handled by the venerable Vincenti press in Venice, a massive music-printing firm that produced approximately 20 collections per year, an output rivaled only by the Gardano family.\textsuperscript{78} A single collection was produced late in Victoria’s career by Francesco and the heirs of Simon Tini in Milan; in all, 12 of the composer’s printed editions appeared in Italy—seven in Rome, four in Venice, and one in Milan. This is unsurprising, given Victoria’s employment history and professional connections; all of the Roman collections, aside from the masses of 1592, were completed during his tenure in Rome. The Venetian collections serve as bookends to his career, as his first book of motets and first book of masses were produced there at the beginning of his Roman activity, and his penultimate offering of 1603 was a reprint of the first book of motets.

The locations incongruous with Victoria’s location were Milan and Dillingen. Coincidentally, these books both appeared in 1589, shortly after his return to Spain. The Milanese print may be explained by several factors: Spain ruled the city from 1535 onward, it was the seat of the Duke of Milan, and it had a reasonably strong printing industry. Milan, the largest archdiocese in Italy at the time, was the center of broad ecclesiastical reform spearheaded by Carlo Borromeo in the years following the Council of Trent.\textsuperscript{79} His emphasis on liturgical and musical reforms and aggressive promotion of Counter-Reformation polyphony proved beneficial for Victoria, as his lone Milanese publication of 1589 was produced by the Tini firm, which was operated under the auspices of the seminary. The press, opened by Michele Tini in 1576, was the second established by Cardinal Borromeo; the first was operated by the da Ponte family, and neither printer had published any polyphony prior to Borromeo’s patronage. Most of the works

\textsuperscript{78} Richard J. Agee, \textit{The Gardano Printing Firms, 1569-1611} (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1998), 73.
\textsuperscript{79} Iain Fenlon, \textit{Music and Culture in Late Renaissance Italy} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 68-69.
produced by Tini during the 1580s and 1590s were associated with the cardinal’s reform efforts, and thus the emergence of polyphony by Victoria, Palestrina, and Lassus is unsurprising.  

Victoria’s Dillingen publication appears difficult to explain until Cardinal Otto Truchsess von Waldburg’s connections to the city are examined. The Cardinal of Augsburg, the likely financier of Victoria’s education at the Jesuit German College and dedicatee of his first publication, founded the University of Dillingen in 1549, and transferred its management to the Jesuit order in 1564. Under the Jesuits, the university became a prominent force in Counter-Reformation educational reform. Cardinal Truchsess also devoted significant energies to the development of Catholic presses in his diocese; the first and most important was established by Sebald Mayer at the University of Dillingen, in the year of the institution’s establishment. After experiencing financial hardship, the press was purchased by the cardinal himself and then left to the Jesuits in 1568, who saw the press thrive as a powerful force in the dissemination of material consistent with Tridentine reforms. Victoria’s only German publication thus was the result of auspicious circumstances: the composer had a long association with the Jesuit Order, and chiefly with the Jesuit educational system and one of its most powerful German patrons, the Cardinal von Truchsess. Though Truchsess died quite early in the composer’s career (1573, the year following the dedication), Victoria continued to reap the benefits of the relationship over two decades later. The German College graduates who returned to the region as clerics helped promote Roman music for liturgical use as well.

---

80 Fenlon, 82-83.
82 Ibid., 121.
Table 4-1. Victoria's Publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td><em>Motecta Qui Partim, Quaternis, Partim, Quinis, Alia, Senis, Alia, Octonis Vocibus Concintur.</em></td>
<td>Sons of Antonio Gardano</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Cardinal Otto von Truchsess</td>
<td>First book of motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581a</td>
<td><em>Hymni Totius Anni Secundum Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Consuetudium, Qui Quattuor Concintur Vocibus.</em></td>
<td>Francesco Zanetto</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Pope Gregory XIII</td>
<td>Hymns and psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581b</td>
<td><em>Cantica B. Virginis Vulgo Magnificat Quatuor Vocibus. Una cum quatuor antiphonis beatae Virginis.</em></td>
<td>Francesco Zanetto</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Cardinal Michele Bonelli (Alessandrino)</td>
<td>Marian service music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583b</td>
<td><em>Motecta Quae Partim, Quaternis, Partim, Quinis, Alia, Senis, Alia, Octonis, Alia, Duodenis Vocibus.</em></td>
<td>Alessandro Gardano</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585a</td>
<td><em>Officium Hebdomadae Sanctae.</em></td>
<td>Alessandro Gardano</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Service music for Holy Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589a</td>
<td><em>Motecta Quae Partim Quaternis, partim quinis, alia senis, alia octonis, alia duodenis vocibus concintur.</em></td>
<td>Francesco and Heirs of Simon Tini</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>Blessed Virgin</td>
<td>Motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589b</td>
<td><em>Cantiones Sacrae Tomae Ludovice A Victoria Abulensis, Musici Suavissimi.</em></td>
<td>Johannes Mayer</td>
<td>Dillingen</td>
<td>Blessed Virgin</td>
<td>Motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td><em>Missae, quattuor, quinque, sex, et octo vocibus concinendae, una cum Antiphonis, Asperges, et Vidi aquam.</em></td>
<td>Francesco Coattino</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Cardinal Albert, son of Empress Maria</td>
<td>Masses; misc. service pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600a</td>
<td><em>Missae, Magnificat, Motecta, Psalmi, et alia quam plurima.</em></td>
<td>Juan Flamenco (Imprenta Real)</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Philip III</td>
<td>Masses; misc. service pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600b</td>
<td><em>Hymni Totius Anni Iuxta ritum Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae.</em></td>
<td>Jacobo Vicentium</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Inscription by editor</td>
<td>Hymns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td><em>Motecta, Quae Partim Quaternis, Partim Quinis, Alia senis, Alia Octonis, Alia Duodenis Vocibus.</em></td>
<td>Angelo Gardano</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>None; reprint</td>
<td>Motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td><em>Motets</em></td>
<td>Angelo Gardano</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Reprint</td>
<td>Motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td><em>Officium Defunctororum, sex vocibus. In obitu Ex obsequis Sacrae Imperatricis.</em></td>
<td>Juan Flamenco (Imprenta Real)</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Princess Margarita</td>
<td>Office for the Dead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Victoria’s Primary Italian Printers: The Gardano Family

Without a doubt, the two most influential printers of music during the sixteenth century were the houses of Gardano and Scotto, who brought the technique of single-impression printing of polyphony to Venice, and thus were able to provide high quality, affordable prints to a wider audience. The firms “virtually monopolized the publishing of music in Italy during the middle decades of the sixteenth century, and contributed more than anyone else to the shift to commercial distribution of music.”\(^{84}\) Most of the music produced by the Gardano and Scotto presses was secular vocal polyphony, though the Gardanos did print a few keyboard collections.\(^{85}\) However, in the last years of the sixteenth century, a new demand arose for *basso seguenti* for sacred collections, which the Gardanos increasingly supplied.\(^{86}\) Both establishments held the advantage of an unusually long period of activity; Scotto was in business for 134 years, while Gardano was active for 73. During those periods, the output of each press was enormous—c. 1,650 and c. 1,425 editions, respectively—figures that exceed the *combined* numbers reached by other Venetian and northern European music printers.\(^{87}\) One of the primary factors in the success of the two businesses was their maintenance of a wide distribution network that included other printers, agents, and booksellers, including family members.

Antonio Gardano was French; upon his arrival in Venice, he was referred to as “musico francese,” as he was likely first recognized as a composer and teacher.\(^{88}\) He worked his way into respectable upper-middle class circles by the time he opened his shop in Venice.\(^{89}\) It is unknown where Gardano received his training as a printer, though it is possible he began his career in Paris.


\(^{86}\) Agee, 122.

\(^{87}\) Bernstein, 10, 115.

\(^{88}\) Lewis, Vol. 1, 19.

\(^{89}\) Ibid., 25.
or Lyons, or perhaps with Agostino Bindoni in Venice, who later became his father-in-law. Regardless of his professional heritage, his training must have been excellent, as even his first prints are of outstanding quality.\footnote{Lewis, Vol. 1, 20.}

Gardano opened his printing firm in 1538, though he surely was active in the Venetian industry before this date, as the guild required foreign printers to work in the city a minimum of five years before they became master printers and thus eligible for entry.\footnote{Bernstein, 132.} Antonio was likely the first printer in Venice to use the single-impression method of printing for music, though it had already been implemented by Dorico in Rome (1537) and by others in London, Paris, Lyons, and a number of German cities.\footnote{Ibid., 135.} During his lifetime, the firm produced almost 450 prints, and 269 of those were madrigal collections; the next best-represented genre was the motet (76 editions).\footnote{Lewis, Vol. 1, 95.} Though Gardano did not produce sacred music nearly as prolifically as secular works, he strongly supported the composers of San Marco\footnote{Ibid., Vol. 3, 8.} and introduced to Venice the repertoire of virtually all of the major church composers of Italy, especially Roman composers and individuals connected to powerful courts such as the Imperial establishment in Vienna.\footnote{Bernstein, 162-63.} In particular, the sons of Gardano published the most famous contemporary artists active in Italy: the Gabrielis, Gesualdo, Lassus, Marenzio, Philippe de Monte, Palestrina, Schütz, Vecchi, Victoria, Wert, and numerous others.\footnote{Agee, 3.}

Antonio Gardano was active until the late 1560s, when his two eldest sons, Alessandro and Angelo, assumed leadership roles in the firm. The Gardano brothers printed under the name “Sons of Antonio Gardano” by 1570, following their father’s death. Rather unusually, the
younger of the two official partners in the business, Antonio, became head of the press; Alessandro took his share of the inheritance and left the firm to begin his own business in the late 1570s, while Matthio remained a silent partner.\textsuperscript{97}

Angelo Gardano enjoyed a prominent place of respect in the Venetian industry; he was elected prior of the printing guild twice, and remained far more prolific than either his elder brother or his father. Around the time Alessandro left the family firm (1575-77), a devastating plague struck the city, killing approximately a quarter of its population and severely impacting commerce. Both factors must have temporarily affected Angelo’s press, as the average number of works issued per year suddenly dropped from around 20 to just three in 1577.\textsuperscript{98} Thankfully the effects were not persistent; from the late 1570s to the 1590s, the firm averaged around 28 prints per year.\textsuperscript{99}

Toward the end of his career, Angelo tended to reprint editions more frequently, particularly of sacred music; during the 1590s, the press produced at least 16 editions of Palestrina’s works alone, which may suggest belated Counter-Reformation influence or simply indicates that Gardano found Palestrina’s music to be quite lucrative, though secular genres still comprised approximately 60% of the total output.\textsuperscript{100} Angelo maintained a frenetic pace of production until his death in 1611, when the firm was officially taken over by his son-in-law, Bartolomeo Magni. Magni’s son assumed leadership upon his father’s death in the late 1640s or early 1650s, and retained control until his own death in 1673. By the last decade of the firm’s

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{97} Agee, 61.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{98} Bernstein, 138-39.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{99} Ibid., 139.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{100} Agee, 84-85.}
\end{footnotes}
existence, music comprised only a small segment of its output, and records of the firm suddenly cease in 1685.101

Alessandro Gardano was not as prolific as his father or brother; from the time he left the family business until the appearance of his last prints in 1591, he produced around 50 musical collections. His younger brother, on the other hand, oversaw at least 813 editions between their professional separation and his death in 1611.102 The split between Antonio and Alessandro seems to have been amicable; Alessandro initially tried to achieve a balance of connection and distinction from the family business. His first independent prints bear the original French spelling of the family surname, “Gardane,” and he used an altered version of the famous Gardano printer’s mark, a lion and bear holding a rose. Alessandro’s prints bear a mark depicting two lions supporting a globe.103 Evidence suggests a close alliance between the brothers, as Angelo appointed Alessandro his agent outside of Venice, primarily for the Roman market. Additionally, Alessandro capitalized on the family name upon arrival in Rome by returning to the Italian spelling of his name and re-adopting the familiar lion-and-bear insignia.104 Perhaps this was done in a bid to capitalize on the venerable family name; ultimately, it was a wise marketing decision.

Alessandro’s establishment in Rome fulfilled a distinct void in the Roman music printing market, since the Dorico firm halted production in 1572; Gardano’s arrival date in Rome is unknown, but his last Venetian prints appeared in 1581. Between 1583 and 1591, the Roman firm issued more than 90 prints, and most of these were done in cooperation with other businessmen. Among Alessandro’s associates were Domenico Basa, Giacomo Bericcio,

101 Agee, 89.
102 Ibid., 4.
103 Ibid., 62.
104 Ibid., 71, 73.
Francesco Coattino, Bernardino Donangeli, and Giacomo Tornieri. Unlike his brother, a majority of the works he issued were non-musical: during his tenure in Rome, he printed 39 music books, only seven of which were reprints.\(^{105}\) Also in contrast to the Venetian firm and in a sharp departure from his own previous output, the Roman press’s output was overwhelmingly sacred; seven of his 11 Venetian editions were secular.\(^{106}\) Naturally, the most strongly represented composers were famous musicians active in Rome, including Palestrina (five editions) and Victoria (four editions).\(^{107}\)

In 1585, Gardano and Coattino formed a partnership, but by 1589, Gardano had returned to Venice, dissolved the partnership and given his half of the business to Coattino. However, between 1590 and 1591, he was again producing prints with Coattino.\(^{108}\) Some evidence suggests Gardano again returned to Venice, as payment records exist from 1593 and 1594, but no concrete evidence of his death in either exists.\(^{109}\)

**Printing Characteristics of the Gardano Firms**

Most publications, including those across all generations of the Gardano family, used a mixture of papers from different sources within a single volume, as paper was apparently sorted according to quality and size, rather than source; a mixture of watermarks and inconsistent wear on pages belies this fact.\(^{110}\) Formats of prints followed specific trends as well. The first format of choice for most Venetian polyphonic editions was oblong quarto, and printers usually maintained a framework of standing type, or *skeleton formes*. These generally included titles, composer

---

\(^{105}\) Agee, 73.  
\(^{106}\) Ibid., 20.  
\(^{107}\) Ibid., 73.  
\(^{108}\) Ibid., 63-65.  
\(^{109}\) Ibid., 65.  
\(^{110}\) Ibid., 130, 132.
names, and other headings, in order to save press time. Oblong quarto was used by the elder Gardano until the firm gradually conformed to the use of upright quarto; this format was introduced by Scotto in 1564, but took two decades to become standard in Venice.\(^{111}\) Until the last years of his life, Angelo continued the traditions of his father, and reserved the more expensive folio format for “the most serious of polyphonic publications, plainchant, or some editions of instrumental music,” and these editions include Victoria’s first book of masses (1576).\(^{112}\) Apart from some of the folio editions, most of the works produced by the Venetian Gardano press were paginated, rather than foliated. Sometimes the numbers correspond to a piece’s order in the collection, rather than a folio or page number, and this practice was likely done to maintain uniformity between partbooks, as some parts might require more space than others, and thus works would appear on different page numbers.\(^{113}\) In contrast, most of Alessandro’s prints were in upright quarto after 1581, and many of his Roman editions were in folio, including Victoria’s second mass book, motet collection, and the *Officium Hebdomadæ Sanctæ* (1583a, 1585a, and 1585a), and Guerrero’s Vespers and Passions (1584 and 1585, respectively).\(^{114}\) Agee suggests that folio was “preferred by Roman printers for mass publications, and indeed the trend may have been set by the papal chapel itself in emulation of deluxe manuscripts.”\(^{115}\)

Angelo Gardano’s renown must have rested at least partially upon his reputation for producing accurate renderings of the music, executed at a high technical standard; occasionally minor mistakes were left unaltered, but often the errors were pasted over in-house, and nearly

\(^{111}\) Bernstein, 38.
\(^{112}\) Agee, 96-97.
\(^{113}\) Ibid., 98-99.
\(^{114}\) Ibid., 135.
\(^{115}\) Ibid.
undetectable.\textsuperscript{116} As head of the press, Angelo edited proofs himself or designated another family member in his place, and it is also possible the composers were responsible for corrections.\textsuperscript{117} Though Scotto and Gardano were both known for producing high quality prints, they generally did not expend time or resources on rectifying what were considered minor errors, such as crooked letters, incorrect labeling of parts, mistakes in pagination, and erroneous signatures at the bottom of the page.\textsuperscript{118} Minor inconsistencies such as the use of a mixture of initial sets were common, as an unusually large number of initials were required for the production of partbooks. Agee indicates that Alessandro Gardano’s work was “sloppy” compared to his brother’s, and give examples of incorrect initials, awkward cleffings that resulted in excessive quantities of imprecisely printed ledger lines, and “inconsistent and generally poor” inking.\textsuperscript{119}

Some of the ways in which printers recycled editions were to rearrange the order of a collection; delete or include new works; combine or separate collections into a different number of volumes; or alter titles.\textsuperscript{120} This practice was quite common for the Scotto and Gardano firms, among others, as this enabled the printer to issue the collection as a “new” edition. It is therefore unsurprising that so many reprints of Victoria’s works were issued by the Gardano press, though some of the works in the 1603 edition were significantly altered by the composer.\textsuperscript{121}

\textit{Victoria’s Madrid Prints and the Imprenta Real}

Two of Victoria’s most significant late publications (1600a and 1605) were produced by the Imprenta Real in Madrid. The royal press was formed under the auspices of one of the most

\textsuperscript{116} Agee, 132.
\textsuperscript{117} Bernstein, 31.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 33.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid., 146.
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 151-52.
\textsuperscript{121} The subject of Victoria’s chronic republication of works is beyond the scope of this study; the topic has not been thoroughly addressed by modern scholars, and thus warrants future examination.
powerful printing dynasties in sixteenth century Spain: two branches of the Italian Giunta family who initially established themselves in Salamanca. The first Giuntas were merchants, editors, and printers based in Florence, and the family business spread to Venice, Lyons, Salamanca, Burgos, and Madrid. Lucantonio Giunta—uncle of Juan de Junta, the first of the family to arrive in Spain—was not only one of the wealthiest publishers in the world by 1520, but also maintained a vast network of agents and close colleagues throughout Europe, which undoubtedly ensured success for his family members upon their arrival in the Iberian Peninsula.

First Branch: Juan de Junta and Heirs (Burgos and Salamanca; active c. 1520-1598)

Juan de Junta was active as a bookseller in Salamanca from 1520; he also ran printing workshops in Burgos from 1527 to 1558, and in Salamanca from 1532 to 1552. Junta’s first publication was issued in 1526, and likely was something intended for a local or regional audience, as the printer’s name appeared not as “Giovanni di Giunta,” but the Hispanicized “Juan de Junta.” Burgos maintained its status as a prominent administrative city and home to high ranking royal officials until Philip II established Madrid as the capital in 1561; it is unsurprising that a member of one of the most prominent printing families of the century chose to open a business in such a favorable climate.

Though his name appeared on all the prints that came out of his shops, the operations were left in the hands of various people who oversaw the technical procedures. Juan de Junta remained outside of Spain on business to Lyons between 1542 and 1557. Little information exists regarding his reasons for such a long venture outside of Spain; Juan Delgado Casado

---

122 Much of the information regarding printers in Spain may be found in Juan Delgado Casado, *Diccionario de impresores españoles (siglos XV-XVII)* I. (Madrid: Editorial Arco/Libros, S.L., 1996).
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124 Delgado Casado, 353-54.
125 Pettas, 3.
alludes to possible explanations, including health issues and tenuous political relations that made travel between Spain and France tricky. In his absence, most of the daily business was left to his partner Alejandro de Cánova, particularly at the shop in Salamanca. The shop in Burgos was managed by Martín de Eguía during Junta’s travels, and later, by Rodrigo de la Torre. Both of the first Junta shops were known for quality work, characterized by immaculate engravings and the presence of elaborate borders and other illustrations.

In 1525 Junta traveled to Burgos to deal with matters pertaining to the will of Alonso de Melgar; while there, he married Melgar’s widow, Isabel de Basilea, the daughter of Fadrique de Basilea, a well known printer in Burgos. In 1527 he established himself as a printer in Burgos, in the shop that had belonged to Basilea and Melgar and was now Isabel’s property. After their father’s death, Juan and Isabel’s two children, Lucrecia and Felipe, took over the family business. The Burgos shop primarily printed Spanish-language texts: histories, translations of Latin verse, devotional works and official documents, such as the records of court proceedings in Valladolid and Toledo. The Juntas also produced liturgical works from about 1575. These practices were continued under the leadership of Martín de Eguía, Rodrigo de la Torre, Alonso de Medina, and Juan Gómez de Valdivielso, until Felipe Junta took over; his son-in-law, Juan Bautista Varesio, printed under the designation “por Juan Bautista Varesio, en la imprenta de Felipe de Junta” after Felipe’s death in either 1596 or 1598.

In 1532 Junta left the Burgos shop in capable hands, and moved to Salamanca, where Cánova ran their shop. The first work produced by the Junta press in Salamanca was a
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126 Pettas, 7.
127 A reasonable number of documents exist that reference the first Spanish branch of the Junta family, and these are particularly valuable for the way in which they outline the family’s relationships with businesses in other cities in Spain; for more information, see Delgado Casado, 354-55.
128 “By Juan Bautista Varesio, on the press of Felipe de Junta.” Ibid., 352-54.
129 Ibid., 354. Detailed information regarding the bookselling portion of Juan de Junta’s business may be found in Pettas, “A Sixteenth Century Spanish Bookstore: The Inventory of Juan de Junta.”
Manuale Ecclesiae Salmanticensis (1532). Works that followed from this particularly productive shop included liturgical texts; legal and legislative documents; Greek, Latin and Spanish classics; and works by professors at the university, including Domingo de Soto and Diego de Covarrubias. The Salamanca workshop passed into the hands of Julio Junta’s wife and daughter—who married another printer, Matías Gast—and the firm continued production under the name “Herederos de Juan de Junta” until Gast set out to form an independent press.

The establishment in Burgos was inherited by Felipe Junta, who in turn passed the business to his daughter at the end of the sixteenth century; she was married to another printer, Juan Bautista Varesio. Various individuals managed the Burgos shop, even during Juan de Junta’s lifetime. By the time Felipe took charge, Juan Gómez de Valdivielso oversaw daily operations. It is possible that he and Felipe Junta also formed part of the “Herederos de Juan de Junta” group in Salamanca during those years. As manager of the Burgos press, he used the printer’s mark “por los herederos de Juan de Junta” until about 1560.

Second Branch: Julio Junta and the Imprenta Real (Madrid; active c. 1594-c. 1697)

The second branch of the Junta family arrived years after Juan de Junta; the primary figure was Julio Junta (or “Junti de Modesti”), a son of the Italian merchant Bernardo Junta (brother of Juan de Junta) and Dorotea Modest. Julio was accompanied to Spain by his brother Lucas and several other family members, who originally settled in Salamanca. Both Lucas and Julio began work as booksellers in Salamanca; Lucas also did some printing, and Julio was a merchant, editor, and entrepreneur who was partially responsible for the growth of printing in Spain. As a merchant, his gradual ventures into diverse fields provided him connections with a

---

130 Delgado Casado, 350.
131 Ibid., 351.
132 Ibid., 355.
multitude of influential people. He bought printing supplies that had belonged to Cornelio Bernardo, and in 1571, his presence was documented in Madrid in relation to the printing and sale of liturgical books, and area that would become one of his core business ventures.\textsuperscript{133}

Julio Junta’s legacy is unusual, considering his enormous impact on the industry: he never personally printed a single publication. He was commissioned by Philip II to bring Nuevo Rezado (“New Prayer”) books to Spain. At first he was responsible for their importation, but he soon suggested printing the books domestically; thus, his business quickly widened to include managing a network of printers and merchants of committed to printing and distributing these works throughout the Peninsula.\textsuperscript{134}

Another significant result of Julio Junta’s activities was the establishment of the Imprenta Real in Madrid under a 1594 agreement with the Crown; Julio placed at its head his nephew Tomás, who was given the title of “Impresor Real.” Though his nephew was in charge of operations, Julio Junta was a mentor and figurehead. He signed many printing agreements, receipts, and employment contracts on behalf of the Imprenta Real until his death in 1619.\textsuperscript{135} Tomás commenced printing in the year of his appointment but was not officially listed in print as “Impresor del Rey” until 1596; this was likely done in deference to the widow of another printer, Alonso Gómez, who also held the title.\textsuperscript{136} Between 1596 and 1617 a number of printers were named in books produced by the Imprenta Real; by 1618 Tomás’s name again appeared in the printer’s mark.\textsuperscript{137} After his death in 1624, the title of Impresor Real proceeded to his widow, Teresa Junta, then to their son, Bernardo (active c. 1657-58). After Bernardo’s death in 1658, the family’s activity in Spain seems to end. Bernardo Junta’s brief tenure as Impresor del Rey was

\textsuperscript{133} Delgado Casado, 356.
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., 356-57.
\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 356.
\textsuperscript{136} Ibid., 342-43.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 359.
not particularly fruitful, and he does not appear to have left any family upon his death. Most of his personal belongings were inherited by Cofradía del Santísimo de la Parroquia de San Andrés, but his printing materials were left to Mateo Fernández, his successor at the Imprenta Real from 1659.  

In its earliest stages, the Imprenta Real was charged with printing official texts, especially Nuevo Rezado books. It later produced a variety of texts, but primarily dealt with those pertaining to events of the royal family and government-oriented documents. During Juan Flamenco’s tenure as Impresor Real, the press turned out some high quality works, including a Missale Romanum (1600), a Spanish-language edition of St. Augustine’s Confessions (1596), the Obras of St Teresa of Ávila (1597), José de Sigüenza, Luis de Granada, and Juan de los Ángeles. The Imprenta Real printed many of the most important authors and texts of the period, both Spanish and foreign, but most of these were non-musical; only a small fraction of its output contained polyphony.

Juan Flamenco, Head of the Imprenta Real (1596-1612)  

The Imprenta Real enjoyed an unusually long life for a Spanish press; the firm existed in some form from 1594 until at least 1697. Juan Flamenco was linked to the development of the Imprenta Real almost from the beginning, and it seems the entirety of his activity as a printer in Madrid (1596-1612) is linked to the royal press. He likely was employed by the Junta family before 1596, as Julio Junta named Flamenco the first technical manager of the Imprenta Real.

The first known mention of Juan Flamenco appears in a contract with the wife of Hubert Gotard,
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138 Delgado Casado, 350.
139 Ibid., 343.
140 Other Spanish forms of his name include Juan Flandro, Juan de Flandres, and Juan de Flandres; in Latin publications, Ioannem Flandrum was used.
141 Unless otherwise stated, information on Juan Flamenco was summarized from Delgado Casado, 238.
the famous printer from Barcelona. He later married Catalina Rodriguez, and their daughter Maria married another printer, Jean de Buc. Though he did not specialize in polyphonic music, the Imprenta Real produced four vocal collections during Juan Flamenco’s tenure: Philippe Rogier’s Missae sex (1598); Alonso Lobo’s first book of masses (1602); and Victoria’s Missae, Magnificat, Motecta, Psalms, et alia quam plurima. Quae partim Octonis, alia Nonis, alia Duodenis vocibus concinuntur haec omnia sunt in hoc libro ad pulsandum in organis (hereafter “1600a”) and Officium defunctorum of 1605.

Dedications

Victoria’s dedicatees represent an influential cross-section of post-Tridentine religious and political figures: he clearly intended to associate himself with powerful individuals. If records of monetary support for these publications were extant, those documents might reveal handsome rewards, considering the wealthy individuals involved. Even his first volume, published in 1572, bore the name of one of the most powerful figures in the German Counter-Reformation: Cardinal Otto Truchsess von Waldburg. Victoria’s second dedication (1576) was to Duke Ernst of Bavaria. Ernst’s father, Duke Albrecht, arranged a series of benefices for his son, including a Salzburg canonry (at age eleven), and the bishoprics of Freising, Hildesheim, Liège, and Münster. By the time he was elected Archbishop and Elector of Cologne in 1583, Ernst was a formidable Catholic force in a region torn by factional divisions, but his power was strengthened by the support of the papacy and Philip II.142

In 1581, two books appeared in homage to prominent religious figures: Pope Gregory XIII and Cardinal Alessandrino, Michele Bonelli (1541-1598), the great-nephew of Pope Pius V.

Bonelli was a member of the Dominican order, but, like Victoria, was educated at the German College. Significantly, Alessandrino served as a papal ambassador to Spain and Portugal during a trip in 1571, alongside Francisco de Borja, head of the Jesuit order.

By 1583, Victoria’s dedications simultaneously take a turn toward political figures (1583a: Philip II and 1585b: Duke of Savoy) and either no dedicatee (1585a) or an homage to the Blessed Virgin Mary, rather than a living individual (1583b, 1589a, 1589b). Charles Emmanuel I was Duke of Savoy from 1580 until his death in 1630; he was married to the Infanta Catalina Micaela of Austria, daughter of Philip II. The Duke of Savoy was allied with Spain against France, and was involved in Counter-Reformation efforts as well.

The 1592 publication further reveals the intersection of sacred and secular, as the dedicatee is Cardinal Alberto, the son of Victoria’s employer, the Empress María. The final four publications do not stray from these precedents. 1600a was printed in honor of the newly crowned Philip III; 1600b includes only an inscription by the editor; no dedication appears in the 1603 motet collection reprint; and his final collection, the Officium defunctorum (1605), was presented to Margarita of Austria, in honor of her recently deceased mother, the Empress.

**Victoria’s Publications: Overview, Contents**

During his lifetime, Victoria printed 16 books containing sacred music for nearly all liturgical functions. These include 20 masses, 16 Magnificats, 44 authenticated motets, hymns, an Officium Hebdomadae Sanctae, seven psalms (five polychoral settings for Vespers, and two for Compline), 10 Marian antiphons, and three sequences. Aside from the Mass Ordinary and Magnificat, *Pange lingua*, and *Vexilla regis* (which appear in both Roman and Spanish forms),

---


Victoria set very few texts more than once. There are two settings each of *Alma redemptoris mater* (5vv, first published in 1576; 8vv, first published in 1581b), *Ave Regina caelorum* (5vv, 1572; 8vv, 1581b), *O sacrum convivium* (4vv and 6vv; both 1571), and *Regina caeli* (5vv, 1572; 8vv, 1576).\(^{145}\) Originally, composers only set the even verses polyphonically; in the sixteenth century, many started producing separate settings of even and odd verses, as Victoria did. However, the 1600a Magnificats are fully polyphonic. There are four settings of the Marian antiphon *Salve Regina* in Victoria’s output: two for five voices (1576, 1583b), a six-voice work (1576), and an eight-voice setting (1572).\(^{146}\)

Though Victoria did not tend to set texts repeatedly, he did reprint much of his music quite frequently. Details of his printing habits will be described below, accompanied by an overview of contents and extant copies. Over the course of his career, Victoria included increased numbers of works for at least eight voices, culminating in the monumental 1600a collection, which features music primarily written for double and triple choirs. A significant majority of the extant prints reside in archives in Italy, particularly in Rome, but a number of prints exist in Spanish and Portuguese collections as well. Smaller numbers of copies are scattered across three continents: countries represented include Germany, Britain, Poland, Austria, France, Belgium, Ireland, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United States, and Colombia. The 1600a prints will be scrutinized extensively; a selection of Gardano prints will be addressed to a lesser degree of detail, as they serve primarily as material for comparison with the work of the Imprenta Real, and not all of the composer’s publications could be accessed for this study.

The Gardano prints examined here include Victoria’s first motet edition, printed by the Sons of

\(^{145}\) Cramer indicates that Victoria set the hymn *Ave Maris Stella* twice—once with even verses (1576) and once with odds (1600a), but this is not the case (Cramer, 42). 1600a contains chant for the odd verses and polyphony for the evens.

\(^{146}\) Cramer misidentified several printings of this text; the listing in Appendix C is corrected.
Antonio Gardano (1572); the first mass book, completed by Angelo Gardano (1576); and another edition of the motets, printed in Rome by Alessandro Gardano (1585b).


Victoria’s first book of motets is organized rather conventionally by number of voices, ascending from four-voice works to eight. Rather than providing a single table of contents or index for each volume, the publisher included separate indices to clearly divide the collection into three sections for four, five, and six or eight voices, respectively. Some attempt was made to order the pieces according to the liturgical year, but some appear out of order. Nearly half of the 33 items are scored for four voices (14); five- and six-voice pieces comprise the majority of the remaining works (nine each). Only one piece is for eight voices: *Ave Maria.* The 33 items were reprinted numerous times: all appeared between five and eight times in total, and some were revised. All of the examples of this collection that survive in Spanish archives are incomplete (Ávila, Valencia, and Valladolid), though a complete exemplar is held by the Santini Bibliothek in Münster. The source examined here is comprised of digital images from the copies in Ávila and Valencia.

The 1572 prints were issued as a set of six partbooks (Cantus, Altus, Tenor, Bassus, Quintus, and Sextus), under the name “Sons of Antonio Gardano.” Rather than the printer’s mark, the title page bears a large coat of arms belonging to Cardinal Otto von Truchsess, the dedicatee. The inking and typesetting are excellent, as is the consistency of layout; as was common for the Gardanos and other printers of music, *skeleton formes* are retained for each

---

147 Cramer, 23.
page. In most cases, the signatures at the bottom of pages include the identifying text “Motecta Thome Ludouici de Victoria [sic],” along with the standard alphabetical designations for each gathering. Additionally, a single set of intricate initials depicting various figures on horseback is used throughout the edition, apart from a smaller “M” used for a section break on page 15, the “Mens impleatur” portion of O sacrum convivium. According to Gardano custom, the books are paginated, rather than foliated; the numbering remains accurate and the organizational system is consistent from book to book. Even in the Quintus and Sextus volumes, which omit the four-voice works, the numbering reflects the pagination in the other books. For instance, the Quintus book begins on page 17, as the five-voice Ascendens Christus appears on page 17 of the first four volumes.

The parts indicated on the title pages do not always reflect the contents of the partbooks, due to non-standard scorings, which will be the case with many of Victoria’s prints. Often the generically identified Quintus and Sextus volumes label the parts according to where they fit within the polyphonic fabric, but occasionally the “Quintus” or “Sextus” designation remains; in a few instances among the motets divided into multiple sections, the parts are labeled inconsistently from one page to the next, as seen in Vadam circuiibo, pp. 37-38 in the Quintus volume—page 37 is labeled “Quintus,” while page 38 is labeled “Tenor Secundus.” Such inconsistencies of labeling were relatively minor, and rarely corrected by the printer.


Victoria’s first book of masses was printed shortly after Angelo Gardano began running the firm under his own name; the edition is in a large, luxurious folio format. The volume
contains 27 items, 20 of which are new. The title page of this collection indicates his employment at the German College, and its contents reflect the aesthetic and liturgical needs of the church of San Apollinare and similar institutions.¹⁴⁹ Unlike most mass collections of the period, Victoria’s 1576 publication includes a variety of service music: the print begins with five masses, but continues with Magnificat settings, motets, hymns, and psalms. The five masses all contain references to pre-existing material. Missa Ave Maris Stella and Missa De beata Maria quote plainchant; Missa Simile est regnum caelorum parodies a Guerrero motet; Missa Gaudeamus is based on a work by Morales; and Missa Dum complerentur is based on Victoria’s motet of 1572.¹⁵⁰ The masses and Magnificats are grouped together, separated by an Ave Maris Stella, but the other works are organized by ascending number of voices. Victoria provided settings of both odd and even verses for the Magnificats (primi, quarti, and octavi toni). Five Marian antiphon settings follow, then a collection of six- and eight-voice motets, psalms, and antiphons; there does not seem to be a specific liturgical theme, but most of the texts are Marian-focused. The majority of the pieces are scored for four, five, or six voices (three, five, and eight items, respectively), but this collection does include a greater number of eight-voice works (five; one is reprinted from 1572). The Magnificats are primarily set for four voices, though the final verse of most of the settings expands to five or six voices. All of the items are reprinted in subsequent collections, except for the five-voice Salve Regina [I], and thirteen of those appear in print five to seven times.

¹⁴⁹ The German College’s Constitutions indicate that the if the maestro wished to publish music under the title of maestro di cappella of San Apollinare, he must obtain permission from the rector and ensure that the contents aligned with the “decorum and reputation” of the college; Culley, “The Influence of the German College in Rome on music in German-Speaking countries,” 12.
A large number of complete and incomplete copies exist in archives in England, Italy, Portugal, and Spain. For the purpose of this study, the digital images of an example preserved in the Archivo Capitular de Tudela were consulted; unfortunately this exemplar is badly damaged and missing nearly half of its pages, but enough survives to be useful for comparison purposes. The title page is simple, and, like Victoria’s previous Gardano print, prominently displays the coat of arms of his dedicatee, Duke Ernst of Bavaria. In general, the printing quality is superior, but there is more inconsistency in formatting than the 1572 partbooks. The inking and typesetting are generally good, though a few instances of blurred impressions and uneven inking are present. The *formes* used for the Gothic-type headings are retained throughout, though there are a few minor issues with incorrect designations; an example is fol. 84r, part of the odd-verse setting of the *Magnificat quarti toni*, which is mistakenly labeled “Primi toni.” Rather than recycling a single set of initials, as seen in the 1572 edition, the printer used three styles: (1) a set of ornate, calligraphic-style initials in large and small versions; (2) a small floral design, sometimes featuring animals; and (3) the horse-and-rider initial set used throughout the 1572 prints. The use of differing sizes of blocks makes sense, depending upon the amount of music included. In some cases, however, the initial styles are mismatched on the page and across openings. For example, fol. 55r & v, the “Osanna” at the end of *Missa Gaudeamus*, exhibits all three initial styles. In most other cases, an attempt was made to match the style of initial across openings, yielding aesthetically pleasing results.
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151 See Cramer, 23 for complete listing.
1581a [V1428]: Thomae Ludovici A Victoria Abulensis Hymni Totius Anni Secundum Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Consuetudinum, Qui Quattuor Concinnatur Vocibus Una cum quattuor Psalmis, pro praeceptis festivitatibus, qui octo vocibus modulantur. Ad Gregorium XIII. Pont. Max. Romae Ex Typographia Dominici Basae M.D. LXXXI. Romae: apud Franciscum Zanettum MDLXXXI.

1581a is a collection of 36 hymn settings; of these, 34 are new to publication. The collection is ordered by the church year; the exceptions are the hymns for saints, which have their own section, and the eight-voice works, all psalm settings, which appear last. Victoria included the Roman Vexilla regis, and both the Spanish and Roman versions of Pange lingua in this volume, but the Spanish Pange lingua appears at the end of the four-voice works, rather than inserted with the rest. Unlike the 1576 print, this book does not include a relatively balanced selection of scorings: 32 pieces are written for four voices, while four are scored for eight. All of the four voice works except for one are only reprinted in the 1600b edition; the exception is the Spanish Pange lingua that appears in 1600a. The four eight-voice psalm settings, Dixit Dominus, Laudate Dominum omnes gentes, Laudate pueri, and Nisi Dominus, are all reprinted in the same five series of prints: 1583b, 1589a, 1589b, 1600a, and 1603. A surprisingly large number of copies are extant; most are in Italian libraries, but single copies exist in Portugal, Spain, Poland, Germany, and Austria.¹⁵³


Victoria’s Magnificat book includes 24 items; these include discrete odd- and even-verse settings of the Magnificat in all eight tones. Five of the pairs are only printed in this collection, and the three pairs that first appeared in the 1576 books appear here a final time. The eight works

that close the collection comprise a cycle of Marian antiphon settings, which are fitting companions to the Magnificats, and many of them were reprinted numerous times. One unusual organizational feature involves the four antiphon texts: a reprinted *Alma redemptoris* (5vv) is immediately followed by a new eight-voice version, as is *Ave Regina caelorum* (5vv) and the new eight-voice setting. The recycled five- and eight-voice *Regina caeli* and *Salve Regina* [I] pairings conclude the collection. Like 1581a, most of the works are scored for a smaller number of voices; the 16 Magnificat items are primarily for four voices, while the aforementioned antiphon settings comprise the rest. Like the other prints from 1581, a significant quantity of surviving prints exists, primarily in Italian collections.  


1583a, Victoria’s second book of masses, includes all five of the masses from the first book, but unlike its predecessor, this collection does not contain any other service music. Of the new pieces, *Missa Quam pulchri sunt* and *Missa O quam gloriosum* are based on Victoria’s motets from 1583; *Missa Surge propera* parodies a Palestrina motet and the four-voice *Missa Pro defunctis* borrows from Requiem chants.  

1583a, Victoria’s second book of masses, includes all five of the masses from the first book, but unlike its predecessor, this collection does not contain any other service music. Of the new pieces, *Missa Quam pulchri sunt* and *Missa O quam gloriosum* are based on Victoria’s motets from 1583; *Missa Surge propera* parodies a Palestrina motet and the four-voice *Missa Pro defunctis* borrows from Requiem chants. All of the works are ordered by ascending number of voices, except for the *Missa Pro defunctis*, which appears at the end; they are scored for four (5), five (2), and six (2) voices (5, 2, and 2 pieces, respectively). Six of the nine masses were either reprinted later or appear for the final time in this book, and none of them are

154 Cramer, 24-25.
chronically repeated. Fewer copies of 1583a survive in Italy, but many have appeared in far-flung locations, such as the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Spain.\textsuperscript{156}


In 1583, Victoria produced a monumental edition of his motets; the collection included 53 items, of which eight were new. The order is quite similar to the first motet book of 1572: a small number of works are added, removed, or re-ordered, but the general framework remains the same. Six of the new works are for four, five, or six voices (amounting to a total of 16, 12, and 13 works, respectively), and the composer’s largest collection of eight-voice compositions is included as well (11 pieces; one new). In addition, Victoria’s first 12-voice psalm setting, \textit{Laetatus sum}, appears at the end. This is the only 12-voice piece the composer printed outside of Spain; his other two 12-voice works only appear in the first Madrid publication (1600a). Like the previous collection, examples of 1583b survive in archives all over the globe, though a larger proportion is found in Rome.\textsuperscript{157}

\textbf{1585a [V1432]: Thomae Ludovici De Victoria Abulensis Officium Hebdomadae Sanctae Permissu Superiorum. Romae Ex Typographia Domenici Basae 1585. Romae apud Alexandrum Gardanum. MDLXXXV.}

It is quite possible Victoria originally wrote his Holy Week liturgy for a specific location and group of singers, perhaps for one of the Spanish institutions for which he provided music in Rome, as a new setting of the \textit{Vexilla regis} is included at the end of the volume; it is the only time the Spanish version of the chant appears in one of his publications. This is his only \textit{Officium}

\textsuperscript{156} Cramer, 25.
\textsuperscript{157} Ibid., 25-26.
*Hebdomadae Sanctae*, and most of the works are unique to this print. Most of the Holy Week Office items are scored for four voices, but a number of them include a final “Ierusalem” verse that expands the texture to five voices. These are either obligatory or added as an alternative to the given four-voice setting; a handful are scored for five voices with six-voice final verse, while a single piece, *Incipit oratio Ieremiae*, is scored for six voices and optional eight-voice “Ierusalem.” Of the four pieces from previous collections, one is scored for five voices (*Tantum ergo*) and another for six (*O Domine Jesu Christe*). Most of the extant prints are in Italy, but other copies are found in Regensburg and Tarazona.\(^{158}\)

---


Victoria’s 1585 motet collection, produced by the press of Domenico Basa and issued by Alessandro Gardano, contains reprints of many of the items from his earlier motet books. Out of 37 works, 11 are new, but three were written by other composers: two by Guerrero, and one by Soriano. This is the only time Victoria includes works by other people in his prints, and this surely indicates his high level of respect for both. Most of the pieces are taken from the 1572 and 1576 collections, but not in the same order; in fact, the organization is quite different from previous prints, and not in liturgical order. The book opens with the 13 works for six voices and descends to the four-voice pieces, yet the eight-part works appear at the end. Again, most of these pieces are scored for four, five, or six voices (12, 8, and 13, respectively); of the four-voice motets, seven are new and never appear in reprint, nor does the single new five-voice piece, *Resplenduit facies*. Victoria included one new eight-voice work; *Lauda Sion* appears once more

\(^{158}\) Cramer, 26.
in 1600a. Two six-voice pieces are by Guerrero, and Soriano contributed one eight-voice work. Of the works included in the collection, 26 either appear in print again or are the final reprint, and all but one appear five to eight times. An exceptionally large number of copies survive (20); examples are scattered internationally, and seven of those are found on the Iberian Peninsula. A significant number are extant in Rome as well. The observations below are based upon the relatively complete copy in the Archivio de la Catedral de Córdoba.

The title page parallels those found in early Victoria prints done by the Gardanos, as the coat of arms of his dedicatee, Charles Emmanuel I, Duke of Savoy, is featured. Despite assertions that Alessandro Gardano’s craftsmanship lagged behind his brother’s, the 1585a folio edition exhibits fine craftsmanship; minor flaws exist that closely parallel those found in the 1576 prints done by Angelo Gardano. The inking is relatively good, though heavy or uneven at times. The skeletons used for the headings are consistent, and foliation is accurate throughout. Like the first book of masses, which was also in folio format, this edition includes a variety of initial style groups: (1) an ornate, calligraphic set with a thin double border, found in different sizes and at least two slightly different designs; (2) ornate “Residuum” pieces with floral borders, also in varying styles; and (3) a group with bare letters but thick floral borders, found in multiple designs and in at least two sizes. Most of the time, an attempt was made to match initial styles across openings. A few inconsistencies in typesetting occur, as seen in the initials on fol. 8r; in this example, all three of the “P” initials are different styles, and the letters are not properly centered.

159 Cramer, 26-27.
1589a [V1423]: Thomae Ludovici de Victoria, Abulensis, Motecta Quae Partim Quaternis, partim quinis, alia senis, alia octonis, alia duodenis vocibus concinuntur, Quae quidem nunc vero melius excussa, & alia quam plurima adiuncta, noviter sunt impressa. Mediolani, Apud Franciscum, & haeredes Simonis Tini. MDLXXXIX.


Both collections from 1589 are reprints of Victoria’s monumental reissue of the motets (1583b); the collections include 53 items, all of which are reprints. More information on the contents is detailed above. Only a few examples of 1589a (Milan) survive, and all are in Italy; a surprisingly large number of copies of the Dillingen edition survive, and predictably, many of these are in German libraries.161


The collection of 1592 is the second volume designated as his “second” book of masses; the 1576 print was a miscellany of items with five masses at the beginning, and 1583a was a book devoted entirely to mass settings. 1583a and this “second” book differ in significant ways: the former includes nine masses, but five of those are the masses from 1576. The latter contains six new settings and the reprinted Missa Pro defunctis. Additionally, Victoria opened and closed the 1592 collection with two new pairs of non-mass items. The two penitential antiphons used at the opening of Mass, Asperges me, Domine and Vidi aquam, open the collection. Peccantem me and Credo quod redemptor, two responses used during the Office for the Dead, follow the Missa Pro defunctis. Three of these new works are written for four voices, and one for five. The
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antiphons appear once more in 1600a, but the other two items are never reprinted. Two of the new masses, *Missa O magnum mysterium* and *Missa Quarti toni*, are scored for four voices, and *Missa Trahe me post te* and *Missa Ascendens Christus* are written for five voices. A single six-voice mass, *Missa Vidi speciosam*, follows. The composer still shows a preference for four- to six-voice settings in this collection, but he does include his first eight-voice work in the genre, a *Missa Salve Regina*.

Most of Victoria’s parody masses are based on his own works. *Missa O magnum mysterium*, *Missa Ascendens Christus*, and *Missa Vidi speciosam* are based on motets from the 1572 collection, and *Missa Trahe me post te* is based on a work from 1583. *Missa Salve Regina* is based on Victoria’s eight-voice setting of the Marian antiphon. Brill correctly states that the parody source is the eight-voice version from 1576, but mistakenly notes that the antiphon and mass were both originally scored for eight voices and organ; the organ parts do not appear until the 1600a collection. Finally, *Missa Quarti toni* is unique among Victoria’s masses: it is the only setting that appears to be freely-composed. Most of the surviving copies of this print are found in Roman archives, though others are held by institutions in other Italian cities and in Spain.

---

163 Patrick Brill, “The Parody Masses of Tomás Luis de Victoria” (Ph.D. diss., The University of Kansas, 1995), 341.
165 Cramer, 28.
This collection, the first of only two Victoria printed in Spain, was dedicated to the new king, Philip III, and printed with his royal permission. Publishing contracts from the period rarely surface, but in this case a copy of the composer’s contract with the royal firm exists in the Archivo Histórico de Protocolos in Madrid. The contract dates from 1598, the year of Philip II’s death at El Escorial.

This study of Victoria’s first Madrid publication is based primarily on the holdings at the British Library and the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid; each possesses eight of the nine part books. One of two known copies of the organ book resides at Munich’s Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, and it this copy that is referenced. The ninth vocal book has proven more elusive: Eugene Cramer notes that there are copies at the British Library and Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence, but neither institution’s holdings include the volume. The only known copies are in the Archivo Musical de la Catedral in Bogotá, Colombia, one of the oldest and most extensive cathedral music libraries in the New World, and the Archivo General Diocesano de Valladolid; the latter is currently only accessible online and is used for this edition. Other partial copies of the collection are held by Barcelona’s Biblioteca Central, the Muziekbibliotheek den Haags Gemeentemuseum in The Hague, the Biblioteca Estense in Modena, and the cathedral archive of Segorbe.

1600a includes 32 items, most of which are scored for double choir: the exceptions are three works scored for triple choir a12, one nine-voice piece (CCATB//CATB), seven hymns,
antiphons, and sequences for four voices, and one three-voice Magnificat section. Of these 32 works, 18 are reprints from previous publications, primarily those originating in Rome. Most of the 14 polychoral pieces appeared numerous times prior to their first publication in Spain, but without a printed organ accompaniment. An additional five works are reprints; these are all for four voices, and appeared only once or twice before their appearance in 1600a. Fifteen of the reprints resurface either in Victoria’s 1600b or 1603 collections, and 12 of those were published between five and eight times. These comprise a core selection of works that also appear in 1583b, 1589a, 1589b, and 1603, all of which are reprints of the motet collection, as detailed above. Significantly, a substantial proportion (13) of the works included in 1600a had never before been published, and none of them were reissued during Victoria’s lifetime. A substantial portion of the new pieces are scored for a large ensemble (two 12vv, one 9vv, and seven 8vv).

The works unique to 1600a include four unusual masses: Missa Alma redemptoris (8vv), Missa Ave Regina (8vv), Missa Pro victoria (9vv), and Missa Laetatus sum (12vv). Missa Alma redemptoris and Missa Ave Regina both draw upon two parody sources each. The Marian antiphons Alma redemptoris mater and Ave Regina caelorum are two of the few texts the composer set twice; five-voice versions of both were first printed in 1572, and the eight-voice settings appeared in 1581b. Missa Laetatus sum is unusual because it is the first (and only) triple-choir mass Victoria composed. It is based on the 12-voice psalm setting of the same name, first printed in 1583b. The Missa Pro victoria is the only nine-voice mass in the composer’s output, but more significantly, the work’s source is the Janequin chanson La guerre, rather than a sacred selection. Other items unique to 1600a include two fully polyphonic Magnificats (8vv and

---
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12vv), eight-voice settings of *Victimaes paschali laudes*, *Veni sancte Spiritus*, *O Ildephonse*, and *Ecce nunc benedicite*, the *Te Deum*, *Nunc Dimittis*, and the three-voice Magnificat segment.

Seven of Victoria’s previous eleven collections were produced in sumptuous choirbook format; in contrast, the 1600 prints include nine partbooks and an organ score. The organ accompaniment book in itself is unusual, as it is arguably the first of its kind to be published in Europe. Predictably, the eight partbooks are labeled according to standard double-choir nomenclature: Choir I (Cantus I/Altus I/Tenor I/Bassus I) and Choir II (Cantus II/Altus II/Tenor II/Bassus II). However, the parts indicated on the title pages do not always reflect the contents of the book, due to non-standard scorings. For example, Victoria scored *O Ildephonse* for C-I-II-AI-BI//CIII-AII-T-BII; Cantus II appears in the Tenor I book and Cantus III is printed in the Cantus II book (see Table 4-2 for full listing of contents). In the 12-voice pieces, the Choir III parts all appear in the Choir II books.

The anomalous nature of the ninth vocal book is worth noting: rather than appearing in partbook format, it is in the larger choirbook size, like the organ *partitura*. Instead of containing a more-or-less standard set of parts, the book serves as an appendix, providing the “extra” parts that did not fit into the other eight books. For the 12-voice triple choir works, Victoria placed all of the Choir II parts in the ninth book, likely for ease of performance; like the partbooks, the composer probably arranged the prints so that the choirs could remain spatially separate. All seven of the works for four voices and a single three-voice piece are provided in choirbook format as well.

Like Victoria’s 1576 book, 1600a contains a seemingly random mixture of music; both include five masses, whereas the other collections to include masses are comprised of mostly (if not all) masses; a complete listing is included in Table 4-2. The collection opens with the five
masses and the Magnificat a12; these are arranged in ascending order by the number of voice parts. The ordering of other items does not appear to follow the liturgical calendar, but rather is organized by ascending number of voices and at least partially according to type of text. For instance, the sequences are grouped together, as are most of the texts for Marian feasts, including the Marian antiphon settings. The vesper psalm settings comprise a cohesive block of works as well apart from Laetatus sum, which appears as the last work in the partbooks. The single-choir works form a self-contained group in the ninth book, but maintain a similar ordering according to liturgical function and/or genre. Most of the texts are commonly associated with solemn feast days and celebrations for which polyphony was frequently heard, as detailed in Table 4-3, and a significant number are Marian-focused. Some of the feast days, such as Corpus Christi, were especially important to the Spanish church. Additionally, a large proportion are Vespers texts.

An unusual feature of this collection is a Te Deum for four voices; it appears for the first time in 1600a, even though the Te Deum text was extremely common in liturgical and devotional practice. The Te Deum frequently was sung in celebration of military victories, in honor of royal weddings, and for other significant events. One characteristically Spanish item is O Ildephonse, a motet honoring St. Ildefonsus, the patron saint of Toledo who was an archbishop of Toledo during the seventh century and associated with devotion to the Virgin Mary. Additional observations regarding liturgical and/or ceremonial function for the works included in 1600a will be addressed in Chapter Five.

170 The liturgical significance of the mass settings will be addressed in Chapter Five.
Table 4-2. Voicings of 1600a: Polychoral Works.\(^{172}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>vv</th>
<th>C 1, Choir I</th>
<th>C 2, Choir II</th>
<th>A 1, Choir I</th>
<th>A 2, Choir II</th>
<th>T 1, Choir I</th>
<th>T 2, Choir II</th>
<th>B 1, Choir I</th>
<th>B 2, Choir II</th>
<th>9th Book(^{173})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Alma redemptoris</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>**(^{174})</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave Regina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Salve Regina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>C3, CII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>C2, C1</td>
<td>T2, C</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pro victoria</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>C3, CII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>C2, CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Laetatus sum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>C4, CIII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>A3, CIII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>T3, CIII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>B2, CIII(^{175})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat sexti toni</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>C4, CIII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>A3, CIII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>T3, CIII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>B2, CIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dic nobis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>C3, CII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>C2, CI</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veni sancte Spiritus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauda Sion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Ildephonse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>C3, CII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>A2, CII</td>
<td>C2, C1</td>
<td>T, CII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat primi toni</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>C2, CI</td>
<td>B, CII</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letaniae de Beata Virgine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C, CI</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>A, CI</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>T, C1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>B, CI</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma redemptoris mater</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Regina caelorum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina caeli</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve Regina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixit Dominus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudate pueri</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisi Dominus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudate Dominum omnes gentes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce nunc benedictae</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super flumina Babylonis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laetatus sum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>C4, CIII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>A3, CIII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>T2, CIII</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>B2, CIII</td>
<td>C2, CII; C3, CII; A2, CII; T2, CII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{172}\) Roman numerals indicate the chorus number, and Arabic numerals indicate voice part number.

\(^{173}\) The ninth book also contains the single-choir works; these will be detailed in Chapter Five.

\(^{174}\) ** = Parts marked as indicated on title page.

\(^{175}\) The B2, CII book is mismarked in the original; the part clearly belongs with Chorus III.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text Type</th>
<th>Most Common Liturgical Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat sexti toni, 12vv</td>
<td>Canticle</td>
<td>Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Die nobis</em> [Victimae paschali laudes], 8vv</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Easter Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Veni sancte Spiritus</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Pentecost and its octave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lauda Sion</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Corpus Christi and its octave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>O Ildophonse</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Motet</td>
<td>Feast of St. Ildophonus (Jan. 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat primi toni, 8vv</td>
<td>Canticle</td>
<td>Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Letanie de Beata Virgine</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Litany</td>
<td>Special occasions; often added to liturgical functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ave Maria</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Marian Devotion</td>
<td>Devotional text used in some form for Vespers on Marian feasts; Offertory on 4th Sunday of Advent and Feasts of Immaculate Conception, Annunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alma redemptoris mater</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Marian Antiphon</td>
<td>Vespers: Advent and Christmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ave Regina caelorum</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Marian Antiphon</td>
<td>Compline: Septuagesima and Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Regina caeli</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Marian Antiphon</td>
<td>Compline: Holy Thursday to Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salve Regina</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Marian Antiphon</td>
<td>Vespers: Trinity Sunday to Advent; common hymn after Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dixit Dominus</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Vespers: almost always 1st psalm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laudate pueri Dominum</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Vespers: almost always 4th psalm; 2nd psalm on Marian feasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nisi Dominus</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Vespers: 4th psalm on Marian feasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laudate Dominum omnes gentes</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Vespers: 5th psalm on Christmas, Epiphany, some saints’ feasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ecce nunc benedicite</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Compline: 4th psalm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Super flumina Babylonis</em>, 8vv</td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Motet-style setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laetatus sum</em>, 12vv</td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Vespers: 3rd psalm on Marian feasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Te Deum</em>, 4vv</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Matins: Christmas, Easter, Corpus Christi; Corpus Christi procession; misc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Veni creator Spiritus</em>, 4vv</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Vespers/Terce: Pentecost; misc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pange lingua</em> [more hispano], 4vv</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Processional for Holy Thursday and Corpus Christi; Vespers II: Corpus Christi; Eucharist hymn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ave Maris Stella</em>, 4vv</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Vespers I: many Marian feasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nunc Dimittis</em>, 4vv</td>
<td>Canticle</td>
<td>Compline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Asperges me</em>, Domine*, 4vv</td>
<td>Antiphon</td>
<td>Penitential Antiphon: “Asperges” portion of Mass, all seasons except Eastertide, Palm Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vidi aquam</em>, 4vv</td>
<td>Antiphon</td>
<td>Penitential Antiphon: “Asperges” portion of Mass, Eastertide and Palm Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Et misericordia ejus pro Magnificat primi toni</em>, 3vv</td>
<td>Canticle</td>
<td>Vespers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon general observation of Victoria’s printed works, the quality of the 1600a publication is lacking. In particular, the books contain a number of typesetting errors. Although the print quality is not on par with those produced by the Venetian Gardano firm, there are few
glaring musical errors, and the work seems passable for a printer who did not specialize in music. The books display far less consistency; the partbooks do not retain skeleton formes, and as a result, mistakes in headings and placement of initials abound. Unlike Victoria’s Roman and Venetian prints, this collection also contains far fewer illustrations, and the images that are included are less intricate. Rather than exhibiting ornate, engraving-dominated design, the title page merely contains the title information provided above and Philip III’s coat of arms, but this is similar to the early Gardano prints. The only other illustrations are the initials at the beginning of each piece or significant section break within a work. Like the Gardano prints, the 1600a books employ a number of initial styles, ranging from plain letters to more elaborate floral designs, with or without linear borders, and occasionally featuring animal or human figures. All of the initials are fairly small, whereas the Gardano firms tended to favor a mixture of sizes.

The editing seems rather careless for something produced by what presumably was a leading publishing house, even though many of these mistakes would have been considered relatively minor: imprecise foliation abounds, as do incorrect initials at the beginning of works. The most glaring error is in the Altus I book; “Fiat pax,” the final section of Laetatus sum, was left out of the print entirely. The part as printed in earlier collections fits with what is reproduced in the organ book; for transcription purposes, the copy of 1583b held by the Jean Gray Hargove Music Library at the University of California, Berkeley substituted.176 Severely erroneous foliations appear to be isolated to the Tenor II, Bassus I, and Bassus II parts, however. In the Tenor II book fols. 8 and 14-21 are incorrectly numbered. In some cases, the index indicates the inaccurate numbers; in other instances the index is accurate while the actual foliation is incorrect. For example, the index correctly indicates that Missa Laetatus sum begins on fol. 11, though the number on the leaf is 5. Two particularly noticeable errors in placement of initials occur on fol.

3v of the Cantus I book. On this page appear the Kyrie and Gloria of *Missa Ave Regina*, but a typesetter mistakenly used initials one letter alphabetically removed from the correct initial; thus, the text incipits appear as “Lyrie eleison” and “Dt in terra pax.” Additional printer’s errors include incorrect *custodes*, or catchwords, which are segments of text placed in the bottom right corner of the page in order to indicate which text would appear at the top of the following page. Some catchwords were merely one syllable, while some may comprise a short phrase. Dozens of incorrect catchwords are scattered throughout all of the vocal books; many were mistakenly repeated from an adjacent page, such as the word “Nisi” at the bottom of fol. 23v in the Altus II book. The text at the top of 24r is “Sit nomen Domini,” not “Nisi Dominus,” but the catchword “Nisi” is repeated in its correct position, 24v, as *Nisi Dominus* begins at the top of 25v.

1600b [V1429]: *Hymni Totius Anni Iuxta ritum Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae. A Ludovico de Victoria Abulensis, et in Artem Musices celeberimo: Nuper in lucem editi. cum quattuor Vocibus. Venetiis Apud Facobum Vincentium. MDC.*

This is an incomplete reprint of Victoria’s first book of hymns (1581a); the eight-voice works are excluded, as is the setting of *Petrus beatus*. This collection’s scoring is wholly unusual for the composer, as everything is written for four voices. Of the 31 items, 28 are the second of two printings, whereas the other three appeared in this collection for their third (and final) time. Extant copies are few, but complete. Two exist in Italian libraries (Civico Museo Bibliografico, Bologna; Biblioteca Communale Ariostea, Ferrara), and one is housed at the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C.177

---

177 Cramer, 28.
1603 [V1425]: *Thomae Ludovici De Victoria Abulensis. Motecta, Que Partim Quaternis, Partim Quinis, Alia senis, Alia Octonis, Alia Duodenis Vocibus, In omnibus Solemnitatibus per totum Annum, concinuntur, Noviter recognita et Impressa. Venetiis, Apud Angelum Gardanum. MDCIII.*

The 1603 motet book basically is a reprint of 1583b, apart from limited rearrangement and the addition of a few works; it is essentially the same material as the Dillingen and Milan prints of 1589. In total, all 53 pieces are reprinted between four and eight times, apart from the five-voice *Salve Regina* [II]. Voicings are distributed relatively evenly between four, five, six, and eight voices (16, 12, 13, and 11 items, respectively), and the 12-voice *Laetatus sum* is included at the close of the collection. This collection of part books is preserved in two complete sets (Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, Augsburg; Christ Church Library, Oxford), and three incomplete sets (Fabrica da Se Patriarchal, Lisbon; Archivio Capitolare della Cattedrale, Pistoia; Universitetsbiblioteket, Uppsala).178

1604 [V1426]: [Motets]. Angelo Gardano.

The 1604 publication appears to be a final reprint of Victoria’s 1572 *Motecta*, previously reissued in 1583 and 1603; the work survives in one partial exemplar.179 Victoria scholars do not include this print in listings of the composer’s output. Cramer was unaware of its existence and of its mention in Agee’s work on the Gardanos, published the same year as Cramer’s guide.180

---

178 Cramer, 28.
179 Treviso, Biblioteca Capitolare della Cattedrale (I-TVd), T, 5, 6, 7, 8 only.
180 Agee, 321.
Victoria’s final publication, the *Officium Defunctorum*, was written in honor of his recently deceased employer, the Empress María, and dedicated to her daughter, the Infanta Margarita. This print represents a unique segment of the composer’s œuvre: like the collection of Holy Week music, it serves a single, specific liturgical function, whereas the rest of the publications include music appropriate for a variety of special occasions and general seasons in the church year. Only four items are included in Victoria’s Office for the Dead, and all are newly written; these include a fresh setting of the *Requiem* (6vv), a *Versa est luctum* (4vv), and the responsory *Libera me* (6vv). Unlike the majority of his later works, the collection is scored entirely for a smaller number of voices, rather than in double or triple choir format. Remarkably, all four of the extant copies of Victoria’s final collection are complete, and three of them reside in Rome rather than in their country of origin (Biblioteca Musicale Governativa del Conservatorio di Santa Cecilia; Archivio di San Giovanni, Laterano; and Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Giulia). A single copy, at Segorbe Cathedral, remains in Spain.\(^{181}\)

---

\(^{181}\) Cramer, 29.
CHAPTER 5
1600A: SYNTHESIS OF STYLE, FUNCTION, AND STRUCTURE

Robert Stevenson observed a distinct stylistic shift in Victoria’s first Madrid publication; indeed, this collection of repertoire represents a change in approach from compendiums dominated by smaller-scale works in highly contrapuntal textures in favor of a more homophonic and almost exclusively polychoral approach. However, it is difficult to assert that these prints signal a new phase in the composer’s style, as was implied by Stevenson and a number of subsequent scholars. Upon closer examination, the styles of the old and new pieces are similar enough that a significant portion of the organ parts Victoria appended to older works required little alteration beyond surface detail in order to align them stylistically with the new works; the composer’s polychoral approach remains thoroughly grounded in the Roman style in which he crafted his earliest works in the idiom.¹ Therefore, the works of the 1600a collection will be measured against what constituted quality polychoral writing in the Roman style, as established by Anthony Carver and Noel O’Regan. O’Regan’s study thoroughly examines the polychoral works in Victoria’s Roman publications.

The 1600a collection is the apex of Victoria’s pragmatic efforts to attract an elite audience. He collated his finest examples of large-scale writing from his oldest prints and

¹ For instance, Noel O’Regan states that “for about half of the twenty-four pieces, the organ reproduces the vocal parts of Choir I exactly. However, for thirteen of these works it does not just follow Choir I, but makes various changes and additions that fall into a number of categories. The most common change is to substitute the Bassus II part for Bassus I, in order to avoid the fifth – or more rarely the third – of the harmony when it falls in Bassus I. There are also places where the Bassus I part has dropped out, leaving Tenor I with the fifth of the harmony; in these cases the Bassus II part is again added to complete the harmony. Other changes involve adding one or more voices from Choir II, where the organ adopts the Cantus II part rather than Cantus I, where the former is higher in pitch than the latter. Another type of change is to simplify the bass part – and occasionally one or more of the others – by eliminating ornamental figures such as scalic runs, keeping the organ part on a held breve.” His assessment is correct, though the organ rarely reproduces the voices of Choir I verbatim; he also briefly recognizes that in earlier works reprinted in 1600a, Victoria did not rewrite voice parts to achieve spatial independence between choirs, but revised the voices in the organ score to achieve the proper result. Noel O’Regan, “What Can the Organ Partitura of Tomás Luis de Victoria’s Missae, Magnificat, motecta, psalmi et alia quam plurima of 1600 Tell Us About Performance Practice?” Performance Practice Review 14 (2009): 5-6.
supplemented them with newly composed works in order to provide plenty of grand, multi-purpose music for the most important feasts of the church year. The contents and character of the publication certainly seem to indicate Victoria’s desire to cater toward an intensified public taste for spectacle, though the style of composition and the genres included therein do not stray far from the polychoral idiom the composer cultivated at the height of his Roman career.

*Dedication to Philip III*

Stevenson suggests that the change many perceive between Victoria’s earlier aesthetic and the contents of 1600a was fashioned in deference to the “featherweight tastes of this well-intentioned but frivolous young prince,” the newly-ascended Philip III.² The prints certainly reflect his effort to appeal to the dedicatee’s modern and cosmopolitan preferences, which were in marked contrast from his father’s, though Stevenson painted a common, but rather scathing portrait of the new king and his preferred aesthetic:

That Philip III lacked all the weightier virtues of both his father and his grandsire has long been accepted as a historical truism. His musical tastes were known, even before he ascended the throne, to tend exclusively toward light secular songs…After ascending the throne he wasted hundreds of thousands of ducats on idle show. His favorite composer Mateo Romero (‘Maestro Capitan’) catered to his taste for bright, major polychoral masses and motets; and never bothered with learned devices.³

In contrast to his father, the new king certainly was different in demeanor and tastes; however, Philip II rightfully earned a reputation for austerity, reclusiveness, and conservatism. He exhibited a preference for older Franco-Flemish masters over contemporary Spanish composers or the latest trends imported from Italy. His *maestros* were all Franco-Flemish, whereas Philip III increasingly employed native artists. Philip III also adored large celebrations

---

³ Ibid.
and spectacle, likely due to the Duke of Lerma’s influence; thus, Victoria’s dedication of a collection of more modern polychoral repertoire makes perfect sense.

The Latin dedication suggests the composer’s desire to please both the secular and sacred sides of the new king; emphasis on balance pervades both the dedication and the variety of repertoire. This is the first dedication to contain references to the classical Latin figures popular among humanists. The only other dedication in which Victoria made such references is at the head of the 1605 *Officium defunctorum* written in honor of the deceased Empress. In the 1600a dedication Victoria compares Philip III to Alexander the Great, Homer, Achilles, and Plutarch, noble leaders and thinkers who engaged in musical activity as a means of balancing and soothing the cares of leadership. The composer recognizes that great kings needed release from the stress of government and that it is perfectly acceptable to take delight in things such as music, something for which Philip was occasionally criticized. Although the sovereign had just assumed the throne, Victoria unabashedly flatters him by placing him among these men as a great protector and patron of the art, but struck a balance by reminding the new king that “just as this harmony consists of discordant voices, so does love unite citizens with diverse customs…a sound almost celestial to Kings.” The composer must have wished for Philip to remain focused on unifying a kingdom thrown into financial and political turmoil at the close of his father’s reign.

Once Victoria turns toward spiritual matters, he praises Philip’s devotion to the church by stating that he attended services “with great satisfaction in [his] spirit.” He felt assured that the king would protect the sacred art contained within the volumes he now presented, as it was protected by those who celebrated the solemn Mass “in this sacred temple of your most august aunt Juana, who return every day to a more lively and genuine worship” at Descalzas Reales.

---

4 For a complete transcript of the dedicatory epistle, see Appendix D.
Victoria here suggests a connection between the repertoire of the prints and the liturgy at Descalzas, and seems to imply that Philip participated with great pleasure. He certainly attended services at the convent as crown prince, and visited quite frequently during the first few years of his reign; perhaps this collection was meant as a compilation of the best works Victoria had revised and newly crafted for the space, and included pieces the young king enjoyed.

Although dedicated to a thoroughly Spanish king, the works included in the 1600a collection reflect Roman compositional trends Victoria had a hand in popularizing: he served as one of the avenues on which the Roman polyphonic idiom traveled to Spain. Much of the reprinted material was first published in the 1570s and early 1580s, then chronically reprinted; these volumes were distributed widely throughout the Iberian Peninsula, and thus the repertoire would have been known at least in the larger cathedrals. Presentation of a new collection was a matter of convenience, as the 1600a prints contained the most important portions of his polyphonal repertoire within a single publication, and his provision of a pre-realized organ part would have saved the keyboard player a considerable amount of time and effort. Reading from an open-score accompaniment had been commonplace for at least two centuries, though little is revealed about the practice in period sources. Most seem to indicate that the performer was responsible for producing a part in open score. In Il transilvano (1609), Girolamo Diruta requested that his students study polyphonic works by copying them into score and learning to play as many parts as possible. He felt that this style of accompaniment preserved the contrapuntal structure of the work, as figured bass could not reliably reproduce all of the parts.\(^5\)

Some of the newer works represent the composer’s effort to incorporate elements that would appeal more to a local audience than they would to Roman listeners. For instance,

Victoria included some uniquely Spanish items, such as the *Pange lingua* “more hispano,” a motet for the feast of St. Ildefonsus, and a polyphonic setting of the *Te Deum.* He also likely intended this collection primarily for local distribution by limiting the run to 200 copies, rather than the more standard print runs of around 1,000. This also could be explained by the fact that not every church had the means to perform such large works. On the other hand, Victoria’s emphasis on the Magnificat and other Marian texts, as well as his inclusion of organ accompaniment and encouragement of instrumental doubling or replacement of vocal parts reflects devotional and performance trends popular in both Rome and Madrid; thus, the repertoire is far more cosmopolitan than one might initially assume.

**Contract: Timing and Details**

Victoria signed the 1600a printing contract with Julio Junti de Modesti, an agent of the royal press, on 1 October 1598. The composer certainly wasted no time in preparing a collection for the new king: Philip II died on 13 September. The contract does not include details regarding repertoire or the dedication, but still offers insight into the publication process; printing was to commence within six months of the contract date, and Victoria wished for the press to use the type and size of paper conforming to that of his collections published in Venice. The entire run was 200 copies requiring 80 sheets each, but a number of individual partbooks was not specified in the contract. The printer reserved the right to print an additional 100 copies if demand required, but the firm could not sell that share within the first year after publication. Victoria was obliged to pay 2,500 *reales* (85,000 *mrs*) for the run: 1,000 were due at the contract signing, 500 when printing commenced, another 500 mid-run, and the final 500 at completion. If the press

---

6 Polyphonic settings of the *Te Deum* were unusual, but not unprecedented; see John Bailey McGowan, “Sixteenth-century Polyphonic Settings of the Latin Hymn *Te Deum laudamus*” (Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 1967).  
7 For a transcription of the contract, see Appendix B.
was unable to comply with the contract or had to back out of printing the collection, Julio Junti was obligated to return the money. In addition, no other party could print the music; if this stipulation was infringed upon, the firm had to return the deposit, plus remit 30 *escudos de oro* (10,500 *mrs*) to the Hospital General as recompense.

The printing house’s completion timeline is unknown; however, the process must have been complex and time consuming, as the prints were not released until sometime in 1600. If the collection was completed by January 1600 and the firm waited until six months after the contract date to commence the impression process, the shortest possible production span was approximately eight to nine months. Perhaps the extended production period was built in to allow Victoria time to amass funds.

**Polychoral Style: Characteristics and Development**

Allusions to multiple-choir performance by singers and instrumentalists exist from as early as the late fifteenth century, and the clearest initial references to polychoral structure versus simple antiphony date from the 1520s. Psalms were the earliest texts set in a polychoral manner; Venetian *salmi spezzati* featured a group of soloists pitted against a larger choir with two to three singers per part, and the groups would not have been spatially separated. The first non-Italian evidence of *cori spezzati* composition comes from Spain. When Morales applied for the position of *maestro de capilla* at Toledo in 1545, each candidate was obliged to write an *Asperges me, Domine* for double choir. Royal courts adopted the practice relatively early as well; for instance, the 1568 Bavarian royal wedding featured works for multiple choirs. Instruments were

---

9 Ibid., 11.
used frequently for performances of polychoral music in all regions where the style was employed, including Venice, the Habsburg lands, and Rome.\(^{11}\)

The seminal study of the polychoral style is Anthony Carver’s *Cori Spezzati*; his work focuses primarily on the Venetian repertoire and tracing its roots from embryonic principles of contrast found in the works of Franco-Flemish composers associated with the Josquin generation, *alternatim* practices in other Northern Italian locales, and trends at German courts, particularly those associated with the Austrian Habsburgs. The Roman and Spanish styles are relatively under-developed in his study, which prompted Noel O’Regan’s monumental work on the Roman approach.\(^{12}\) Carver viewed *cori spezzati* as a style, rather than a genre, though the technique naturally lends itself better to certain types of works. He defined it thus:

> A polychoral work or passage is one in which the ensemble is consistently split into two or more groups, each retaining its own identity, which sing separately and together within a through-composed framework in which antiphony is a fundamental compositional resource; in tutti passages all voice-parts should normally remain independent, with the possible exception of the bass parts.\(^{13}\)

Carver based his description of *cori spezzati* on theoretical writings by Nicola Vicentino and Gioseffo Zarlino, and O’Regan also adopted their guidelines for his assessment of Roman polychoral works. Both theorists outlined a number of principles common in quality polychoral composition, including its employment in appropriate genres, such as psalms and dialogue texts; free combination of instruments and voices; smooth exchanges between the choirs, most often executed via brief overlap at interchanges; choirs scored in contrasting tessituras; strict observation of mode; and extreme caution in the treatment of bass parts.\(^{14}\) The positioning of the

\(^{11}\) Carver, 16.
\(^{13}\) Carver, xvi.
\(^{14}\) Ibid., 5-12.
bass voices in *tuttis* determined whether the two choirs were truly independent enough to perform spatially separated; if one bass line supported a 6/4 inversion for its respective choir, then it was dependent upon the other bass to provide the root of the chord and thus did not function as a true foundation for its choir, a position that was further weakened by the presence of the chordal fourth. Octaves, unisons, and thirds were permissible between bass voices, but Roman composers almost exclusively placed the root of the chord in both basses, which required approaching and departing each in contrary motion.¹⁵ Likewise, *tuttis* in true polychoral works should not feature voices that double each other, including the basses, as unison motion weakens the independence of the choirs.

The practice of avoiding second inversions suggests that choirs maintaining genuine independence would have been spatially separated, rather than clustered in a single group. According to Zarlino, a dissonant fourth between the bass and an upper voice must be avoided, since listeners seated closer to the offending choir would hear it, and thus the harmonic structure of a *tutti* would be weakened.¹⁶ This harmonic independence was prominent in the Roman polychoral style, perhaps reflecting a wider physical separation between choirs than is evident in other locales. Romans also displayed a penchant for equally cleffed choirs; Giovanni Gabrieli and other Venetians more commonly exploited range contrasts through unequally cleffed groupings.¹⁷ Many of Victoria’s works involve unequal cleffings, unlike Palestrina and his other contemporaries.

¹⁶ Ibid., 161.
Polychoral singing was in sporadic use in Rome from the 1570s and became a standard part of Roman observances by the early 1580s; it was particularly conducive to the efforts of the Tridentine reform movement blossoming during the last third of the century. The style featured largely homophonic, syllabic blocks of sound that rendered the text more intelligible, yet appealed to the communal affinity for contrast and grandeur. By the 1590s, most institutions employed polychoral performance by singers and instrumentalists during major events such as patronal feasts.

The earliest adopters of the style were the institutions that regularly employed enough singers to execute larger-scale repertoire, including the Cappella Giulia, the German College, and a handful of affluent confraternities. Palestrina and Victoria were the first to publish true polychoral works in 1572; however, there are earlier pieces by Palestrina, Animuccia, and Festa that employ the technique inconsistently. The earliest composers frequently accessed varying blocks of sound across choirs rather than limiting alternation according to predetermined groupings, and this is a prominent feature in Victoria’s Ave Maria, the only eight-voice work included in his first print. The collections Palestrina and Victoria published in 1575 and 1576, respectively, feature a number of eight-voice works that are fully polychoral according to Carver’s definition; the choirs maintain harmonic independence and antiphonal exchanges occur between two fixed groups of voices. The Victoria works especially exhibit a trend for homophonic textures. These features surpassed what Phinot, Andrea Gabrieli, and Lassus had done in the Franco-Flemish, Habsburg, and Venetian centers to this point.
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18 O’Regan, “Early Roman Polychoral Music,” 43.
19 Ibid., 44-45.
21 Ibid., 160.
Extant repertoire at the largest Roman churches suggests that the Mass, both Vespers services, and processions would have involved polychoral music on principal feast days, though it is difficult to ascertain which portions of the liturgy would have employed the idiom; its application was rather uneven from institution to institution. The number of polyphonic works performed depended upon the importance of the feast to that particular establishment, the performing resources available, and the chapel’s level of conservativism. For instance, as late as 1616, the Cappella Sistina did not celebrate the entire Vespers service in polyphony, much less polychorally: the ensemble generally performed two or three psalms polyphonically, as well as the hymn and Magnificat. Reconstruction of liturgical practice is impeded further by the lack of extant repertoire, as most of it did not appear in print.

Repertoire during the earliest epoch of Roman polychoral practice revolves primarily around the vespers psalms, the Marian antiphons, and litanies; such texts, as well as the Magnificat, lend themselves well to antiphonal division by verse or half-verse, as was a widespread feature of plainchant and early salmi spezzati performance. By 1600, text setting in all regions tended toward more fragmented division of the material and repetition of call-and-response blocks.

The most common vespers psalms set polychorally during the early portion of Victoria’s career were Dixit Dominus, Beatus vir, Laudate pueri, and Laetatus sum, all of which the composer published in his earliest collections; many were reprinted numerous times. Palestrina’s psalm settings did not include the Doxology. According to O’Regan, this could

24 O’Regan provided a listing of the vespers psalms in order according to frequency of polychoral setting: Dixit Dominus (33); Beatus vir (18); Laudate pueri (18); Confitebor tibi Domine (14); Laetatus sum (8); Credidi (7); Laudate Dominum omnes gentes (7); Lauda Jerusalem (6); Nisi Dominus (4); De profundis (3); In convertendo (3) in “Sacred Polychoral Music in Rome,” 86.
indicate that they were not intended for strict liturgical use; however, a plainchant Doxology would suffice.\textsuperscript{25} Conversely, Victoria’s psalms include doxologies and could be used in their traditional points in the Offices. Psalm settings with a non-traditional structure, such as Palestrina’s, were employed as motets at appropriate points in the service or used for non-liturgical events; for these situations composers frequently chose joyful psalm texts, such as \textit{Jubilate Deo} or any of the psalms that begin with “Laudate Dominum.” O’Regan suggests that these psalm-motets are the closest Roman genre to the non-liturgical Venetian state motet.\textsuperscript{26}

Polychoral Marian antiphon settings offered a wide range of possibilities, since they were regularly performed during Compline and Vespers and could be applied to a wide variety of devotional services; the most common antiphon set during this period was \textit{Ave Regina}, the text proper to Lent.\textsuperscript{27} This is unsurprising, given the particular Roman devotion to Lenten services. Victoria, on the other hand, set \textit{Salve Regina} most frequently: there are two versions a5 and one each for six and eight voices. He set the rest of the Marian antiphons twice each, and all were treated to a polychoral setting for eight voices.

The Magnificat was infrequently set in polychoral fashion; Victoria did not choose to do so until the publication of the 1600a collection. Roman settings of the Mass Ordinary and Propers in this style were rare in the early years, and never achieved the same popularity as vespers psalms or antiphons; there are merely 14 surviving eight-voice masses by Roman composers that date between 1575 and 1620.\textsuperscript{28} Thus, the five polychoral masses by Victoria are exceptional, particularly the triple-choir \textit{Missa Laetatus sum}.

\textsuperscript{25} O’Regan, “Early Roman Polychoral Music,” 46.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{27} O’Regan, “Sacred Polychoral Music in Rome,” 164.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 278.
The 1600a Repertoire: Contents and Function

The contents of Victoria’s prints reflect his Jesuit-like sense of pragmatism; the 16 printed collections contain sacred music applicable to nearly all liturgical and para-liturgical functions, and the style reflects what was popular at the Jesuit colleges and other Roman institutions. These works quickly found their way to Spain due to their prolific publication, and he continued to favor multi-purpose publication with the 1600a prints. Apart from the Mass Ordinary, Magnificat, *Pange lingua*, and *Vexilla Regis* (not included in this collection), Victoria set very few texts more than once; when he did, he favored Marian texts such as the antiphons. This is unsurprising, given the liturgical and devotional practices at the institutions with which the composer was associated in Rome and in Madrid, and the flexibility with which such texts could be applied to public functions.

The music of official liturgical exercises at the Jesuit colleges emphasized the Mass and eventually some of the Offices. The Order’s Roman institutions gradually made extensive use of motets for academic, liturgical, and devotional functions, which explains the contents of Victoria’s Roman publications and in particular the 1572 collection. It was a comprehensive set of motets for varying numbers of voices, scrupulously labeled according to their appropriate feast days, and organized according to the church calendar. The practice of motet substitution closely paralleled trends in other Roman churches; by the 1560s motets commonly figured in the Office, especially in Vespers services.  

The custom of substituting a motet for the Marian antiphon at Vespers may explain the proliferation of motet-style antiphons and Magnificats during the late sixteenth century. The litanies for the saints or the Blessed Virgin were also ubiquitous at devotional functions. It is unknown whether Victoria joined a Marian congregation
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30 Ibid., 208.
as a student, but once he became responsible for the musical activity at the Roman Seminary and German College, his duties would have included providing music for the congregations’ activities. These factors would certainly explain Victoria’s propensity for setting Marian texts during his tenure in Rome.

Marian veneration was significant in Spain as well; antiphons, hymns, and other texts dedicated to the Virgin proliferated due to devotion to the Saturday Office of the Blessed Virgin and other votive observances. Mary appeared in connection to the Trinity in religious philosophy and iconography, and the tie between Mary and the Triune Deity was reinforced through performance of Marian works during Christmas, Corpus Christi, and the Forty Hours Devotion ritual.\(^{31}\) Marian masses and the *Salve Regina* were regularly applied to the liturgy for the dead as well.\(^{32}\) Thus, the substantial presence of Marian masses, Magnificats, antiphons, and devotional works in 1600a makes perfect sense, given the importance of Marian feasts to the liturgical life at Descalzas Reales and Spanish churches, plus the various religious communities in Rome.

Over the course of his career, Victoria’s publications included increased numbers of works for at least eight voices, reflecting the heightened popularity of the polychoral style. This culminated in the monumental 1600a collection, which features music primarily written for double and triple choirs; the works are predominantly scored for a balanced double choir, though several feature a higher Choir I, which is typical of seventeenth century Spanish practice. Victoria mixed clef combinations as well: 19 of the 32 works are in standard clefs while 13 are in *chiavette*, or transposing clefs (see Table 5-1 below). Of the 32 items, 15 are new, including four of the five masses; of those, all but one take Victoria’s own works as parody material, and these sources are all reprinted here, which is highly atypical. Most of the pieces have one flat in the
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32 Ibid., 16.
key signature and a final of either F or G. The only unusual cases are the *Te Deum* (E), *Ave Maris Stella* (D), and *Nunc Dimittis* (A); their finals align with the modes of their chant sources.

### Table 5-1. 1600a Repertoire: Voicing, Cleffing, Finals, and Signatures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title, Date of First Publication</th>
<th>Voicing</th>
<th>Tessitura</th>
<th>Clefs</th>
<th>Combination Type</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Alma redemptoris</em> (1600)</td>
<td>CI-Al-I-BI CII-AlI-TII-BII</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>G₂C₂C₁F₃ G₂C₂C₁F₃</td>
<td>Chiavette</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Ave Regina</em> (1600)</td>
<td>CI-Al-I-BI CII-AlI-TII-BII</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₄ F₄ C₁C₂C₄ F₄</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Salve Regina</em> (1592)</td>
<td>CI-CII-AlI-BI CIII-AlI-TII-BII</td>
<td>Mostly Equal</td>
<td>G₂G₂C₂C₄ C₂C₂F₃</td>
<td>Chiavette (variant)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Pro victoria</em> (1600)</td>
<td>CI-CII-AlI-TI BI CIII-AlI-TII-BII</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₃F₄ C₂C₃F₄</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Laetatus sum</em> (1600)</td>
<td>CI-Al-I-BI CII-CII-AlI-TII CIV-AlIII-TIII-BII</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₄ F₄ C₃C₁F₃ C₁C₂F₄</td>
<td>Standard: Choirs I, III equal, Choir II high</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat sexti toni</em> (1600)</td>
<td>CI-Al-I-BI CII-CII-AlI-TII CIV-AlIII-TIII-BII</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₃F₄ C₂C₃F₃ C₂C₃F₄</td>
<td>Standard: Choirs I, III equal, Choir II high</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dic nobis Maria</em> (1600)</td>
<td>CI-CII-AlI-TI CII-AlI-TII-B</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>G₂G₂C₁C₃ G₂C₂C₁C₄</td>
<td>Chiavette</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Veni sancte Spiritus</em> (1600)</td>
<td>CI-Al-I-BI CII-AlI-TII-BII</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₄ F₄ C₁C₂F₄</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lauda Sion</em> (1585)</td>
<td>CI-Al-I-BI CII-AlI-TII-BII</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₄ F₄ C₁C₂F₄</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>O Ildephonse</em> (1600)</td>
<td>CI-CII-AlI-BI CIII-AlI-T-BII</td>
<td>Mostly Equal</td>
<td>G₂G₂C₂C₄ G₂C₂C₁F₃</td>
<td>Chiavette (variant)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat primi toni</em> (1600)</td>
<td>CI-CII-AlI-TI CIII-AlI-TII-B</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>G₂G₂C₂C₃ G₂C₂C₁F₃</td>
<td>Chiavette (variant)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Letaniae de Beata Virgine</em> (1583)</td>
<td>CI-Al-I-BI CII-AlI-TII-BII</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₃F₄ C₁C₂F₄</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ave Maria</em> (1572)</td>
<td>CI-Al-I-BI CII-AlI-TII-BII</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₃F₄ C₁C₂F₄</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alma redemptoris mater</em> (1581)</td>
<td>CI-Al-I-BI CII-AlI-TII-BII</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>G₂C₂C₁F₃ G₂C₂C₁F₃</td>
<td>Chiavette</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³³ Signature: the natural or flat indicates use of either B or B♭ in the work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title, Date of First Publication</th>
<th>Voicing</th>
<th>Tessitura</th>
<th>Clefs</th>
<th>Combination Type</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave Regina caelorum (1581)</td>
<td>CI-AI-TI-BI CI-III-AII-TII-B</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>$C_1C_3C_4F_4$</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina caeli (1576)</td>
<td>CI-CII-AI-TI CI-III-AII-TII-B</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>$C_1C_3C_4F_4$</td>
<td>Standard (variant)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve Regina (1576)</td>
<td>CI-CII-AI-BI CI-III-AII-TII-B</td>
<td>Mostly Equal</td>
<td>$G_2G_2C_4C_3$</td>
<td>Chiavette (variant)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixit Dominus (1581)</td>
<td>CI-AI-TI-BI CI-III-AII-TII-B</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>$G_2G_2C_4C_3$</td>
<td>Chiavette (variant)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudate pueri (1581)</td>
<td>CI-CII-AI-TI CI-III-AII-TII-B</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>$C_1C_3C_4F_4$</td>
<td>Standard (variant)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisi Dominus (1576)</td>
<td>CI-CII-AI-TI CI-III-AII-TII-B</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>$C_1C_3C_4F_4$</td>
<td>Standard (variant)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudate Dominum omnes gentes (1581)</td>
<td>CI-AI-TI-BI CI-III-AII-TII-B</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>$C_1C_3C_4F_4$</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce nunc benedicite (1600)</td>
<td>CI-AI-TI-BI CI-III-AII-TII-B</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>$C_1C_3C_4F_4$</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super flumina Babylonis (1576)</td>
<td>CI-CII-AI-TI CI-III-AII-TII-B</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>$C_1C_3C_4F_4$</td>
<td>Standard (variant)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laetatus sum (1583)</td>
<td>CI-AI-TI-BI CI-III-AII-TII-CIV-AIIII-TIII-BII</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>$C_1C_3C_4F_4$</td>
<td>Standard: Choirs I, II equal, Choir II high</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Deum (1600)</td>
<td>C-A-T-B</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$C_1C_3C_4F_4$</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veni creator Spiritus (1581)</td>
<td>C-A-T-B</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$C_1C_3C_4F_4$</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua (1581)</td>
<td>C-A-T-B</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$G_2C_4C_3F_3$</td>
<td>Chiavette</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maris Stella (1576)</td>
<td>C-A-T-B</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$C_1C_3C_4F_4$</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunc Dimittis (1600)</td>
<td>C-A-T-B</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$G_2C_4C_3F_3$</td>
<td>Chiavette</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asperges me Domine (1592)</td>
<td>C-A-T-B</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$G_2C_2C_3C_4$</td>
<td>Chiavette (variant)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidi aquam (1592)</td>
<td>C-A-T-B</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$G_2C_2C_3C_4$</td>
<td>Chiavette (variant)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et misericordia eius (1600)</td>
<td>CI-CII-A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$G_2G_2C_2$</td>
<td>Chiavette (variant)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was relatively rare for a print collection to contain a variety of genres; even Palestrina largely limited himself to books of masses, motets, Magnificats, or hymns, rather than a mixture of elements. The diverse repertoire meant potential buyers could use the music for many of the principal feasts of the year, particularly those surrounding Holy Week and Easter, Corpus Christi, and Marian feasts, all of which were important at Descalzas Reales. Corpus Christi was arguably the largest spectacle of the convent’s liturgical calendar, as extra clergy and musicians were recruited for the processions and services, many from the *capilla real*; the Empress habitually participated in the processions, as did the monarchs until the removal of the court to Valladolid.\(^{34}\)

Indeed, the collection is clearly tailored to a regional audience: *O Ildephonse* is a text unique to Spain, as the motet honors the patron saint of Toledo. His feast is among those mandated in the Descalzas foundation documents, and was one that received royal attention: on 23 January 1596 and 1597, at least part of the court spent the feast at the convent; Prince Philip attended church services, then spent the evening visiting with the Empress.\(^{35}\) In addition, polyphonic settings of the *Te Deum* are not terribly common, even though Spanish nobility and royalty regularly used the hymn to commemorate special occasions. María ordered a *Te Deum* to be performed at Descalzas on 26 July 1593 after news of the military victory at Sisech reached Madrid.\(^{36}\) Finally, the setting of the *Pange lingua* references the tune associated with the Toledan rite, rather than the Roman usage. Although several of the hymn settings were first published during Victoria’s Roman career, they all exhibit traits common to Spanish compositions in the

---

\(^{34}\) Hans Khevenhüller made note of their participation nearly every year, but did not detail the events or the music performed; Philip III and his siblings participated prior to his reign as king as well.


\(^{36}\) Ibid., 211-12.
genre: polyphonic treatment of even verses, prominent use of the chant tune in a single voice, usually the cantus, and four-voice scoring.\textsuperscript{37}

Non-Mass Ordinary Works: Liturgical Viability

Most of the works in the 1600a collection align with texts used for portions of the Mass and Office. The vast majority of Victoria’s polyphonic settings include the entire text and Doxology, where appropriate; thus, they are suitable for use in their proper places in the liturgy (see Table 5-2 below). Only a few settings omit portions of the text. These include all three of the sequences (\textit{Dic nobis Maria} [\textit{Victimae paschali laudes}], \textit{Veni sancte Spiritus}, and \textit{Lauda Sion}), though these could easily be used for para-liturgical celebrations on Easter, Pentecost, and Corpus Christi. The \textit{Dic nobis Maria} setting is particularly unusual: Victoria omits the first three lines of \textit{Victimae paschali laudes} to begin with “Dic nobis Maria, quid vidisti in via?” that he employs as a refrain. The settings of the Marian antiphons are complete; the four-antiphon cycle provides an antiphon for Vespers and/or Compline for the entire church year, and thus these would have been valuable for liturgical observances at Descalzas Reales.

The Magnificats are complete settings of the text, including the Doxology. Both are fully polyphonic, unlike Victoria’s earlier works in the genre; previous collections included separate sets of odd and even verses intended for alternation with plainchant. In this case, the composer varies the texture of each verse by alternating between single choirs and double (or triple) choir scoring, though the procedure is not executed in a systematic manner; he employs a similar technique of variation in \textit{Laetatus sum}.

\textsuperscript{37} These apply to predecessors such as Diego Ortiz, Juan de Anchieta, and Francisco de Peñalosa, as well as his contemporary Francisco Guerrero. Stevenson, \textit{Spanish Cathedral Music}, 450-51.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Common Liturgical Functions</th>
<th>Liturgically Complete Setting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Dic nobis [Victimae paschali laudes]</em></td>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Easter Sunday</td>
<td>No; partial setting with refrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Veni sancte Spiritus</em></td>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Pentecost and its octave</td>
<td>No; incomplete setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lauda Sion</em></td>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Corpus Christi and its octave</td>
<td>No; incomplete setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>O Ildephonse</em></td>
<td>Motet</td>
<td>Feast of St. Ildephonsus</td>
<td>n/a (motet text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificats</em></td>
<td>Canticle</td>
<td>Vespers</td>
<td>Yes: all verses with Doxology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Litanie de Beata Virgine</em></td>
<td>Litany</td>
<td>Special occasions</td>
<td>n/a (truncated version of text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ave Maria</em></td>
<td>Marian Devotion</td>
<td>Vespers: Marian feasts; Offertory: 4th Sunday of Advent, Immaculate Conception, Annunciation</td>
<td>n/a (text deviates from standard Ave Maria, but version commonly to the period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alma redemptoris mater</em></td>
<td>Marian Antiphon</td>
<td>Vespers: Advent, Christmastide</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ave Regina caelorum</em></td>
<td>Marian Antiphon</td>
<td>Compline: Septuagesima, Lent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Regina caeli</em></td>
<td>Marian Antiphon</td>
<td>Compline: Holy Thursday to Pentecost</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salve Regina</em></td>
<td>Marian Antiphon</td>
<td>Vespers: Trinity Sunday to Advent; common hymn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dicit Dominus</em></td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Vespers: 1st psalm</td>
<td>Yes; full text with Doxology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laudate pueri Dominum</em></td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Vespers: 4th psalm; 2nd psalm on Marian feasts</td>
<td>Yes; full text with Doxology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nisi Dominus</em></td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Vespers: 4th psalm, Marian feasts</td>
<td>Yes; full text with Doxology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laudate Dominum omnes gentes</em></td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Vespers: 5th psalm, Christmas, Epiphany, some saints’ feasts</td>
<td>Yes; full text with Doxology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ecce nunc benedicite</em></td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Compline: 4th psalm</td>
<td>Yes; full text with Doxology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Super flamina Babylonis</em></td>
<td>Motet</td>
<td>Psalm; no regular liturgical use</td>
<td>n/a (motet setting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laetatus sum</em></td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Vespers: 3rd psalm, Marian feasts</td>
<td>Yes; full text with Doxology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Te Deum</em></td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Matins: Christmas, Easter, Corpus Christi; Corpus Christi procession; misc.</td>
<td>Yes; even verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Veni creator Spiritus</em></td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Vespers/Terce: Pentecost</td>
<td>Yes; V. 1 – plainchant; V. 2 – polyphony; remainder of text omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pange lingua</em></td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Processional: Holy Thursday, Corpus Christi; Vespers II: Corpus Christi</td>
<td>Yes; V. 1 – plainchant; V. 2 – polyphony; remainder of text omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ave Maris Stella</em></td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Vespers: many Marian feasts</td>
<td>Yes; V. 1 – plainchant; V. 2 – polyphony; remainder of text omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nunc Dimittis</em></td>
<td>Canticle</td>
<td>Compline</td>
<td>Yes; V. 1 – plainchant; V. 2 – polyphony; V. 3 omitted; V. 4 – polyphony; first half of Doxology omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Asperges me, Domine</em></td>
<td>Antiphon</td>
<td>Penitential Antiphon: all seasons except Eastertide, Palm Sunday</td>
<td>Yes; full setting, including plainchant sections and Doxology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vidi aquam</em></td>
<td>Antiphon</td>
<td>Penitential Antiphon: Eastertide, Palm Sunday</td>
<td>Yes; full setting, including plainchant sections and Doxology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Victoria’s psalm settings represent an incomplete cycle of vespers psalms suitable for most of the largest feasts in the church year. Table 5-3 outlines the vespers psalms for major feasts celebrated at Descalzas Reales; asterisks denote texts set by Victoria. The bulk of the 1600a psalms can be arranged to nearly fill out the set used at Vespers on most Marian feasts. *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes* is the only one of Victoria’s settings used as the fifth psalm of Vespers, and it is not a particularly common text. It is at least tangentially related to the Marian cycle, as *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes* is sung on Christmas and Epiphany, two feasts whose celebrations commonly incorporate Marian themes. On non-Marian occasions, *Laudate pueri Dominum* is frequently the fourth psalm of Vespers, including services on Easter and Christmas. *Dixit Dominus* is the most pervasive of the psalms, at it nearly always appears as the first in the cycle. It is surprising that Victoria set only two of the psalms used at Easter and one for Corpus Christi, as these observances were exceedingly important in Rome and in Spain. Perhaps the omission was intentional: the composer could have been concerned with universal marketability of the prints, rather than exclusively catering to local practices.

**Table 5-3. Vespers Psalms on Major Feasts.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marian Feasts</th>
<th>Easter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Dixit Dominus</em></td>
<td><em>Dixit Dominus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laudate pueri Dominum</em></td>
<td><em>Confitebor tibi, Domine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laetatus sum</em></td>
<td><em>Beatus vir</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nisi Dominus</em></td>
<td><em>Laudate pueri Dominum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies</td>
<td><em>In exitu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Christmas Day, Epiphany</em></td>
<td><em>Corpus Christi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dixit Dominus</em></td>
<td><em>Dixit Dominus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Confitebor tibi, Domine</em></td>
<td><em>Confitebor tibi, Domine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Beatus vir</em></td>
<td><em>Credidi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laudate pueri Dominum</em></td>
<td><em>Beati omnes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laudate Dominum omnes gentes</em></td>
<td><em>Lauda Jerusalem</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Letaniae de Beata Virgine* and *Ave Maria* texts were appropriate for devotional purposes rather than liturgical use. Victoria presented the Litany text in truncated form, and set a variant on *Ave Maria* that was popular during the Renaissance; the same alternate text was employed by Palestrina, Willaert, Guerrero, and Lassus, among others. Other unusual or non-liturgical texts Victoria included in this collection are the motet *O Ildephonse*, noted above, and *Super flumina Babylonis*. *Super flumina Babylonis* is a psalm text, but not one used on Sundays or other feasts; it is the fourth psalm of Vespers on ordinary Thursdays and thus an unlikely candidate for liturgically functional polyphonic treatment. Victoria only set the first five verses of twelve and excluded the Doxology. His truncation of the text and treatment in motet style with persistent repetition of phrases suits its original purpose as an occasional piece; the composer wrote *Super flumina Babylonis* for the formal separation of the German seminarians and foreign students of the German College, noted in Chapter Two.

The smaller-scale works included in the ninth vocal book are all liturgically viable. Four are hymns used at various points in the liturgy on major feasts (*Te Deum, Veni creator Spiritus, Pange lingua*, and *Ave Maris Stella*). Some settings incorporate the necessary plainchant to round out the liturgical text, while others invite personal insertion of the appropriate chants. *Te Deum* excludes the chant, but the even verses are set polyphonically; much of the writing is very similar, akin to a modified strophic structure. The only out-of-place element is one of the “Sanctus” statements from Verse 5.

*Veni creator Spiritus, Pange lingua*, and *Ave Maris Stella* are all set in a unified fashion: Victoria provides the chant for the first verse, then polyphony for the second, and omits the text for further verses. In every case, the subsequent verses could easily be substituted. Victoria also provided a setting of the Canticle of Simeon, *Nunc Dimittis*, which is set similarly; the entire text
of Verse 1 is included in plainchant, but Verse 3 and the first half of the Doxology are omitted. The composer set Verses 2 and 4 and the second half of the Doxology in contrasting, animated homophony. Finally, Victoria includes both penitential antiphons, and both are liturgically complete. These texts appear in the “Asperges” portion of the Mass, directly preceding the procession that officially begins the service. Asperges me, Domine is appropriate for any celebration apart from Eastertide and Palm Sunday, where Vidi aquam fills the void.

Masses and Parody Sources

The 1600a collection includes five masses, four of which are new to this publication, and none appear again in print during Victoria’s lifetime: Missa Alma redemptoris, Missa Ave Regina, Missa Laetatus sum, and Missa Pro victoria. The fifth, Missa Salve Regina, first appeared in Victoria’s second mass book of 1592. All are parody masses that borrow loosely from the source materials; four of the parody sources are included in the print, and all are works Victoria reprinted numerous times during and after his tenure in Rome. Victoria’s parody style in 1600a is less obvious and formulaic than in the previous mass collections. He infrequently incorporates the full polyphonic fabric of his model, but habitually chooses to borrow single themes or generate completely new materials.38 The composer’s methods of parody in the masses has been covered exhaustively by Patrick Brill, and thus an extensive re-examination is beyond the purview of this study; of importance are portions of source music that are readily visible or audible and could enhance the sense of aural continuity.39 Special attention will be given to

---

38 Patrick Brill, “The Parody Masses of Tomás Luis de Victoria” (Ph.D. diss., The University of Kansas, 1995).
39 For a summary, see Brill, 490ff.
Victoria’s employment of chant tunes in the masses, sources, and other liturgical items, ties heretofore unexplored in this collection.\(^{40}\)

**Masses and Parody Sources: Initial Details**

Most of the masses and sources have F as a final and all have a one-flat signature, including Janequin’s *La guerre*. The only exception is *Salve Regina* and its parody mass, which both have a final of G (for a listing of voicings and clef combinations, see Tables 5-4 and 5-5 below). Most of the sources and parodies share clef configurations as well. Again, the only exceptions are *Salve Regina* and *Missa Salve Regina*; both employ an unusual variant on *chiavette*, though the top voice in Choir II of the pair differs. The use of *chiavette* cleffings here and elsewhere in the collection suggest that these works would have been transposed down a fourth, an indication that appears in the organ book. The ranges of the voice parts in *Alma Redemptoris*, *Missa Alma redemptoris*, *Salve Regina*, and *Missa Salve Regina* are higher than the others (for a listing of ranges, see Example 5-1 below). However, transposition would render the Altus and Bassus parts virtually unperformable for most who customarily sing in those ranges. The ranges of the choirs are almost perfectly balanced, characteristic of much of the 1600a repertoire. Vicentino and Zarlino advocate for choirs with contrasting tessituras, something for which the Venetians were known; adjacent voices in some of Giovanni Gabrieli’s works hardly intersect at the extreme boundaries of their ranges. Roman polychoral composers tended to write for equal choirs, a principle Victoria at least partially embraced, though the tessituras of the voices within choirs normally overlap by a significant margin, as detailed in Example 5-1.

\(^{40}\) Brill briefly mentions that Victoria quoted plainchant in two instances (*Salve Regina* and *Alma Redemptoris mater*), but does not outline its use in any of the masses or their polyphonic sources (Brill, 341, 366, 370).
### Table 5-4. Voicing and Clef Combinations for Masses in 1600a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Title</th>
<th>Voicing</th>
<th>Clefs</th>
<th>Choir Spacing</th>
<th>Clef Combination Type</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Alma redemptoris</td>
<td>CI-AI-TI-BI</td>
<td>G₂C₂C₃F₃</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Chiavette</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CII-AII-TII-BII</td>
<td>G₂C₂C₃F₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave Regina</td>
<td>CI-AI-TI-BI</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₄F₄</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CII-AII-TII-BII</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₄F₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Salve Regina</td>
<td>CI-CH-AI-BI</td>
<td>G₂G₃C₂C₄</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>Chiavette (variant)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIII-AII-TI-BII</td>
<td>G₂C₂C₃F₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pro victoria</td>
<td>CI-CH-AI-BI</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₃C₄F₄</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIII-AII-TI-BII</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Laetatus sum</td>
<td>CI-CH-AI-BI</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₃C₄F₄</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>Standard: Choirs I, III equal, Choir II high voices (CCAT)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIV-AIII-TIII-BIII</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5-5. Voicing and Clef Combinations for Parody Sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parody Source</th>
<th>Voicing</th>
<th>Clefs</th>
<th>Choir Spacing</th>
<th>Clef Combination Type</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alma redemptoris mater</td>
<td>CI-AI-TI-BI</td>
<td>G₂C₂C₃F₃</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Chiavette</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CII-AII-TII-BII</td>
<td>G₂C₂C₃F₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Regina caelorum</td>
<td>CI-AI-TI-BI</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₄F₄</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CII-AII-TII-BII</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₄F₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve Regina</td>
<td>CI-CH-AI-BI</td>
<td>G₂G₃C₂C₄</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>Chiavette (variant)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIII-AII-TI-BII</td>
<td>G₂C₂C₃F₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janequin: La guerre (Missa Pro victoria)</td>
<td>C-A-T-B</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₄F₄</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laetatus sum</td>
<td>CI-AI-TI-BI</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₃C₄F₄</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>Standard: Choirs I, III equal, Choir II high voices (CCAT)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CII-AIII-TIII-BIII</td>
<td>C₁C₂C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 5-1. Ranges of Voice Parts, 1600a Masses and Parody Sources.

Missa Alma redemptoris: \(^{41}\)  

Alma redemptoris:  

Missa Ave Regina:  

Ave Regina caelorum:  

Missa Salve Regina:  

Salve Regina:  

Missa Laetatus sum: outer = standard; II – higher-voiced choir  

Laetatus sum: outer = standard; II – higher-voiced choir  

Missa Pro victoria:  

Janequin, La guerre:  

\(^{41}\) Ranges are in descending voice order and grouped according to choir; a double bar line indicates a break between choirs.
Three of the five masses and their respective sources employ equal clef schemes between the two choirs, and the voice parts retain similar ranges. Missa Laetatus sum and its companion psalm are partially equal: Choirs I and III are scored for the standard CATB voicing and thus occupy the same clef combination and essentially the same ranges. Choir II is scored for a higher assemblage of voices (CCAT) that is reflected in the group’s slightly varied clef combination. Missa Salve Regina and its antiphon are scored for unequal clef combinations that reflect the slightly lower scoring in Choir II. The ranges in the mass settings extend more widely than the parody sources, particularly in the Altus and Bassus voices (Example 5-1, above).

As Victoria’s style evolved, his mass settings became increasingly concise; the works in 1600a are no exception, though these masses contain the greatest number of repeated passages. This is remedied by his choice to only incorporate one section of the Agnus Dei text in all of the masses. The average length of the masses in the prints is approximately 380 measures, whereas his earliest masses are nearly twice as long. Unsurprisingly, Missa Salve Regina, the only reprinted mass, is one of the longest, though Missa Laetatus sum is the most voluminous setting, both in number of voices and length. The Kyrie is by far the longest of the five, as is the Credo; the Gloria is nearly the same length as its counterpart in Missa Salve Regina, and the Sanctus and Agnus Dei occupy a comparable amount of space as the others (see Table 5-6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Kyrie</th>
<th>Gloria</th>
<th>Credo</th>
<th>Sanctus</th>
<th>Agnus Dei</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alma redemptoris mater</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Regina</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve Regina</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro victoria</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laetatus sum</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 Brill, 365.
The Masses and Sources: Liturgical Functions and Use of Parody Materials

Three of the masses, Missa Alma redemptoris mater, Missa Ave Regina, and Missa Salve Regina, form an incomplete cycle based upon the four Marian antiphons proper to certain seasons in the liturgical calendar; these and their partner antiphons offer material suitable for polyphonic performance for the entire rotation of Marian feasts mandated by the patrons of Descalzas Reales. Two of Victoria’s antiphon parodies are particularly unusual, as he chose to draw material from a pair of settings of the same texts. Missa Alma redemptoris mater and Missa Ave Regina are both based upon their respective five-voice antiphon settings first printed in 1572 and their eight-voice counterparts, which appeared in 1581. Missa Salve Regina is based upon his eight-voice antiphon originally published in 1576. Victoria also references the chant tunes in the Alma redemptoris mater and Salve Regina antiphons and masses. He also retains the modal finals of the plainchant sources: Alma redemptoris mater is in Mode 5 and Ave Regina caelorum occupies the space of its plagal counterpart, Mode 6, both of which employ F as final. The solemn tone version of Salve Regina is in Mode 1, which would normally have a D final; Victoria’s eight-voice Salve Regina and mass are in the most common transposition, on G.

Alma redemptoris mater is proper to Advent and Christmas; it is usually used during Vespers on Sundays and feasts and at the end of some Compline services from the Saturday before Advent through Vespers II on the Feast of the Purification (2 February), which marks the end of Christmastide. The mass and antiphon are especially appropriate for the Marian feasts of the season, including the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin (8 December) and Purification (2 February), but could be applied to a number of other festivities during the period, including Christmas (25 December), Circumcision (1 January), and Epiphany (6 January).
Victoria’s eight-voice *Alma redemptoris mater* features two chant fragments employed in sporadic, cantus firmus-like fashion; one is the opening phrase of the tune, which appears most prominently in Cantus I at the beginning of the work, measures 2-9 (see Examples 5-2 and 5-3). The original melody for *Alma redemptoris mater* occupies the range C3 to D4, normally associated with the plagal version of the mode. The assignment of Mode 5 to the chant is rationalized by its emphasis on C, rather than A, the reciting tone of Mode 6. Victoria chooses to transpose the opening to begin on F, and he inserts the characteristic raised fourth scale degree naturally found in the Lydian modes, but frequently avoided.

*Missa Alma redemptoris* most conspicuously features the plainchant incipit in the Sanctus. The melody emerges in the uppermost voice of Choir I at the opening of the movement (mm. 2-6), which is unsurprising since Victoria chose to borrow the entire polyphonic fabric of the antiphon opening. The melody transfers to Cantus II upon the entry of Choir II; the second choir provides a nearly exact repetition of the phrase (mm. 5-11).

Example 5-2. *Alma redemptoris mater*, Chant Incipit (Simple Tone).

Example 5-3. Victoria: *Alma redemptoris mater*, Cantus I, mm. 2-12.\(^{43}\)

A second melodic fragment appears far more often in both source antiphon and mass but remains unidentified as pre-existent material, despite its distinct melodic shape; the fragment

---

\(^{43}\) The bracket indicates the borrowed plainchant segment.
first emerges in the Cantus I of *Alma redemptoris mater* on the text “sumens illud Ave” (mm. 83-90; Example 5-4). In the mass, the first three pitches of the melody initially surface as Tenor I opens the “Christe” section of the Kyrie (mm. 17-29, Example 5-5), and Tenor I briefly resumes the tune at the opening of the second phrase, though it becomes heavily ornamented and dissolves into the texture within a few measures (mm. 21-25). After Tenor I’s opening leap the melody transfers to Cantus II, which retains the fragment in sustained pitches through the course of the section, save the cadence. The tune resumes in Cantus I to close the Kyrie II (mm. 37-47). Victoria borrows the melody a final time during the “miserere nobis” portion of the Agnus Dei; it emerges in Cantus I, measures 16-24, where the composer also accesses portions of the polyphonic structure of the parody source in which this tune originally arises.


**Example 5-5. Melodic Fragment in *Missa Alma redemptoris*, Christe, Tenor I, Choir II, and Organ, mm. 17-29.**
(Example 5-5, cont. Melodic Fragment in Missa Alma redemptoris, “Christe,” Tenor I, Choir II, and Organ, mm. 23-29.)

Missa Ave Regina’s source antiphon is primarily intended for Compline and devotional purposes from the feast of the Purification to None on Holy Thursday, a service combined with Tenebrae; altogether its use spans from Septuagesima (the period after Christmastide) and Lent. Ave Regina caelorum also makes an appearance at Compline on Sundays and feasts during Holy Week. Thus, this antiphon and its accompanying mass are appropriate for any Sundays or feasts during Septuagesima and Lent, though not many distinctive feasts fall within the period; the only Marian celebration is the Annunciation (25 March).

Victoria’s eight-voice Ave Regina caelorum setting is loosely parodied throughout the mass, including an unidentifed, but chant-like motive featured in the source. The chant does not make any conspicuous appearances, unlike Alma redemptoris mater and its mass parody. The opening motive appears in Cantus I and Bassus I as each emerges as one voice of an imitative

44 For an exhaustive analysis of this mass and source pair, see Brill, 402-28.
pair featured in the first phrase of the source antiphon, and the opening section repeats in Choir II (Choir I, Example 5-6; Choir II, mm. 9-18). In each case, Cantus and Bassus retain the melody. Victoria loosely borrowed the entire opening of the antiphon at the beginning of the Kyrie in Missa Ave Regina (Example 5-7). The same opening structure is further diluted to begin the Agnus Dei, mm. 1-12.


Missa Salve Regina is inspired by the Marian antiphon for Vespers I of Trinity Sunday through the Saturday before Advent I and thus covers the broadest span of the liturgical calendar. Salve Regina is also a common hymn after Pentecost. The Descalzas Reales calendar of
polyphonic feast obligations includes numerous saints’ days during ordinary time, but a significant quantity are Marian feasts for which this mass would be particularly appropriate: the Visitation (2 July), Our Lady of the Snows (5 August), Assumption (15 August), the Nativity of the Virgin (8 September), and Presentation of the Virgin (21 November). Thus, this mass is applicable to far more situations than the other Marian antiphon-based works. This mass and parody pair was also more likely to be performed in churches throughout Spain. *Salve Regina* was the only Marian antiphon sung with any frequency until after the reformers of Trent applied the four-text cycle to the Roman rite; it was used for Saturday *Salve* services and remained a popular devotional item in Spain and in Italy. Thus it is unsurprising that Victoria chose to set the *Salve Regina* text three times.

The *Salve Regina* antiphon included in 1600a features two conspicuous segments of the solemn tone version of the *Salve Regina* chant: the incipit and the “nobis post hoc” portions (Examples 5-8 and 5-11). Victoria’s *Salve Regina* begins with the incipit in plainchant (Example 5-9, Segment A); the line extends into the imitative Cantus I and Cantus II entries but evaporates almost immediately (Segment B). The *Secunda pars* commences with a statement of Segment A in Tenor I, which dissolves into the polyphonic texture (Example 5-10). The tune migrates to Cantus III (mm. 22-25), where it breaks down into a similar, truncated statement upon repetition (mm. 26-28). The Bassus II cadential figure at the end of the *Secunda pars* mimics the opening of the chant as well (mm. 35-37).

*Missa Salve Regina* highlights the chant incipit in at least three points distributed through the work. To open the Gloria, Victoria loosely borrows material from the *Secunda pars* of the source, including the chant incipit (Gloria, mm. 1-10); he does the same at the beginning of the

---

45 For a summary of usage by Spanish composers, including those active in Italy, see Michael O’Connor, “The Polyphonic Compositions on Marian Texts by Juan de Esquivel Barahona: A Study of Institutional Marian Devotion in Late Renaissance Spain” (Ph.D. diss., The Florida State University, 2006), 45ff.
Agnus Dei, but the fragment appears in transposition (mm. 1-10). The segment resurfaces in the Bassus I cadential figure at the close of the “Benedictus” section of the Sanctus (mm. 57-60).

A second distinct portion of the original plainchant appears in both the parody and its source: the opening of the “nobis post hoc” section toward the end of the antiphon (Example 5-11). The center of the Sexta pars (Choir I) of Victoria’s Salve Regina features this segment in imitative entries for Cantus I, Cantus II, and Bassus I (mm. 134-138), the point at which this text occurs in both plainchant and the polyphonic setting (Example 5-12).

Example 5-8. Salve Regina (Solemn Tone), Opening Phrase.

Example 5-9. Victoria: Salve Regina, Choir I, mm. 1-5.

Example 5-11. *Salve Regina* (Solemn Tone), "nobis post hoc exsilium."


---

46 Brackets in Examples 5-12 and 5-13 denote use of the chant fragment highlighted in Example 5-11.
The “nobis post hoc” melody emerges in *Missa Salve Regina* at the beginning of the Credo; Choir I references both the plainchant and polyphonic fabric of the model (Example 5-13). The Sanctus commences with an ascending fifth motive as well, but it does fully present this fragment (Example 5-14). These entries are paired with an ascending third motive in Cantus II and Altus I, a motive common to Alleluia settings, among other chants. These ideas return in Choir II’s modified restatement of the opening (mm. 7-13).

**Example 5-13. Victoria: *Missa Salve Regina*, Credo, Choir I, mm. 1-6.**

**Example 5-14. Victoria: *Missa Salve Regina*, Sanctus, Choir I, mm. 1-6.**
*Missa Laetatus sum* is the only triple choir mass by the composer; it is based upon his 12-voice vespers psalm *Laetatus sum*, first printed in the 1583b collection and reprinted four times. *Laetatus sum* is the third psalm of Vespers I on many of the Marian feasts observed at Descalzas Reales, a grouping that represents nearly every season of the liturgical year: the Immaculate Conception, Purification, Annunciation, Assumption, and Nativity of the Virgin. It appears as the third psalm of Vespers II for all Marian feasts, and in the Vespers service for the Feast of the Circumcision. The first verse of the original text is the psalm verse paired with the Introit *Laetare Jerusalem* on Laetare Sunday, the fourth Sunday in Lent; it is also the Gradual reading for the day (“I rejoiced at the words that were spoken to me: ‘We shall go into the house of the Lord.’”). Laetare Sunday is a joyful respite during Lent, much like Gaudete Sunday, the third Sunday of Advent. It is intended to remind the faithful of their identity as the people of God.47

The first verse of *Laetatus sum* foreshadows Gaudete Sunday as well, as it is the Alleluia verse for the second Sunday in Advent. Thus, this particularly grand mass setting could be employed in tandem with its psalm source at a number of points during the year.

The plainchant *Laetatus sum* may be sung in all psalm tones except Tones 2 and 5; when the first verse appears in the service for the fourth Sunday in Lent, the accompanying antiphon is in Mode 5 and the setting for the Gradual of the day is in Mode 7. The Alleluia with which the verse is paired on the second Sunday in Advent is in Mode 1. Thus, if Victoria intended to preserve modal continuity between the plainchant usage and his polyphonic reworkings of the text, it could be used any time Tone 6 is employed for the psalm reading at Vespers (for instance, Nativity of the Virgin, Vespers II). Unlike the Marian antiphons and their parody masses, *Laetatus sum* does not feature a particularly distinct plainchant. It is unsurprising that Victoria

does not choose to overtly reference the psalm tone, as it does not provide memorable melodic fodder for parody; however, he hints at the tone in the other psalm settings.

Victoria employs direct parody of the polyphonic texture less frequently in *Missa Laetatus sum*; instead, he more often chooses to recycle motivic material or rearrange portions of the polychoral structure of the model. Since his *Laetatus sum* setting is essentially through-composed, there is little clear evidence of motivic recycling.\(^{48}\) The Kyrie features clever reworking of the beginning of the “Fiat pax” section of *Laetatus sum* (*Laetatus sum*, mm. 102ff). Victoria loosely parallels the rhythmic and harmonic structure to open the mass, but the phrase handed between Choirs III and I in the Kyrie is far more expansive than the idea featured in the source. The contrasting texture of the “Christe” (a3: Cantus I, II, IV) is imitative; the material is similar in voicing, texture, and initial melodic shape to the “Rogate” portion of the model, likewise scored imitatively for Choir II, a3 (CII, CIII, and AII; *Laetatus sum*, mm. 89-101). Victoria’s Kyrie II bookends the movement with music that initially quotes the “Fiat pax” excerpt in complete blocks, though Choirs I and III swap material (*Missa Laetatus sum*, Kyrie, mm. 42-47).

Only one clear reference to the parody source appears in the Gloria; the phrase “ad confitendum” (*Laetatus sum*, mm. 56-59) is reworked slightly, then expanded for the “Tu solus sanctus. Tu solus Dominus. Tu solus Altissimus, Jesu Christe” segment of the Gloria (mm. 80-87). “Domine Deus, Rex caelestis” (Choir II, mm. 28-44) and the adjacent “Domine Deus, Agnus Dei” (Choir I, mm. 45-58) share thematic material that is loosely derived from the opening of the movement, but there are no clear parallels with the model.

Victoria borrows most extensively at the outset of the Credo, measures 1-25; its root is the “Illuc enim” section of the psalm, measures 42-63. The polychoral blocks of material are

\(^{48}\) An exhaustive summary is in Brill, 460ff.
rearranged from bottom to top rather than top to bottom, and the rhythms are altered to fit the
text in the opening section, though the third block of material (Choir I) does not match the model
(mm. 7-10). The process is reversed for the second half of the parodied portion: the choirs enter
from bottom to top, whereas the original entrances systematically descend from Choir I to Choir
III. Again, the third phrase is altered from the original (mm. 13-15).

The only point at which Victoria parodies the opening of the psalm setting is submerged
in the Crucifixus portion of the Credo. Choir II performs the section as a unit, but the staggered
entrances to the “Et resurrexit” mimic the three-voice opening of the psalm (*Missa Laetatus sum*,
Credo, mm. 88-91). In the Credo, the bottom two voices enter first, as Victoria delays the entry
of Cantus III by two measures. “Et resurrexit” is one of the few points at which the composer
employs triple meter in *Missa Laetatus sum*; the gesture provides both a connection with the
source and subtle text painting (“Et resurrexit tertia die”). The opening of the “Et in spiritum”
(mm. 121ff.) parallels the structure of the opening of the movement, but does not exactly parody
the source; rather, its rhythmic profile recalls the “Iluc enim” music upon which the opening
structure is based.

The Sanctus contains almost entirely new material; the highly imitative “Benedictus” is
scored for Choir II only, and the a12 “Hosanna” returns in truncated form as the second
“Hosanna,” similar to the structure of the Kyrie. Victoria couples the melodic material of the
“Benedictus” with the contour of the first statements of “miserere nobis” in the next movement
(Agnus Dei, mm. 13-20). Some of the final “miserere” entries that close the Agnus Dei are
reminiscent of the “Fiat pax” material from the model.

The *Missa Pro victoria* is the only parody mass in Victoria’s output that borrows from a
secular source, and he chose a particularly distinct one: Clément Janequin’s four-voice chanson
La guerre, written to commemorate the 1525 Battle of Marignano. The chanson first appeared in print in 1528.\textsuperscript{49} La guerre was a popular source for the “battle mass” subset of parody works, particularly in Spain; other composers who wrote masses inspired by the chanson are Juan Esquivel, Francisco Guerrero, and Cristóbal de Morales.\textsuperscript{50} Out of the five masses in the 1600a prints, Missa Pro victoria offers the most frequent and recognizable references to the material that inspired him. There is no obvious liturgical intent for this mass; however, it was clearly directed toward his patron.\textsuperscript{51} In his presentation letters to the secular courts of the Duke of Urbino and Archduke Ferdinand, Victoria made a point to highlight this mass as something the king enjoyed. He certainly regarded the piece as something that would appeal to an audience beyond cathedral chapters or convent musicians.

Missa Pro victoria features a number of prominent materials from the chanson, including the opening. It never appears exactly, as the text warrants some alteration, though Choir II’s first phrase at the start of the Kyrie comes exceedingly close: compare measures 1-10 with the first 10 measures of La guerre (Examples 5-15a and b). Victoria creates some balance in the mass by incorporating the same material at the head of the Agnus Dei, measures 1-10. The composer evokes the opening of La guerre through the use of similar rhythmic and harmonic structure in the Credo, particularly in the initial entries of Choir I during the Crucifixus section, measures 51-

\textsuperscript{49} Brill, 429.
\textsuperscript{50} The Morales mass is now lost. The masses by Victoria, Esquivel, and Guerrero are briefly compared in Clive Walkley, Juan Esquivel: A Master of Sacred Music during the Spanish Golden Age (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: The Boydell Press, 2010), 86-99.
52, and the entries by Choir II and Cantus I at “Et in Spiritum Sanctum,” measures 84-85.

Victoria employs an analogous procedure at the start of the “Benedictus” (mm. 34-37).

**Example 5-15a and b. Victoria: Missa Pro victoria, Kyrie, mm. 1-10; Janequin: La guerre, mm. 1-10.**
(Example 5-15a, cont. Missa Pro victoria, Kyrie, mm. 6-10.)
A rapid-fire point of paired imitation from *La guerre* (Example 5-16a) makes a striking appearance during the Crucifixus on the text “Et iterum venturus est cum gloria, judicare” (Example 5-16b), perhaps a bit of sly text correlation on the part of the composer. The full text translates to “And he shall come again with glory, to judge the living and the dead: and his kingdom shall have no end,” while the corresponding point in the chanson translates to “and you will hear, if you listen well, blows thrown from all sides;” thus, a reference to battle is juxtaposed with imagery of divine judgment and a victorious divine kingdom. The rest of the section loosely imitates the rapid “de cous costez” (“on all sides”) motive of the model, primarily on multiple repetitions of the text “non erit finis” (“there will be no end,” mm. 79-83).

---

Example 5-16a and b. Janequin: *La guerre*, mm. 20-29; Victoria: *Missa Pro victoria*, Credo, mm. 74-77.

Example 5-16b. Victoria: *Missa Pro victoria*, Credo, mm. 74-77.
The introduction to the *Seconda pars* of *La guerre* is easily the most recognizable material Victoria chose to parody; Janequin employs martial drum rhythms and onomatopoeia to depict the charge into battle, which returns as an extended variant (Examples 5-17 and 5-18). Victoria borrows the rhythmic profile of this distinctive variation in every movement the mass. For instance, the close of the Kyrie is saturated with this rapid-fire motion (Example 5-19). Most of the Agnus Dei mirrors this in extended form, which reinforces the rounded, large-scale structure of the mass and provides an energetic finale (*Missa Pro victoria*, Agnus Dei, mm. 16-27). The music also appears in the Gloria (mm. 39-40); a truncated variant returns during the “in gloria Dei Patris” at the close of the movement (mm. 57-59 and 65-67). The Credo briefly features the rhythm of the battle motive in measures 10-11 and 23-24. The close of the Benedictus highlights an abbreviated variation similar to the one found in the Gloria (mm. 40-45).

**Example 5-17. Janequin: *La guerre*. Opening of *Seconda pars*, mm. 121-26.**
Example 5-19. Victoria: Missa Pro victoria, Kyrie, mm. 36-44.
The Magnificats: Liturgical Usage and Efficiency in Recycling

The Magnificat is the canticle sung during Vespers. Out of the liturgical items for the service, it is the article most commonly set polyphonically. Much of the time the Magnificat was sung *alternatim*, with alternating verses in plainchant; most composers crafted discrete settings of the odds, evens, or a set of each, which is what Victoria in his settings published prior to 1600. Thus, the fully-polyphonic settings Victoria composed for the 1600a publication are somewhat surprising; however, Lucy Hruza posits that these could have been intended for Vespers I on the evening prior to feasts, as the service tended to be more elaborate than its counterpart on the feast day proper.\(^{53}\)

Some of Victoria’s most ingenious recycling of material occurs in the two Magnificats unique to the 1600a prints. He condenses and expands upon the even and odd settings of the Magnificats *primi toni* and *sesti toni*, initially published in 1576 and 1581, respectively. Each pair is largely scored for four voices, though three of the voices expand to five or six at the conclusion; the even-verse setting of the *primi toni* inflates to five voices in its penultimate verse (“Sicut locutus est”), then to six for the conclusion (“Sicut erat”). Both sets of *sesti toni* verses are increased to five voices only on their final verse. For the scorings, see Tables 5-7 and 5-8. Table 5-10 summarizes Victoria’s borrowing methods in this pair of Magnificats.\(^{54}\)

The scoring and cleffing of the *Magnificat sexti toni* matches those of the other triple-choir works, *Laetatus sum* and *Missa Laetatus* (for scorings of both 1600a Magnificats, see Table 5-9). The ranges of individual voices are likewise analogous; the outer choirs are scored CATB, while Choir II occupies a higher tessitura (CCAT). The *Magnificat primi toni* is scored in

---

53 Hruza, 18-19.
54 Daniele Filippi compared Victoria’s borrowing methods in the Magnificats to some of Palestrina’s re-workings in “Polychoral Writings and Sonic Creativity in Palestrina and Victoria,” *Polifone* VIII/2-3 (2008): 63-182.
chiavette and for unequal choirs, CCAT//CATB. The clef combinations of both pairs of original four-voice settings align with their polychoral reinventions.

Table 5-7. Magnificat primi toni: Source Settings (1576 and 1581b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Scoring (Odds)</th>
<th>Clefs</th>
<th>Scoring (Evens)</th>
<th>Clefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anima mea</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₃C₃F₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et exultavit</td>
<td></td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₂C₂F₃</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quia respexit</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₂C₂F₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quia fecit</td>
<td></td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₂C₂F₃</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et misericordia</td>
<td>CCAT</td>
<td>G₃G₃C₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecit potentiam</td>
<td>ATTB</td>
<td>C₂C₁F₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposuit potentes</td>
<td>ATTB</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₂C₂F₃</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esurientes</td>
<td></td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₂C₂F₃</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suscepit Israel</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₂C₂F₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicut locutus est</td>
<td>CAATB</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₂C₂F₃</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Patri</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₂C₂F₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicut erat</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAATB</td>
<td>G₂C₂C₃F₃</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-8. Magnificat sexti toni: Source Settings (1581b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Scoring (Odds)</th>
<th>Clefs</th>
<th>Scoring (Evens)</th>
<th>Clefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anima mea</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>C₁C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et exultavit</td>
<td></td>
<td>ATTB</td>
<td>G₂C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quia respexit</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>C₁C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quia fecit</td>
<td></td>
<td>ATTB</td>
<td>C₂C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et misericordia</td>
<td>ATB</td>
<td>C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecit potentiam</td>
<td>TTB</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₃C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposuit potentes</td>
<td>ATTB</td>
<td>C₁C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esurientes</td>
<td></td>
<td>ATTB</td>
<td>C₂C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suscepit Israel</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₂C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicut locutus est</td>
<td>ATTB</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>G₂C₃F₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Patri</td>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>C₁C₃C₄F₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicut erat</td>
<td></td>
<td>AATB</td>
<td>G₂C₃C₄F₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-9. Magnificat sexti toni and Magnificat primi toni (1600a): Settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Clefs</th>
<th>Tessitura of Choirs</th>
<th>Clef Combination Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat sexti toni</td>
<td>CI-AI-TI-BI</td>
<td>C1C2C4F4</td>
<td>Unequal; Choirs I, III equal, Choir II high</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CII-AIII-TII-II</td>
<td>C1C2C3F3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIV-AIII-TII-BII</td>
<td>C1C2C4F4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat primi toni</td>
<td>CI-CII-AI-TI</td>
<td>G2G2C2C3</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>Chiavette (variant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIII-AII-TII-B</td>
<td>G2C2C3F3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-10. Magnificats a8 and a12: Polychoral Layouts and Borrowing from Sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Magnificat a8</th>
<th>Use of Originals</th>
<th>Magnificat a12</th>
<th>Use of Originals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anima mea</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Almost exact; cadential phrase condensed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et exultavit</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Minor re-use of themes; use of chant more pronounced in new version</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Close usage of original but not exact, largely to accommodate change in voicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quia respexit</td>
<td>Choir I, Choir II</td>
<td>Largely re-written to accommodate double choir; retains chant tune divided across choirs</td>
<td>Choir I, Choir II, Choir III</td>
<td>Opening phrase reused (Choir III); most of verse is re-written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quia fecit</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>New; in triple meter, more homophonic, and much more concise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et misericordia</td>
<td>CCAT or CCA</td>
<td>Exact; alternate version: canon at unison, Cantus voices</td>
<td>ATB</td>
<td>New; still scored ATB, imitative, but less than half the length of the original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecit potentiam</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>New to accommodate double choir; opens in triple meter</td>
<td>Choir I, Choir II</td>
<td>New; original scored TTB and highly imitative; new version dominated by homophonic exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit potentes</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>New; concise homophony in new version; new version in triple meter</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Exact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esurientes</td>
<td>Choir I, Choir II</td>
<td>Revised for double choir; includes chant material</td>
<td>Choir I, Choir II, Choir III</td>
<td>Mostly re-written; opening loosely based on original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suscepit Israel</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Exact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicut locutus</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>New; first half of new version in triple meter</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>New; in triple meter and compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Patri, Sicut erat</td>
<td>Choir I, Choir II</td>
<td>New; borrowed from <em>Dixit Dominus</em></td>
<td>Choir I, Choir II, Choir III</td>
<td>New; borrowed from <em>Laetatus sum</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The two tones in which Victoria chooses to set the double- and triple-choir versions have important liturgical significance; like the psalms and other items of the liturgy, the Magnificat may be sung in one of eight tones proper to certain portions of the church calendar. In particular, the Magnificat tone is dependent upon the mode of its antiphon for the day. The most prevalent tones are the first and eighth, as they are employed for the highest-ranking feasts, including Christmas, Pentecost, and Trinity Sunday. Of the feasts celebrated with polyphony at Mass and Vespers at Descalzas, the Magnificat primi toni would be appropriate for Epiphany, Purification of the Virgin, the feast of St. Agatha, the Invention of the Cross, Visitation of the Virgin, Assumption, Nativity of the Virgin, St. Michael the Archangel, All Saints, Conception of the Virgin, Vespers II on Christmas Day, Vespers II on the Octave Sunday of Corpus Christi, and Pentecost.

In another ingenious instance of borrowing Victoria transfers the Doxology of his setting of the psalm Dixit Dominus to the Magnificat primi toni almost exactly, though the psalm is set for equal choirs and the Magnificat primi toni is scored for high and low choirs. The composer’s coupling of the Magnificat and psalm must have been a conscious decision to create an aural sense of continuity: Magnificat Tone 1 is employed for a large proportion of the feasts celebrated at Descalzas, and Dixit Dominus is the first psalm sung at Vespers on all of these occasions.

The CATB scoring of the psalm is transformed to CCAT in the Magnificat primi toni with only minor adjustments to accommodate range: Altus I, measures 129-30 of Dixit Dominus contains an A3, which is beyond the range of a standard Cantus part, so the composer shifts the pitch to A4 in the Magnificat (Cantus II, 222-23; Examples 5-20a and b). In measure 222 of the

---

Magnificat, Victoria alters the Cantus II pitch from A4 to D5. A final minor alteration occurs in the Bassus II parts at the end of the psalm setting; a rest separates the end of the phrase “saeculorum, Amen” in measures 138-39 from its next statement, which commences in measure 140. In the Magnificat, the composer eliminates the rest to strengthen the cadence on G (m. 223). The only major omission is the first statement of the text “Gloria Patri, et Filio” in measures 187-90. Choir II commences the Magnificat Doxology, rather than Choir I, thus avoiding a restatement of the first phrase (Dixit Dominus, mm. 101-7).

Example 5-20a and b. Magnificat primi toni, mm. 222-23; Dixit Dominus, mm. 139-40.

Like the Magnificat primi toni, the Magnificat sexti toni is appropriate for a number of prominent feasts. Tone 6 is the third most frequent tone behind Tones 1 and 8; its significant appearances are at Vespers I on Corpus Christi and on Trinity Sunday. Among the other feasts
observed with polyphony at Descalzas Reales, Tone 6 is employed on the Octave of the Epiphany, Vespers II on All Saints, and the Sunday within the Octave of Christmas. Thus, the Magnificat sexti toni would be viable for a substantial portion of the remaining major feasts not covered by the primi toni setting.

Victoria recycles the Doxology from Laetatus sum in the Magnificat sexti toni, though the liturgical overlap between the two items is tenuous in comparison to the Magnificat primi toni and Dixit Dominus pairing. Laetatus sum is the third psalm for a handful of feasts that do not include Magnificats in the sixth tone. Victoria’s borrowing is not exact as in the previous example, as the material appears in condensed form; the “Gloria Patri” is shorter and only preserves the final phrase from the source, and the “Sicut erat” rhythms are altered.56

Beyond matters of common scoring between source materials, Victoria elects to borrow from the Tone 1 and Tone 6 Magnificat tunes; they proceed as indicated in Example 5.21. Most instances of chant usage are partial at best, or simply fragments that mimic the incipit at the verse or half-verse, and the tune does not emerge in every verse of either setting (Table 5.11).

Example 5.21a and b. Magnificat Tunes.

a. Magnificat primi toni

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Segment A} & \text{Segment B} & \text{Segment C} & \text{Segment D} & \text{Alternate Ending} \\
\hline
\text{Magnificat} & \text{a - n - i - ma} & \text{Do - mi - num} & \text{Do - mi - num} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. Magnificat sexti toni

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Segment A} & \text{Segment B} \\
\hline
\text{Magnificat} & \text{a - n - i - ma} & \text{Do - mi - num} \\
\end{array}
\]

56 Carver, 120.
Table 5-11. *Magnificat primi toni* and *Magnificat sexti toni*: Chant Application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th><strong>Magnificat primi toni</strong></th>
<th><strong>Magnificat sexti toni</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: <em>Anima mea</em></td>
<td>Primarily limited to brief snippets of A and D at beginnings and endings of phrases; the only statement close to exact is <strong>Tenor II</strong>, where C and D are briefly interrupted (mm. 6-10).</td>
<td><strong>Tenor I</strong>: B (mm. 2-5), answered by partial, transposed statement in <strong>Bassus I</strong> (mm. 2-3); imitative pair answered by <strong>Cantus I</strong>: B (mm. 5-10) and transposed statement in <strong>Altus I</strong> (mm. 5-6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: <em>Et exultavit</em></td>
<td>Vague quotations of the tune. <strong>Cantus I</strong>: A, B (mm. 18-24); C opens third phrase (mm. 24-26); <strong>Cantus II</strong>: B (mm. 26-29); C dissolves into cadence (mm. 30-32).</td>
<td>Interrupted; <strong>Cantus III</strong>: A (mm. 13-16), B (mm. 21-28).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: <em>Quia respexit</em></td>
<td>Incomplete statement of entire tune passed between top voices of the choirs; <strong>Cantus III</strong>: A (mm. 35-38); <strong>Cantus I</strong>: B (mm. 38-42); <strong>Cantus III</strong>: C (mm. 42-44).</td>
<td>No use of tune.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: <em>Quia fecit</em></td>
<td>No explicit usage; openings of phrases mimic upward motion of incipit.</td>
<td>Openings of phrases mimic upward motion of incipit; <strong>Cantus III</strong>: incomplete, embellished version of B (mm. 59-61).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: <em>Et misericordia</em></td>
<td>No use of tune.</td>
<td>No use of tune.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: <em>Fecit potentiam</em></td>
<td>No use of tune.</td>
<td>No use of tune.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: <em>Deposuit potentes</em></td>
<td>First half of tune appears in interrupted form; <strong>Cantus III</strong>: first phrase begins with A, then the tune is abandoned (mm. 126-27); second phrase quotes B (mm. 131-34).</td>
<td>Same style of paired entry as Verse 1 (opening of A only; mm. 91-98); B only appears in <strong>Cantus IV, Altus III</strong> pair (mm. 100-106).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: <em>Esurientes implere</em></td>
<td>Brief snippet at opening of verse only; <strong>Cantus I</strong>: B (mm. 135-37).</td>
<td>No use of tune.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: <em>Suscepit Israel</em></td>
<td>Single segment buried in the middle of the verse; <strong>Tenor II</strong>: C (mm. 162-64).</td>
<td><strong>Altus I, Tenor I, Bassus I</strong>: Incipit buried in texture (mm. 128-32); <strong>Bassus I</strong>: B (mm. 141-47); <strong>Cantus I, Bassus I</strong>: ornamented version of B (mm. 147-50); <strong>Altus I, Tenor I</strong>: B (mm. 149-53).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: <em>Sicut locutus</em></td>
<td>No use of tune.</td>
<td>No use of tune.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: <em>Gloria Patri</em></td>
<td>Condensed version divided between top voices, first two phrases; <strong>Cantus III</strong>: A, B (mm. 187-90); <strong>Cantus I</strong>: C (mm. 190-92).</td>
<td>No use of tune.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: <em>Sicut erat</em></td>
<td>No use of tune.</td>
<td>No use of tune.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Magnificat primi toni* commences with the plainchant incipit in Tenor II; as the voices of Choir II enter in pairs, the first few pitches of every entry mimic the opening of the second half of the tune (Segment C, above; see Example 5-22 below). Only Tenor II presents the full half-verse melody, albeit in embellished form (mm. 6-10). The melody is divided between opposing Cantus parts in Verses 2, 3, and 11. The first half of the tune appears in interrupted form in Verse 7, *Deposuit potentes* (Example 5-23); Cantus III’s first phrase opens with Segment A, then the
melody is abandoned (mm. 126-27), and the second phrase includes Segment B. At other points the tune is interrupted, fragmented, or buried in the polyphonic fabric.

**Example 5-22. Magnificat primi toni, mm. 2-10.**

**Example 5-23. Magnificat primi toni, mm. 126-34.**
Victoria does not incorporate the tune as pervasively into the *Magnificat sexti toni*. Verse 1 and Verse 7 feature paired imitation on segments of the tune, while it is presented in a complete, but interrupted fashion in Cantus III, Verse 2, a phenomenon similar to the interruption in Example 5-23. Other statements of the melody are fragmented, submerged in the texture, or embellished, as in the *Magnificat primi toni*. For instance, Verse 4 commences with ascending motion in each voice (Example 5-24); the entries mimic the first few pitches of the incipit (Segment A). An incomplete, embellished version of Segment B appears in Cantus III (mm. 59-61).

**Example 5-24. Magnificat sexti toni, mm. 53-62.**
Other Liturgical Items: Methods of Chant Incorporation

Victoria’s reliance on chant sources extends into the rest of the non-mass items as well; two-thirds of the 1600a repertoire contains at least fleeting references to their associated plainchants, including all of the four-voice works. Many of the citations are fragmented and meandering, as openings or endings of chant phrases are often applied to openings or endings of polyphonic phrases setting the same segments of text. Some are set in longer note values, usually with some sort of embellishment or truncation of the tune; others migrate between voices and are condensed or fragmented.

Three of the four Marian antiphon settings were discussed above, in conjunction with their parody masses. The beginning of *Alma redemptoris mater* contains distinct references to the incipit of the simple tone version of the tune, *Salve Regina* pays homage to the solemn tone melody, and *Ave Regina caelorum* bears no resemblance to the chant. *Regina caeli*, the fourth antiphon setting, references the openings of four phrases of the solemn tone version of the plainchant (Example 5-25). Segment A appears as the first pitches of the top three voices of each choir, measures 1-8 (Example 5-26). Segment B emerges in its respective position in Cantus II, Tenor I, Altus II, and Bassus, measures 23-27, while both Altus voices mimic the contour of the fragment; Segment B next transfers to the lower three voices of Choir II in analogous fashion (mm. 27-30), and returns to Choir I for the close of the section (Example 5-27). The *Seconda pars* commences with the first few pitches of Segment C in all voices of Choir I, with the addition of Cantus III (Example 5-28). Finally, “Ora pro nobis Deum” is repeated numerous times in both choirs starting at measure 86 (Example 5-29); some voices contain the entire Segment D at the opening of multiple statements of the text, while others simply commence with the descending fifth.
Example 5-25. Borrowed Fragments of *Regina caeli*, Solemn Tone.


Example 5-27. Use of Segment B: *Regina caeli*, Choirs I and II, mm. 23-32.

Bracketed times in Examples 5-26 through 5-29 indicate usage of the plainchant segment indicated, rather than ligatures.
Example 5-28. Use of Segment C: *Regina caeli*, Choir I, mm. 56-60.\textsuperscript{58}

Example 5-29. Use of Segment D: *Regina caeli*, Choir II, mm. 86-89.

Victoria’s setting of the sequence *Lauda Sion* contains few references to its source chant, all of which are extremely fleeting (Example 5-30); the Cantus I entry at the opening of the work represents an ornamented version of the opening of Verse 1, though the first pitch is altered from E to D (Example 5-31). The composer employs two portions of Verse 2: “Quia major” appears in Tenor I and Bassus I, measures 21-24, and “Nec laudare sufficis” emerges in chromatic alteration and embellished, and is exchanged between Cantus II and Cantus I (Examples 5-32 and 5-33).

\textsuperscript{58} Cantus III not pictured.
Example 5-30. *Lauda Sion*: Opening of Verse 1, Second and Third Phrases of Verse 2.

Example 5-31. *Victoria*: *Lauda Sion*, Embellishment of Verse 1, Cantus I, mm. 1-6.

Example 5-32. *Victoria*: *Lauda Sion*, "Quia major," Tenor I and Bassus I, mm. 21-24.\(^{59}\)


Victoria accesses fragments of the tones associated with three of the psalm settings: *Dixit Dominus*, *Laudate pueri*, and *Nisi Dominus*. Since all of these works reference the Tone 1 version of the chant, the melodic content is extremely similar. *Dixit Dominus* opens with the psalm tone in Cantus I, mm. 1-7 (Example 5-34); the quotation continues in Cantus II, measures 7-11, then returns to Cantus I (mm. 11-15). Another brief snippet enters in Cantus II, measures 36-39. The opening Cantus I melody of *Laudate pueri* presents a heavily ornamented version of the melody (mm. 1-3 of Example 5-35); it is stripped of its decoration and employed in a more

---

\(^{59}\) Brackets in Examples 5-32 and 5-33 indicate material borrowed from the plainchant source.
straightforward form in Cantus III, measures 9-15. The melody returns in Cantus III at the opening of the “Quis sicut” section, measures 49-53, and a final time in measures 89-94. The only clear use of the tone in *Nisi Dominus* is in the opening phrase, Cantus I (Example 5-36).

**Example 5-34. *Dixit Dominus*, Chant Quotation, Cantus I, mm. 1-7.**

![Dixit Dominus, Chant Quotation, Cantus I, mm. 1-7.](image)

**Example 5-35. *Laudate pueri*, Ornamented Chant Quotation, Cantus I, mm. 1-5.**

![Laudate pueri, Ornamented Chant Quotation, Cantus I, mm. 1-5.](image)

**Example 5-36. *Nisi Dominius*, Chant Quotation, Cantus I, mm. 1-4.**

![Nisi Dominius, Chant Quotation, Cantus I, mm. 1-4.](image)

Victoria’s exploitation of chant materials in the four-voice repertoire is far more pervasive; every item employs its plainchant source at least temporarily. The *Te Deum* contains numerous quotations of the chant, denoted in Example 5-37. Quotations are embellished or presented as fragments embedded in the texture; the tune first emerges in the Cantus in Verse 2 (mm. 1-7), and appears in fragmentary form in the Tenor during the second half of the verse (mm. 4-5). The tune returns in the Cantus and Tenor at the opening of Verse 4 (mm. 8-11), then briefly in the Altus (mm. 10-12). Cantus again retains the melody for the single “Sanctus” from Verse 5; it is nearly an exact quotation (mm. 16-19). Verse 6 opens with a slightly embellished reference in the Cantus (mm. 20-23), then the tune transfers to Tenor for the second half of the verse (mm. 23-27). Victoria quotes the melody in embellished form in the Cantus in Verses 8...
and 10 (mm. 28-33, 34-37), then the tune returns to the Tenor during the second half of Verse 10 (mm. 38-40). The Cantus retains the melody in altered form for Verse 12 (mm. 41-47), though the entirety of the Cantus line mimics the chant more closely in Verse 14 (mm. 48-52). Quotations resume in the Tenor at the end of Verse 18 (mm. 67-72), cease for the first half of Verse 20, then return in the Tenor to conclude the verse (mm. 80-86). The Tenor commences Verse 22 with a brief reference to the tune (mm. 88-90); it re-emerges in the Cantus at the opening of Verse 26 (mm. 104-05), migrates to Tenor in altered form (mm. 105-08), and returns to the Cantus for the second half of the verse (mm. 109-14). The melody remains in the Cantus for the first half of the final verse (mm. 115-20), then disappears for the remainder of the work.

_Veni creator Spiritus_ is an example of a straightforward _cantus firmus_ setting; the chant melody is presented in the Tenor for the entire work, though the Cantus briefly paraphrases the opening of the tune (mm. 7-11).°° _Ave Maris Stella_ is set in the same manner, but the tune remains confined to the Tenor. Victoria adds the cadential leading tone at the end of the first phrase (mm. 11), paraphrases the opening of the second phrase (mm. 14-15), inserts a note (mm. 16-17), then omits the E to F repetition at the end (m. 19). The final phrase proceeds as written.°°

---

°° Victoria reproduces the tune in its entirety as the Tenor incipit; see Appendix E, _Veni creator Spiritus_, p. 1112.

°° The setting for _Ave Maris Stella_ also includes its entire chant source (Appendix E, _Ave Maris Stella_, p. 1118).

Verse 2

Te aeternum Patreem, omnis terrae veneratur.

Verse 4

Ti-bi Cherubim et Seraphim incesabili voce proclamant: Sanctus.

Verse 6

Pent sunt coeli et terrae majestatis gloriae tuae. Te Propheta rum laudabilis numerus.

Verse 8

Te permebem terrarum sancta confiteretur Ecclesia.

Verse 10

Verum et unicum Filium.

Verse 12

Tu Rex gloriae, Christe.

Verse 14

Tu ad sexteram Dei sedes, in gloria Patris.

Verse 16

Te ergo quae-simus, tu his famulis subveni, quos pretiosos san-gui-ne reddisti.

Verse 18

Salvum fac populum tuum Domine, et bene dic haecemidi
ta tuae.

Verse 20

Dignare Domine ei isto, sine pecatum nos custodi.

Verse 22

Fiat misericordia tua Domine super nos, que-madmodum speravi mus in te.
Pange lingua employs the entire plainchant but it is shared among the voices, primarily the Altus, Tenor, and Bassus.\(^\text{62}\) While one voice maintains a lengthy segment of the tune, others reference short fragments in imitation, as at the beginning; for instance, the Altus entry (mm. 7-10) anticipates a longer statement in the Bassus, which presents a truncated version of the first phrase of the chant (mm. 9-17). The second phrase emerges in partial form as the opening of the next phrase in the Bassus (mm. 19-21). The third segment of the chant, “Sanguinisque pretiosi,” migrates to the Tenor amid imitative entries in the other voices, which mimic the triad outlined at the beginning of the phrase (mm. 25-31); Victoria decorates the cadence as well. The phrase “Quem in mundi pretium” is quoted verbatim in the Tenor (mm. 33-38); the subsequent segment of the tune migrates to the Bassus on the text “Sui moras” (mm. 38-43), and appears intact with minor cadential decoration. Victoria briefly quotes the opening of the phrase “Fructus ventris…” in imitative entries for the remaining voices. The final section of the melody emerges multiple times: first, in the Altus (mm. 45-48), which overlaps with the Bassus statement (mm. 48-50); the material then returns to the Altus (mm. 50-53) but dissolves into free polyphony. The same occurs in the Bassus, though this final statement evaporates after the first four pitches (mm. 51-53).

References to the chant material are less overt in Nunc Dimittis; Victoria quotes the tune less than in the other four-voice works, as it is rather nondescript.\(^\text{63}\) It appears in the Cantus in partial form for most of Verse 2 (mm. 4-9), then the Tenor for the duration of Verse 4 (mm. 13-20). Victoria’s setting of the “Sicut erat” portion of the Doxology contains no references to the plainchant.

\(^{62}\) The Pange lingua setting includes the entire chant tune as well (Appendix E, Pange lingua, p. 1114).

\(^{63}\) As with the previous selections, Victoria includes the entire chant tune (Appendix E, Nunc Dimittis, p. 1121).
Both of the penitential antiphon settings, *Asperges me, Domine* and *Vidi aquam*, contain sporadic and fragmentary quotations of their respective chant materials, much like the Marian antiphons; however, the *Asperges me* tune is present almost constantly (Example 5-38).\(^6^4\) The Cantus presents Segment A in transposed form (mm. 2-5), and the first four pitches of the next phrase trace the contour of Segment B (mm. 6-7).\(^6^5\) The tune migrates to the Bassus for Segment C (mm. 11-12), which is overlapped by a second entry of the same segment in the Cantus (mm. 12-14). Segment D appears in three voices: Cantus, Tenor, and Altus (mm. 16-18). A lengthy quotation from the second half of the psalm verse comprises Segment E in the Tenor, albeit in condensed form with added stepwise motion to fill in two skips of a third (mm. 24-31). The melody returns in the Cantus, albeit in chromatic alteration (Segments F and G, mm. 35-38). The statement of Segment G in the Cantus overlaps with a repetition in the Tenor, and the Cantus version is joined by elision to a truncated rendering of Segment H (mm. 38-41). The Tenor then takes over the tune through the end of the piece (Segment I, mm. 42-49), with chromatic alteration and addition of stepwise motion that recalls the same material presented in the second half of the psalm verse.

\(^6^4\) Portions of both antiphon chants are included in their respective settings; the tunes are transcribed in their entirety below as Examples 5-38 and 5-39 (for the full settings, refer to Appendix E, *Asperges me, Domine*, pp. 1123-25, and *Vidi aquam*, pp. 1126-28).

\(^6^5\) The chant incipit is musically identical to Segment C; however, the text and music do not appear together in the material Victoria set polyphonically. Segments A-D are labeled as such since the fragments emerge in the polyphonic setting, concurrent with the same portions of the text found in the plainchant source.
Example 5-38. *Asperges me, Domine.*

Victoria sets *Vidi aquam* similarly, though his employment of the tune is less pervasive (Example 5-39). Segment A emerges in the Cantus (mm. 2-7), as in the opening of *Asperges me*; the Altus and Bassus entries on “a latere” mimic the respective portion of the tune (Segment B; *Vidi aquam* mm. 9-10), and the Bassus retains the intervallic material of “dextro” as well (Segment C; *Vidi aquam* mm. 11-13). All of the initial entries in each voice of the Alleluia section of the sequence recall the opening of the first Alleluia of the chant, Segment D (mm. 14-16), and a similar procedure occurs at the beginning of the next phrase (Segment E, mm. 18-21). The plainchant disappears entirely from measure 22 through the end of the antiphon (m. 34). Victoria does not quote any of the Alleluia material from this portion of the tune; instead he employs the previous Alleluia section to facilitate a stronger sense of unity (compare mm. 13-18...
with mm. 29-34). As in Asperges me, the composer provides the plainchant for the first half of the psalm verse and preserves the same structure for the second half; the Tenor retains a condensed version of the tune (Segment F; mm. 39-45). Once again the “Gloria Patri” portion of the Doxology appears in plainchant, while a truncated and slightly modified version of the “Sicut erat” (Segments G and H) remains in the Tenor (mm. 51-63). The Cantus and Altus briefly mimic the static line that opens the second half of the Doxology (mm. 51-52).

The 1600a Organ Score: Alterations and Function

The organ score to 1600a is generally overlooked in discussions of Victoria’s output beyond mention of its novelty; a large number of adjustments in the organ book were intended to simplify the contrapuntal structure of the voice parts, but most biographers assume it merely doubles Choir I without much beyond superficial examination. The composer introduces a variety of alterations, ranging from simple reductions to complex reworkings of passages in order to support the choral independence inherent to Roman polychoral tuttis; the general types of changes are summarized below.

Types of Alterations in the 1600a Organ Book.

Rhythmic Alterations:
- Combining repeated pitches
- Removal of dots or ties
- Removal of syncopation or straightening of rhythmic figures
- Equal subdivision of long notes
- Other shifts of rhythmic emphasis

Melodic Alterations:
- Removal of embellishments
- Addition or removal of stepwise motion
- Simplification of cadential figures
- Addition of embellishment (rare)
- Omission of pitches or entire phrases
- Voice-leading changes

Borrowing from Another Choir:
- Re-voicing to fill out chords with pitches found in another choir
- Filling in of contrapuntal texture with excerpts from another choir
- Doubling material found only in another choir

Bass Independence:
- Changes to double root/Bassus II
- Octave changes
- Omission to avoid thirds between basses
The most pervasive type of alteration found in Victoria’s organ writing is the condensation of repeated pitches into longer durations; the Cantus I, Altus I, and Bassus I of *Salve Regina*, measure 8 is a typical example (Example 5-40a). The reverse process appears frequently as well, including the Cantus I of *Missa Laetatus sum*, Kyrie, measure 18 (Example 5-40b). Removal of ties or dots in order to rearticulate a pitch occurs almost as frequently as the combination or subdivision of a repeated pitch. Pertinent examples from *Laetatus sum* emerge toward the opening of the piece, including the rearticulated Cantus I pitch in measures 11-12, and the Altus I and Tenor I notes that follow in measure 15 (Examples 5-41a and b).

Victoria also prefers to simplify animated homophony by removing syncopation or simplifying rhythms that only serve to complicate the texture. One brief example is found in the Cantus I, Altus I, and Tenor I voices of *Laetatus sum*, measures 60-61 (Example 5-42); a single-voice example is Tenor I of the Sanctus, *Missa Alma redemptoris*, measures 20-21 (Example 5-43). Sometimes Victoria chooses to redistribute the subdivision of long notes or otherwise shift the rhythmic emphasis of a single line, as in the Altus I voice of the Sanctus of *Missa Alma redemptoris* (mm. 24-25), where the result transfers emphasis to a strong beat (Example 5-44). This example could also be interpreted as an instance of combining pitch reduction with removal of ties, as in Examples 5-40a and 5-41a.
Examples 5-40a and b. Pitch Reduction and Subdivision.

a. *Salve Regina*, Choir I, m. 8

b. *Missa Laetatus sum*, Kyrie, Choir I, mm. 17-19


a. Cantus I, mm. 11-12.

b. Altus I and Tenor I, m. 15
Example 5-42. Simplification of Rhythm: *Laetatus sum*, mm. 60-61.

Melodic alteration to the original voice parts generally involves simplifications such as removal of embellishments, omission or addition of stepwise motion, and reduction of cadential figures. In the *Missa Salve Regina*, Credo, measure 23, Victoria removes the embellishment of Cantus II (Example 5-45). Examples of omission and addition of stepwise motion include *Missa Alma redemptoris*, Credo, measure 34 (Tenor I) and *Missa Alma redemptoris*, Sanctus, measure 32 (Altus I), respectively (Examples 5-46a and b). Cadential figures are frequently simplified as well, as in Altus II of *Missa Ave Regina*, Sanctus, measure 64 (Example 5-47).
Examples 5-46a and b. Removal and Addition of Stepwise Motion: Missa Alma redemptoris.

a. Removal: Credo, Tenor I, m. 34-35

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Credo, Tenor I: m. 34-35} & \\
\text{Altus I: m. 32} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

b. Addition: Sanctus, Altus I, m. 32

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sanctus, Altus I: m. 32} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Example 5-47. Cadential Simplification: Missa Ave Regina, Sanctus, Altus II, m. 64-65.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Example 5-47} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Added embellishments are rare. One example is at the end of the Gloria, Missa Alma redemptoris, measure 23; the Bassus figure is altered to parallel the Altus in thirds (Example 5-48). Occasionally Victoria chooses to omit single pitches or even short phrases from the organ part, such as in measure 62 of the Tenor I line of Alma redemptoris mater (Example 5-49). The omission transforms the previously ragged phrase ending into a neat vertical block of material in which all voices cut off simultaneously. A few minor voice leading adjustments occur in the organ parts as well; for example, in Salve Regina, measure 171, Cantus I is embellished in order to approach E♭ from below instead of above (Example 5-50).

Example 5-49. Omission: Alma redemptoris mater, Tenor I, m. 62.

Example 5-50. Voice Leading Change: Salve Regina, Cantus I, m. 171.
Sometimes changes to the organ part necessitated borrowing material from voices in another choir in order to fill in the third or fifth of a chord, or to retain important cadential figuration. Occasionally this becomes rather complex. For instance, Victoria frequently chooses to borrow material in order to render extremely static Altus parts a little more active and to retain cadential motion only present in Choir II, as in *Salve Regina*, measures 158-62 (Example 5-51). The composer discarded the Altus I line in favor of doubling Cantus III. The procedure is reversed at the close of *Salve Regina*: beginning in measure 195, Victoria doubles the simpler Cantus III part instead of Altus I, likely to de-clutter the tutti texture and to fill out the triads featured in the heavily-reduced organ scoring (see Appendix E, *Salve Regina*, p. 971). Victoria did something similar at the close of the *Letaniae de Beata Virgine*, measures 162-64. In this case, the florid Altus I line is replaced with the much simpler leading tone resolution present in Altus II. During the “Esurientes” a12 section of the *Magnificat sexti toni*, Victoria chooses to draw the Cantus IV and Tenor III parts into the highest voice of the organ part in order to fill in the chordal third and preserve the leading tone cadential resolution at the end of the phrase (*Magnificat sexti toni*, mm. 115-16).

In *Missa Pro victoria* the doublings shift constantly, as there are five voices in Choir I and the composer opts to double only four. Most of the time Victoria doubles Cantus II, though the top voice of the organ part occasionally moves between Cantus I and Cantus II, depending upon which pitches are more essential to the harmonic structure, as at the opening of the Gloria (Appendix E, *Missa Pro victoria*, 627). In measures 9-11, the composer revoices Cantus II and Tenor I to fill out the triad; the top voice of the organ part doubles the Cantus I pitches, while the tenor picks up the dropped Cantus II line. In other instances Victoria enriches the contrapuntal texture with excerpts from the other choir as a means of maintaining continuity. Examples
include his assimilation of Tenor I with Bassus II in *Missa Alma redemptoris*, Sanctus, mm. 45-48 (Example 5-52) and Bassus I doubling Bassus II in *Alma redemptoris mater*, mm. 34-36 (Example 5-53).


**Bassus Doublings: Polychoral Procedure and Organ Alterations**

The harmonic adjustments Victoria makes most frequently involve borrowing pitches from another choir in order to fill in the third or fifth of the chord, or to reinforce the root. This most frequently—and most significantly—occurs in the bass line, a practice that sheds light on the composer’s concept of polychoral structure. Basses in Roman style *cori spezzati* retain the root of the chord as often as possible in *tutti* passages and move in contrary motion to one
another; Victoria adheres to this principle almost exclusively, even at exchange points between choirs. A good example is the “Quia respe xit” section of the Magnificat sexti toni (mm. 29-52). The basses of Laetatus sum, Missa Laetatus sum, and the Magnificat sexti toni unwaveringly follow the root doubling rule, even in combination with Tenor II. Tenor II is the lowest voice of Choir II and essentially functions as a third bass line, scoring that is also present in the Magnificat sexti toni. In passages where the two bass lines already contain the root of the chord, Victoria occasionally changes the octave of Bassus I to double at the octave instead of unison; this arrangement is especially ideal in polychoral exchanges (Example 5-54).

Example 5-54. Octave Change in Bassus I: Missa Salve Regina, Agnus Dei, mm. 21-22.

There are a few points at which Victoria does not observe the root doubling rule at interchanges between choirs, but this is extremely rare; for instance, two exchanges in Veni sancte Spiritus are by fourth (see Appendix E, Veni sancte Spiritus, pp. 798-99, mm. 47-48 and 52-53). The composer chooses to allow the offending pitch to remain in the organ part in both instances (D, m. 47; A, m. 52), as Bassus I does not overlap with Bassus II. The cutoff of Choir I is neatly aligned in both instances, but the entries by Choir II are slightly staggered. Bassus II is never the first to enter, and thus never sounds in direct opposition to Bassus I. In mm. 47-48, Tenor II satisfies the root doubling by entering first; rather unusually, Cantus II doubles the root

66 See also Missa Laetatus sum, Credo, mm. 147-153 for an excellent instance of this procedure.
in Bassus I in mm. 52-53. A similar instance is at the opening exchange of the “Esurientes implevit bonis” of the Magnificat primi toni (mm. 136-37). Tenor I is the acting bass voice for Choir I, which is scored CCAT; the entrances of the Choir II voices are again staggered, but Tenor I only overlaps with Cantus III and Tenor II. The latter double the root of the D major triad at Choir I’s cadence point. Bassus II follows on a G, which is then doubled by Tenor I, and order is restored.

Sometimes the existing Bassus I line is adjusted in the organ book in order to avoid thirds or fifths between the basses or to reinforce the root at the octave; measure 66 of the Missa Salve Regina is an instance in which Victoria doubled Bassus II in order to mask a third between basses (Example 5-55). The composer frequently employs extreme reductions of Bassus I in order to reinforce chordal roots at the end of a work. A typical example is Salve Regina, mm. 195-203. Occasionally he allows thirds between basses to remain in the organ part, though most are either on weak beats or concealed in the texture. For an example, in Missa Pro victoria, Credo, mm. 23-24, the Bassus parts trade the root and third of the C major triad. Another of Victoria’s favorite devices for avoiding parallels and excessive emphasis on the third of the chord is briefly passing downward through the third when approaching a root doubling; typical examples are the downbeats of measures 57 and 59 of Alma redemptoris mater (Example 5-56). This is also an instance in which the composer minimizes the impact of the root-third relationship between basses through immersion in the imitative texture of the passage. Both elements are frequently retained in the organ scoring. Another example of movement through downward arpeggiation of the triad occurs repeatedly in both Bassus voices of Letaniae de Beata Virgine, mm. 155-60. Sometimes one bass line presents the root while the other features a melismatic figure that emphasizes the root but does not remain there long, as in the decoration
the Bassus parts exchange in the Credo of Missa Ave Regina (Example 5-57). This occurs with some frequency, and usually remains in the organ score.\textsuperscript{67} The aforementioned segment of the Letaniae features the same figuration in mm. 155, 157, and 159.

Example 5-55. Avoidance of Third: Missa Salve Regina, Credo, mm. 66-68.

Example 5-56. Move to Root via Third: Alma redemptoris mater, mm. 57-59.

\textsuperscript{67} For an instance in which the figure pervades an entire work, see Veni sancte Spiritus (Appendix E, p. 792ff).
One complex example that combines multiple adjustments is in *Salve Regina*, mm. 83-88: Victoria alters Bassus I to align with the rhythm found in Cantus I, and the bass line is simplified. In mm. 86-87 the organ bass line is adjusted to double Bassus II, then the cadence is completed an octave higher. Another example appears later in the work; the opening of the *Septima pars* features Choir II for four measures, then the phrase passes to Choir I and builds to a tutti beginning in measure 156. At the conclusion of the opening section, mm. 159-62, Victoria heavily reduces Bassus I to double Bassus II, which removes the problematic open fifth between basses on the downbeat of measure 160 (see Example 5-51, above). The composer alters other voices in this phrase as well: Cantus II is reduced in measure 160, and Altus I appropriates the cadential figure of Cantus III. Through this variety of alterations, Victoria not only provides a stronger bass line for the second half of the tutti, but also de-clutters the texture as it approaches the cadence point.

Some of the most complicated textures of the 1600a collection occur in *Missa Pro victoria*, which prompts the composer to seek creative solutions in order to render the choirs harmonically independent; these do not necessarily require re-arrangement of the existing Bassus I line or other voices, beyond basic simplification of the rhythm or melodic structure. For example, the Kyrie II and Agnus Dei feature the same problematic material: a staggered, descending triadic figure traded between Bassus I and Bassus II (Example 5-58; see also Missa
*Pro victoria*, Kyrie, mm. 36-41, and Agnus Dei, mm. 16-21 and 25). The tenors are the lowest sounding voices at this point (each on F3), and thus, they temporarily function as the basses.

**Example 5-58. Arpeggiated Bass Figure: Missa Pro victoria, Kyrie, Tenor I, Bassus I, Left Hand of Organ, mm. 36-39.**

![Arpeggiated Bass Figure](image)

**Victoria’s Polychoral Technique: Assimilation of the Old into the New**

Many authors accept the 1600a repertoire as representative of Victoria’s so-called “late” style. Differences between the composer’s early and late polychoral style are difficult to parse, since a number of characteristics apply to much of the collection. First, elements of contrast pervade Victoria’s style, polychoral technique notwithstanding; for instance, textural diversity arises repeatedly. Victoria nearly always features imitative polyphony and homophonic scoring in the same work, as well as alternations between single choirs and *tutti* writing. Sometimes exchanges between choirs occur at the verse or half verse; for example, he employs this procedure in the Magnificats. One typical technique he utilizes for smaller sections within a piece is a gradual truncation of successive *alternatim* statements. A single choir begins the section with a relatively long phrase, which is passed to the opposing choir at a brief exchange
point; the subsequent phrases tend to condense in length until rapid-fire alternatim occurs, frequently on a single word. Examples from early works include the Gloria Patri of Dixit Dominus (mm. 101-19) and the second verse of Laudate pueri (mm. 20-36). Instances of gradual tutti building in pieces new to 1600a include the “Fecit potentiam” verse of the Magnificat sexti toni (mm. 78-90) and the first section of O Ildephonse (mm. 1-14).

In some cases Victoria bypasses the use of fragmented segments in favor of turning directly from longer phrases exchanged between choirs to entries that suddenly overlap into a grand superimposition of material: an unexpected transition to tutti. One early example is the opening of the Letaniae de Beata Virgine. The choirs regularly trade phrases with minimal overlap until “miserere nobis” (mm. 31-35); Choir I enters first, then Choir II responds almost immediately, and the result is the first thick, polyphonic tutti of the work. A similar, but more expansive, early example is the opening of Dixit Dominus (mm. 1-36). This structure occurs less often in pieces new to the 1600a collection; however, one example arises in the third verse of Veni, sancte Spiritus (mm. 24-34). Choir I declaims the first line of the verse, then Choir II performs the second. The third line commences first in Choir I, followed by a nearly immediate repetition by Choir II.

The vast majority of the reprinted works were first published in the composer’s early publications (1572, 1576, 1581, and 1583); the newest of the “older” pieces are Lauda Sion (1585) and Missa Salve Regina (1592). Victoria employs substantial variety in texture even in the early works, and many of those decisions were dependent upon the liturgical purpose of the work, the structure of the text, or the amount of text covered. As one might expect, the Kyrie, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei movements of all of the masses feature highly polyphonic textures and
more repetition of text, even though they are new; the Glorias and Credos tend toward homophonic and syllabic text setting due to the verbosity of the text.

Three out of the four Marian antiphons feature pervasive, through-composed polyphony. *Salve Regina* contains a substantial number of single-choir sections and more regularly employs homophonic antiphony (Table 5-12); much of the scoring involves segmentation of the text in polyphonic exchanges rather than exchanges of full lines. *Alma redemptoris mater* and *Regina caeli* do not contain large portions of text confined to a single choir, and *Ave Regina caelorum* includes only three lines declaimed by a single choir (Tables 5-13 through 5-15). The repetitive features of *Regina caeli*’s form will be addressed in more detail below.

Table 5-12. *Salve Regina*: Layout of Text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Layout</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-18</td>
<td><em>Salve Regina, mater misericordiae:</em></td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Imitative pairs at opening: AI/CII, BI/CI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-37</td>
<td><em>Vita dulcedo, et spes nostra, salve.</em></td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Inexact imitative pairs open with similar material to first section: AII/TI, CIII/BII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-54</td>
<td><em>Ad te clamamus exsules filii Evae.</em></td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Similar structure as previous sections, though one pair commences section in tandem (AI/BI); CII/CI also paired at opening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-78</td>
<td><em>Ad te suspiramus, gementes et flentes in hac lacrimarum vale.</em></td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Similar structure as previous section; CIII begins, AII/TI enter together, BII enters last.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-116</td>
<td>*Eia, ergo,</td>
<td>advocata nostra,</td>
<td>illos tuos misericordes oculos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117-50</td>
<td><em>Et Jesum, beneditum fructum ventris tui, nobis post hoc exilium ostende.</em></td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Employment of imitative pairs reminiscent of first two sections: CI/AI vs. BI/CII; pairing consistent throughout section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-203</td>
<td>*O clemens,</td>
<td>O pia,</td>
<td>O dulcis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

68 A “clean” homophonic exchange is one where all voices of the exiting choir cut off simultaneously; the voices of the second choir enter simultaneously, and there is very little overlap between choirs at the exchange point.
Table 5-13. *Alma redemptoris mater*: Layout of Text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>Redemptoris Mater,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Porta manes,</td>
<td>et stella maris,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-46</td>
<td>Surgere qui curat populo:</td>
<td>Closely overlapped statements produce florid <em>tutti</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-52</td>
<td><em>Seconda pars</em>: Tu</td>
<td>quae genuisti,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-67</td>
<td>Natura mirante,</td>
<td>tuum sanctum Genitorem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-85</td>
<td>Virgo prius</td>
<td>ac posterius,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-111</td>
<td>Sumens illud Ave,</td>
<td>peccatorum miserere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-14. *Regina caeli, laetare*: Layout of Text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Refrain 1</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>Regina caeli</td>
<td>laetare,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Refrain 2</td>
<td>12-23</td>
<td>Alleluia.</td>
<td>Longer, polyphonic phrases in antiphony that close <em>tutti</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23-38</td>
<td>Quia quem meruisti portare,</td>
<td>Full statement by Choir I, then Choir II; returns to Choir I with brief <em>tutti</em> on “portare.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38-55</td>
<td>Alleluia.</td>
<td>Multitude of quick, homophonic exchanges concluding in <em>tutti</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>56-76</td>
<td><em>Seconda pars</em>: Resurrexit, sicut dixit,</td>
<td><strong>Statement 1</strong>: Choir I and Cantus III; <strong>Statement 2</strong>: Choir II; <strong>Statement 3</strong>: concise, homophonic <em>tutti</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Refrain 3</td>
<td>76-86</td>
<td>Alleluia.</td>
<td>Sylvestris similar to Refrain 1: simple imitative texture in long phrases, beginning with Choir II; no <em>tutti</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>86-108</td>
<td>Ora pro nobis Deum,</td>
<td>Long phrases as in the previous refrain; exchanges between Choir II, then Choir I twice, then layered final <em>tutti</em> statement of full line of text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>109-26</td>
<td>Alleluia.</td>
<td>Same material as Refrain 2; diverges at m. 122 into more expansive <em>tutti</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-15. *Ave Regina caelorum*: Layout of Text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Layout</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td><em>Ave Regina caelorum,</em></td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Pairs in inexact imitation (CI/TI vs. AI/BI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-18</td>
<td><em>Ave, Domina Angelorum:</em></td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Variation on first section; pairs follow the same pattern as Choir I (CII/TII vs. AII/BII).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-24</td>
<td><em>Salve, radix sancta,</em></td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Single “Salve” by Choir II echoes Choir I statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-37</td>
<td>*Ex qua mundo</td>
<td>lux est orta:*</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-50</td>
<td><em>Seconda pars:</em> Gaude, gaude gloriosa,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-56</td>
<td><em>Super omnes speciosa,</em></td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-69</td>
<td>*Vale,</td>
<td>valde decora,*</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-89</td>
<td>*Et pro nobis</td>
<td>semper Christum exora.*</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly to *Salve Regina*, the psalms tend toward clean textural blocks that Victoria transfers from one voice to another with little overlap at exchange points; he also sets the text concisely and with less repetition than the antiphons. This economical treatment is unsurprising, given the fact that each Vespers service includes five psalms. Though the composer assigns a number of half-verses, and fewer full verses, to a single choir, he occasionally scores small portions of a section *tutti*, particularly at closing cadences. *Laudate pueri Dominum* and *Laetatus sum* contain the highest number of full verses assigned to a single choir, with five each (Tables 5-16 and 5-17). Three of the six verses of *Nisi Dominus* are scored for single choir; Choir I declaims Verse 3, while Choir II performs Verses 4 and 5 without any division between the two (Table 5-18). Victoria only scores one full verse of *Dixit Dominus* for one choir, although a single choir declaims a number of half-verses (Table 5-19). *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes*
features textures similar to those in the more aggressively polyphonic of the antiphons, likely due
to the brevity of the text. Victoria’s setting of this psalm contains pervasive use of the full choir
and fragments in antiphony, as no full verse or half-verse is scored for a single choir (Table 5-
20). Thus, the composer’s treatment of the psalms is far from homogenous, apart from the
Doxologies of the eight-voice settings: all include effective use of silence immediately preceding
the Doxology, and all are constructed in a similar style.

Table 5-16. Laudate pueri Dominum: Polychoral Layout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Laudate pueri Dominum:</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>laudate nomen Domini.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9-14</td>
<td>Sit nomen Domini benedictum,</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>ex hoc nunc, et usque in saeculum.</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>A solis ortu usque ad occasum,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>29-36</td>
<td>laudabile</td>
<td>nomen Domini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37-42</td>
<td>Excelsus super omnes gentes Dominus,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>42-48</td>
<td>et super caelos gloria ejus.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>49-57</td>
<td>Quis sicut Dominus Deus noster, qui in altis habitat,</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>et humilia respicit in caelo et in terra?</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>66-74</td>
<td>Suscitans a terra inopem:</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td></td>
<td>et de stercore</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>erigens pauperem:</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>73-77</td>
<td>Ut collocet eum cum principibus,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>77-82</td>
<td>cum principibus populi sui.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>82-87</td>
<td>Qui habitare facit sterrilem in domo:</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>86-98</td>
<td>matrem filiorum laetantem.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[repetition of half-verse]</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dox.</td>
<td>99-105</td>
<td>Gloria Patri, et Filio,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105-15</td>
<td>et Spiritui Sancto.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115-22</td>
<td>Sicut erat</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in principio, et nunc, et semper,</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122-38</td>
<td>et in saecula</td>
<td>saeculorum. Amen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-17. *Laetatus sum*: Polychoral Layout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>Laetatus sum in his quae dicta sunt mihi:</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>8-18</td>
<td>in domum Domini ibimus.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>Stantes errant pedes nostrì,</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>22-28</td>
<td>in atriis tuis Jerusalem.</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29-33</td>
<td>Jerusalem, quae aedificatur ut cìvitas:</td>
<td>Choir III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>34-41</td>
<td>cujus participatio ejus in idipsum.</td>
<td>Choir III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42-53</td>
<td>Illuc enim ascenderunt</td>
<td>tribus, tribus Domini:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>53-63</td>
<td>testimonium Israel</td>
<td>ad confìtendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>63-71</td>
<td>Quia illic sederunt</td>
<td>[&quot;sederunt&quot; repetition] sedes in judicio,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>70-88</td>
<td>sedes super domum David.</td>
<td>Choir I Choir II Choir III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>89-95</td>
<td>Rogate quae ad pacem sunt Jerusalem:</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>95-101</td>
<td>et abundantìa diligèntìbus te.</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>102-07</td>
<td>Fiat pax</td>
<td>in virtute tua:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>107-12</td>
<td>et abundantìa in turribìs tuìs.</td>
<td>Choir III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>111-16</td>
<td>Propter fratries meos et proxìmos meos,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>116-20</td>
<td>loquebar pacem de te:</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>119-24</td>
<td>Propter domus Domini Dei nostri:</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>124-33</td>
<td>quæsivi bona tìbi.</td>
<td>Choir I Choir II Choir III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dox.</td>
<td>133-36</td>
<td>Gloria Patri, et Filìo,</td>
<td>Choir III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136-42</td>
<td>et Spiritùi Sancto.</td>
<td>Choir I Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142-50</td>
<td>Sicut erat</td>
<td>in principìo,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-18. *Nisi Dominus*: Polychoral Layout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Nisi Dominus aedificaverit domum,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>6-13</td>
<td>in vanum</td>
<td>laboraverunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>Nisi Dominus custodierit civitatem,</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>17-27</td>
<td>frustra vigilat</td>
<td>qui custodit eam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28-35</td>
<td>Vanum est vosìs ante lucem surgere:</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>surgite postquam sederìtis, qui manucaìtis panem dolorìs.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>Cum dederit dilectis suis somnum:</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>ecce haereditas Domini, filìi: merces, fructus ventris.</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>58-64</td>
<td>Sicut sagittae in manu potentes:</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>64-69</td>
<td>ita filìi excussorum.</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>70-83</td>
<td>Beatus vir</td>
<td>qui implevit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>83-105</td>
<td>non confundetur</td>
<td>cum loquetur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dox.</td>
<td>106-12</td>
<td>Gloria Patri, et Filìo,</td>
<td>Choir I Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112-16</td>
<td>et Spiritùi Sancto.</td>
<td>Choir I Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116-27</td>
<td>Sicut erat</td>
<td>in principìo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127-42</td>
<td>et in saecula,</td>
<td>saeculorum. Amen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-19. *Dixit Dominus*: Polychoral Layout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Dixit Dominus Domino meo:</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>Sede a dextris meis.</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Donec ponam inimicos tuos,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>scabellum pedum tuorum.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>Virgam virtutis tuae emittet Dominus ex Sion:</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>27-36</td>
<td>dominare in medio inimicorum tuorum.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Tecum principium in die virtutis tuae</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>44-49</td>
<td>ex utero</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48-55</td>
<td>Juravit Dominus, et non paenitebit eum:</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>53-63</td>
<td>Tu es sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech.</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>62-70</td>
<td>Dominus a dextris tuis,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>69-76</td>
<td>confregit in die irae suae reges.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>74-82</td>
<td>Judicabit in nationibus.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>82-89</td>
<td>conquassabit capita in terra multorum.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>88-94</td>
<td>De torrente</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>94-100</td>
<td>propertia</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dox.</td>
<td>101-07</td>
<td>Gloria Patri, et Filio,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107-19</td>
<td>et Spiritui Sancto.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119-33</td>
<td>Sicut erat</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131-48</td>
<td>et in saecula,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-20. *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes*: Polychoral Layout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Layout</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>Laudate Dominum</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Full statement of half-verse by Choir I; short <em>tutti</em> layering of Segment 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>eum, omnes populi.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Nearly exact repetition of material/procedure of first half-verse; entry of choirs reversed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13-26</td>
<td>Quoniam confirmata est super nos</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td><strong>Segment 1</strong>: Choir I; <strong>Segment 2</strong>: stated first by Choir II, then repeated by Choir I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>25-47</td>
<td>et veritas Domini</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Full statement of half-verse by Choir II, then Choir I, and again by Choir II; <strong>Segment 2</strong>: entry by Choir I repeated identically by Choir II, then layered into <em>tutti</em> repetition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dox.</td>
<td>48-56</td>
<td>Gloria Patri, et Filio,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Exact restatement of phrase by Choir II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-68</td>
<td>et Spiritui Sancto.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Exact restatement by Choir II; subsequent repetitions are loosely layered for <em>tutti</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68-82</td>
<td>Sicut erat</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td><strong>Segment 1</strong>: exact repetition by Choir I; <strong>Segment 3</strong>: nearly identical repetition by Choir I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81-98</td>
<td>et in saecula,</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td><strong>Segment 1</strong>: exact repetition by Choir I; <strong>Segment 2</strong>: first statements in exact repetition (Choir II, Choir I), subsequent closely layered, more independence of voices (<em>tutti</em>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the ideals of Roman polychoral style was to score for completely independent choirs; most of Victoria’s polychoral scoring in 1600a reflects his desire to reinforce this concept, particularly through doubling the roots of chords in both Bassus parts. Occasionally bass lines necessitate re-scoring in the organ part in order to reinforce choral independence, something that is not necessarily exclusive to the early works. A substantial proportion of the re-scoring in the organ part is confined to the reprinted pieces, but most of it does not radically alter the character of the music.

*Ave Maria and Dic nobis Maria: A Case Study in Emerging and Mature Procedure*

Two contrasting works that represent the extreme boundaries of the composer’s compositional activity, yet happen to appear in the 1600a collection, allow for an exploration of techniques common across Victoria’s polychoral output: *Ave Maria*, his earliest eight-voice work (1572), and *Dic nobis Maria*, arguably the most modern of the new pieces. *Ave Maria* represents the shadowy, gray areas inherent to any emerging style; the work contains a large quantity of imitative scoring that allows for the blurring of boundaries between choirs at *tutti* and exchange points between choirs. Victoria extensively accesses a variety of polychoral groupings across choirs, rather than maintaining rigid divisions, which necessitated creative solutions when he fitted the work with an organ score. The form of *Ave Maria* is dictated by brief segments of text and sections freely overlap, again contributing to a sense of ambiguity.

*Dic nobis Maria* stands in stark contrast to *Ave Maria*, as it is almost entirely homophonic. This is indicative of broader changes associated with early Baroque style; composers began to emphasize clearer textures and harmonic motion more frequently than complex linear constructions. The choirs remain rigidly separate and only briefly overlap at
exchange points, and the only true *tutti* are extremely concise. The form is far more clear-cut than *Ave Maria*’s: the a8 section “Dic nobis” serves as a refrain between verses, all of which are performed by Choir I and organ. In this case, Victoria maintains strict adherence to bass doubling rules and finds no reason to make any changes to the written Choir I parts when transferring them to the organ score.

*Harmonic Palette, Ranges, Clef Schemes*

*Ave Maria* and *Dic nobis Maria* are each scored for two, four-part choirs in G Dorian. Beyond these basic elements, the details of scoring diverge: Victoria writes *Ave Maria* for balanced CATB choirs in the standard clef combination (C₁C₃C₄F₄), but *Dic nobis* features scoring for high and low choirs (CCAT//CATB) in *chiavette* (G₂G₂C₁C₃//G₂C₂C₃C₄), a scoring typical of Iberian polyphonic style. Most of the voices in both pieces occupy a range of approximately an octave, apart from the Bassus I and II in *Ave Maria*; like many Bassus parts in the collection, these extend to approximately an octave and a half in range (Examples 5-59 and 5-60). Voices in Choir I of *Ave Maria* occupy virtually the same range as their counterparts in Choir II. Of the voices in *Dic nobis Maria*, the anomalous ranges are Cantus I and Altus I; Cantus I reaches a perfect fifth, while Altus I extends to a diminished fifth. The tessitura of *Dic nobis Maria* is considerably higher than *Ave Maria*, but due to the *chiavette* cleffings, the piece may have been transposed down a fourth for performance, and thus probably occupies a similar range as *Ave Maria*.

**Example 5-59. Ave Maria: Ranges (C1-AI-TI-BI//CII-AII-TII-BII).**
The harmonic palettes in *Ave Maria* and *Dic nobis Maria* are surprisingly similar, given the expanse of thirty years between compositions (Table 5-21). Victoria expresses a strong preference for major triads in both, though *Dic nobis* sounds more “major” than *Ave Maria*, partly due to their contrasting reliance on G major and g minor triads, respectively. The second most common sonority in *Ave Maria* is D major; since the work is in transposed Mode 1, this is unsurprising. *Dic nobis Maria* also contains numerous D major triads, though there is a stronger preference for the C triads. Both works access the C minor triad more frequently than C major. *Ave Maria* features alternation between F major and B♭ major triads far more often than *Dic nobis* as well.

**Table 5-21. Sonorities Found in *Ave Maria* and *Dic nobis Maria*.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sonority</th>
<th>Ave Maria</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Dic nobis Maria</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G; g</td>
<td>G: 11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>G: 22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D; d</td>
<td>D: 30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>D: 21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C; c</td>
<td>C: 10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>C: 11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A; a</td>
<td>A: 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A: 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[F♯o]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, M; m</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage, M; m</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^69 This total includes three instances of ambiguity in which an open fifth occurs between G and D.
The harmonies in *Dic nobis* sound almost bland in comparison to *Ave Maria*, as Victoria eschews non-chord tones almost entirely and thus avoids most dissonance, whereas *Ave Maria* overflows with suspensions and other decorations. He particularly seems to favor the 4-3 suspension, as is prevalent in the Cantus I and II lines, mm. 20-26 (Example 5-61).

**Example 5-61. 4-3 Suspensions in *Ave Maria*, mm. 20-26: Organ Reduction, Choirs I and II.**

Root movement in both works tends to occur most frequently by fourth or fifth and by step; triads appear in root position most of the time. *Dic nobis Maria* commonly features root movement around the circle of fifths. An example is at the phrase “tu nobis victor Rex, miserere” toward the end of the final verse (mm. 37-43). Extended passages employing only movement around the circle of fifths do not appear in *Ave Maria*. There are a number of instances of root movement by third in *Dic nobis Maria*, but the phenomenon is more common in *Ave Maria*. For instance, it occurs in the harmonic pattern in measures 59-63 of the latter, which is repeated in measures 63-67 (g – D – B♭ – F – G – c – D – g/G). *Ave Maria* also features more root movement by minor third; the progression E♭ major to C minor occurs in Example 5-61 above. Victoria tends to mix major and minor sonorities quite freely, which results in striking cross relations, such as the opening of *Dic nobis Maria* (Example 5-62). Choir II’s first statement proceeds as follows: g – B♭ – F – G – c – g. Victoria commences with root movement by third, then down a fourth, and by step. He then inserts a single, tangentially related chord between...
statements of the major and minor versions of triads that share a root (G). The progression is repeated when Choir I enters (mm. 3-5), but the final sonority is D major, presenting a second instance of cross relation. Another example of creative mixture of chord qualities involves the composer’s use of the F♯ diminished triad. The D – C – f♯6 – g – D progression appears in Choir II of Ave Maria (mm. 41-43), then Choir I repeats the gesture (mm. 43-44). A similar procedure occurs in Dic nobis, mm. 35-37 (B – c – f♯6 – G – c – D).

Example 5-62. Dic nobis Maria, mm. 1-5.

Ave Maria

Ave Maria (Appendix E, pp. 882-96) is by far the most complex reworking of an older piece, and thus warrants extended examination; it contains embryonic elements of what became Victoria’s standard polychoral procedure. This is the only work in 1600a that originally appeared
in the composer’s 1572 publication, and the only eight-voice piece in the first print. Unlike most of the other eight-voice pieces, *Ave Maria* contains numerous passages in which voices are mixed freely between choirs in an exploration of texture and timbre, and the alterations he applies to the organ score are unusual, because he extensively doubles all eight voices and provides solutions to Bassus doubling problems inherent in the early Roman style.

The form of *Ave Maria* consists of discrete sections based upon each line of text; the work is essentially through-composed, which Victoria exploits by varying the treatment of each line (Table 5-22). Phrase lengths vary, as do the manner in which the composer divides the choir into antiphonal groups and the way in which he applies polychoral technique to those groupings.

### Table 5-22. *Ave Maria*: Polychoral Layout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Phrase Division</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1-16</td>
<td>Ave Maria,</td>
<td>gratia plena:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>16-26</td>
<td>Benedicta tu</td>
<td>in mulieribus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>26-41</td>
<td>Et benedictus</td>
<td>fructus ventris tui,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>41-58</td>
<td>Sancta Maria,</td>
<td>Regina caeli,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>59-72</td>
<td>Ora pro nobis peccatoribus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>72-93</td>
<td>Ut cum electis</td>
<td>te videamus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ave Maria begins in a manner common to many of Victoria’s polychoral works: Choir I presents the initial phrase in an expansive fashion, with melismatic figures in Cantus I and Altus I during the second half of the phrase, then the material is transferred to Choir II in nearly an exact repetition (Example 5-63). The exchange point in measure 5 contains the first major alteration between Choir I and the organ book: Bassus I began the cadence on a D, the fifth of the G minor triad, and this pitch is replaced by the root, which is Bassus II’s starting pitch. This doubling, in a sense, would drown out the 6/4 inversion present in Choir I, particularly if the singers stood near the organ. At the same point (m. 5), Tenor I has a rest in the vocal score; Victoria fills the space with the G from Tenor II’s entry. The Choir II cadence is divided between pairs of voices: Tenor II and Bassus II complete the phrase in measure 8, while Cantus II and Altus II finish a measure later, overlapping with entries by the Choir I voices.

Example 5-63. Ave Maria, mm. 1-5.
The polychoral division loosens further on the phrase “gratia plena” (Segment 2: Example 5-64); Choir I’s entries are staggered so that Altus I enters earlier than the rest (m. 8), Cantus I enters late (m. 9, beat 2), and Tenor I and Bassus II arrive as a homophonic pair (downbeat of m. 9). In later works, exchange points between choirs typically overlap between Bassus voices, and generally on the root of the chord; in this case, the exchange between basses does not overlap at all. Altus II hands the root of the G minor triad to Bassus I. This delayed by Bassus I avoids a fourth between basses, as the Choir II cadence in the previous measure is on D.

Example 5-64. Ave Maria, mm. 8-11.

At the end of the Choir I statement of “gratia plena,” Victoria proceeds similarly to the first exchange point (m. 5): Altus I has a rest on the cadence in measure 11, so he simply extends the D from the previous measure to ensure a clean cutoff for the entire choir and to partially fill out the chord, as all of the other voices end the phrase on G. Choir II’s next entry slightly
overlaps with Choir I’s exit as expected, and their phrase essentially restates Choir I’s “gratia plena,” including analogous staggering of entries. However, the exit is far less precise: the subsequent phrase, “Dominus tecum,” includes the first tutti of the piece (mm. 12-16).

Victoria arrives at the first tutti of the work through a procedure present throughout the entire 1600a collection: opening sections typically commence with a relatively long and polyphonic (or quasi-polyphonic) statement by one choir. The phrase is either repeated or extended by a similar statement by the other choir, and the two briefly overlap. The musical material and text may or may not be repeated; in Ave Maria the composer frequently repeats text and occasionally recycles music. The process typically repeats itself for a second exchange of phrases between choirs, and usually the second segment is more concise, as it does here; the process continues to subtly build into a tutti, as statements become shorter and more closely layered between choirs, as occurs in Segments 2 and 3 of Section A.

In most of Victoria’s tutti the Bassus parts retain the triadic roots; however, Section A exhibits some contrapuntal decisions Vicentino and Zarlino would have deemed questionable for polychoral scoring (Example 5-65). First, Bassus I, measure 13, begins with a root doubling (G); then, during the second half of the measure, the voice leaps down to E and back up to G, while Bassus II proceeds to the root of the next chord (C). This not only results in a weaker third between basses, but a 6/4 inversion for Choir I on the last beat of the measure. To remedy this Victoria chooses to double the C in the organ part, rather than the written Bassus I pitches. He retains the descending run in measure 14, and the two chordal roots in measure 15. The downbeat of this measure is a good example of a technique Victoria employs with some frequency in later works to deal with root movement by third: he delays Bassus II’s move to the root (G) by leaping from the third above, the root of the previous sonority (B♭).
Texturally, the *tutti* at the close of Section A is similar to many in Victoria’s output, as the voices remain relatively independent. Sometimes pairs or trios of voices move roughly in tandem (i.e., Altus I and Bassus I, mm. 13-15, or Cantus II, Altus II, and Bassus II), but their placement is always staggered to create the illusion of complex polyphony. The phrase does not conclude cleanly, a trait that is ubiquitous in much of Victoria’s output beyond polychoral *tutti*. He frequently allows one or two voices in the single-choir texture to enter or exit early or late, another technique that creates the illusion of polyphonic movement in textures that are otherwise relatively homophonic, as in *O Ildephonse*, mm. 34-37 (Example 5-66).
The Section A *tutti* overlaps seamlessly with the beginning of Section B (Example 5-67), which commences with Choir I’s statement of Segment 1 ("benedicta tu,” mm. 16-18); the segment moves to Choir II in measure 18. At this point, the blocks of material for each choir become more clearly homophonic, though this is the point at which the divisions between choirs begin to dissolve. Bassus II anticipates the entry of the rest of Choir II by imitating the downward-fifth motion of Bassus I, and Altus II and Tenor II complete the phrase in alignment with Bassus II. Cantus II weaves a tight and more rapid decorative line, which extends into the continuation of the phrase, “in mulieribus” (Segment 2), taken up by the top three voices of Choir I, who enter and exit in a staggered manner; the Segment 2 material is seamlessly transferred to a new opposing aggregate of voices, albeit in embellished form and with the addition of a bass line (mm. 22–24). Cantus II remains the topmost active voice and retains the melodic line initially presented in Cantus I, while the other roles are filled by Altus II, Tenor II, and Bassus I. The same material appears in exact repetition in Cantus I, Altus I, Tenor I, and Bassus II in measures 24–26. The lowest sounding voices double the root of the chord at every exchange point, regardless of the current voice combination.
Since the scoring of Section B involves choral mixture, Victoria’s adaptation for the organ accompaniment diverges from his relatively standard approach of doubling Choir I. The composer condenses the disparate eight-part texture into four-part keyboard writing by alternating between Cantus I and II, Altus I and II, Tenor I and II, and Bassus I and II, depending upon which voice is active. At the opening of Segment 2, “in mulieribus,” the organ texture omits Cantus II but doubles the upper three voices of Choir I. Cantus II joins when Cantus I exits in measure 22. Victoria maintains a four-voice texture throughout the section, though he occasionally subdivides entry or exit notes in order to render the transition between one voice and its counterpart in the other choir seamless; for instance, the connection between tenors in measure 22 and again in measure 24 (Example 5-67, above).

Victoria preserves the CI/AI/TI/BII versus CII/AII/TII/BI opposition at the beginning of Section C (mm. 26-32: Example 5-68), but the divide between relatively homophonic blocks of
voices quickly dissolves into independent, imitative statements in all voices. In mm. 28-32 the organ part returns to primarily doubling Choir I; however, Bassus II prevails in measures 28 and 30-32, in order to reinforce root movement. The bass line of the organ score includes the D from Bassus I on the downbeat of measure 28, which sounds against the triadic third in Bassus II. The bass subsequently leaps downward to double the root drawn from Bassus II. The composer does not provide a true tutti cadence at the end of Segment 1, as the text statement is incomplete. A cadence occurs between AI, TI, TII, and BII in measure 32, as Cantus I, Bassus I, Cantus II, and Altus II complete the phrase with Segment 2, “fructus ventris tui,” which is initially stated in a clean, animated block of homophony; the Segment 2 text repeats through measure 39. The organ book only doubles three voices of the statement by the first aggregate of voices; Victoria temporarily omits Cantus II, which parallels the texture at the opening of the “in mulieribus” segment at the end of Section B.

The second statement of Segment 2 overlaps slightly with the first, and mimics the homophonic texture of the former, though Tenor II slightly anticipates the entrance in order to enliven the texture (mm. 33-36; see Example 5-69 below). This time, Victoria omits Tenor II from the organ book, which reinforces the homophonic nature of the rest of its respective block of voices. The third and final statement of “fructus ventris tui” overlaps with the second group’s declamation; individual voices from across the choirs enter in polyphony, then the composer extended the line to a tutti climax on “Jesus,” certainly an attention-grabbing device (Segment 3, mm. 39-41; see Example 5-69, below). In the final statement, the organ initially doubles Bassus I, then switches to Bassus II in measures 40-41; this minimizes the impact of the otherwise prevailing second inversion chord in Choir I, as occurred at the opening of the piece.
Example 5-68. *Ave Maria*, mm. 26-32.

Example 5-69. *Ave Maria*, mm. 32-41.
The scoring again decreases in intensity at the opening of Section D; much of Segments 1 and 2, “Sancta Maria, Regina caeli” (mm. 41-52), is rigidly homophonic and the cleanest polychoral scoring to appear in the work thus far. Choir II commences the exchanges with a terse statement of “Sancta Maria” (mm. 41-44; Example 5-70), repeated verbatim by Choir I, and the same process occurs on the text “Regina caeli,” beginning in m. 44. The text setting of “Regina caeli,” however, is more expansive; the penultimate syllable is decorated in every voice except the Altus. Throughout this section, the basses exchange material as expected in “good” polychoral procedure.

Example 5-70. *Ave Maria*, mm. 41-44.

The boundary between choirs breaks down again at the third iteration of Segment 2, “Regina caeli” (mm. 49-52), which appears in Cantus I, Cantus II, Altus II, and Tenor II (Example 5-71); Cantus I proceeds without a break after the Choir I statement that concludes in
m. 49, much like the Cantus II at the initial dissolution of the choral division (mm. 20-22). The organ score omits Cantus II, but Victoria blends the Cantus II cadential figure with the end of the Altus II line, albeit an octave lower (mm. 51-52). The remaining voices, apart from Bassus I (Altus I, Tenor I, Cantus II, and Bassus II), continue with a concise, syllabic “dulcis et pia,” which is restated exactly by the opposing voices (Segment 3, mm. 52-55), and the process is repeated to complete the section with *alternatim* statements of Segment 4, “O Mater Dei” (mm. 55-58; see Example 5-71). Victoria employs the same solution in the organ part as in the previous sections that close in mixed choral scoring: the organ texture remains a4 through the connection of alternating Cantus I and II, Altus I and II, Tenor I and II, and Bassus I and II statements. At most exchanges, the Bassus voices double the root, though there is one instance of a third (m. 53); however, the third appears in Bassus II, and its impact is softened by the fact that the organ doubles the root.

**Example 5-71. Ave Maria, mm. 49-58.**

![Example 5-71. Ave Maria, mm. 49-58.](image-url)
Section E is the only section Victoria sets in triple meter (“Ora pro nobis peccatoribus;” see Example 5-72). This section is highly syllabic and homophonic, although the voices retain the same unusual division from Section D; the organ doublings follow an identical procedure as well. The phrase lengths extend to include the entire line of text, which is in contrast to the rate at which the previous statements proceed, but the structure of repetition remains the same: the phrase declaimed by the first aggregate slightly overlaps with the restatement by the opposing group, then the third statement is tutti. This tutti is highly unusual, as Victoria inserted a brief rest in all voices prior to the statement (m. 67) and the tutti is homorhythmic. During the final phrase, the organ bass line leaps indiscriminately between Bassus I and Bassus II, depending upon the location of the root; Bassus I frequently contains the fifth or third. The only exception is at the cadence, where the organ retains the D from Bassus I, rather than doubling the root (G).

Example 5-72. Ave Maria, mm. 59-71.
The final “Ora pro nobis peccatoribus” transitions immediately into the final section, “Ut cum electis te videamus,” in measure 72 (Example 5-73). Victoria introduces a fresh re-arrangement of voices in Section F: for the initial volleys of “Ut cum electis” (Segment 1) and the first statement of “te videamus” (Segment 2), the choirs retain most of their proper members, but the Altus parts are swapped (mm. 72-77). Both segments of text are presented in a predominantly homophonic manner, and the basses exchange roots appropriately. The organ doubles a4 according to which voices are active, apart from the second statement of Segment 2, beginning with Cantus II in measure 77; Victoria only doubles Altus I and Bassus II in anticipation of staggered entries to the *tutti* statement of Segment 1 that commences in Cantus I (mm. 78-82). The organ part doubles Choir I for the duration of the *tutti*, albeit in slightly simplified form. Bassus I provides the most secure root movement, as Bassus II contains thirds, fifths, and a downward run. The only point at which Bassus I appears slightly altered in the organ book is measure 81: the voice part delays movement to the root in comparison with Bassus II, so Victoria amends the organ bass to reach G at the same instant as Bassus II.

The *tutti* statement of Segment 1 proceeds directly into a varied restatement of Segment 2 by the Choir II/Altus I group (mm. 82-84), and the only voices doubled by organ in this instance are Altus I and Bassus II. Rather than responding with the same segment of text, the opposite group (Choir I/Altus II) launches the entire ensemble into the final *tutti*, “ut cum electis, ut cum electis, te videamus, te videamus” (mm. 83-93; Example 5-74). Throughout the closing section Cantus I, Altus II, and Bassus II move at roughly the same rate and are almost entirely doubled by organ; Victoria avoids the more florid Bassus I in the organ part, as thirds and fifths abound. The sole instance at which the Bassus I pitch is doubled to reinforce a root is the G in measure 91. The Altus doubling deviates in measure 90 in order to transition between Altus II and Altus I.
via stepwise motion; the composer retains Altus I in the organ part for measure 91 and the first half of measure 92, but he revoices the final Altus pitches to include the B♮ from Cantus II (8vb), which would otherwise be omitted from the organ part. The Tenor line of the organ book also freely mixes Tenors I and II in simplified form due to doubling requirements.

Example 5-73. *Ave Maria*, mm. 72-82.

Example 5-74. *Ave Maria*, mm. 83-93.
At the far end of the stylistic spectrum lies *Dic nobis Maria*, Victoria’s adaptation of a portion of the *Victimae paschali laudes* sequence for Easter Sunday. The form of the work is far more coherent than *Ave Maria*; rather than relying upon phrase-by-phrase interpolation of the text in the manner of Josquin and his contemporaries, Victoria chooses to set *Dic nobis Maria* in a format akin to the *ritornello* structure popular with composers of the emerging Baroque style (Table 5-23). The “Dic nobis” refrain is homophonic and syllabic, almost to extremes; the subsequent verse sections invariably follow suit. The refrain is in triple meter, as are portions of the intervening verses (i.e., “Sepulchrum Christi,” mm. 15-19, and the entire conclusion, “Scimus Christum” a8). *Dic nobis* is also remarkable because the organ scoring never deviates from what is written for Choir I. The Bassus voices invariably double each other at the octave or unison at exchange points and in *tutti*; thus, Victoria was not obliged to seek doubling solutions for the organ part.

**Table 5-23. *Dic nobis Maria*: Polychoral Layout.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refrain</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>Dic nobis Maria, quem vidisti in via?</td>
<td>Choir I Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse 1</td>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>Sepulcrum Christi viventis: et gloriam vidi resurgentis.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrain</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>Dic nobis Maria, quem vidisti in via?</td>
<td>Choir I Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse 2</td>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>Angelicos testes, sudarium et vestes.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrain</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>Dic nobis Maria, quem vidisti in via?</td>
<td>Choir I Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td>24-28</td>
<td>Surrrexit Christus spes mea: praevos in Galilaeam.</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrain</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>Dic nobis Maria, quem vidisti in via?</td>
<td>Choir I Choir II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse 4</td>
<td>29-52</td>
<td>Scimus Christum surrexisse a mortuis vere; tu nobis victor Rex, miserere. Alleluia.</td>
<td>Choir I Choir II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The refrain commences as one might expect: the phrase is stated by Choir II (mm. 1-3), then passed at a brief exchange point to Choir II, although in slightly re-arranged form (mm. 3-5). This is one of a handful of Victoria works that feature choirs in contrasting tessituras; Choir I
is scored for a higher choir (CCAT), and Choir II is a standard grouping (CATB). The exchange continues with an alteration between Choir II and Choir I on “quid vidisti in via” (mm. 5-9). The refrain concludes with a fragmented restatement of the phrase, something Victoria returns to frequently at the ends of sections in other works: Choir II declaims “quid vidisti,” which is overlapped by the same statement in Choir I, albeit extended to include the rest of the text, to which Choir II joins (mm. 11-12).

“Dic nobis Maria” alternates with verses scored exclusively for Choir I and organ until the final verse. Contrary to many of the other single-choir sections in Victoria’s polychoral works, these are overwhelmingly homophonic, rather than imitative; even most of the pieces new to 1600a feature at least some independent polyphonic lines or imitative pairs (for example, the “Domine, Deus” section of Missa Alma redemptoris, Gloria, mm. 28ff, and Benedictus of Missa Ave Regina, Sanctus, mm. 37ff.). Examples of paired counterpoint in other works in the collection include the openings of most of the single-choir verses of both Magnificat settings and the first entries of Veni sancte Spiritus.

Dic nobis Maria concludes with an a8 scoring of the final verse, “Scimus Christum,” rather than with a final statement of the refrain. Verse 4 is in triple meter and features rapid-fire alternatim, beginning with Choir II’s opening “Scimus Christum,” transferred in transposed form to Choir I; the process repeats on the words “surrexise” and “a mortuis.” The pattern deviates at measure 35 when Choir II restates “a mortuis” and completes the phrase with “vere,” a simple and efficient means of changing the order in which the choirs declaim the text. Choir I begins the next volley with “tu nobis victor Rex” in measure 37, then Choir II immediately responds (m. 38), resulting in far greater overlap between choirs than earlier in the piece; compare the exchanges in mm. 1-6 (Example 5-75) with mm. 36-40 (Example 5-76). Declamation of
“miserere” follows in Choir I and Choir II in succession, then Choir I re-states “miserere” a third time, in order to reverse the order of entries again as Choir II commences the final section: a barrage of antiphonal Alleluias. The frenzy of motion ceases abruptly for a grand pause in measure 49, then both choirs combine forces for the concluding statement of “Alleluia,” one of the only true tutti in the piece; the other occurs in the last two measures of the refrain.

Example 5-75. *Dic nobis Maria*, mm. 1-6, Voices Only.

Example 5-76. *Dic nobis Maria*, mm. 36-40, Voices Only.
Victoria’s 1600a Style: Shades of Gray

Victoria’s usage of polyphonic technique and harmonic language in *Dic nobis Maria* is forward-thinking; however, this work is exceptional, as there are numerous examples of similar techniques employed to a lesser degree in works both old and new. Among the elements traditionally assigned to Victoria’s late style include circle of fifth harmonic movement, strict homophonic textures, and conciseness, the last of which certainly applies to the latest works in the composer’s *opera omnia*. To these elements should be added the proto-ritornello form exemplified in *Dic nobis*, as well as employment of contrast and chromaticism.

*Ecce nunc benedicite* is the only 1600a work to approach the style of *Dic nobis Maria*; thus, these are the only two works that could be considered true examples of an experimental “late” style in Victoria’s output. The piece features homophonic alternation between choirs with minimal overlap at most exchange points, sparing use of *tutti*, and the composer’s text setting is concise. *Ecce nunc benedicite* contains harmonic language similar to *Dic nobis Maria*, including root movement by third. Some of these result in colorful cross relations, such as the progression in mm. 57-58; note in particular the juxtaposition of the A major and B♭ major triads (Example 5-77). Victoria also sparingly employs the B diminished triad in a manner that parallels his use of the F♯ diminished triad in both *Ave Maria* and *Dic nobis Maria* (Example 5-78). In contrast, *Ecce nunc benedicite* does not conform to the quasi-ritornello structure of *Dic nobis Maria*, nor does the texture remain rigidly homophonic; non-harmonic tones such as neighbor notes and suspensions are present, but not as pervasive as in early works. Examples 5-77 and 5-78 contain non-chord tones typical of this piece.
Example 5-77. *Ecce nunc benedicite*, Choir I, mm. 57-58.

Example 5-78. *Ecce nunc benedicite*, Choir I, mm. 1-4.

The remainder of the 1600a collection exhibits the elements of Victoria’s “late” style to a lesser degree; they are present even in the early works. Brief examples occur in pieces as early as *Super flumina Babylonis* (1576); an example of root movement around the circle of fifths paired with strict homophony in rapid alternation occurs in mm. 20-24 on the word “suspendimus.” The harmonic rhythm proceeds at a relatively slow rate of one chord per measure. *Regina caeli* is another example from the same year that contains these same elements. Two of the Alleluia sections present swift homophonic alternation between choirs that exclusively features the triads F, B♭, and C major (mm. 39-55 and 109-26). *Super flumina Babylonis* also encompasses a wide variety of textures, such as the opening by a single choir, albeit in imitative pairs (mm. 1-6); strict *alteratim* in homophony, as noted above; or shifts between lengthy single-choir statements.
and thick *tutti* polyphony, as seen at “Quia illic,” Choir I (mm. 30-39), “Et qui abduxerunt,” Choir II (mm. 40-52), and the impressive a8 “Quomodo cantabimus,” beginning in measure 52.

Contrast through textural variety and irregular use of polychoral blocks is not limited to the earlier works such as *Ave Maria; O Ildephonse* and *Veni, sancte Spiritus* both navigate freely through long sections in which the choirs take turns handling expansive polyphonic phrases, quick and homophonic *alternatim*, and layered *tutti*. *O Ildephonse* in particular seems a veritable repository for ideas. The opening features long, florid phrases for single choirs (mm. 1-10), which contrasts sharply with sections such as the multitude of “angelicus manibus” statements traded between choirs in measures 20-24, leading into a layered *tutti* (mm 24-28).

The refrain-verse form of *Dic nobis Maria* has precedents in earlier works, including *Regina caeli* (1576) and the first of the sequences, *Lauda Sion* (1585); as in *Dic nobis*, the forms of the earlier settings are dictated by the text. The repetitive structure of *Regina caeli* is more overt than that of *Lauda Sion*, but notably lacks formulaic writing; each line concludes with “Alleluia,” which Victoria exploits in a subtle manner to thematically unite his *Prima* and *Seconda pars* (see text, below).

**Regina caeli: Text.**

*Prima pars:* Regina caeli laetare, Alleluia.
Quia quem meruisti portare, Alleluia.

*Seconda pars:* Resurrexit, sicut dixit, Alleluia,
Ora pro nobis Deum, Alleluia.

All of the voices are relatively independent from one another by the end of the first section, “Regina caeli laetare,” which abruptly builds from a single choir to *tutti* within the first 12 measures of the piece. The first Alleluia section presents clearer separation between choirs, though the texture within groupings is not rigidly homophonic; the choirs exchange material
briefly before building to a rather busy *tutti* that concludes in m. 23. The next line of the text commences in homophony disguised by staggered entries in Choir I, as the texture moves toward longer, single-choir phrases that abruptly conclude in a brief, mostly homophonic cadential *tutti* (mm. 23-38). The second set of Alleluias stands in sharp relief to everything that came before; a lengthy series of rapid homophonic exchanges climaxes, only to be interrupted by complete silence in measure 50, and the section concludes with a concise, homophonic *tutti* (mm. 51-55).

The first line of the *Seconda pars* proceeds similarly to the second line of the *Prima pars*. Long phrases are exchanged by the choirs, though in this case they build to a brief, homophonic *tutti* (mm. 72-76). The third Alleluia section presents new material, which is imitative, like the first Alleluias; however, this section is simpler, more concise, and contains no *tutti*. The second line of the *Seconda pars* parallels the first in structure alone; Victoria presents the material for “Ora pro nobis Deum” in long, single-choir phrases (mm. 86-103). This line is repeated by each choir four times, an almost excessive repetition of material by this composer’s standards. The final repetitions in each choir are closely superimposed into a grand *tutti* (mm. 102-108). The *tutti* is followed by effective use of silence leading into the final Alleluia section, beginning in m. 108: an expansive and exact restatement of the second Alleluia section that closed the *Prima pars*. The material diverges in measure 122, where Victoria adds a full *tutti*.

In *Lauda Sion*, Victoria recycles materials on a smaller scale; overt repetition only occurs between the first and second stanzas of the text, and the structure parallels the rhyme scheme of the poetry (see below). The first and second lines are sung by Choirs I and II in succession. The phrases are not set to identical music, but their textures are similar, featuring slightly staggered entries and animated homophony (mm. 1-10). The third line of the stanza, “in hymnis et canticis,” is set to contrasting music. The statement by Choir I repeats exactly in Choir II, then
the text is restated in closer succession to achieve a dense tutti; however, Choir I’s cadence extends beyond Choir II’s, providing a seamless transition into the beginning of the second stanza in Choir II. The first two phrases of the second stanza are set to the same music as the opening, though the roles of the choirs are reversed. The third line, “nec laudare sufficis,” features the contrasting “in hymnis et canticis” music from the end of the first stanza (mm. 25-32).

*Lauda Sion: Text.*

Lauda Sion Salvatorem,
Lauda ducem et pastorem,
In hymnis et canticis.

Quantum potes, tantum aude:
Quia major omni laude,
Nec laudare sufficis.

Sit laus plena, sit sonora,
Sit jucunda, sit decora,
Mentis jubilatio.

Quod non capis, quod non vides,
Animosa firmat fides,
Praeter rerum ordinem.
Bone pastor, panis vere,
Jesu, nostri miserere:
Tu nos pasce, nos tuere,
Tu nos bona fac videre
In terra viventium.

Victoria fuses the third and fourth stanzas into a single, rhythmically contrasting unit full of dance-like syncopation, relatively strict homophony, and exchange points that vary between the barest overlap and deep layering in which one choir begins a restatement of material almost immediately following the other choir’s entry (mm. 32-47). The lengthier final stanza
commences in stark contrast to the middle section, where Victoria sets the first two lines in triple meter homophony for Choir I alone (mm. 47-55), then the next pair of lines feature rapid exchange between choirs (mm. 55-63). The composer sets the final phrase, “in terra viventium,” in a thick and closely overlapped manner, leading to a relatively lengthy tutti (mm. 63-75).

Veni, sancte Spiritus (1600), the third of the sequences, presents the consummate mixture of structural elements typical of Victoria’s earlier works. The motet exhibits a variety of textures and phrase lengths, like O Ildephonse; however, Victoria very clearly structures Veni, sancte Spiritus to parallel the construction of the text, as in Regina caeli and Lauda Sion. Each verse is in tripartite form, and the composer scores most in a similar manner: Phrase 1 for a single choir, Phrase 2 for the opposing choir, and Phrase 3 in alternation between both choirs and/or tutti.

The form features some structural unity, albeit in a subtler manner than the proto-ritornello of Dic nobis Maria; there are repetitions of material, but at irregular intervals (Table 5-24). Two pairs of adjacent verses contain restated elements, though the two groups are melodically unrelated to each other: Verses 3 and 5 and Verses 9 and 10. The second group, Verses 9 and 10, follows a similar polychoral procedure as the first pairing, though the tuttis are extended in the later pair. The texts “sacrum septenarium” and “da perenne gaudium” are the only phrases Victoria treats with extensive repetition, perhaps as a case of subtle text painting for the former (“seven-fold gifts”), and as a persistent petition in the latter (“grant eternal joy”). Most of the verses close tutti; however, Verse 1 is scored for Choir I only, and the rest involve a mixture of the two choirs. Verse 2 concludes with exchanges between choirs but no true tutti, and the final phrase of Verse 7 is scored for Choir I. Following the persistent statements of “da perenne gaudium” at the end of Verse 10, the composer elects to complete the piece in an understated manner: with sudden silence and a simple “Amen,” decorated only by the Tenors.


Table 5-24. *Veni, Sancte Spiritus*: Polychoral Layout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Layout</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Veni, Sancte Spiritus,</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Opens in pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Et emitte caelitus</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Imitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Lucis tuae radium.</td>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Closes with clean exchange point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Veni, pater pauperum,</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Homophony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Veni dator munerum,</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>a3 (AII/TII/BII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Veni, lumen cordium.</td>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Choir II Staggered entries, beginning with Choir II; layered repetitions of text, but no true <em>tutti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consolatur optime,</td>
<td>24-27</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Mostly homophonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Dulcis hospes animae,</td>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Mostly homophonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Dulce refrigerium.</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Choir II Closely layered statements ending <em>tutti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>O lux beatissima.</td>
<td>34-37</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Restates material from first line of V. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Reple cordis intima,</td>
<td>37-40</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Restates material from second line of V. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>Tuorum fidelium.</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Choir II Nearly exact replica of third line of V. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lava quod est sordidum,</td>
<td>44-47</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Return to longer phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>Riga quod est aridum,</td>
<td>47-50</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Approximation of previous line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>Sana quod est saucium.</td>
<td>50-52</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>No <em>tutti</em> ending to verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Da tuis fidelibus,</td>
<td>52-56</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Slightly staggered entries throughout verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>In te confidentibus,</td>
<td>55-58</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c</td>
<td>Sacrum septinarium.</td>
<td>57-63</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Choir II Closely layered entries, multiple repetitions; mimics ending of V. 2 (closer exchanges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Da virtutis meritum,</td>
<td>63-67</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Inexact restatement of first line of V. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>Da salutis exitum,</td>
<td>66-69</td>
<td>Choir II</td>
<td>Exact restatement of second line of V. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c</td>
<td>Da perenne gaudium.</td>
<td>68-74</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Choir II Exact restatement of third line of V. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amen.</td>
<td>75-78</td>
<td>Choir I</td>
<td>Choir II Silence precedes concise <em>tutti</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alternative Scorings*

One of the most significant reasons it is difficult to assign distinct groups of characteristics to Victoria’s early and late polychoral works is his creativity with regard to choral division; a number of pieces do not maintain strict boundaries between choirs, even those new to 1600a, nor does the organ part consistently double Choir I. Alternative scorings do tend to fall into several general categories. First, there are brief points at which a single voice joins the opposing choir for a few measures at a time, or perhaps the organ part does so. This occurs in three of the oldest works in the collection: *Ave Maria* (1572), *Ave Regina caelorum* (1581), and *Regina caeli* (1576). The instances in *Ave Maria* are widespread and complex, as examined above. At the first statement of “lux est orta” in *Ave Regina caelorum* (mm. 27-29), Cantus II
joins Cantus I and Altus I briefly, then proceeds with its own Choir II statement of the same text. In *Regina caeli*, Victoria adds Cantus III to Choir I’s opening phrase of the *Seunda pars* (mm. 56-65). Another instance from *Regina caeli* is mm. 95-96: the Bassus I phrase is extended to join the beginning of Choir II’s statement.

A second type of blurring between choir boundaries occurs more frequently: unclear divisions between *alternatim* blocks. There are some instances of unaligned entry or exit between choirs in *Ave Regina caelorum*, but usually the boundaries between blocks are very clear. In some of the other older works there are numerous examples of a single voice entering or exiting their choir’s phrase slightly out of sync, as a means of animating otherwise bland homophony, as observed in *Ave Maria*; these include the *Letaniae de Beata Virgine*, *Dixit Dominus*, *Laudate pueri*, and *Nisi Dominus*, all published between 1576 and 1583. The phenomenon pervades *Dixit Dominus* in particular, especially beginning in m. 129. Among the newer works there are numerous examples of misalignment within choral blocks, a procedure that permeates *Veni, Sancte Spiritus*, *O Ildephonse*, and the masses.

Other instances of hazy partitioning between choirs are due to the intensely polyphonic nature of the work, as in *Alma redemptoris mater*, *Regina caeli*, and portions of *Nisi Dominus*. Most of the counterpoint in *Alma redemptoris mater* is highly imitative, so the boundaries between single-choir entries and exits are imprecise, due to pervasive staggering of individual voices; however, there is no obvious re-distribution of voices into unusual groupings. This is the case at the opening of *Regina caeli* and during numerous *tutti* throughout the older repertoire, including *Nisi Dominus* (mm. 132-35). Some of the new works blur boundaries between choirs to a limited extent, as in *Veni, Sancte Spiritus*. The final line of the second verse is initiated by Choir II with staggered entries for every voice; Cantus I begins the Choir I statement of the text
prematurely, and thus temporarily joins Choir II (mm. 16-20). The other voices of Choir I enter at disparate points, as do the closely overlapped restatements in Choir II that close the section, though Victoria evaded a true *tutti* (mm. 19-24).

The most blatant examples of redistribution of voices and alternate organ doubling, *Ave Maria* notwithstanding, are in the masses; none maintain strict division between choirs or typical organ doubling. One of the most common changes Victoria makes in the scoring is pairing a single voice from Choir I with the full texture of Choir II. The organ always doubles Choir II and omits the solo voice. All five Kyries contain alternate scoring during the Christe section. *Missa Alma redemptoris* and *Missa Ave Regina* each access the aforementioned Choir II with single voice scoring: Tenor I in the former, and Altus I in the latter. *Missa Laetatus sum* presents another unusual inter-choral scoring decision; Victoria sets the Christe for the top voice of each choir (CI-CII-CIV) without organ accompaniment. In *Missa Pro victoria*, the organ book doubles Cantus II during Kyries I and II, but switches to Cantus I for the Christe. The composer does not score the Kyrie of *Missa Salve Regina* in an unusual manner; he reduces the Christe to Choir II without a solo voice or organ scoring.

Three of the Glorias contain alternative scorings, two of which are similar. The “Domine Deus, Agnus Dei” section is presented by three voices in *Missa Alma redemptoris* and *Missa Laetatus sum*: CI-AI-TI of Choir I and CII-CIII-AII of Choir II, respectively. In both examples Victoria chooses to omit the organ accompaniment. This is unsurprising in *Missa Laetatus sum*, as the composer draws the active voices from Choir II, but it is rather unusual that the voices in the *Missa Alma redemptoris* remain unaccompanied. *Missa Pro victoria*’s scoring changes to the Gloria are a simple matter of Cantus doubling, as in the Kyrie; the organ doubles Cantus II until
the “Qui tollis,” where Cantus I takes over at first (mm. 29-32), then the highest organ line shifts to an altered version of Cantus II in the following phrase (mm. 33ff).

Two Credos exhibit parallel scorings as well: the Crucifixus sections in Missa Alma redemptoris and Missa Salve Regina are scored across choirs, but the organ accompaniment doubles all of the voices, as in Ave Maria. The Missa Alma redemptoris version commences with Cantus I (m. 51), answered in canon at the unison by Cantus II one measure later; Altus II and Tenor II join in free counterpoint at m. 55. The material is evenly divided between choirs in Missa Salve Regina. Cantus III and Altus II (both Choir II) enter first as an imitative pair (m. 69), then Altus I and Cantus I join in imitation (m. 71), and their replication of the Choir II pair remains identical until m. 76.

The Credo of Missa Pro victoria contains varied scoring, but all of the changes pertain to organ doubling, rather than mixture across choirs. For most of the mass, the organ book doubles Cantus II; the organist alternatively doubles Cantus I during the opening phrase of the Credo (mm. 1-4). The scoring returns to normal in Choir I’s second phrase (mm. 7-10). Another instance of doubling change is the beginning of the “Et incarnatus est” section. It is scored for Cantus I, Cantus II, Altus I and Tenor I, but the organist only accompanies the bottom three voices (mm. 38-42). Victoria restores the full five-voice texture with standard organ doublings in the second phrase of the section (mm. 43-50). As in the previous Credo examples, the Crucifixus in Missa Pro victoria is scored for four voices. In this case, the composer opts for Choir I minus Cantus I. The voices are doubled in the organ, but Victoria includes an unusual note in the organ book, “Crucifixus iiiij voc. si placet, vel sine organo,” indicating that the organist may opt to omit the accompaniment for this section. The composer mixes the voicing across choirs once again at
the opening of “Et in Spiritum Sanctum.” Cantus I joins Choir II for the first phrase of the section (mm. 84-87), and none of the voices are accompanied.

The final scoring changes in the masses occur in the Benedictus sections of Missa Alma redemptoris and Missa Ave Regina, another of the affinities between the two settings. Victoria scores both for Choir II with a single voice from Choir I, as in their respective Christe settings; Tenor I in the former, and Altus I for the latter. Each organ part doubles Choir II, though the keyboard briefly covers Tenor I in Missa Alma redemptoris (mm. 46-48).

**Chromaticism**

Victoria employs chromaticism relatively freely, though his harmonic palette is not as varied, nor are the accidentals as pervasive, as those of late Lassus or Gesualdo. The 1600a collection includes a large quantity of obligatory accidentals, which result in blatant cross-relations and juxtaposition of unusual sonorities, as demonstrated in Ave Maria and Dic nobis Maria. The new works contain a heavier concentration of such activity, but examples occur in nearly every piece in the publication. Even Victoria’s plainchant quotations occasionally contain chromatic alteration; examples occur throughout his output and include Te Deum (1600), Pange lingua (1581), Ave Maris Stella (1576), and Asperges me, Domine (1592). Stevenson associates the more frequent sharpening of pitches in plainchant with local Spanish practice; perhaps the practice of including obligatory cross-relations also reflects local tradition.70

Among the most colorful works are O Ildephonse, Dic nobis Maria, and the Magnificat primi toni, all of which are new to 1600a. To this list may be added Laudate Dominum omnes gentes, originally printed in 1581; the other psalms feature minimal chromaticism, apart from cadential gestures. The most pervasively chromatic of the mass and parody pairs is Salve Regina

---

and Missa Salve Regina, both of which are reprints, whereas the Missa pro Victoria, Laetatus sum, and Missa Laetatus sum are surprisingly diatonic. Much of Victoria’s creative harmonic activity falls within three general types: vacillation between major and minor triads with a shared root, generally interrupted by a single contrasting chord and dictated by a chromatic line in a single voice; similar vacillation without the single-voice chromaticism; and unusual chord progressions that produce cross-relations but fall outside the first two types.

Victoria produces chromaticism of the first type through horizontal lines that are nearly always F♯ – G – F♮, B♭ – C – B♭, or B♭ – A – B♭. O Ildephonse contains the F♯ – G – F♮ line in Altus II (mm. 19-20), producing the progression D – g – d (Example 5-79); other instances include the Magnificat sexti toni, mm. 169-70, and Missa Salve Regina, Gloria, mm. 15-16. An example of the second type of horizontal line is from O Ildephonse (mm. 28-29 of Example 5-80), where Victoria nests the progression G – c – g between two D major triads. The B♭ – A – B♭ line occurs twice in the Magnificat primi toni. In the first instance the line appears as a portion of a particularly colorful passage replete with juxtaposed B♭s, B♭s, F♯s, and E♭s, and features an augmented sixth chord (Example 5-81; see m. 113, beat 4). The second progression is far simpler and more typical: g – D – G – c – g (mm. 131-32).

**Example 5-79. O Ildephonse, Choir II, mm. 19-20.**
Victoria also vacillates between major and minor sonorities without relying upon a chromatic melodic line, and these instances of chromaticism are more pervasive than the first; most of the examples in 1600a shift between G major and g minor chords with an intervening D major triad, producing myriad juxtapositions of B♭ and F♯. *O Ildephonse* features an extended passage that employs G major and minor sonorities, as well as D major and minor (Example 5-82). Other examples include *Missa Salve Regina*, Gloria (mm. 33-37) and *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes* (mm. 42-43). Victoria employs a similar idea to particularly striking effect in *Lauda Sion*; after an overwhelmingly bright opening full of major sonorities, the composer
emphasized g minor at the head of repeated statements of “et hymnis et canticis” (mm. 9-13) by placing the chord between D major triads, then continuing to G major. The same progression returns at the text “nec laudare sufficis,” measures 25-30.

**Example 5-82. O Ildephonse, Choirs I and II, mm. 43-45.**

![Sheet Music](image)

Occasionally the composer mixes sonorities in unusual ways, again producing cross-relations. Some of the most complex examples occur in the Magnificat primi toni and Salve Regina. In measures 12-13 of the Magnificat, Victoria places an F♯ diminished triad alongside g minor; G major and c minor appear together in measure 22. The most complicated progression of the collection occurs in measures 27-28 and results in a profusion of cross-relations: B♭ – a°6 – B♭6 – c6 – D – g (Example 5-83). Victoria sparingly employs diminished triads for chromatic color, but the augmented triad is extremely rare; their appearance in conjunction is especially noteworthy. Salve Regina contains an instance in which the composer contrasts c minor, D major, and d minor in succession (m. 64 of Example 5-84), which produces a jarring cross-
relation between the $F\#$ in Cantus III and $F\#$ in Altus II. Another unusual progression involving a diminished triad occurs in measure 67: $F - b_6^0 - c - g$.

**Example 5-83. Magnificat primi toni, Choir I and Organ, mm. 27-28.**

**Example 5-84. Salve Regina, Choir II, mm. 64-68.**

**Conclusion**

Stevenson dismisses the works of the 1600a collection as inferior and anomalous, a viewpoint perhaps best expressed in his discussion of the masses in comparison with the *Officium defunctorum* published five years later:
Whatever the distinctive merits of Victoria’s 1600 masses, his muse during his late forties would be deemed by the majority of critics to have drooped (like the music of certain later-day Romanticists)—were these 1600 masses the only works from his final period in Spain whereupon to rest a judgment. Fortunately, he is spared this judgment by virtue of his “swan song,” the *Officium defunctorum*, published at Madrid in 1605…the *Missa pro defunctis* in the 1605 imprint (folios 1-18) would win greater sympathy than the 1600 masses, (1) because the individual sections are not forever tediously in “F Major”, and (2) because the bright bauble of antiphony does not distract him like an eternal plaything.\(^7\)

He found the collection monotonous; the analysis above suggests an alternative view. Victoria certainly intended the collection as homage to his new king, but he clearly sought to achieve a sense of balance: the composer included works applicable for a variety of liturgical and para-liturgical purposes; merged old and new stylistic elements; included long-established repertoire alongside newly composed works; reveled in contrast of texture, harmony, voice combinations, and alternating forces pitted against one another; and sought to wed Spanish and Roman elements. In this manner, the prints reflect Victoria’s pragmatic and cosmopolitan sensibilities, as well as the tastes of his audience.

CHAPTER 6
SYNTHESIS OF PERFORMANCE PRACTICE CONTEXTS IN ROME AND MADRID

Victoria’s 1600a prints provide a snapshot of the festive polychoral practices of his primary cities of employment. The central focus for Roman practices is the German College, as its liturgy reflects widespread trends on major feasts at the largest churches in the city; the habits of the Spanish churches and devotional institutions such as the Archconfraternity of the Resurrection will be examined to a lesser extent. Of particular importance is the application of organ accompaniment to plainchant, falsobordone, and polyphonic repertoire at the German College, as the practice reveals much about the use of organ in the liturgy, and is likely one of the situations that inspired Victoria to provide the organ part for the 1600a collection. In Madrid, the activity of the capilla real and Descalzas Reales are of primary importance, as the new works in the collection were undoubtedly intended for use in these two chapels.

Polychoral works in Rome were most commonly performed with one singer per part; for instance, the church of S. Giacomo employed 12 singers in three choirs to celebrate the birth of the infanta Ana of Spain in 1601. An organ usually accompanied at least one choir. If extra organs were required, the institution rented portable instruments. The organist doubled the lowest sounding voice in a practice known as basso seguente, the predecessor to basso continuo.

Victoria’s organ book for 1600a is unusual due to its fully realized polyphonic structure, which provides a tangible reflection of performance practices of the late sixteenth century. Organists were expected to either double or fill in for portions of a choir by reading from the appropriate vocal book(s) or copying the parts into open score. Since Victoria’s collection primarily contains works for eight or more voices published in partbook format, such an

---

2 Ibid., 123-24.
arrangement would have been cumbersome at best; Victoria’s innovation potentially rescued him from a time consuming task. However, this practice overlaps with the development of organ reductions and increased reliance on basso continuo parts, rather than attempting to realize the entire polyphonic fabric of a work. The earliest partiture were printed by Northern Italian houses in the mid-1590s, and these provide a single bass line as accompaniment, a soprano and bass line, or some sort of three-voice reduction. Full replications of the vocal lines are generally limited to works with five voices or fewer. Victoria’s organ score is highly unusual among printed polychoral examples from the turn of the seventeenth century since he provides full four-part support for one choir; others simply provide a bass line for each choir.

A wide variety of instruments other than organ were involved in polychoral performance from as early as the 1580s, though little is known regarding their specific roles; for instance, the Archconfraternity of the Resurrection hired strings, cornetti, and sackbuts for Easter in 1581 and 1583, but this information was gleaned solely from terse payment records that do not indicate whether they doubled one or both choirs or played from an independent part.

Performance Practice at the German College and Archconfraternity of the Resurrection

Though it is impossible to describe the institution’s performance practice in detail, it is evident that the musical fame of the German College derived from its performance of polyphonic

---


4 Horsley, 473-74.

5 The earliest examples are examined by Horsley (Ibid., 469-70). These include Giovanni Croce’s Motetti a otto voci (Venice: Vincenti, 1594); Adriano Banchieri, Concerti ecclesiastici a otto voci (Venice: Vincenti, 1595); and Croce, Messe a otto voci (Venice: Vincenti, 1596). The first truly independent basso continuo in printed church music was Lodovico Grossi da Viadana’s Cento concerti ecclesiastici (Venice: Vincenti, 1602).

service music, particularly on major feasts; this makes sense when considering the trends in Rome during the last quarter of the sixteenth century.\(^7\) Precious details are few, as most documents such as administrative records, diaries of students and employees, and the correspondence of rectors and maestri di cappella do not survive. In fact, the records to which scholars refer only deal with music indirectly.\(^8\) Monophony and polyphony were in use from the formation of the San Apollinare choir in 1575; rector Michele Lauretano’s aim was to render the service more pleasing and interesting for visitors, as a means of ensuring consistent church attendance.\(^9\) The same sentiment applied to the use of instruments to a limited extent, and influence of Post-Tridentine reform is also evident in Lauretano’s desire for clean, skilled singing that did not obscure the text.\(^10\)

Lauretano’s goal, from the inception of his liturgical plan, was for students to become skilled in singing in plainchant and polyphony for church functions. Accounts exist of chant, falsobordone, and polyphonic singing at mass, the Offices, and other functions. These techniques were frequently executed in combination; some services employed only plainchant, while others involved all three singing styles with organ accompaniment, and the choice was generally made according to the day’s degree of liturgical importance. Some accounts refer to an additional type of singing known as cantus firmus. This was a recitation technique poised somewhere between speech and song and presented almost exclusively during the penitential seasons of Advent and Lent, apart from high Mass and Vespers.\(^11\)

\(^7\) Thomas Culley, Jesuits and Music I: A Study of the Musicians Connected with the German College in Rome during the 17th Century and of their Activities in Northern Europe (Rome and St. Louis: Jesuit Historical Institute, 1970), 79.
\(^8\) Ibid., 79.
\(^9\) Ibid., 76.
\(^10\) Ibid., 77.
\(^11\) Ibid., 78.
No rigid strategy dictated which items of the mass, Offices, or other functions were sung in chant or polyphonically; however, the invitatoy, responsories, and hymn of Matins were quite frequently sung in parts, at least on the more important feast days. Sometimes a soloist or small ensemble of particularly skilled students would sing selected verses of the psalms or hymns, or they would perform motets, all of which were regularly accompanied by organ. Culley concludes that this flexible mixture of techniques likely occurred throughout the church year; musical selections probably depended upon a number of practical factors, such as the availability of rehearsal time and the skill of the students attending the college at the time.\textsuperscript{12}

Though both plainchant and polyphony were employed in the Mass Ordinary and Propers at San Apollinare, there are only a handful of surviving descriptions; however, motets are mentioned fairly frequently. According to Steinhuber’s account of the college’s history, the students participated in a ceremonial entry to the church of S. Apollinare on 8 May 1575. In the following days, the college held its first solemn mass, which involved a performance of a Confitemini Domino (Psalm 104) set for three choirs.\textsuperscript{13} One remark of particular importance pertains to a service on 6 January 1585: “At the Benedictus, the organ was played, but by way of exception, because Maestro Victoria was present, whose Benedictus was sung.”\textsuperscript{14} This reveals that the Benedictus was not normally accompanied and, perhaps more interestingly, the author mentions that Victoria was either in attendance or assisting at the mass, which was held years after his tenure as maestro di cappella.

\textsuperscript{12} Culley, \textit{Jesuits and Music}, 78-81.
\textsuperscript{14} This is a reference from Lauretano’s diary that appears in Culley, \textit{Jesuits and Music}, 82.
Music selection for the Offices was similar, though more details survive. At Lauds, the antiphons, hymn, and Benedictus were normally sung polyphonically on high feast days; Vespers featured a mixture of techniques as well, ranging from strictly chant, falsobordone, motets for soloists, and full polyphony, all of which could be accompanied by organ. The choir of San Apollinare frequently engaged in polychoral performance, which was in vogue in Rome. One record from Compline of 17 January 1583 describes such an occasion:

After the exhortation was finished, Compline was begun at once, and it was sung most solemnly—with organ, [and] the psalms in part music [in Musica]. And the psalms Ecce nunc benedicite Dominum and Nunc dimittis were sung in two choirs, one choir standing at the organ, and the other in the accustomed place.

Another description of a Compline service in 1585 suggests that the organ was used in dialogue for an eight-voice setting of the Nunc dimittis, and as accompaniment for Palestrina’s eight-voice setting of Surge illuminare Jerusalem. It seems likely that the organist replaced some voices or perhaps a full choir in the former, as “none of the boys could be absent from the choir,” which was preparing to sing the Palestrina motet immediately following the canticle.

Liturgical functions unassociated with the Mass or Offices also featured elaborate music. For example, in 1583 the Litanies of the Virgin Mary were sung by two polyphonic choirs and a falsobordone choir on each Saturday in Lent. Events surrounding Corpus Christi involved opulent music; in particular, the students sang as part of the city-wide procession through Rome, regarded as the most significant element of the feast. Processions became a vital element in Roman religious festivities during the second half of the sixteenth century. Some were dictated by the liturgy for feasts (Palm Sunday, Holy Thursday, and Corpus Christi), and others were only partially liturgical in nature. Roman churches and confraternities frequently hired multiple choirs

---

15 Culley suggests that there is evidence of this practice from at least the early 1580s (Culley, Jesuits and Music, 81).
16 Ibid.
17 Ibid., 82.
18 Ibid.
of varying size for processions. Archival records tend to distinguish between ensembles hired to sing polyphony and those relegated to chant or *falsobordone*, as some singers processed while others were stationed on platforms along the route. Some institutions hired huge numbers of performers; for example, the church of S. Giacomo frequently hired 50 or more singers for their Easter Sunday procession. By 1594, they hired approximately five singers per part, though the bulk of the repertoire was likely plainchant or *falsobordone*. Another of the most extravagant events in Rome was the series of processions for Holy Thursday and Good Friday in which all of the confraternities, clergy from religious institutions, and members of orders took part.

A description of the Corpus Christi procession on 12 June 1583 provides perhaps the most detailed recount of performance practice available regarding the German College:

Then [came] a choir of Gregorian [chant], which numbered about twenty-five, and sang *Pange lingua*, etc.…then a choir of *falsobordone* in three voices, which sang *Sacrīs solemniis iuncta sint gaudia*. And they [the singers] each had a large sheet of paper in hand, where the music and words were…Then the polyphony [*la Musica*] [came], all [the singers] in a group…When the Most Holy Sacrament was at the altar of Maestro Gaudentio, the singers, [who] customarily divide themselves into two choirs at the sides of the altar, and sing some verses of *Lauda Sion*, did not divide themselves this year, however, and sang only *O salutaris hostia*, while the Most Holy Sacrament was incensed...

The participating choirs were divided according to the type of singing employed; it appears the singers would have been accustomed to spatial division in certain circumstances as well, as indicated by the author’s note regarding *Lauda Sion*. Perhaps the sequence was performed in *alternatim* style, where one of the choirs performed odd or even verses in plainchant and the second group responded in polyphony, an arrangement common for polyphonic settings of strophic texts. Sometimes the singers stopped at platforms constructed along the processional

---

route in order to sing more complex works, such as motets, which is the case with the double-choir *Lauda Sion* noted in Lauretano’s diary; references to the singing of polyphony during the procession itself are rare.\(^{22}\)

Little information remains regarding specific compositions performed at the German College, but what may be gleaned suggests a repertoire filled with works by the most prominent composers of the era; financial records indicate that the institution bought motet books by Palestrina and Victoria and paid to re-bind the Morales Magnificats at some point.\(^{23}\) Very few descriptions of performances at San Apollinare provide titles, such as the examples cited above. An additional account from 1583 indicates the choir sang Lassus’ *Deus misereatur nostrri*, and another states that Palestrina’s *Nos autem* was performed in 1585.\(^{24}\)

By the 1580s, three spatially separated choirs were commonly employed for sung Mass and Vespers on the highest-ranking feasts, occasions on which many of the larger institutions constructed special platforms inside the church. Unfortunately, much of the repertoire is unknown; O’Regan assumes a vast quantity of the works written for special occasions do not survive, as there was not a feasible market for its publication.\(^{25}\) As observed in records from the German College, the Cappella Giulia, other prominent confraternities, and Roman churches that employed singers on feast days, much of the polychoral singing was executed with one singer per part.\(^{26}\)

O’Regan posited a number of Victoria’s works may possibly have been performed during Easter festivities at the confraternity in particular, including *Surrexit pastor*, published in 1572, and *Ardens est cor meum*, published in 1576; both are scored for six voices. Others include the

\(^{22}\) O’Regan, “Processions and their music,” 68.

\(^{23}\) Culley, *Jesuits and Music*, 83.

\(^{24}\) Ibid., 84.


\(^{26}\) Ibid., 287.
two Regina caeli settings (5vv and 8vv), and it is possible that portions of his polychoral Vespers repertoire were performed, such as the Laetatus sum setting published in 1583 and included in the 1600a collection; this was the first Roman triple-choir work in print. These suggestions are plausible, given the fact that S. Giacomo’s library included most of Victoria’s prints issued through 1585. The works from the 1572 and 1576 prints could have been written for and used by the German College and Roman Seminary musicians, including the polychoral works, as each institution had sufficient performing resources at their disposal.

The organ had varying functions at San Apollinare; one of the most important was to provide music for “liturgical action,” moments when the singers were processing into the church or were otherwise occupied. Various contemporary descriptions state that works were sung “on the organ,” though it is not entirely clear what this means. Culley suggests that the organ could have functioned as a basso continuo instrument, doubled one or more voices, or replaced voices missing from the choral texture; in a student-led worship setting, any or all of these functions are logical. The organist frequently performed portions of the liturgy normally sung; examples include playing alternate verses of hymns and psalms or repetitions of antiphons. For instance, the verses of the Te Deum were performed in alternation by a polyphonic choir and a plainchant choir, and on at least one occasion in the mid-1580s, the organist played the verses meant to be chanted.

Other instruments were employed at San Apollinare, at least shortly after Lauretano’s death and very likely before. The rector approved of the use of organ, but it is unsure what he thought of other instruments in church, apart from his opinion that they should not “disturb the

28 Ibid.
29 Culley, Jesuits and Music, 84.
30 Ibid., 85.
gravity of the divine offices.” Contemporary accounts indicate their presence, but not their precise function; cornetto and sackbut appear frequently, often in conjunction with large festivities. Both were employed for solemn Vespers, and references to their use in processions into the church exist, as do allusions to their use in combination with voices. The only other instrument mentioned in accounts of liturgical practice during this period is the harp, normally used in conjunction with organ.

Pay records for outside musicians hired for feast days are scarce, even at the church of S. Giacomo and its adjacent Archconfraternity of the Resurrection; for instance, lists from the institutions’ Easter services of 1579 and 1580 do not survive, but the list of performers from Easter 1581 includes seven singers and at least six instrumentalists. It is also possible that some of the Spanish members of the papal choir, namely castrati, may have offered their services for free. Ceremonial trumpeters and ministriles (cornett and sackbut players) were also employed consistently. A list from 1583 yields the same number of instrumentalists, but includes 11 paid singers, rather than seven; these numbers continued to increase in later years, as did the amount of money spent. Instruments featured prominently in Spanish churches from at least the 1520s, and it is possible that the practices of the two national churches in Rome encouraged their adoption in the city. There is evidence of their use as accompaniment for polychoral works at the end of the century, and wind instruments were likely used for processions as well.

---

31 Culley, Jesuits and Music, 85-86.
32 Ibid., 86-87.
33 Ibid., 87.
34 O’Regan, “Victoria, Soto, and the Spanish Archconfraternity,” 285. O’Regan does not cite specific examples from archival records or accounts of events.
35 Ibid.
Polychoral Performance Practice at the Spanish Court: Valladolid and Madrid

Performance practices at Descalzas Reales and in the capilla real were markedly similar to corresponding institutions in Rome; the bajón was used to double voices in the royal chapel as early as the 1580s; organ and ministriles frequently doubled or replaced voices, or performed in alternatim with the voices; and the Capilla Real employed the Venetian-style basso seguente in polychoral performances from the 1590s at the latest, particularly in performances of villancicos. An early example of spatially separate polychoral performance is Queen Ana de Austria’s entrance to Burgos in 1570. A mixture of voices and instruments were used, but not commingled: voices performed on one side of the street, and instruments on the other. The most significant changes occurred after Philip III ascended the throne and the court moved to Valladolid. There were massive celebrations on major feasts and household occasions, such as the infante’s baptism in 1605. Many of these were orchestrated by the Duke of Lerma and incorporated festivities at a variety of venues in the city including the cathedral, the palace, and the home of Don Juan de Borja, who temporarily moved to Valladolid after the Empress María’s death. Borja maintained a sizeable library of music and instrument collection, both of which were appraised for sale by Victoria upon Borja’s death; he brought some of the items to Spain following his service as ambassador in Prague but others were accumulated later, including a collection of polychoral works. For instance, the set of 1600a partbooks at the Biblioteca Nacional de España are from Borja’s private collection; the prints were among the large quantity

39 Cristina Diego Pacheco, “Ciudad y corte: el paisaje sonoro en Valladolid a principios del siglo XVII,” in Vicente and Tomás, Tomás Luis de Victoria y la cultura musical, 134.
of materials the Duke of Lerma purchased for the collegiate church in Lerma. The incomplete collection was purchased by nineteenth-century collector Federico Olmeda, who gave the partbooks to Barbieri, and Barbieri left his estate to the Biblioteca Nacional. Repertoire performed in Valladolid during the court’s stay was as cosmopolitan as that of Madrid or Rome: Spanish, Italian, and Franco-Flemish composers are all substantially represented. Surviving repertoire at the cathedral includes composers whose works were standard fare in most Spanish churches, including Morales, Guerrero, Victoria, Vivanco, and Rogier.

Musicians connected with the royal household produced both liturgical and quasi-liturgical works in the polyphonic idiom, including Juan Bautista Comes, Gabriel Díaz, Géry de Ghersem, and Mateo Romero; performances of such repertoire frequently included a choir of *ministriles*. The royal chapel was enormous at the turn of the seventeenth century, and certainly capable of performing large-scale polyphonic music. Around 1601 the chapel comprised more than 60 persons, not including choirboys, the *maestro*, and organists. Chapel records from this year mention a 19-voice mass by Mateo Romero, and an inventory of Romero’s works composed for the chapel during the first few years of Philip III’s reign include an abundance of masses, motets, and *villancicos* for double and triple choirs, and a number of pieces for four or more groups.

---

42 This is not particularly unusual, as is commonly assumed; Toledo’s collections reflected varied tastes rather than a sense of isolation; Spanish composers were heavily represented, as well as Franco-Flemish and Italian ones. See Lucy Hruza, “The Marian Repertory by Tomas Luis de Victoria in Toledo, *Biblioteca Capitular Mus. B. 30: A Case Study in Renaissance Imitatio*” (Ph.D. diss., University of Calgary, 1997), 4-6.
43 Diego Pacheco, 151-53.
44 Luis Robledo Estaire, “La transformación de la actividad musical en la corte de Felipe III,” in Vicente and Tomá’s, *Tomás Luis de Victoria y la cultura musical*, 103-05.
Spanish Polychoral Spaces: The Alcázar, El Escorial, Descalzas Reales, and Other Venues

Most areas allotted for musical performance in the court’s sacred spaces were cramped. The chapel in the old Alcázar contained a small gallery at the rear of the room that housed the organ and from whence the capilla performed; the space was located above the royal galleries. Even the ceremonial layouts for large state events at churches outside of the palace complex provided only a small space for singers, even when the bulk of the chapel personnel were present.\textsuperscript{46} Luis Robledo suggests that El Escorial would have been the ideal performance space for spatially separated polychoral singing, as the basilica is massive, though the lack of space did not hinder performances of triple-choir works at Margarita de Austria’s funeral rites at San Gerónico in 1611. Evidence survives of cramped conditions for polychoral performance in far-flung locations as well, including S. Marco in Venice, so it is plausible such works were presented at the Alcázar, in the church at Descalzas Reales, and in other spaces in which the royal chapel performed. One solution Robledo suggests was an arrangement similar to the solo and ripieno groupings of the emerging Baroque style: a choir of soloists pitted against other choir(s) of instrumentalists and/or singers with at least two per part.\textsuperscript{47} Such an arrangement seems extraordinary; most situations probably warranted use of a smaller ensemble, particularly in situations where the chapel personnel was much smaller, such as at Descalzas Reales.

The church at Descalzas is another small performance location with little floor space for performers, and period accounts of events held at the convent do not shed much light on use of performance space. It is also difficult to determine whether the original organ galleries would have been large enough to hold the capilla, since much of the interior was rebuilt after the

\textsuperscript{46} Luis Robledo stated that the space allotted for the choir at Philip III’s funeral at S. Gerónico was “remarkably narrow.” See Robledo, “Questions of Performance Practice in Philip III’s Chapel,” \textit{Early Music} 22/2, Iberian Discoveries II (May 1994): 207.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 217. This type of scoring is supported by evidence from funerary rites held in honor of Philip II, and performances of the Passion during Holy Week, 1611 (Ibid., 209-25).
devastating fire in the nineteenth century. Galleries flank the nave above ground level, next to each organ; they were retained as private royal and Imperial space.48 The area below the galleries is occupied by chapels, and thus unsuitable as performance space. The coro is located at the rear of the nave, but this location was off limits to the chaplains, as it was considered part of the cloistered area of the convent and thus occupied exclusively by the nuns. Despite the reconstruction, the footprint of the church remains essentially the same; space would have been extremely cramped if the entire capilla performed, particularly on occasions at which the monarch was present, as he brought his entourage of criados and occasionally additional musicians. It thus makes perfect sense to assume that polychoral works would have been performed with one person per part, perhaps with some instrumental doubling.

If records of performances in the Alcázar chapel are any indication of what might have been done at the convent, instrumentalists would have been seated with the voice part they were reinforcing, and the groups would have remained together, rather than spatially separate. However, the capilla real could have performed spatially separate polychoral works in the palace chapel, if one group remained in the organ gallery while the other performed from the altar.49 The existence of two organ galleries at Descalzas supports the notion of spatially separate performance. One organ was brought from Flanders and installed in 1601; presumably the lost contract of 1604 was for a second organ. Accounts of performances in the Alcázar chapel from Philip III’s reign suggest that groups could have been placed in the organ loft at the rear of the church and at the altar. A similar arrangement could have been used at Descalzas Reales, though on the sides of the church, rather than front and back, provided the organ galleries afforded

enough space for more performers than the organists alone. The use of altar space for performers would facilitate spatially separate performance by a third choir as well, as there is evidence of triple-choir performances at the convent from at least 1615, and the repertoire of Victoria’s 1600a collection certainly would support earlier triple choir performance at Descalzas, at least on the most opulently celebrated occasions.

1600a: Repertoire-Specific Performance Implications

As described in Chapter Five, the composer’s organ scorings frequently contain alterations that reinforce the independence of Choir I, which suggests that Victoria intended for the groups to perform spatially separated, in the Roman style. Many of the changes occur in the organ reproduction of Bassus I, primarily as a means of reinforcing root movement and glossing over harmonies that would be potentially problematic for a spatially separated Choir I, such as the vertical fourths present in second inversion triads. Victoria made additional organ alterations to fill in harmonies completed by single voices of Choir II.

Victoria indicates that the organ score could be employed as a replacement for a choir or to reinforce the singers. He also consciously left some single-choir portions of pieces unaccompanied or indicated that the organist could omit sections, suggestions that could be applied even in large-ensemble performances, in keeping with the composer’s love of contrast. Victoria provides unusual scorings at several points in the collection, such as the Christe and the Benedictus portions of Missa Alma redemptoris and Missa Ave Regina; Choir II and a solo voice from Choir I perform accompanied by organ, though Victoria chooses to omit the soloist from the keyboard score. These could easily be executed by a soloist and Choir II with more than one
voice per part, or by a group of five soloists. Since the sections are nestled between a8 sections, the divergence certainly suits Victoria’s penchant for contrast.

Other portions of the mass repertoire lend themselves well to performance by soloists from each choir, as in the Crucifixus of Missa Alma redemptoris and Missa Salve Regina; Victoria scores for Cantus I and the top three voices of Choir II in the former and the top two voices of each choir for the latter, all of which are doubled by organ. As in the Kyrie examples, the composer flanks both Crucifixus sections with expansive polychoral material. Perhaps the Christe of Missa Laetatus sum could be performed by soloists as well, since Victoria composes the section for the top voice of each choir without organ accompaniment. The Domine Deus, Agnus Dei section of the Gloria, Missa Alma redemptoris, could also be executed by soloists (Cantus I, Altus I, and Tenor I); Victoria scores the section for the top three voices of Choir I without organ accompaniment, which is unusual. He indicated something similar for the Crucifixus of Missa Pro victoria, though in that case organ doubling is included in the score, albeit with a note indicating the accompaniment was optional.

One potential performance issue is range; if one were to apply the rubric inconsistently indicated in the organ score, the music should be transposed down a fourth, at least for the works in chiavette clef combinations, which would render the Altus and Bassus parts too low to sing. In works such as Missa Alma redemptoris, this would render the Bassus parts too low to be sung. Noel O’Regan rationalizes transposition by assuming that the bajonista at Descalzas Reales could have covered the bass line, a plausible solution. In reality, the capillas of Descalzas Reales and other institutions likely accessed a wide variety of performance solutions. Descalzas

---

50 O’Regan also suggested the performance scoring of soloist plus Choir II and organ for these mass sections, and noted that the arrangement “presumably can apply to the bulk of the print’s contents as well.” See Noel O’Regan, “What Can the Organ Partitura to Tomas Luis de Victoria’s Missae, Magnificat, motecta, psalmi et alia quam plurima of 1600 Tell Us About Performance Practice?” Performance Practice Review 14 (2009): 2.
51 Ibid., 10.
Reales certainly employed enough chapel personnel to execute large-scale polychoral works with one or more singers per part, plus instrumentalists. The convent employed the composer himself as organist following the Empress’s death, and also retained a full-time bajonista, who undoubtedly provided support for choral singing, and perhaps to soloists. Other instrumentalists and singers participated on the highest-ranking feasts as well, despite the limited physical space.

This spirit of experimentation with ensemble size and makeup in performances of Victoria’s polychoral works has been embraced to stunning effect by ensembles such as Ensemble Plus Ultra; for instance, their recording of *Missa Laetatus sum* features Choir I accompanied by the extant organ part, a Choir II comprised of a Cantus soloist with wind instruments, and *a cappella* Choir III. During the Christe segment of the Kyrie, Michael Noone opts for one Cantus soloist combined with a pair of *cornetti*, rather than the three singers indicated by the score. Such experimentation aligns with period practice and yields a pleasing aesthetic result. Since Victoria himself suggested a variety of performance solutions in his letters marketing the collection, modern liberties with ensemble size and scoring are certainly consistent with the composer’s intentions for his works.

---

EPILOGUE: VICTORIA AS PRODUCT OF HIS AGE

Tomás Luis de Victoria was a consummate member of humanist society, and the 1600a publication represents the culmination of his experience, influences, and the musical culture in Rome and Madrid, his skill as a musician and prowess as a businessman married with his devotion to the church to elevate him as one of the finest composers of the late Renaissance. Victoria synthesized the best of what was available to him in an efficient and pragmatic manner, including compositional influences, education, worldview, and access to powerful patrons. Perhaps he was not a brilliant prodigy akin to the mythical figures of the Romantic era, but he certainly possessed a gift of sensitivity toward his market and in turn produced high quality materials that met public demand.

The purpose of this study was to approach the composer’s life in a manner that would enrich Victoria’s story and augment common understanding of this neglected portion of his art by providing the cultural context normally excluded from biographies. Most cling desperately to what little fact survives without attempting to clothe Victoria in humanity; some early biographers resorted to fanciful descriptions of the composer’s life and projected emotions or potential motivations for his career choices with no basis fact. Since major life-and-works studies were executed by monumental figures such as Pedrell and Stevenson, many scholars assume study of Victoria has been exhausted, whereas there is much to be done.

There are a number of outstanding questions and important projects worth pursuing in the future, such as a new *opera omnia* to replace Pedrell’s monumental, yet flawed work from the turn of the twentieth century. In addition, no scholar has attempted a meticulous comparison of the various printed versions of Victoria’s complete output. Individuals such as Daniele Filippi and Noel O’Regan have compared Victoria’s polychoral style to his Roman and Spanish
contemporaries to a limited extent, though more exhaustive work remains; it would also prove valuable to trace the influence and diffusion of the composer’s polychoral language throughout the Iberian Peninsula.\(^1\) Another beneficial investigation would probe Victoria’s impact upon the circle of composers at the Spanish court in Madrid, particularly with regard to those favored by Philip III.

Victoria occupied two divergent worlds: most of his formal education and career occurred in Rome, while he spent his later years serving the widowed Empress María of Austria upon her return to Madrid. This move, among others, seemingly contradicts a “normal” career path for church musicians of the late Renaissance. Unlike other great Spanish composers, such as Cristóbal de Morales or Francisco de Soto, or his Italian or Franco-Flemish counterparts, Victoria never entered the papal choir nor served as singer or maestro of the Cappella Giulia, both of which were the primary goals of many musicians working in Rome. These positions, particularly those tied to the papacy, all but guaranteed a lifetime of work and access to benefices that would provide for the composer for the rest of his life. Victoria never occupied a truly full-time position as singer, organist, or maestro in any church or educational setting, apart from the brief stint at the head of the German College chapel. Upon his return to Madrid, Victoria held a full-time chaplaincy, a post that was not exclusively musical. While working at a small royal convent might seem an odd choice, this position provided the type of freedom he required to conduct business outside of his official duties and allowed him remain in close proximity to his family; Victoria received a reasonable salary and housing, and enjoyed a number of non-residential benefices procured during his time in Rome. He thus did not require a full-time

\(^{1}\) Owen Rees addressed the proliferation of Roman polyphony at Tarazona, and addressed the need to study the phenomenon further. See Owen Rees, “Roman Polyphony at Tarazona,” *Early Music* 23/3, Iberian Discoveries III (Aug. 1995): 411-419.
position to survive, as is evident from the fact that he did not take advantage of his celebrity by seeking a particularly high-profile post.

To this point, there has not been a complete, context-driven approach to the composer’s story; a fresh interpretation of primary and secondary sources reveals that his life-long association with the Jesuit Order significantly contributed to the composer’s formation and his seemingly odd career moves, and appears to have shaped his intellectual outlook, his character, and his vocation. The Jesuit mindset is most apparent in three areas of Victoria’s character and behavior: his emphasis on a connection to the world through service, his sense of spirituality and religious devotion, and the pragmatism made manifest by his prowess as a businessman, both in securing printing contracts and as a marketer of his publications. This combination of elements reveals the composer as an archetypical example of the Renaissance humanist ideal: a pious, productive member of society.

Modern individuals commonly equate humanist philosophy with secular humanism, rather than the religiously infused flavor of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Renaissance humanism emerged as a literary effort largely associated with Petrarch, emphasized the study and emulation of Classical Latin authors who were elevated as ideal didactic models. By the founding of the Jesuit Order, humanist education expanded to include Greek authors and works of the church fathers, an approach intended to produce a marriage between intellectual knowledge and internal spiritual growth, which would in turn result in the students’s participation in outward action as upstanding contributors to society.

Much of the Order’s staggering success in education may be traced to its members’ connections to the nobility, wise associations with prominent religious figures, and cultivation of an appealing public image through building projects, celebrations, and ceremony. This
philosophy is reflected in Victoria’s pragmatic approach to career building, as he secured favor with a vast array of patrons over the course of his life, many of whom were tied to the Order in some way. Jesuit priests found their way into some of the most powerful courts in Europe, including the papal curia. They were confessors to kings, contributed heavily at the Council of Trent, forged relationships with cardinals, and recruited the sons of nobility into the schools; these were among the figures active in Victoria’s places of employment in Rome and in Madrid.²

The role of the Jesuits in Victoria’s education and career has been mentioned in previous investigations of his life, but the links between the composer and the Order’s history and ideals have never been thoroughly addressed. While many Jesuits spent their lives opposing heresy, most remained focused on the ideals of the Order’s founders: spiritual renewal of themselves and others, scrupulous doctrinal instruction, and caring for the physical needs of people from all walks of life. The Society’s members maintained full engagement with the humanistic culture of their time rather than spending their days in secluded prayer and contemplation, and their public involvement extended beyond charitable efforts and into the cutting edge of the arts and sciences. The Jesuits patronized some of the finest artists, architects, and musicians available for service in their churches and pursued intellectual excellence in various fields, including science.

A possible, yet unquantifiable, impact of the Society and humanist philosophy on Victoria is this sense of complete engagement with the world around him, indicated in particular by a desire to serve the less fortunate. Jesuits believed society benefitted best from their active involvement in secular culture as a means of relating to a broad demographic in their quest of “helping souls,” as it was described by Ignatius; Victoria’s charitable activities suggest a similar attitude. Victoria became involved with the Spanish Archconfraternity of the Resurrection, both as a musician and as a volunteer. Confraternities provided numerous benefits for their members,

including spiritual support and opportunities to participate in offering indispensable social services that were beyond the capabilities of the Papal State. These organizations ministered to the thousands of visitors who flocked to Rome on a yearly basis, and took care of the poor, imprisoned, and marginalized.

The Archconfraternity’s practices reflect those common to most Roman devotional societies; they chose to focus their charitable energies upon sick and imprisoned Spaniards. Victoria’s involvement is reflected by evidence of his participation in a variety of activities, concentrated most heavily during the years 1583 and 1584. He was paid to organize the lavish music for the Corpus Christi processions for nearly a decade, but more importantly, he was appointed as one of the volunteer visitors to the sick and impoverished during 1583. Victoria’s diligence in this task is evident in the account books, which record over two dozen payments to the needy, all signed by the composer himself.3 Similarly, after the Empress María’s death, Victoria’s employment shifted from her personal household to one of her endowed chaplaincies at Descalzas Reales; though his involvement cannot be corroborated, part of the duties of the chaplains of the convent were to minister to the occupants of the adjacent Hospital de la Misericordia, a place where sick and/or poor clergy could come for rehabilitation or housing. This place of residence was maintained by the convent, so the priests of Descalzas also met the spiritual needs of its occupants.

Victoria’s career path, compositional choices, and print dedications indicate a man devoted to all things religious, a rather common trait during the post-Tridentine era of reform, but potentially tied to his Jesuit upbringing as well. He did not pursue high-profile, full-time maestro posts; rather, his extended full-time tenures were restricted to chaplaincies. Chaplains

chanted the Mass and other required liturgies and occasionally provided polyphonic performances in situations where the institution did not maintain a regular choir, as was the case at S. Girolamo della Carità. For the most part, a chaplain’s primary duties were contemplation, prayer, and the care of souls via the administration of rites. Posts in Roman churches increased a musician’s visibility, since all of the institutions staged massive public spectacles on important feasts. While Victoria was involved with some of these activities, particularly during the early portion of his career, he gradually sought more private pursuits. Victoria chose this path as a chaplain in stark contrast to someone like Palestrina, who was married twice and briefly contemplated the priesthood following his first wife’s death, yet subsequently remarried to a wealthy widow, a move that rendered him independently wealthy. Even so, Palestrina still spent a significant portion of his career in prominent positions in the Sistine choir and at the head of the Cappella Giulia, whereas upon his return to Spain, Victoria turned down offers to head the musical chapels at Zaragoza and Seville, two of the wealthiest and most prestigious cathedrals on the Peninsula.

Victoria’s compositional output reflects this piety as well; exclusivity toward church music is not unique to Victoria, but certainly contributes to his cultivation of a spiritual image. While the composer was not nearly as prolific as Palestrina, his works are exclusively sacred, whereas his Roman counterpart published two sets of madrigals. The sources for Victoria’s parody masses include almost exclusively sacred items, ranging from plainchant to motets, primarily his own. The single secular source pertains to the Missa Pro victoria, which did not appear until the collection devoted to Philip III; the unusual source and boisterous style of the mass are perhaps more indicative of the new king’s tastes, rather than the composer’s, though the spirit of experimentation does not seem completely out of character.
A brief glance at the dedications to his publications further reveals Victoria’s devotion to spiritual goals; in the midst of thanking Truchsess profusely for his patronage in the dedication to his debut print, Victoria offers the music “to the glory of God,” and refers to the works contained within as “pious art.” The letter printed at the head of the 1581 Magnificats dedicated to Cardinal Michele Bonelli is particularly interesting: Victoria briefly discussed the nature of music as the most useful of the arts, as it could gently penetrate the hearts of those who hear it, and stated that in this case he took great care to work toward an art intended for the greater benefit of God, a sentiment that echoes the dedication to Truchsess, as well as Ignatius Loyola’s unofficial motto: “to the greater glory of God.” Bonelli would have recognized the reference, as Victoria and the Cardinal were students at the German College together. The 1583 dedication to Philip II contains similar elements, but the composer also indicated his desire to retire to Spain to simply serve as priest, and to live a quiet, prayerful, and contemplative life – at the ripe old age of 35.

Victoria’s pragmatism is the strongest character trait one might tie to Jesuit influence. Like the Order’s leadership, the composer quickly learned to forge connections with important people and organizations, and these relationships ultimately proved fruitful. Victoria’s patrons represent an influential cross-section of religious and political dignitaries; the variety and geographical spread are somewhat unusual, as many composers tended to limit their dedicatees to their immediate sphere of influence. Victoria’s education at the German College led to his tenures as maestro of the Roman Seminary and German College, positions that surely raised his profile as a musician and composer, and it is likely Victoria came under Cardinal Truchsess’s nurture as a result of their mutual involvement with the College as well. Victoria also forged a close relationship with the extremely powerful Habsburg family. The composer’s connection

---

4 Palestrina almost exclusively dedicated his prints to his relatively small circle of Roman patrons, as indicated in Jane A. Bernstein, “Publish or Perish? Palestrina and Print Culture in 16th-Century Italy,” *Early Music* 35/2 (May 2007): 233.
with the Empress María can be less reliably traced to Jesuit influence, yet this remains a possibility; the Spanish and Austrian Habsburg lines both supported the Jesuits’ efforts, particularly in areas affected by Protestant reform. While the Empress lived at the imperial court in Vienna, she acted as advocate and patron for a number of individual Jesuits and for institutions of the Order and maintained close lines of communication to the upper echelons of Jesuit administration in Rome. She also bequeathed a large sum of money to the Jesuit college in Vienna and to found another school in Madrid prior to her move back to the capital. María and Philip’s sister, Juana, maintained a strong political—and pious—presence at court in Madrid, particularly while she served as regent in Philip’s stead from 1554 to 1559; she served as religious guide to the Habsburg women in particular. Juana patronized a number of authors’ works on religion and was particularly influenced by Francisco de Borja, who became third General of the Jesuit Order. Borja’s views made a strong impact on the Spanish royal family, as he was responsible for the household’s religious instruction and served as one of their official confessors from about 1553.5

An examination of Victoria’s Jesuit-like pragmatism must also extend to his tendency to keep his options open. Victoria never professed as a Jesuit, and several factors may explain his avoidance of ties to this and any other religious order, as detailed in Chapter Two. The composer’s decision may have been driven by financial considerations in particular; Jesuits were not allowed to take beneficed positions because acceptance of a steady income source broke their vow of poverty.6 By 1579 Victoria was collecting benefices in excess of 307 ducados annually,

---

and continued to amass funds. Evidence suggests Victoria financed some of his publications himself, indicating some financial stability on his part. Even if he did print at his own expense, the composer marketed his prints well and likely saw a satisfying return on his investment.

Crucial to Victoria’s success was the fact that he published the majority of his compositional output, primarily in massive markets. It is highly unusual that he exclusively published in single-composer volumes, even at the beginning of his career. A significant portion of Palestrina’s output was published posthumously. For instance, he only saw six of his 15 mass collections to the press. During Palestrina’s lifetime, individual works frequently appeared in anthologies compiled by the printers themselves, whereas Victoria’s did not: he maintained tight control over his creative process and image by focusing on single-composer collections, which one might equate with a modern “vanity” publication.

Another indicator of Victoria’s shrewd business sense was in his marketing strategy. Once any printing order was complete, the author was responsible for the distribution of a portion of the finished product, and Victoria was a particularly enterprising salesman. If surviving records are any indication, he routinely sent books to churches all over Europe and even to the New World. All but one of his extant letters accompanied copies of prints, mentioned prints that had been sent, or served as a reminder to the institution that he had not yet been honored with a reward for prints sent. Documented payments for the 1600a tomes indicate that Victoria easily recouped his investment; in the accompanying letters, the composer was quick to offer performance solutions to churches with personnel they considered inadequate for large-scale polychoral repertoire, thus providing a convenient sales angle. Victoria emphasized the

---

8 For more on Palestrina’s publishing habits and vanity publication, see Bernstein, “Publish or Perish? Palestrina and Print Culture in 16th-Century Italy.” Early Music 35/2 (May 2007): 225-35.
organ accompaniment and indicated that instruments could easily be substituted for voices. The musical analysis provided in Chapter Five confirms that the organ score could effortlessly replace one of the choirs in most cases. Although the book was printed in open score, it was a vast improvement over attempting to read from multiple partbooks or sketching out a reduction, problems with which Victoria would have been familiar, since he was an organist himself.

In conclusion, Victoria’s life and output deliver a particularly vivid portrait of how well a humanist environment could serve its student, particularly one who was trained by the Jesuits. He was thoroughly educated in Latin, which widened his employment prospects. The composer clearly was affected by the Jesuit desire to contribute to society by ministering to others, and his choice to serve primarily in a priest’s role also reflects a certain sense of spiritual devotion. Most importantly, the Jesuit Order was known for its practicality in dealing with everyday problems and in drawing people into their churches. This stance often led to loosening of rules, such as the relaxation of Ignatius’s original misgivings regarding polyphonic performance, as he began to see music as a devotional—and promotional—tool. Observing Victoria’s musical choices, his business practices, and interpersonal connections, it is easy to accept that the composer adopted the Order’s pragmatic ways. He chose to write music appropriate for a number of diverse employment environments; the vast majority of his known output appeared in print during his lifetime, which attests to its flexibility and potential for widespread performance. Victoria learned to market his music skillfully by sending letters that offered performance solutions, and he aligned himself with some of the best and brightest figures in the church and nobility by seeking prominent dedicatees, which ensured that his music circulated among the principal Roman and Spanish churches. Whether it was by careful planning or sheer chance, Victoria’s efforts ultimately succeeded to this end.
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# APPENDICES

## Appendix A. Summary of Archival Documents Related to Victoria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Location</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Recipient/Institution</th>
<th>Archive Information</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Title/Position Indicated</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Jan 1582 (Rome)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Seville Cathedral</td>
<td>Archivo Capitular de la Catedral, Sección Fondo Histórico General, Caja 108, doc. nº 9a/3r</td>
<td>Victoria sent books to maestro Francisco Guerrero for service in the cathedral approximately two years prior; he wrote to request remuneration for printing costs.</td>
<td>“su capellán” – archival note erroneously calls him “maestro de capilla del Papa.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Dec 1583 (Rome)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Jaén Cathedral</td>
<td>Archivo de la cathedral, s.l.</td>
<td>Letter sent alongside collection of prints; stated that he had lived in Rome for 18 years, confirming his arrival in the city c. 1565.</td>
<td>“capellán de vuestra señoría” – secretary calls him “maestro de musica”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jan 1586 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Payment record – institution</td>
<td>Descalzas Reales</td>
<td>RB, MD/F/8, Libros de la sacristía, 66r</td>
<td>Alonso López purchased three books of Victoria’s works (masses, motets, Holy Week Office). The convent’s first record of payment to a composer for books, and earliest mention of Victoria.</td>
<td>“maestro de capilla” – López refers to him as maestro; does not specify location or employer</td>
<td>20 ducados (7,500 mrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June 1586 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Payment record – institution</td>
<td>Descalzas Reales</td>
<td>RB, MD/F/8, 68v</td>
<td>López dispensed payment for binding of Victoria prints, as well as Magnificats by Morales and works by various composers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Oct 1586 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Giovenale Ancina, Rome</td>
<td>Rome: Archivio della Congregazione dell’Oratorio, ms. A.I.34</td>
<td>Personal letter in which Victoria mentions his desire to return to Rome until his death; states that Philip Neri had promised him a place in the Congregation.</td>
<td>Did not refer to his occupation, unlike most of Victoria’s correspondence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Mar 1588 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Sigüenza Cathedral</td>
<td>Archivo de la Catedral, sin signatura</td>
<td>Request for remuneration for three prints sent via Francisco de Végar; requested no more than 20 ducados for the group.</td>
<td>“capellán de la emperatriz”</td>
<td>20 ducados (7,500 mrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Facsimile: Ibid., 63-64.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Location</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Recipient/Institution</th>
<th>Archive Information</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Title/Position Indicated</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 July 1593 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Jaén Cathedral</td>
<td>Archivo de la Catedral, sin signatura</td>
<td>Letter accompanying a collection of masses published in Rome, presumably the 1592 print; requests a reward. A note on the reverse indicates receipt by the chapter on 7 Aug 1593.</td>
<td>No reference to occupation; scribe referred to him as “maestro” on the reverse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Jan 1594 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Duke of Sesa</td>
<td>AHN, <em>Libros de iglesias</em> 2141, 236v-237r</td>
<td>Letter from Philip II to the Duke of Sesa, ambassador to Rome; request for the transfer of 150 <em>ducados</em> in pensions at Córdoba to Victoria, upon the death of its former occupant; requested bull of approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d/l</td>
<td>Letter fragment</td>
<td>Francisco de Soto, Rome</td>
<td>Rome: Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele II, Manoscrito musicale 130, f. 1</td>
<td>Informal outline of publication that never went to press; accompanies a manuscript held by the Biblioteca Nazionale; at the end he authorized Soto to make any necessary corrections while the work was in press.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Feb 1598 (Madrid)</td>
<td><em>Poder en causa propia y cesión</em></td>
<td>Juan Nuñez de Alegría</td>
<td>AHP 1358, 201r-v</td>
<td>Authorized collection from Jaén (rents for 1597 and 1598); this was <em>juro</em> income belonging to Isabel de Vitoria y Loayza and Francisca de Loayza; additional <em>poder</em> to collect pension from bishopric of Córdoba and <em>gajes</em> from Empress. Witnesses include Juan de Arce.</td>
<td>“clerigo capellan de la magestad de la emperatriz”</td>
<td>200 <em>ducados</em>, Jaén (75,000 <em>mrs</em>). 150 <em>ducados</em>, Córdoba (56,250 <em>mrs</em>). 120 <em>ducados</em>, <em>gajes</em> (45,000 <em>mrs</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 March 1598 (Madrid)</td>
<td><em>Carta de poder</em></td>
<td>Diego de Vergara Gaveria and Juan López de Oreytia (Seville)</td>
<td>AHP 1358, 383r-v</td>
<td>Authorized to collect 100 <em>pesos</em> for books sent to Lima; witnesses include Juan Baptista de Medina (royal <em>maestro de ministriles</em>), Juan de Arce.</td>
<td>“capellan de la magestad de la emperatriz”</td>
<td>100 <em>pesos</em> (9 reales; 306 <em>mrs</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Oct 1598 (Madrid)</td>
<td><em>Scriptura de contrato</em></td>
<td>Imprenta Real (Julio Junti de Modesti), Victoria</td>
<td>AHP 1358, 661r-663v</td>
<td>Printing contract between Victoria and Julio Junti de Modesti of the Imprenta Real. Detailed in Chapter Four.</td>
<td>“capellan de la magestad de la emperatriz”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Facsimile: Ibid., 78-79.
7 *Gajes* are perks, or perks above and beyond base salary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Location</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Recipient/Institution</th>
<th>Archive Information</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Title/Position Indicated</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Aug 1599 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Protocol document: response to tutela</td>
<td>AHP 2171, 308r-309r</td>
<td>Victoria and his brother Agustín declined to serve as guardians to Juan Luis de Victoria’s children in the case of his death; cited their jobs with the Empress, among other responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Feb 1601 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Jaén Cathedral</td>
<td>Archivo de la Catedral, sin signatura&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Letter accompanied a set of 1600a partbooks; ensured that despite the large resources implied by the repertoire, it could be performed by a small group bolstered by instrumentalists. A note on the reverse indicates its receipt on 15 Mar 1601.</td>
<td>“maestro de capilla de las Descalzas”</td>
<td>Signature does not include a title; archival note calls him “maestro de capilla de las Descalzas”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 July 1601 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Salamanca Cathedral</td>
<td>Archivo de la Catedral, Ala C 3 leg 4 n° 11&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Nearly exact copy of the letter sent to Jaén on 10 Feb 1601; a note states that it was read before the chapter on 20 July, and the chapter voted to send reward.</td>
<td>“capellan de la emperatriz”</td>
<td>6 ducados (2,250 mrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jan 1602 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Alonso Mendez</td>
<td>AHP 2818, 106v</td>
<td>Poder to Alonso Mendez (contador in Málaga); received payment for music books.</td>
<td>“capellan de la emperatriz nuestra señora”</td>
<td>50 ducados (18,750 mrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 April 1602 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Archduke Ferdinand (Graz)</td>
<td>Steiermärkische Landesarchiv, HK 1602-VIII-6&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Letter sent with a set of 1600a partbooks; Victoria mentions only the “misa de la batalla, de que el Rey nuestro señor gustó mucho,” and indicated remuneration could be sent through the Spanish ambassador at the Graz court or via Francisco de Soto in Rome.</td>
<td>“capellan de la emperatriz”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Jan 1603 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Diego Fernández de Córdova</td>
<td>AHP 2823, 49r-v</td>
<td>Poder to Diego Fernández de Córdova (treasurer); collected pension for second half of previous year; witnesses include Bartolomé de Dueñas, Gaspar Ramirez, and Juan Bernando.</td>
<td>“clerigo capellan de la emperatriz nuestra señora”</td>
<td>75 ducados (28,125 mrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>8</sup> Facsimile: Vicente, Tomás Luis de Victoria: Cartas, 84-85.<br>
<sup>9</sup> Facsimile: Ibid., 91-92.<br>
<sup>10</sup> Facsimile: Ibid., 97-98.
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<th>Archive Information</th>
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<th>Amount</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 Jan 1603 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Alonso López, Francisco de Varrosa</td>
<td>AHP 2823, 104r-v</td>
<td>Poder to Alonso López (a chaplain of the Empress) and Francisco de Varrosa; allowed them to collect 1602 income from repayment of a loan to the parish church in Mondéjar; could accept consumable goods such as wheat, barley, lambs, etc.</td>
<td>“maestro tome de Vitoria capellan de la magestad de la emperatriz nuestra señora”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Jan 1603 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de pago</td>
<td>Juan Fernández de Córdova</td>
<td>AHP 2823, 191v-192r</td>
<td>Confirmed receipt of part of the previous year’s benefice via Domingo Gutierrez (contador to the Empress); money sent 8 Nov 1602.</td>
<td>“clerigo”</td>
<td>33,000 mrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June 1603 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Duke of Urbino</td>
<td>Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana Ms 375, XXX, cc. 249-250</td>
<td>Letter sent alongside a set of the 1600a partbooks. As he did in the letter to Archduke Ferdinand, Victoria emphasized the Missa pro victoria and requested payment via Francisco de Soto in Rome.</td>
<td>“capellan de su magestad”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nov 1603 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Maestro Olias, Francisco Varrosa</td>
<td>AHP 2826, 2823v</td>
<td>Olias (Alcalá de Henares) and Varrosa (Vallecas) authorized to collect income on loan to Mondéjar for 1603.</td>
<td>“capellan que fui de la magestad de la emperatriz que esta en el cielo”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nov 1603 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Miguel Prieto</td>
<td>AHP 2826, 2903r-v</td>
<td>Authorization to collect income from Mondéjar loan.</td>
<td>“capellan que fui de la magestad de la emperatriz difunta questa en gloria”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nov 1603 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>María de la Cruz y Victoria</td>
<td>AHP 2826, 2904r-v</td>
<td>Authorized sister to collect income on a loan he had with Valdescapas (bishopric of León); poder valid for ten year term.</td>
<td>“capellan que fui de la magestad de la emperatriz que esta en el cielo”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jan 1604 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Diego Fernández de Córdova</td>
<td>AHP 2828, 72r</td>
<td>Collection of pension from Córdoba, August to December of the previous year.</td>
<td>“capellan de la magestad de la emperatriz que esta en el cielo”</td>
<td>150 ducados (56,250 mrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Jan 1604 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Francisco Lozano</td>
<td>AHP 2828, 70r</td>
<td>Authorized to collect rents from the city of Segovia for the past year (13 August to end of December 1603).</td>
<td>“capellan de la magestad de la emperatriz que esta en el cielo”</td>
<td>100 ducados (37,500 mrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Facsimile: Vicente, Tomás Luis de Victoria: Cartas, 103-06.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Location</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Recipient/Institution</th>
<th>Archive Information</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Title/Position Indicated</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Feb 1604 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Poder en causa propia y cesión</td>
<td>Martín Perserio</td>
<td>AHP 2828, 393r-v</td>
<td>Martin Perserio (one of the Empress’s chaplains) authorized to collect his Segovian rents for the two previous years; ceded the money to Perserio, perhaps to repay a debt.</td>
<td>“capellan de su magestad de la emperatriz que esta en el cielo”</td>
<td>200 ducados (75,000 mrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Aug 1604 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Luis de Onguero</td>
<td>AHP 2829, 378v-379r</td>
<td>Poder to Onguero (chaplain to the king) to collect rents from bishopric of Córdoba for the past year.</td>
<td>“capellan que fui de la señora emperatriz que esta en el cielo”</td>
<td>150 ducados (56,250 mrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Nov 1604 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Juan Martínez, Juan Martínez, Miguel Labratidero</td>
<td>AHP 3101, 618r</td>
<td>Martinez (cleric), Martinez (baker), and Labratidero authorized to collect income from Mondéjar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Nov 1604 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Antonio Suárez de Victoria</td>
<td>AHP 2190, 493r</td>
<td>Poder Authorized brother living in Valladolid to collect reward for prints sent to Archduke Albert; payment sent via Don Juan Carrillo (canon of Toledo), a chaplain in the king’s service.</td>
<td>“capellan de la magestad de la emperatriz”</td>
<td>100 ducados (37,500 mrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 Jan 1605 (Madrid) | Escritura de cesión, poder en causa propia | Isabel Díaz y Poe | AHP 2830, 7r-10v | Borrowed 720 ducados from Isabel Díaz y Poe, perhaps to pay for his final publication; in case he died within six years, he mortgaged 120 ducados in salary, and several of his benefices – loan to Mondéjar, 300 ducados; Córdoba, 150 ducados; Segovia, 100 ducados; Zamora & loan to Villa Yuarna, 120 ducados; 200 ducados in perquisites from the Descalzas foundation; Alonso López mortgaged his own 100 ducados in yearly expense funds from the chaplains’ foundation and served as guarantor. | “el maestro Tome de Vitoria, residente en esta villa de Madrid, capellan de su magestad” | Loan: 720 ducados (270,000 mrs). 
Mortgaged items: 990 ducados (371,250 mrs) 
Mortgaged by López: 100 ducados (37,500 mrs) |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/ Location</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Recipient/ Institution</th>
<th>Archive Information</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Title/Position Indicated</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Jan 1605 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Pedro del Rio, Maestro Olias</td>
<td>AHP 1332, 38r (s.f.)</td>
<td>Poder authorizing Rio (racionero of Toledo Cathedral) and maestro Olias (Alcala) to collect pensions that Luis Onguero signed over to Victoria; completed 10 Jan 1607.</td>
<td>“capellan de la magestad de la emperatriz”</td>
<td>150 ducados (56,250 mrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Dec 1605 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Escritura de venta, cesión, renuncia- ción, y traspaso</td>
<td>Juan de Arce, Martin Perserio</td>
<td>AHP 2832, 847r-850v</td>
<td>Deed of sale, cession, renunciation, and transfer on tax and/or loan income on a number of properties in Madrid; he acted on behalf of Juan de Arce (resident of Valladolid); deed was sold to Martin Perserio, who tied the income to his chaplaincy.</td>
<td>“El maestro tome de Vitoria capellan de su magestad de la emperatriz queste en el cielo”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d. [1606] (Madrid)</td>
<td>Asiento de cédula</td>
<td>Philip III</td>
<td>AHN 2146, fol. 246v-247r</td>
<td>Stated that Victoria was in the organ post in 1606, and had served at the low salary for two years (40,000 mrs) – an official recognition of his request for a raise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Jan 1606 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Pedro del Rio, Bernardo Pérez</td>
<td>AHP 2834, 78r-v</td>
<td>Poder to Pedro del Rio (racionero of Toledo) and Bernardo Pérez (Madrid; possibly his assistant organist) – collection of Toledan rent from 1605, ceded by Luis Onguero on 8 Jan 1605.</td>
<td>“capellan de su magestad de la emperatriz nuestra señora que esta en el cielo”</td>
<td>150 ducados (56,250 mrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Jan 1606 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Agustin de Valverde</td>
<td>AHP 2834, 79r-v</td>
<td>Poder to Valverde (resident of Segovia); authorized to collect his Segovian income for previous half-year.</td>
<td>“el maestro tome de Vitoria capellan de su magestad de la emperatriz nuestra señora que esta en el cielo”</td>
<td>50 ducados (18,750 mrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jan 1606 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Poder en causa propia</td>
<td>Luis de Onguero</td>
<td>AHP 2834, 121r-122v</td>
<td>Authorized collection of rents from Don Pablo de Laguna (bishop of Córdoba) for all of 1605.</td>
<td>“el maestro tome de Vitoria capellan de su magestad de la emperatriz nuestra señora que esta en el cielo”</td>
<td>150 ducados (56,250 mrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date/Location</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Recipient/Institution</td>
<td>Archive Information</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Title/Position Indicated</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb 1606 (Madrid)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>German College</td>
<td>Rome: Pontificium Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum, Fondo Sant’ Apollinare (APO) n° 16a</td>
<td>Letter sent with a copy of 1605 print; Victoria refers to himself as the first maestro of the college, and requests recompense sent via Francisco de Soto. Letter was received on 6 September, and response sent two days later; contents of the reply are unknown.</td>
<td>“capellan de la emperatriz”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jun 1606</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Agustin de Valverde</td>
<td>AHP 2835, 1218r-v</td>
<td>Authorized collection of rent from diocese of Segovia for 1605.</td>
<td>“el maestro tome de Vitoria capellan de su magestad”</td>
<td>100 ducados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Jul 1606</td>
<td>Acrecentamiento</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>AHN Consejos 253, 34r-v</td>
<td>Philip III granted raise in Descalzas organist’s salary and consented to provide back pay from January 1606.</td>
<td>“el maestro tome de Vitoria capellan de su magestad mi señora”</td>
<td>75,000 mrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Dec 1606</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Martín Rodrigo</td>
<td>AHP 2836, 774v-775v</td>
<td>Poder to Rodrigo (canon of Alvarračín) to obtain payment for books from Doctor Vanolas (canon of Alvarračín).</td>
<td>“el maestro Tome de bitoria capellan de su magestad de la enperatriz mi señora”</td>
<td>150 reales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Jan 1607</td>
<td>Carta de poder</td>
<td>Juan Martínez</td>
<td>AHP 3101, 618r</td>
<td>Verification of fulfilment of poder for income from loan to Mondéjar, 8 Jan 1605.</td>
<td>“el maestro tome de Vitoria clerigo presvitero capellan de su magestad de la enperatriz questa en gloria”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jul 1611</td>
<td>Acrecentamiento</td>
<td>Victoria, Bernardo Pérez de Medrano</td>
<td>AHN Consejos 253, 116r-117v</td>
<td>Philip III granted Victoria’s request to name Bernardo Pérez de Medrano as his successor as organist at Descalzas Reales.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Aug 1611</td>
<td>Libro de difuntos entry</td>
<td>Parish of San Ginés, Madrid</td>
<td>Parroquia de San Ginés, Libro segundo de difuntos, 93v-94r</td>
<td>Statement of Victoria’s death in his home on Calle Arenal; will made before Juan de Trujillo; burial at Descalzas Reales.</td>
<td>“clerigo organista de las descaças”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Facsimile: Vicente, Tomás Luis de Victoria: Cartas, 111-114.
Appendix B. Documents

Madrid, AHP, Prot. 1332, 38r (s.f.)

Sepan quantos esta carta de poder bieren como yo tome de bitoria capellan de la magestad de la enperatriz nuestra señora que esta en el cielo residente en esta corte = otorgo y conozco por esta presente carta quedo y mi poder cunplido bastante como le tengo y en tal caso se rrequiere y es necesario con libre y xeneral administraçion al señor pedro del rrio rracionero de la santa yglesia de la ciudad de toledo y al señor maestro olias rracionero de la santa yglesia de alcala y a cada uno y qualquer dellos ynsolidun especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre e para mi puedan pedir y demandar rresçebir aber y cobrar ansi en juyçio como fuera del del ylustrisimo cardenal de toledo y de quien por su señorra ylustrisima lo aya y deba pagar en cualquier manera con bienen saber çiento y cinquenta ducados. que yo e de haber y me pertenezen en nombre y como çesonario que soy de luis onguero capellan del rey nuestro señor por poder en causa propia por el en mi fabor. otorgado ante Juan calbo escudero, escrivano de su magestad residente en esta corte. Su fecho en ella en ocho de henero del año de mill y seisçientos y cinco. Por la causa y rraçon que en el se contiene y declara a que me rrefiero cuyo treslado. Sinado de alono carmona escrivano del numero desta dicha villa para la cobranza de los dichos çiento y cincuenta ducados. Les enbio juntamente con este dicho poder y çerca y en rrazon de lo de suso rreferido hagalos autos y deligencias neçesarios…lo otorgue assi ante el escrivano publico, y testigos y uso escriptos, que fue fecha y ortorgada en la villa de madrid, a diez dias del mes de henero de mil seiscientos y siete años. Estando presentes por testigos francisco muñoz y pedro ramirez y nuno. suarez estantes en esta corte…Thome de Victoria

AHP, Prot. 1358, fol. 201r-v.

Sepan quantos esta carta de poder en causa propia y cesion vieren como yo Thome de victoria clero e capellan de la magestad de emperatriz residente en esta corte conozco por esta carta que doi y otorgo mi poder cunplido libre lleno bastante segun que yo le tengo de dinero qual casso se rrequiere a Juan Martinez de alegria residente en la dicha corte y a quien el estubiere especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre representando mi persona e para el mismo y como [ ] e causa propia pueda pedir demandar rrezibir haver y cobrar [ ] del tesorero o receptor que es afuere de las acavalas e rentas rreales de la çiudad de jaen e…de quien y a cuyo cargo ser de lo dar e pagar el a saver duzientos ducados de la renta de todo este presente ano de quinientos e noventa y ocho dellos tanto quito tengo a juro de por vida al Alvarrazin de todo dicho el millar situados en las dichas alcavalas e partido por previlegio de su magestad en caveçã e por las vidas de dona ysavel de vitoria y loaysa y dona francisca de loaysa y mi dispersicion el traslado del qual dicho previlegio tengo que antes de [ ] dicho thesorero / y para que asi mismo pueda [aido] y cobrar en la manera susodicho y de quien y [ ] pueda y deba en paga ser obligado las rentas y gajes deste dicho ano noventa y ocho y de los çiento y zinquenta ducados de pinsion y gajes que yo tengo sobre [ ] obispas de cordova reservados y por bulas apostolicas y de los çiento y veinte ducados de gajes que tengo de la dicha magestad de la emperatriz – de manera que del dicho [ ] y pinsion y de los dichos gajes an de aver y cobrar la renta deste dicho ano noventa y ocho enteramente e por suma en [ ] quatroçientos y setenta ducados e para los haver y cobrar e hazer e disponer dellos compará del dicho y en cosa suya propia le çedo renuncio e trespasso mis dichos cien y once reales personales [ ] mis […y…] y le pongo que mi dinero e hago rrendaderos e procuradora [ ] en ello – y en su fecho propio por razon que an dever e le doi los dichos quatroçientos e setenta ducados por otros treintas que me a
Poder a Diego de Bergara Gaviria

Sepan cuanto esta carta de poder vieren como yo Thome de Vitoria cappellan de la magestad de la enperatriz Ressidente en esta corte conozco por esta carta que doy e otorgo mi poder cumplido y bastante según que yo le tengo y de derecho se requiere a los señores Diego de Bergara Gaviria y Juan Lopez de Oreyta compañia Ressidentes en la ciudad de Sevilla y a cada uno y cualquier dellos. Por si ynsolidun especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre y como yo mismo representando mi persona puedan pedir y demandar recibir aver y cobrar en juicio fuera del de Juan Lopez de Mendoza estante en la dicha ciudad que vino en la flota que de presente a llegado de las yndias y de sus vienes y de quien y con derecho puedan es a saver cien pesos de A nuebe Reales que le susodicho trae consignados para mi del dotor Solis abogado en la ciudad de los Reyes olima que con firmeza me as ymbiado firmada de su nombre y descontando dello lo que Pareçiere y dijere se deve de fere y aberias de los dichos cien Pessos y para guardar dellos mi orden y boluntad y de lo que recivieren y cobraren den y otorguen su canta o cartas de pago e ffiniquito y otro cualquier Recaudo que convenga y no pareçiendo lo paga de Pressente Renunciarlas leyes y exceçiones de dinero que sobre este casso ablan...en la villa de Madrid corte de su magestad A doce días del mes de marco de mill y quinientos y noventa y ocho anos siendo presentes por testigos a lo que dicho es Juan bumptista de medina maestro de los ministriles de su magestad Joan de Arce Francisco Villota Ressidentes en esta corte...Thome de Victoria

Scriptura de contracto entre Thome de vitoria y Julio Junti de modesti

En la villa de Madrid A primero dia del mes de octubre de mill y quinientos y noventa y ocho anos ante mi el escrivano publico por pareçieron presente los dichos thome de vitoria capellan de la magestad de la enperatriz de la una presente julio junti de modesti de la otra amvos rresidente en esta corte // y dijeron que entre ellos son convenidos y concertados sobre y en Raçon de la ymprission de un libro de musica que el dicho thomee de vitoria tiene compuesto e por la presente se conbienen y conçiertan en la firma de manera siguiente
Primeramente que el dicho julio junti de modesti se encarga de haçer ymprimir y que ymprimira a toda su costa el dicho libro de musica la qual ymprission comencara dentro de seys meses primeros siguientes contados desde oy dia de la fecha desta escriptura en adelante en papel ordinario y de quartilla conforme y del tamaño de los que se ynprimen en venenzia
Yten que la dicha ymprission a de ser de duçientos juegos de a ochenta pliegos cada uno que sobre los que se al dicho la quenta y han de dar ynpressos al dicho Thomee de Victoria en la manera susodicho
Yten que demas de los dichos duçientos juegos de dicho Julio junti a de poder ymprimir otros cien juegos para si e por su quenta sin que por ellos aya de dar cossa ninguna al dicho tomeee de Victoria con que no los ha de poder vender por si ni por ynterposita perssona denttro de un año contado desde el dia que se ubiere acabado la dicha ymprission / y en conformidad desto el dicho
julio junti aya de tener los dichos çien juegos en parte quel dicho thomee de Victoria sea y heste seguro que no se vendan ni usse dellos hasta ser cumplido el dicho año =
Yten que por Racon de la dicha ynpression el dicho tome de Victoria sea obligado y se obliga de dar y pagar e quedara e pagara al dicho julio junti de modesti / va quien por ello deva haver dos mill y quinientos reales que Balen ochenta e cinco mill mrs en que sean convenido y concertado por el precio de los dichos libros siendo cada uno de los dichos ochenta pliegos porque siendo mas e menos pliegos se los ha de pagar al Respecto las quales dichos dos mill e quinientos Reales le ha de dar e pagar y dar el paga por los mill reales dellos luego de contado librados en el Banco de Diego Gaytan de Bargas e Christoval ortiz parece de que el dicho julio juntis se dio por entregado [ ] fecho a toda su voluntad por quanto los a Recevido realmente con efecto e porque la entrega e paga de prescente no parece renuncio la exceçion de la nonumerata pecunia y las leyes de la entrega le prueba della como en ella ese contiene y dellas A mayor abundamente Otorgo carta de pago en forma al dicho thomee de Victoria // y otros quinientos reales se los ha de dar e pagar luego que se comienze a ymprimir los dichos libros y otros quinientos reales estandos ynpressos la mitad dellos y los quinientos reales restantes a cumplimiento de todo el dicho precio en acavandosse la dicha obra e ynpression de los dichos duçientos juegos llanamente de llano en llano sopena de execuçion y costa de la cobranza
Yten que en casso que la dicha ynpresion no tenga efecto el dicho julio junti de modesti sea obligado y se lo obliga de Bolver y que Bovera el pagara al dicho thomee de Vitoria o a quien por ello deva haver los dichos mill reales que ansi ha Recevido y sellan pagado a quenta de la dicha ynpression desde oy dia de la fecha de esta escriptura en seys meses primeros siguientes llanamente de llano en llano sin pleyto ni exesçion segun e sopena de execuçion y costas de la cobranza

Yten que la dicha ynpression sea de comensar como arriba esta dicho dentro de los dichos seis meses primeros siguientes contados desde oy dia de la fecha de esta escriptura prezisamente y prosiguirse hasta que se acave de manera que otra ninguna persona ni el dicho julio junti pueda ymprimir ny ymprima por si ny por otra persona que suplenta ny en los dichos moldes otra ningún ynpression primero que la del dicho tome de vitoria y si lo hiciere sea obligado y se obliga el dicho Julio Junti aboluir luego los dichos dichos mil reales que ansi a rezibido con mas treinta escudos de oro de pena por el ospetal general desta villa de madrid y que en este casso este concierta sea qual ninguno…

Y anbas las dichas partes cada una por lo que le toca se obligaron las sus vienes avidos y por haver deanse o guardar y cumplir pagar e haver por firme e no lo rreclamar ni contradezir yr conbenir contra ello sopena que sobre lo dicho sean contrados en juizio ny suera del e de se pagar y pagado lo quede pidieren y demandaren en contrario seguren conbinieren contra ello contre costas y dineros para execucion dello…el dicho dia mes e ano siendo personas por testigos a lo que dicho es manuel de maçedo y geronimo de obregon e andres de parra residentes en esta lugar e yo el scrivano doi fe que conozco a los dichos otorganes e firmaronlo de sus nombres…el dicho julio junti y testado luego – Thome de Victoria Julio Junti de Modesti

**AHP, Prot. 2171, fol. 308r-309r (not legible; highly deteriorated).**

“Tutela de los Higos de Juan Luis Vitoria” in which Agustín and Tomás de Victoria did not accept guardianship of Juan Luis de Victoria’s children due to their employment with the Empress (4 Aug 1599).
AHP, Prot. 2190, fol. 493r.

Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria capellan de su magestad de la enperatriz difunta que es en gloria otorgo por la carta que doy mi poder cumplido quan bastante de dinero se rrequiere y sea necesario al señor Antonio xuarez de bitoria mi hermano residente en la ciudad de Valladolid y a la persona que sostituyere especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre e para mi pida demandar al cobre del señor don juan carrillo canónigo de la santa iglesia de Toledo seccionero de su magestad y de otra qualquier persona o personas que lo deva pagar por su merced deba saver cien ducados que me a hecho merced el serenísimo archiduque Alberto conde de flandres por unos libros de musica librados en el dicho señor don juan carrillo…Y me obligo, que cumpliere este poder, y las catas de pago, y todo lo otro que por virtud del fuere hecho: y no yre contra ello, so obligacion que hago de mi persona y bienes, y le relieve en forma de derecho. Y por mas firmeza lo otorgue ante el escrivano publico y testigos yuso escritos, que fue fecha y otorgada en la villa de madrid a veinte y tres días del mes de novienbre de seiscientos e quatro anos. Estado presentes por testigos Bartolome de Duenas E domingo Beltran E manuel Martinez…Thome de victoria

AHP, Prot. 2818, fol. 106v.

Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo tome de vitoria capellan de la enperatriz nuestra señora residente en esta villa de madrid / otorgo e conozco que doy e otogo todo mi poder cumplido quan bastante yo le tengo e de diego mas puede y deve valer a diego Fernandez de cordova tesorero de la santa cruzada de la dicha ciudad especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre y ansi como yo mismo e represantando mi propia persona e para mi pueda demandar rrecvir aver e cobraren Juiciuo efuer del de la mesa capitular y obispado de la dicha ciudad de Cordova setenta y cinco ducados que se me deven de la mitad de los cientos e cinqanta Ducados que tengo de pinson en cada un ano por bulas apostólicas sobre el dicho obispado y son de lo corrido desde el dia de san juan de junio de el ano pasado de mil y seiscientos y dos hasta el dia de navidad pasado fin de el dicho ano y de lo que rrecviviere y cobraren pueda dar y otorgar su carta o cartas de pago y otros recados necearios las quales balan e sean tan firmes bastantes e balederas como si yo mismo las diese y otorgase y a ello presente fuese y por mi fuese rrecvivido e cobrado y sobre la dicha cobranza pueda parecer en Juiciuo ante qualesquier Juéces y justicias antellos…E lo firme de mi nombre que fue fecha y otorgada en la villa de madrid a honze dias del mes de henero de mil e seiscientos E tres anos siendo testigos bartolome de duenas y Gaspar Ramirez Juan Bernardo residentes esta villa…Thome de victoria

AHP, Prot. 2823, fol. 49r-v.

Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria clérigo capellan de la enperatriz nuestra señora residente en esta villa de madrid / otorgo e conozco que doy e otogo todo mi poder cumplido quan bastante yo le tengo e de diego mas puede y deve valer a diego Fernandez de cordova tesorero de la santa cruzada de la dicha ciudad especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre y ansi como yo mismo e represantando mi propia persona e para mi pueda demandar rrecvir aver e cobraren Juiciuo efuer del de la mesa capitular y obispado de la dicha ciudad de Cordova setenta y cinco ducados que se me deven de la mitad de los cientos e cinqanta Ducados que tengo de pinson en cada un ano por bulas apostólicas sobre el dicho obispado y son de lo corrido desde el dia de san juan de junio de el ano pasado de mil y seiscientos y dos hasta el dia de navidad pasado fin de el dicho ano y de lo que rrecviviere y cobraren pueda dar y otorgar su carta o cartas de pago y otros recados necearios las quales balan e sean tan firmes bastantes e balederas como si yo mismo las diese y otorgase y a ello presente fuese y por mi fuese rrecvivido e cobrado y sobre la dicha cobranza pueda parecer en Juiciuo ante qualesquier Juéces y justicias antellos…E lo firme de mi nombre que fue fecha y otorgada en la villa de madrid a honze dias del mes de henero de mil e seiscientos E tres anos siendo testigos bartolome de duenas y Gaspar Ramirez Juan Bernardo residentes esta villa…Thome de victoria
AHP, Prot. 2823, 104r-v.
Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria capellan de la magestad de la enperatriz nuestra señora residente en esta villa de madrid otorgo e conozco que doy y otorgo mi poder cumplido quan bastante yo le tengo y de dinero mas puede e debe valer a Alonso lopez clerigo capellan de su magestad de la dicha enperatriz y a francesco de varroso natural del lugar de vallecas a entramas a dos juntos y a cada uno por si ynsolidun especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre y ansi como yo mismo e para mi representando mi propia persona puedan pedir demandar recibir aver e cobrar en juicio e fuera del de cualquier persona o personas a cuyo cargo ayan estado y estén la cobranca e resçivo de los frutos pertenecientes a secura beneficiados e conpaneros de la yglesia parrochial de la villa de mondeaxar los que a mi y me pertenecen y de aver de todo el ano pasado de mil e seiscientos e dos como prestamero de la dicha yglesia ansi trigo cebada y otras a comunias corderos binos menudos pertenecientes al dicho por esta mio y de lo que los susodichos e cada uno dellos rrescibieren e cobraren puedan dar y den su carta o cartas de pago lasto e finiquito con cesion de dineros a los que pagaren como fiadores de otros en pareciendo la paga de presente y la puedan confesar y darse por contentos y entregados della e renunçiar las leyes y ecebçion de la numerata pecunia prueva e paga e las demas deste caso segun e como en ella se contiene sobre la dicha cobranza…fecha y otorgada en la dicha villa de madrid a diez y ocho días del mes de henero de mil de seiscientos e tres anos siendo testigos Bartelome de duenas e bartelome Escudero e Pedro…Thome de Victoria

AHP, Prot. 2823, 191v-192v.
En la villa de madrid a veinte y treinta días del mes de henero de mil y seiscientos y tres anos ante mi el escritano e testigos…presente tome de vitoria cleriigo residente en la dicha villa y dixo y confeso aver resçivido del señor Juan fernandez de cordova tesorero de la de alcantara por mano de el señor domingo gutierrez contador de la magestad de la enperatriz treinta e tres mill mrs en virtud de una cobranca del señor gonçalo fernandez de cordova firmada de su nombre su data en cordova otro de novienbre del ano pasado de mil y seiscientos e dos que su tenor de la quales como se sigue:

En virtud desta paga [ ] señor Juan fernandez de cordova del señor tome de vitoria treinta y tres mill maravedis que se cobrado aquí de la renta de los çiento e cinquenta ducados que tiene de pension sobre este obispado en esta manera los ocho mill y treçientos maravedis del depositario del esto lio del dicho señor obispo Don francisco de reynoso de la rrata del de san juan del ano de mill y seysçientos y uno hasta veintidos de agosto del dicho ano que gozo del ovispado deo contando lo que devio pagar le susidio y escusado de la dicha rrata e los veinte y cinco mill e treçientos e doze maravedis que cobre [ ] de la parroquia de san juan deste ano de mill y seiscientos y dos del contando lo que devio pagar de su sidio y le cusado de la dicha paga anvias partida montaron treynta y tres mill y seiscientos e treze maravedis e se treze maravedis se gastaron de dineros de escrivanos traslados de los poderes e quedaron liquidos los dichos treinta y tres mill maravedis los quales le pagara vmd tomando carta de pago ante el escritano para que descargo e los pondra vmd por quenta del señor pedro fernandez de cordova nuestro ermano a quien los he entregado de contado dada en cordova a ocho de novienbre del ano de mill y seiscientos y dos anos…
El traslado de la cual dicha letra va cierto y concuerda con su original que volvia la presente para que lo entregue con esta carta de pago e de los dichos treinta e tres mill maravedis El dicho tome de vitoria se tubo por bien contento pagado y entregado a toda su boluntad por quanto los resçivi e pasaron de su poder a el…ante mi el dicho escrivano e testigos e lo firmo de su nombre…Thome de Victoria

AHP, Prot. 2826, 2823v.
Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria capellan que fue de la magestad de la emperatriz que esta en el cielo residente en la villa de madrid otorgo por esta carta e doy todo mi poder cumplido quan bastante de dinero se rrequiere y es neçesario y mas puede y deve valer a maestro oliva rraicionero de la villa de alcalá de henares y a francisco barrosa vecino del del arrendador o arrendadores coxedor o coxedores que ayan sido son ofueren y de la persona o personas a cuyo cargo fuere la paga en cualquier manera les a saver todos los frutos que me pertenecen y de aver y se me deven de prestamo de la villa de mondexar de todo este presente ano de mil y seisientos e tres…otorgue asy en la villa de Madrid a diez días del mes de noviembre de mil y seisientos y tres…Thome de victoria

AHP, Prot. 2826, 2903r-v.
Sepan quanto los esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria capellan que fui de la magestad de la emperatriz difunta que esta en gloria residente en esta villa e otorgo y conozco por esta carta que doy todo mi poder cumplido quan bastante de derecho se rrequiere y es necesario e mas puede y deve baler a miguel prieto residente en esta villa e especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre e para mi pida demande resçiva y al cobre en juicio y fuera del del arrendador o arrendadores coxedor y coxedores que ayan sido sino fueren e de la persona o personas a cuyo cargo fuere la paga en cualquier manera es a saver todos los frutos que me pertenece e de aver y se me deven de prestamo que tengo en la villa de mondexar de todo le presente ano de mil y seisientos y tres hasta fin del E de lo que recibiere e cobrare e de cualquier cossa e parte dello pueda dar y otorgar su carta o cartas de pago finiquito y lasto e poderes en caussa propia a los que pagaren por otros con las condiciones fuere [ ] y firmeza al que se requieran e no paresiendo la paga de presente la pueda confesar y dar sepa entregado de ella…otorgue en la villa de Madrid a diez y ocho días de mes de noviembre de mil y seisientos y tres anos siendo testigos bartolome de duenas y sebastian Osorio…Thome de victoria

AHP, Prot. 2826, 2904r-v.
Sepan quantos esta carta de Poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria capellan que fue de la magestad de la emperatriz que esta en el cielo residente en esta villa de madrid otorgo y conozco por esta carta que doy y otorgo todo mi poder cumplido quan bastante de dinero se rrequiere y es neçesario e mas pueda y deve valer a dona maria de la cruz y vitoria mi hermana e especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre e para ella misma por tiempo y espacio de diez anos cumplidos primeros siguientes que corren y se quentan desde oy dia de la fecha desta escritura hasta ser cumplidos pida demande resçiva y al cobre en juicio fuera desde las arrendadores mayordomos terceros coxedores y de la persona o personas a cuyo cargo fuere la paga y de quien como y con dinero la deva hacer en cualquier manera a saver todos los frutos
que se me devieren e pertenescieren de aquí adelante durante los dichos diez anos del prestamo que tenga en baldescapa obispado de leon a los tiempos y plaços que yo los avia de cobrar dello en reciviere y cobrare y de qualquer cossa y parte dello pueda dar y otorgar en carta o cartas de pago firmado e lastos poderes en en causa propia…en la villa de madrid a diez y ocho días del mes de nobiembre de mil y seiscientos y tres anos siendo bartolome de duenas Joan bernardo sebastian Osorio…Thome de victoria

AHP, Prot. 2828, fol. 70r.
Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria capellan de su magesstad de la emperatriz que esta en el cielo otorgo por esta carta que doy todo mi poder cumplida quan bastante de lo se requiere y es necesario como puede debe valer a francisco locano mercader vizino de la ciudad de Segovia que […] con facultad de juicios y sostituir especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre e para mi pida demandar rresçivio y ay al cobre del señor obispo de la ciudad de Segovia y de sus mayordomos y tesoreros y de otras qualesquier personas a cuyo cargo […] pagas a saver todos los maravedis que se me deven del desde treçe de agosto del ano pasado de mil y seyscientos e tres hasta fin de diziembre de los çien ducados que tiene de pension…pagado por bulas apostolicas…fecha y otorgada en la villa de madrid a onze días del mes de henero de mil y seiscientos y quatro anos. Estando presentes por testigos Bartolome de Duenas Juan Bernardo y Alonso de cobarrubias…Thome de victoria

AHP, Prot. 2828, 72r.
Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria capellan de la magesstad de la emperatriz que esta en el cielo otorgo por esta carta que doy todo mi poder cumplido quan bastante de dinero se rrequiere y es necesario al señor diego Fernandez de cordoba tesorero de la santa obisbado de cordoba con facultad de sostituir especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre pida demande rresçivio y ay al cobre del señor obispo de la dicha ciudad de cordoba e de quien doy de otra cualquier persona a cuyo cargo […] la paga […] a saver todos los […] que se me deven de lo corrido desde presente de agosto del ano pasado de mil y seyscientos e tres hasta el fin de mes de diziembre desde los ciento cinquenta ducados de pension en cada un ano sobre santa obispado por bula appostolica…Y por mas firmeza lo otorgue ante el escrivano publico y testigos yusoescritos: que fue fecha y otorgada en la villa de Madrid al ocho días del mes de henero de mil y seiscientos y quatro anos. Estando presentes por testigos Bartolome de Duenas, Juan Bernardo, Alonso de cobarrubias…Thome de victoria

AHP, Prot. 2828, 393r-v.
Poder en causa propia del padre martin perserio que otorgue el maestro tome de vitoria
Sepan quanto desta carta de poder en caussa propia y zesion vieren como yo el maestro tome de victoria capellan de su magesstad de la emperatriz que esta en el cielo otorgo por esta carta que doy todo mi poder cumplido quan bastante de derecho se rrequiere y sea neçesario en las demas puede deve valer al padre martin perserio ansí mismo capellan de la emperatriz especialmente para mi y en mi nombre […] como en su […] y causa propia pida demande rreçivir y [doy] al cobre en juicio e fuera del…a saver duçientos ducados en reales que se me deven corridos de la pension que tengo de çien ducados de renta en cada un ano sobre los vienes y rrentas del obispado de Segovia por bulas apostolicas y donde lo corrido de los dos anos pasados de seiscientos y dos y seiscientos y tres los quales me deven y zesa de cobrar de las personas que adelante heran declarados en esta manera lo corrido y devido de todo el dicho ano pasado de mil
y seiscientos y dos y del doscientos e tres hasta veinte y tres de abril del del señor dotor Maldonado racionero de la santa yglesia de la dicha ciudad de Segovia e de pedro garcía mayordomo que fueron del senor arcobispo de Santiago obispo que fue de la dicha ciudad de Segovia… desde el dicho día veinte y tres de abril del dicho ano hasta trece de agosto luego siguiente del dicho ano de ezalentísimo señor nuncio y coletor de su santidad y de rreal [ ] y sus compañeros veinos de la dicha ciudad de Segovia arredadores de los frutos del dicho obispado = y desde el dicho día trece de agosto hasta navidad del dicho ano de seiscientos y tres del señor obispo que oy es del dicho obispado y de subvienes mayordomos y todo de otras cualesquier personas a cuyo cargo fuere o aya sido la paga y la deva pagar en cualquier forma que de quien con dinero pueda e deva e de lo susodicho… e le ponga e subrrogo en mi mismo lugar el dinero esto por razón que dicho martin perserio vacadado las dichos doscientos ducados de que me doy…otorgue así en la villa de Madrid a honce días del mes de hebrero de mil y seiscientos y quatro siendo Bartolome de duenas joan Bernardo sebastian Osorio…Thome de victoria

AHP, Prot. 2829, fol. 378v-379r.

Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como el maestro tome de vitoria rresidente en esta villa de Madrid capellan que fuera de la magestad de la señora enperatriz que esta en el cielo otorgó por esta carta e doy mi poder cumplido quan bastante de dinero se requiere y sea necesario y mas puedo e debe valer al señor Luis de unguero capellan del rrei nuestro señor rresidente en la ciudad de Valladolid corte [ ] para por mi y en mi nombre e para mi pida demande resçiva ay al cobre en juicio e fuera del de los senores Joan Fernandez de cordoba y Cosme rruiz enbito residente en la ciudad de balladolid u de zoria cualquier persona o personas a cuyo cargo fuere la paga e la deva hacer e de quien e con dinero deva e pueda Esa saver ciento e zinquenta ducados por tantos el señor obispo de la ciudad de cordova me libro de lo corrido de un ano que desde san Joan de Junio del ano pasado de mil seiscientos e tres hasta el mismo día de este presente de mil y seiscientos E quatro de otros tantos que tengo de pension e renta en cada un ano en los vienes y rentas del dicho obispado por bulas apostolicas de su santidad…lo otorguen en la villa de Madrid a diez y seite días del mes de agosto de mil y seiscientos E quatro anos siendo Bartolome de Duenas Juan Bernardo y Alonso Carmona…Thome de victoria

AHP, Prot. 2830, fol. 7r-10v.

Sepan quantos esta escritura de cession y poder en causa propia y todo poder [ ] que en ella de hara mincion vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria rresidente en esta villa de Madrid capellan de su magestad otorgo e conozco que vendo cedo renuncio esta paso a la señora dona ysavel diez y poe muger que fue gavin salvono [ ] criado de la magestad de la enperatriz nuestra señora para hella y para sus herederos y sucesores presentes y por venir y para aquel o aquellos que de hella o de hellos hubiere causa rraçon y rrecurso en cualquier manera sea saver ciento y veinte ducados de renta en cada un ano que la dicha señora enperatriz me hiço merced a el tiempo de su fin e muerte por su testamento devajo de cuya dispusieron mano por mis días y para que los uviese y cobrase de las rrentas que suma necesaria dexo para este efeto y las dema cosas tocantes a los criados de su magestad como del dichos su testamento lo [ ] y los dema recaudos que desto trata y libros de su real hacienda y distribuciones hella consta y parece a que confirmo que son mis propios para sostener en posesion y propiedad por los días de mi bida y que de presente no los tengo enaxenados en ninguno [ ] ncia y ansi lo declaro la qual dicha renta de los dichos ciento y veinte ducados vendo cedo rençunçio estas paso por los dichos mis
días y para que cede hellos desde primero de henero deste ano de la carta por precio Y quantia de setecientos y veinte ducados que de compra de hellos me a dado y pagado e yo de su mano e rrecивido realmente y con efeto y an passado de su poder all mio de que me doy y otorgo por bien contento pagado y entregado a toda my voluntad…y digo y confiesso ques verdadeiro precio y balor que oy dia balen los dichos çiento y veinte ducados de renta por los dichos mis dias son los dichos setecientos y veinte ducados…y si aora o en algun tiempo mas vale o valer pudiere la dicha renta del dicho precio de los dichos seteciento y veinte ducados de la tal demas [ ] valer hago gracia cesion y donacion a la dicha dona ysavel diaz y a los dichos sus herederos y sucesores y si esta donacion e cede o en cualquier tiempo eceder pudiere de los quinientos ducados de oro tantas quantas veces de [ ] e ceder U cediere tantas donaciones le hago sobre que renuncio las leyes dellas donaciones e ynsinuaciones y las del ordenamiento real fecha en alcada de henares que dispone sobre las cossas que se compran o venden por mas o por menos de la mitad del justo o medio justo precio = y desde oy dia que esta escriptura es fecha y otorgada por los dichos mis dias requito desisto y de la poder de la rreal corporal tenencia posesion señorio y propiedad titulo viz action e recurso que yo avia e tenia a los dichos çientos y veinte ducados de renta de la dicha merced y todo lo çedo renuncio y traspasa en la dicha dona Ysavel diez…y doy poder cunplida a la dicha ysabel diez y a quien sucediere en su dinero para que luego y cada y quando que quisiere helle o quien su poder para ello ubiere por autoridad de justicia o sin hella pueda en [ ] tomar y aprehender la posesion de los dichos çiento y veinte ducados de renta…y pidase a note en los libros de la haçienda rreal de su magestad cesaria de la enperatriz nuestra señora para que conste pertenezeres a la dicha dona ysavel y a los dichos sus herederos los dichos çiento y veinte ducados de renta…y desde luego le doy poder en caussa propia para que ella o los dichos sus herederos y sucesores y quien sucediere en su dinero…y balgan como si yo mismo las otorgara siendo presente por la dicha rracon de aver recivido los dichos setecientos y veinte y cinco ducados por el precio y balor de los dichos çiento y veinte ducados de renta que como contento ha [ ] y enteramente pagado de hellos le otorgo carta de pago y finiquito en vastante forma y para la dicha cobrança le cedo todos mis derechos y acciones…y me obligo que los dichos çiento y veinte ducados de renta por los dichos mis dias me son devidos y me pertenecen por la dicha merced y que no los tengo vendidos en otra persona çedidos renunciados ni traspasados obligados ni ypotecados por deuda mia ni ajena ni como fiador de estos y questan libres y esintos de toda carga y obligacion y satisfacion…o si pagaren tres meses contados principio de cada un ano que no se le pague a la dicha dona ysavel diez los dichos çiento y veinte ducados enteramente por los dichos tercios o al fin de los dichos anos que corriere y fuere corriende la dicha renta en cada uno de los que faltare la dicha paga haçiendo yncierta por esta rraçion y por las demas referidas en la tal escritura haciendo por su presente las dilixencias ordinares y que serta enqueta para la dicha cobrança con testimonio de hellas y esta escritura firmes cada uno de los dichos anos por los dichos mis dias y un mes despues dare y pagare a la dicha dona ysavel diez por quien su poder ubiere o sucediere en su dinero los dichos çiento y veinte ducados de renta en cada un ano puestas y pagados en esta villa de Madrid a mi costa e mision en su casa y poder o de la persona ques suyo obiere sopena de pagar y que pagare a la que fuere desde esta villa a la parte y engardo mes yo biviere o morare o tubiere bienes o fuere necesario hacer dilixencias sobre la cobrança quinientos mrs de salario de cada un dia dellos que en la dicha cobrança y dilixencias de hella se ocupare de la y da esta y buesta por los quales dichos salarios se me pueda exa con esta dicha escritura y la de la rraçion y juramento de la tal persona que a hello fuere sin que sea neçesario otra prueba ni averiguacion alguna aunque de fecho y de dinero serte quiera cuyo beneficio renuncio y de hella rrelievo y si
la dicha dona ysavel diez quisiere [ ] la dicha renta en otra presente se la dare señalare y situare en presente cierta llana y sigura y que bien y llanamente sin pleito ni contradiccion alguna y sin que tenga necesidad de entrar en contienda de juramentos sobre la dicha cobrança le pague la dicha renta a su contento y satisfacion o de la persona quel dicho su poder obiere luego que por parte de la dicha dona ysavel diez me den rrequerido sin poner escussa ni dilaçion alguna y para mas seguridad de todo lo contenido en esta escritura y paga dello que en hella se hare mincion doy por mi fiador all señor Alonso lopez capellan de la magestad çesaría de la enperatriz y de la señora princessa residente en esta villa = yo el dicho Alonso lopez que estoy presente acepto de hacer la dicha fiança y de [ ] cirtas fiador del dicho señor maestro vitoria y haciendolo ansí como su fiador llano y principal pagador haciendo de deuda caso ageno propio mio y sin que sea necesarío hacher excursion de bienes [ ] el dicho señor maestro vitoria ni los suyos ni esta dilixencia alguna aunque de hecho y de dinero se requieren…yo el dicho maestro vitoria porta cita y especial y espresa ypoteca ypoteco el prestome de mondexar que vale en cada un ano de renta treçientos ducados = y ciento y cinquenta ducados que tengo de renta y pension en cada un ano sobre el obispo de cordova y cien ducados sobre obispado de segovia = y ciento y veinte sobre el obispo de camerla y la renta del préstamo de villa Yuarna y docientos ducados de gajes que tengo de su alteça de la princesa mi señora = e yo el dicho Alonzo lopes ypoteco por la dicha taçida y especial y espresa ypoteca que a otro cientos ducados que tengo de gajes en cada un ano de las rentas de la dicha señora princesa dona juana y situada en ellas que son mias propias…en la villa de Madrid a primero de henero de mill y seisçientos y cinco anos…Thome de victoria Dona ysabel diez Alonso lopez

AHP, Prot. 2832, fol. 847r-850v.

Most of the contract was excised from this transcription, due to poor legibility; Victoria acted as agent on behalf of Juan de Arces, rather than himself.
satisfacción = y el dicho senor lizençiado martin peserio me pide le haga y otorgue la dicha escritura y cumpla en el dicho conçierto…otorgo y conozco por esta escritura que en nombre del dicho Juan de arze mi parte de sus herederos y sucesores vendo cedo rrenuncio [ ] en venta rreal por juro de [ ] para agora e para siembre jamaba la dicha capellanía capellan o capellanes que por tiempo fueren y subzedieren en ella para la dicha capellanía y dichos capellanes que binieren y subzedieren en ella en cualquier tiempo el dicho çenso…en la villa de Madrid a nueve dias del mes de diziembre de mil y seiscientos y cinco anos siendo testigo juan Bernardo Cristobal de Lerma y francisco de Villalta…Thome de victoria

AHP, Prot. 2834, fol. 78r-v.
Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria capellan de su magestad de la emperatriz nuestra señora que esta en el çielo Ressidente en esta villa dessonario del seño Luis unguerdo capellan de su magestad Ressidente en su corte en virtud de la çession e poder que del tiene que passo y el otorgo ante juan calvo scrivano de su magestad su fecha a ocho dias del mes de henero del ano passado de mill y seiscientos e cinco a [ ] del ussando otorgo y conozco por esta carta que doy mi poder cumplido quan bastante de dinero se requiere y es nezessario y mas puede y deve valer al señor agustin de balverde Ressidente en la ciudad de segovia espeçialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre e para mi pida demanden rescivan ayan e cobren en juicio y fuera desde seño obispo de la dicha çiudad de Segovia y de sus mayordomos y de la perssona o perssonas a cuyo cargo fuere a paga e la deviere hazer en cualquier manera y de quien e con dinero deva e pueda es a saver çiento y cinquenta ducados que valen çiento y seis mill y duçientos y cinquenta mrs de lo corrido y devido de todo el ano passado de mill y seiscientos y cinco de otra tanta cantidad quel dicho mi parte tiene de renta en cada un ano sobre los frutos del dicho arcobispo y a mi me pertenencon como su zessionero y de lo que Resçiviere y cobraren y de cualquier cossa e parte dello puedan dar y otorgar sus carta o cartas de pago lasto y finiquito a los que pasaren como fiadores de otros las quales valgan y sean tan firmes vastantes y valederas como si yo mismo las diera y otorgara e fuera presente a su otorgamiento…lo otorgue anssi en la villa de Madrid a onze dias del mes de henero de mill y seiscientos y seis anos siendo testamentarios Juan Bernardo Cristobal de Lerma y francisco de villalto…Thome de victoria

AHP, Prot. 2834, 79r-v.
Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria capellan de su magestad de la emperatriz nuestra señora que esta en el çielo Ressidente en esta villa dessonario del seño Luis unguerdo capellan de su magestad Ressidente en su corte en virtud de la çession e poder que del tiene que passo y el otorgo ante juan calvo scrivano de su magestad su fecha a ocho dias del mes de henero del ano passado de mill y seiscientos e cinco a [ ] del ussando otorgo y conozco por esta carta que doy mi poder cumplido quan bastante de dinero se requiere y es nezessario y mas puede y deve valer al seño obispo de la dicha çiudad de Segovia y de sus mayordomos y de la perssona o perssonas a cuyo cargo fuere a paga e la deviere hazer en cualquier manera y de quien e con dinero deva e pueda es a saver çiento y cinquenta ducados que valen çiento y seis mill y setecientos y cinquenta mrs que se me deven de lo corrido y devido de medio ano que cumplio el dia de navidad pasada del ano de mill y seiscientos y cinco de los çien ducados que tengo de renta en cada un ano sobre el dicho obispado por bulas apostolicas de su santidad…lo otorgue anssi ante escrivano publico y testamentarios en la villa de Madrid a onze días del mes de henero de mill y seiscientos y seis anos siendo testigos juan Bernardo Cristobal de Lerma y francisco de Villalta…Thome de victoria
AHP, Prot. 2834, 121r-122v.

Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria capellan de su magestad de la emperatriz nuestra señora questa en el cielo Ressidente en esta villa otorgo y conozco por esta carta que doy mi poder cumplido en causa propia quan bastante de derecho se rrequiere y es nezessario y mas puede y debe valer al señor Luis unguero capellan de su magestad ressidene en la ciudad de Valladolid especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre y para el mismo como en su mismo fecho y caussa propia pida demande resciva aya y cobre en juicio y fuera desde el señor don pablo de laguna obispo de Cordova u de su mayordomo o mayordomos y de la perssona o personas a cuyo cargo fuere la paga e la deviere hazer en cualquier manera y de quien y con dinero deve e pueda esa saver ciento y cinquenta ducados que valen cincuenta y seis mill y duçientos y cinqenta mrs que se me deven de todo el ano passado de mill y seiscientos y cinco y todo lo demas que se me deve e deviere deste presentse ano de mill y seiscientos y seis y los demas anos al venideros durante los dias de mi vida o mi entra fuere mi voluntad que para la dicha cobranza le zedo de todo lo qual y dar y otorgar cartas de pago y finiquito y lasto que quisiere y le fueren pedidas y hazer sobre ella los autos y diligencias que judiciás y estrajudicialmente convengan y sean nezessarias y los que yo podria hazer presentse siendo = le zedo renuncio y tresspaso todos mis derechos y acçiones reales y personales mistos u treces direto e executivos que tengo e me pertenezen y mi pueden pertenezer en esta racon y le haga procurador actor defensor en su mismo fecho y caussa propia con libre y general administracion para que aya e cobre lo sussodicho e les ha dado e pagado de los çiento y cinqenta ducados de pinsiones que en cada un ano tengo rezerbados sobre los frutos y rentas del dicho obispado por bulas apostolicas de su santidad = esto por quanto que en compenssacon y paga dello el dicho senor Luis unguero…y otorgar poder en caussa propia en forma para que aya e cobre para mi mismo otros ciento y cinquenta ducados en cada un ano desde principio del dicho ano de seiscientos e cinco en adelante durante sus dias dellos mismos que en cada un ano tiene de penssion sobre el dicho arcobispado de Toledo por bulas apostolicas de su ssantidad del qual dicho poder essicion a mayor abundamiento me doy e otorgo por vien contento y entregado a mi voluntad y le recivio de la prueva del otorgamiento sobre que renuncio las sebçion de la nonumerata pecunia y las demas de este cass o como en ellas se contiene y queda a cargo del dicho senor Luis unguero el subsidio y escussado que de la dicha mi pinssion se deve y deviere y al mio el pagar y descontar el subsidio y escussado que se deve y deviere de la suya y si alguna cantidad fuere e montare el dicho subsidio y escussado mas de la dicha pinssion que la otra en qualquer que sea por lo que a mi toca yo de mi parte le hago quita su esta y donacion en forma como el dicho senor Luis unguero me la tiene de [ ] mi y prometo y me obligo de aber por formeste poder y de no le contradezir ni revocar en tiempo alguno sole pressa obligacion que para ello hago de mi persona e vienes avidos e por aver y doy poder a las justicias de su magestad de ecclesiasticas y seglares de qualesquier partes que sean…lo otorgue anssi ante el scrivano testamentarios en la villa de Madrid a diez y seis dias del mes de henero del mill y seiscientos e seis anos siendo testigos Juan Bernardo Cristobal de Lerma y francisco de Villalta estos y el otorgantes que conozco lo firmo Thome de viction

AHP, Prot. 2835, fol. 1218r-v.

Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria capellan de su magestad Ressidente en esta villa de Madrid otorgo y conosco por esta carta que doy todo mi poder cumplido quan bastante de derecho se rrequiere y es nezessario y mas puede y debe valer al señor agustin de balverde Ressidente en la ciudad de Segovia especialmente para que por mi y
en mi nombre y para mi mismo pida demanee resqivir aya e cobre en juicio y fuera del de señor obispo de la dicha ciudad de Segovia y de sus mayordomos o de la persona o personas a cuyo cargo fuere la paga e la deviere hazer en qualquier manera y de quien y con derecho deydeva y pueda le a saber cien ducados que valen treynta y siete mill y quinientos maravedis que se me deven de lo corrido y devido de un ano que se cumplio el dia de san juan de junio passado deste presentes mes y ano de mill y seisientos y seis anos de otra tanta cantidad que tengo de renta en cada un ano sobre el dicho obispado por bulas apostólicos de su santidad...lo otorgue ansi ante el scrivano y testamentarios en la villa de madrid a veinte y seis dia del mes de junio y seisientos y seis anos siendo testamentarios juan Bernardo Cristobal de lerma y Gaspar [saltan]...Thome de victoria

**AHP, Prot. 2836, fol. 774v-775v.**

Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vienen como yo el maestro tome de bitoria capellan de su magestad de la emperatriz nuestra señora Vezino de esta villa de Madrid otorgo e conozco por esta carta que doy mi poder cumplido quan bastante de dinero se requiere y es necezario al señor dotor martin rodrigo canonigo de la yglesia de alvarraçin especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre y para mi mismo pida demande reservia y cobre del señor dotor vanolas canonigo de la dicha yglesia e ynquisidor de sardena y de la expressa persona a cuyo cargo fuere la paga e la deviere hazer en qualquier manera y de quien y con dinero deva e peuda a esta y finiquito cincuenta reales que valen cinco mill y cien mrs de otros tantos quel sussodicho me deve por averles librado el dean y cavildo de la dicha yglesia en sumo para que me los diesse e pagasse a mi de los libros de musica que di para el servicio y ornato de los oficios divinos que en la dicha yglesia se zelebran los cuales dichos ciento y zinquenta Reales aya e cobre segun y por la dicha Racion en la forma referida y de qualesquier frutos y vienes pertenezientes al dicho su canonicato...lo otorgue anssi ante escrivano publico y testamentarios en la villa de Madrid a diez y nueve de diziembre de mill y seisientos y seis anos. Estando presentes por testigos Bartolome de Duenas E Joan Bernardo [ ] Alonso [ ] Thome de victoria

**AHP, Prot. 3101, fol. 618r.**

Sepan quantos esta carta de poder vieren como yo el maestro tome de vitoria clerigo presvitero capellan de su magestad de la emperatriz que esta en gloria residente en esta villa de Madrid otorgo por esta carta que doy mi poder cumplido quan bastante de dinero se rrequiere al licenciado Joan martinez clerigo vecino de la villa de mondezar y a juan martinez panadero vezino desta villa y a miguel labratidero su cuad^ y a cada uno ynsolidun especialmente para que por mi y en mi nombre pidan demanden resçivan e cobren de pedro sanchez vezino de la dicha villa de mondezar arrendedor del trigo ochenta e nueve fanegas e [ ] de trigo = e de Alonzo lopez vezino de aunon cincuenta e nueve fanegas y ocho [ ] de cebada = y de Joan sanchez payatos vezino de almonacir cinc mil e noveçientos e siete mrs que me tocan de corderos lo qual ay de cobre de los susodichos y qualquier dellos...e de quien por ellos lo deva y pagar que me lo deven como a prestamero que soy del prestamo que tengo en la dicha iglesia...Y por mas firmeza lo otorgue ante el escrivano publico y testigos yuesoescritos: que fue fecha y otorgada en la villa de Madrid a nuebe dias del mes de nobienbre de mil y seisientos y quatro anos. Estando presentes por testigos Bartolome de Duenas E Joan Bernardo [ ] Alonso [ ] Thome de victoria
Appendix C. Tomás Luis de Victoria: Works Catalog, Inventory of Prints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Work</th>
<th>vv</th>
<th>1572</th>
<th>1576</th>
<th>1581a</th>
<th>1581b</th>
<th>1583a</th>
<th>1583b</th>
<th>1585a</th>
<th>1585b</th>
<th>1589a</th>
<th>1589b</th>
<th>1592</th>
<th>1600a</th>
<th>1600b</th>
<th>1603</th>
<th>1605</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad caenam agni providi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad preces nostras</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aestimatus sum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleph. Ego vir; 6vv “Ierusalem”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleph. Quomodo obscuratum; alt.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma redemptoris mater</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma redemptoris mater</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amicus meus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animam meam dilectam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardens est cor meum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendens Christus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asperges me, Domine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astiterunt reges</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurea luce</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maris Stella</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Regina caelorum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Regina caelorum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Dei genitrix [Guerrero]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedicta sit sancta Trinitas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictus Dominus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caligaverunt oculi mei</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christe redemptor omnium [I]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Even verses of hymn texts are set polyphonically, unless otherwise noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Work</th>
<th>vv</th>
<th>1572</th>
<th>1576</th>
<th>1581a</th>
<th>1581b</th>
<th>1583a</th>
<th>1583b</th>
<th>1585a</th>
<th>1585b</th>
<th>1589a</th>
<th>1589b</th>
<th>1592</th>
<th>1600a</th>
<th>1600b</th>
<th>1603</th>
<th>1605</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christe redemptor omnium [II]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditor alme siderum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congratulamini mihi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credo quod redemptor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum beatus Ignatius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendit angelus Domine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deus tuorum militum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dic nobis [Victimae paschali laudes]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixit Dominus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor bonus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor egregie</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domine non sum dignus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dum complerentur</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duo seraphim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce Dominus venit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce nunc benedicite</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce quomodo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce sacerdos magnus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eram quasi agnus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estote fortes in bello</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et misericordia eius pro Magnificat primi toni</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exultet caelum laudibus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaude Maria virgo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudent in caelis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heth. Cogitavit Dominus; 5vv “Ierusalem”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Work</td>
<td>vv</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1581a</td>
<td>1581b</td>
<td>1583a</td>
<td>1583b</td>
<td>1585a</td>
<td>1585b</td>
<td>1589a</td>
<td>1589b</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1600a</td>
<td>1600b</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heth. Misericordiae; 6vv “Ierusalem”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic vir dispiciens</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostis Herodes impie</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huius obtentu Deus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iesus corona virginum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iesus nostra redemptio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iesum tradidit impius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incipit lamentatio Ieremiae; 5vv “Ierusalem”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incipit oratio Ieremiae; opt. 8vv “Ierusalem”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In illo tempore [Soriano]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iod. Manum suam; 6vv “Ierusalem”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iste confessor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iste sanctus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iudas mercator</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laetatus sum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamed. Matribus suis dixerunt; alt. 5vv “Ierusalem”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauda mater Ecclesia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauda Sion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudate Dominum omnes gentes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudate pueri Dominum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectio Taedet animam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libera me, 6vv</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letaniae de Beata Virgine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucis creator optime</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Work</td>
<td>vv</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1581a</td>
<td>1581b</td>
<td>1583a</td>
<td>1583b</td>
<td>1585a</td>
<td>1585b</td>
<td>1589a</td>
<td>1589b</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1600a</td>
<td>1600b</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magi viderunt stellam</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat primi toni</em> [odds]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat primi toni</em> [evens]; “Sicut locutus” 5vv, “Sicut erat” 6vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat primi toni</em> [all verses]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat secundi toni</em> [odds]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat secundi toni</em> [evens]; “Sicut erat” 6vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat tertii toni</em> [odds]; “Gloria Patri” 5vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat tertii toni</em> [evens]; “Sicut locutus” 5vv, “Sicut erat” 6vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat quarti toni</em> [odds]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat quarti toni</em> [evens]; “Sicut erat” 5vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat quinti toni</em> [odds]; “Gloria Patri” 5vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat quinti toni</em> [evens]; “Sicut erat” 6vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat sexti toni</em> [odds]; “Gloria Patri” 5vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat sexti toni</em> [evens]; “Sicut erat” 5vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat sexti toni</em> [all verses]</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Work</td>
<td>vv</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1581a</td>
<td>1581b</td>
<td>1583a</td>
<td>1583b</td>
<td>1585a</td>
<td>1585b</td>
<td>1589a</td>
<td>1589b</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1600a</td>
<td>1600b</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat septimi toni [odds]; “Gloria Patri” 5vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat septimi toni [evens]; “Sicut erat” 5vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat octavi toni [odds]; “Gloria Patri” 6vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat octavi toni [evens]; “Sicut erat” 6vv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miserere mei Deus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Alma redemptoris</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ascendens Christus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave Maris Stella</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave Regina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa De beata Maria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Dum complementur</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Gaudeamus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Laetatus sum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa O magnum mysterium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa O quam gloriosum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pro defunctis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pro defunctis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pro victoria</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Quam pulchri sunt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Quarti toni</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Salve Regina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Work</td>
<td>vv</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1581a</td>
<td>1581b</td>
<td>1583a</td>
<td>1583b</td>
<td>1585a</td>
<td>1585b</td>
<td>1589a</td>
<td>1589b</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1600a</td>
<td>1600b</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Simile est regnum caelorum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Surge propera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Trahe me, post te</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Vidi speciosam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne timeas Maria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigra sum sed formosa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisi Dominus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunc Dimittis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O decus apostolicum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Domine Iesu Christe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Ildephonse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O lux beata Trinitas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O lux et decus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O magnum mysterium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O quam gloriosum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O quam metuendus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O regem caeli</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O sacrum convivium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O sacrum convivium</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O vos omnes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O vos omnes, [Responsory]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua [Hispano]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua [Romano]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passio secundum Ioannem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passio secundum Mathaeum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Cramer listed the setting in 1600a as the Roman version; rather, it is the Spanish tune (Cramer, 36).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Work</th>
<th>vv</th>
<th>1572</th>
<th>1576</th>
<th>1581a</th>
<th>1581b</th>
<th>1583a</th>
<th>1583b</th>
<th>1585a</th>
<th>1585b</th>
<th>1589a</th>
<th>1589b</th>
<th>1592</th>
<th>1600a</th>
<th>1600b</th>
<th>1603</th>
<th>1605</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastores loquebantur</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Guerrero]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peccantem me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peccantem me [Guerrero]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peccantem me [Guerrero]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrus beatus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popule meus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuere hebraeorum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quam pulchris sunt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quem vidistis, pastores</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quicumque Christum quaeñrits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quodcunque vincis [same music as Petrus beatus]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recessit pastor noster</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina caeli, laetare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina caeli, laetare</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resplenduit facies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex gloriose martyrum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve Regina [I]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve Regina [II]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve Regina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve Regina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvete flores martyrum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Maria succurre miseris</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctorum meritis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senex puerum portabat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniores populi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepulto Domino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super flumina Babylonis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrexit pastor bonus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Work</td>
<td>vv</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1581a</td>
<td>1581b</td>
<td>1583a</td>
<td>1583b</td>
<td>1585a</td>
<td>1585b</td>
<td>1589a</td>
<td>1589b</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1600a</td>
<td>1600b</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamquam ad latronem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantum ergo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Deum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenebrae factae sunt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibi Christe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradiderunt me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trahe me post te</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristes erant apostoli</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu es Petrus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una hora</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unus ex discipulis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbs beata Ierusalem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ut queant laxis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vadam et circuibo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vau. Et egressus est; alt. 5vv “Ierusalem”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veni creator Spiritus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veni sancte Spiritus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veni sponsa Christi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vere languores</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versa est in luctum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vexilla regis [Hispano]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vexilla regis [Romano]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidi aquam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidi speciosam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. 1600a Edition Notes

The commonly accepted edition of the 1600a works is Pedrell’s *opera omnia*; however, his transcriptions do not always align with the prints, something that Walter Hirschl, Hans von May, and Robert Stevenson addressed in part. Their lists of errata almost entirely exclude the organ score, which contains more errors than the voice parts. This edition is based on sets of partbooks held by the British Library and Biblioteca Nacional de España, the organ book at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, and “cuaderno de voces sueltas” in the Archivo General Diocesano de Valladolid.\(^1\)

Note values were cut in half, and archaic clefs were exchanged for modern clefs appropriate for each voice type; Pedrell’s *opera omnia* features the original note values and extensive retention of C clefs. Brackets above pitches indicate ligatures. The Latin texts reflect modern orthography, apart from the transcription of the dedicatory epistle. Italics indicate instances where text was omitted or the composer indicated repetition (*ij*). The organ book is in open score; this edition employs modern grand staff reduction. Clefs in the organ scores were occasionally adjusted to permit facile reading, as were positions of voice parts within the grand staff, since the ranges of adjacent voices regularly cross. Accidentals that appear in-staff without parenthesis were included by the composer; this edition retains all obligatory accidentals, though some are redundant in modern notation. Some instances of *musica ficta* in the organ score necessitated use of parenthesis rather than *ficta*, and any parenthesis in voice parts are cautionary.

Errata for each work are organized according to four categories: errata in the 1600a prints, errata in the Pedrell edition, incorrect text underlay in Pedrell, and issues of retention, omission, or addition of ties across barlines in Pedrell. Many errors in the original prints were amended by hand, post-production; these are noted in the lists of 1600a errata. Names of rhythmic values are standardized according to the original values, and are abbreviated as indicated below:

\[
\begin{align*}
  l &= \text{longa} & sb &= \text{semibreve} & sm &= \text{semiminim} \\
  b &= \text{breve} & m &= \text{minim} & f &= \text{fusa}
\end{align*}
\]

The Pedrell *opera omnia* is referenced according to the following abbreviation style: volume (Roman numeral), page, system, measure(s) within the system (i.e., VI, p. 6, system 2, mm. 4-6).

---

**Missa Alma redemptoris:**

**Kyrie:**
- **Errata (1600a).** Cantus I: fol. 14, line 3 (m. 32) – wrong note, first syllable of “eleison” (E; should be D). Altus I: fol. 1r, line 4 – upward stem added to left-hand side of ligature. Tenor I: 1r – mismarked as III, Choir II (corrected by hand).
- **Errata (Pedrell).** Organ: Tenor, m. 3 (IV, p. 99, m. 3) – indicated flat (B) as obligatory.
- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus I: mm. 7 (IV, p. 99, m. 7). Altus II: mm. 19-20 (IV, p. 100, system 2, mm. 3-4); m. 36 (IV, p. 102, system 1, m. 1). Tenor II: mm. 6-7 (IV, p. 99, mm. 6-7); mm. 34-35 (IV, p. 101, system 2, mm. 5-6). Bassus II: mm. 19-20 (IV, p. 100, system 2, mm. 3-4); mm. 21-24 (IV, p. 100, system 2, m. 5 – p. 101, system 1, m. 2); m. 35 (IV, p. 101, system 2, m. 6).
- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Altus, mm. 22-23 (IV, p. 100, system 1, m. 6 – p. 101, system 1, m. 1) – retained; Altus and Bassus, mm. 23-24 (IV, p. 101, system 1, mm. 1-2) – retained Altus, omitted Bassus; Tenor, mm. 44-45 (IV, p. 102, system 2, mm. 3-4) – omitted.

**Gloria:**
- **Errata.** Organ: 2v, system 1, Bassus – superfluous rest marked out by hand.
- **Errata in Pedrell.** All: mm. 57-60 (IV, p. 106, system 2, mm. 3-6) – doubled rhythms on beats 1-2 of m. 57, resulting in extra sb of material.2 Tenor I: m. 34 (IV, p. 105, system 1, m. 7) – indicated flat (E) as obligatory. Choir II: m. 61 (IV, p. 106, system 2, m. 7) – incorrect rhythm (3 beats; should be 2). Tenor II: m. 60 (IV, p. 106, system 2, m. 6) – omitted E. Organ: Tenor, m. 49 (IV, p. 106, system 1, m. 1) – did not reduce beat 4 to m; Tenor, m. 61 (IV, p. 106, system 2, m. 7) – wrong note, beat 4 (G; should be E).

**Credo:**
- **Errata (1600a).** Organ: 2r, system 2, Bassus (mm. 27-31) – final rest incorrect (sb; should be m); 2v, system 3, Altus (m. 41) – sharp omitted (indicated with parenthesis); 3v, system 3, Bassus (m. 115) – natural omitted (B; indicated with parenthesis).
- **Errata (Pedrell).** Organ: Altus, m. 15 (IV, p. 109, system 1, m. 3) – did not reduce beat 1 to m; Tenor, m. 97 (IV, p. 114, system 2, m. 1) – re-articulated F, rather than retaining dot.
- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Organ: Cantus II, mm. 86-89 (IV, p. 113, system 3, mm. 4-7) – retained.

**Sanctus:**
- **Errata (Pedrell).** Organ: Cantus, m. 6 (IV, p. 117, system 1, m. 6) – incorrect rhythm (b; should be sb); Tenor, m. 12 (IV, p. 117, system 2, m. 6) – re-articulated G instead of

---

retaining dot; Cantus, m. 30 (IV, p. 119, system 1, m. 3) – retained sb, rather than subdividing beats 3-4 into 2 m.

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus I: m. 11 (IV, p. 117, system 2, m. 5); Altus II: mm. 22-25 (IV, p. 118, system 2, mm. 2-5). Tenor II: mm. 9-11 (IV, p. 117, system 2, mm. 3-5).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Altus II: mm. 16-17 (IV, p. 118, system 1, mm. 3-4) – omitted. Organ: Altus, m. 23-24 (IV, p. 118, system 2, mm. 3-4) – omitted.

**Agnus Dei:**

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Organ: Tenor, m. 27 (IV, p. 122, system 2, m. 6) – added tie, second and third notes.

**Missa Ave Regina:**

**Kyrie:**

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Bassus II: mm. 37-38 (VI, p. 3, system 3, mm. 4-5) – incorrect rhythm (doubles organ book, rather than sb-sb-l). Organ: mm. 24-26 (VI, p. 3, system 1, mm. 2-4) – doubles Altus I, rather than Altus II.

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus I: m. 41 (VI, p. 4, system 2, m. 2). Tenor I: mm. 46-47 (VI, p. 4, system 2, mm. 2-3). Cantus II: m. 19 (VI, p. 2, system 2, m. 5); m. 42 (VI, p. 4, system 1, m. 3); m. 47 (VI, p. 4, system 2, m. 3). Altus II: m. 36 (VI, p. 3, system 3, m. 3). Bassus II: mm. 36-37 (VI, p. 3, system 3, mm. 3-4).

**Gloria:**

- **Errata (1600a).** Cantus I: 3v, line 8 (m. 33) – rhythm corrected by hand, beat 3 (sm to m). Organ: 6r, system 2, Tenor – clef placed on line 3, rather than line 4.

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Organ: All, m. 3 (VI, p. 5, system 1, m. 3) – omitted; Altus, m. 23 (VI, p. 6, system 2, m. 1) – did not cancel sharp (F) from Cantus (indicated in parenthesis).

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Tenor I: mm. 62-63 (VI, p. 9, system 1, mm. 4-5). Tenor II: mm. 66-67 (p. 9, system 2, mm. 1-2).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Altus, mm. 33-35 (VI, p. 7, system 1, mm. 5-7) – tied across mm. 34-35 instead of mm. 33-34.

**Credo:**

- **Errata (1600a).** Altus I: 5r, line 1 (m. 80) – first pitch corrected by hand (from F to E). Tenor I: 5r, line 3 (m. 99, beat 2) – wrong note (B; should be C). Organ: 7r, system 2, Cantus (mm. 24-30) – missing 2 mm. of rests; 6v, system 3, Tenor (m. 51) – natural omitted from second B (indicated by parenthesis).

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Organ: Tenor, m. 61 (VI, p. 14, system 3, m. 4) – reduced beat 4 to m (from 2 sm); Cantus, m. 70 (VI, p. 15, system 2, m. 4) – wrong notes, beat 4 (D; should be B); Bassus, m. 72 (VI, p. 15, system 3, m. 2) – did not reduce beat 2 to m.
• **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).**  *Cantus I:* mm. 57-59 (VI, p. 14, system 2, m. 4 – system 3, m. 2).  *Tenor I:* m. 47 (VI, p. 13, system 2, m. 7).  *Tenor II:* mm. 119-20 (VI, p. 19, system 1, mm. 6-7).

• **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).**  *Organ:* Tenor, mm. 117-18 (VI, p. 19, system 1, mm. 4-5) – retained.

**Sanctus:**

• **Errata (1600a).**  *Cantus I:* 5r, line 6 – text “B. tacet” added by hand.  *Altus I:* 5v, line 2 (m. 34) – final coloration inked in by hand, and second pitch corrected from F to E.  *Cantus II:* 5r, line 1 – final rest (b) and l inked in by hand.

• **Errata (Pedrell).**  *Altus I:* m. 7 (VI, p. 20, system 1, m. 1) – indicated flat as obligatory.  *Tenor II:* mm. 20 (VI, p. 20, system 2, m. 7) – wrong note, beats 2-3 (D; should be C); m. 63 (VI, p. 23, system 3, m. 4) – simplified beat 1 to double organ.  *Organ:* Altus, m. 13 (VI, p. 20, system 1, m. 7) – did not reduce beat 1; Altus, m. 48 (VI, p. 23, system 1, m. 1) – did not reduce beat 4.

• **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).**  *Altus I:* mm. 4 (VI, p. 19, system 1, m. 4); m. 48 (VI, p. 23, system 1, m. 1).  *Bassus I:* mm. 27-28 (VI, p. 21, system 1, mm. 7-8).  *Tenor II:* mm. 34-35 (VI, p. 21, system 2, mm. 6-7); m. 39 (VI, p. 22, system 1, m. 3); mm. 44-52 (VI, p. 22, system 2, m. 3 – p. 23, system 1, m. 5); mm. 62-63 (VI, p. 23, system 3, mm. 3-4).  *Bassus II:* m. 6 (VI, p. 19, system 2, m. 6); mm. 21-23 (VI, p. 21, system 1, mm. 1-3); mm. 30-31 (VI, p. 21, system 2, mm. 2-3); mm. 52-53 (VI, p. 23, system 1, mm. 5-6);

• **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).**  *Bassus II:* mm. 52-53 (VI, p. 23, system 1, mm. 5-6) – added.

**Agnus Dei:**

• **Errata (Pedrell).**  *Tenor II:* m. 15 (VI, p. 25, system 1, m. 3) – final pitch incorrect (A; should be F); mm. 19-21 (VI, p. 25, system 2, mm. 1-3) – pitches and rhythms incorrect:

1600a:

```
\[ \text{re - re no - bis, mi se - re - re no - bis, mi se -} \]
```

Pedrell:

```
\[ \text{re - re no - - - - - - bis, mi se -} \]
```

*Organ:* Bassus, m. 4 (VI, p. 24, system 1, m. 4) – wrong note, beat 4 (A; should be F).

• **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).**  *Tenor II:* mm. 20-23 (VI, p. 25, system 2, mm. 2-5).

• **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).**  *Organ:* mm. 4-5 (VI, p. 24, system 1, mm. 4-5) – omitted.
**Missa Salve Regina:**

**Kyrie:**
- **Errata (Pedrell).** Bassus I: m. 42 (IV, p. 74, system 2, m. 3) – added flat to E (*ficta*).
  Organ: Bassus, m. 2 (IV, p. 72, m. 2) – notated beats 3-4 as dotted *m-sm*, rather than *m-m*; Altus, m. 6 (IV, p. 72, m. 6) – notated beats 1-2 as dotted *m-sm*, rather than *m-m*; Altus, m. 15 (IV, p. 73, system 1, m. 7) – doubled voice; Cantus II, m. 43 (IV, p. 74, system 2, m. 4) – wrong note (A; should be G).
- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Cantus III (Choir II): m. 10 (IV, p. 73, system 1, m. 2). Altus II: mm. 10 (IV, p. 73, system 1, m. 2). Tenor I (Choir II): m. 9 (IV, p. 73, system 1, m. 1). Bassus II: mm. 9-12 (IV, p. 73, system 1, mm. 1-4); m. 36 (IV, p. 74, system 1, m. 4).
- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Cantus I, mm. 40-41 (IV, p. 74, system 2, mm. 1-2) – retained.

**Gloria:**
- **Errata (1600a).** Cantus I: 5v, line 7 (m. 24) – superfluous pitch marked out by hand. Altus I: 6v, line 7 (m. 90) – note inserted by hand. Altus II: 6v, lines 2-3 (mm. 66-68) – text at end of second line omitted, as well as first syllable of third line (“peccata mundi”).
- **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus I: m. 16 (IV, p. 76, system 1, m. 2) – added sharp (*ficta*); m. 42 (IV, p. 77, system 2, m. 7) – omitted natural. Cantus II (Choir I): m. 56 (IV, p. 78, system 2, m. 6) – wrong note, beat 1 (E-flat; should be D). Altus I: m. 28 (IV, p. 76, system 2, m. 7) – indicated sharp with *ficta*; mm. 55-56 (IV, p. 78, system 3, mm. 1-2) – incorrect text and music (reflects Altus line from organ book); m. 90 (IV, p. 81, system 1, m. 1) – wrong note (G; should be B-natural). Bassus I: m. 41 (IV, p. 77, system 2, m. 6) – wrong note, beat 2 (E; should be D); m. 55 (IV, p. 78, system 3, m. 1) – dot omitted (F); m. 57 (IV, p. 78, system 3, m. 3) – wrong note, beat 1 (D; should be C). Cantus III (Choir II): m. 91 (IV, p. 81, system 1, m. 2) – wrong note, beat 3 (B; should be C). Altus II: m. 8 (IV, p. 75, system 2, m. 1) – omitted sharp (F); m. 83 (IV, p. 80, system 2, m. 1) – omitted natural (B); m. 98 (IV, p. 81, system 2, m. 1) – omitted flat (E). Tenor I (Choir II): m. 63 (IV, p. 79, system 1, m. 3) – omitted sharp (first F). Organ: Cantus II, m. 12 (IV, p. 75, system 2, m. 5) – did not reduce beats 1-2 to *sb*; Altus, m. 35 (IV, p. 77, system 1, m. 7) – did not reduce beats 3-4 to *sb*; Cantus I, mm. 35-36 (IV, p. 77, system 1, m. 7 – system 2, m. 1) – doubled rhythm from voice book; Altus, m. 39 (IV, p. 77, system 3, m. 4) – did not reduce beats 1-2; Altus, mm. 40-42 (IV, p. 77, system 2, mm. 5-7) – incorrect rhythm (*l-b*; should be *b-l*); Bassus, m. 41 (IV, p. 77, system 2, m. 6) – did not reduce to *b*; Bassus, mm. 52, 56 (IV, p. 78, system 2, m. 4, system 3, m. 2) – did not reduce beats 1-2; Cantus II, m. 64 (IV, p. 79, system 1, m. 4) – omitted sharp (F); Cantus I, m. 65 (IV, p. 79, system 1, m. 5) – added sharp (C, beat 1); Cantus II, m. 72 (IV, p. 79, system 2, m. 5) – notated natural (B) as obligatory; Cantus I, m. 89 (IV, p. 80, system 2, m. 7) – did not reduce beats 3-4 to *sb*.
**Credo:**

- **Errata (1600a).** Cantus I: 7r, line 7 (m. 115) – two sb rests inserted by hand. Cantus II (Choir I): 7r, line 2 (m. 24) – middle syllable of “genitum” omitted.
- **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus I: m. 83 (IV, p. 87, system 3, m. 2) – omitted natural (B). Cantus II (Choir I): m. 21 (IV, p. 83, system 2, m. 1) – beat 2 should be 8vb. Cantus II (Choir I): m. 113 – ficta (sharp) added to first F; mm. 166-169 (IV, p. 92, system 2, mm. 5-8) – incorrect rhythm (f, rather than b-b-l). Altus I: m. 86 (IV, p. 87, system 3, m. 5) – omitted dot (B); m. 135 (IV, p. 90, system 2, m. 3) – did not reduce beats 1-2 to sb. Bassus I: mm. 133-39 (IV, p. 90, system 2) – C clef placed on third line instead of fourth. Cantus III (Choir II): m. 84 (IV, p. 87, system 3, m. 3) – wrong note, beat 4 (flat; should be natural); m. 132 (IV, p. 90, system 1, 7) – superfluous tie; m. 151 (IV, p. 91, system 2, m. 5) – inserted m rest, and thus shortened value of “Et.” Tenor I (Choir II): m. 123 (IV, p. 89, system 2, m. 6) – omitted natural (B; ficta). Organ: Altus, m. 15 (IV, p. 83, system 1, m. 2) – wrong note, first two pitches (G; should be B); Cantus II, m. 23 (IV, p. 83, system 2, m. 3) – did not reduce stepwise motion; Cantus II, m. 29 (IV, p. 84, system 1, m. 2) – notated natural as obligatory; Bassus, mm. 40-41 (IV, p. 84, system 2, mm. 6-7) – retained rhythm of voice part (minus tie); Cantus I, m. 42 (IV, p. 85, system 1, m. 1) – did not reduce beats 3-4; Cantus II, m. 53 (IV, p. 85, system 2, m. 4) – notated natural as obligatory, and did not reduce beats 3-4; mm. 64-68 (IV, 86, system 2, mm.3-7) – notated right hand as though it were in bass clef, but did not change clef; Cantus III, mm. 74-75 (IV, p. 87, system 1, m. 6 – system 2, m. 1) – wrong note (E; should be D); Altus II, m. 78 (IV, p. 87, system 2, m. 4) – adjusted rhythm (B) to dotted figure, filled in skip of third with A; Cantus I, m. 88 (IV, p. 87, system 3, m. 7) – notated natural (C) as obligatory; Cantus II, m. 134 (IV, p. 90, system 2, m. 2) – omitted natural; Altus I, m. 135 (IV, p. 90, system 2, m. 3) – did not reduce beats 1-2; Altus I, mm. 140-1 (IV, p. 91, system 1, mm. 1-2) – did not lengthen G; Cantus I, mm. 165-66 (IV, p. 92, system 2, mm. 4-5) – incorrect rhythm (m on beat 1, and beat 2 omitted; should be sb).
- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Cantus II (Choir I): mm. 166-169 (IV, p. 92, system 2, mm. 5-8). Cantus III (Choir II): mm. 47-48 (IV, p. 85, system 1, mm. 6-7); m. 150 (IV, p. 91, system 2, m. 4). Altus II: mm. 133-34 (IV, p. 90, system 2, mm. 1-2). Bassus II: m. 126 (IV, p. 90, system 1, m. 1).
- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Cantus I, mm. 6-7 (IV, p. 82, system 1, m. 6 – system 2, m. 1) – retained; Bassus, mm. 22-23 (IV, p. 83, system 2, mm. 3-4) – omitted; Altus, mm. 67-68 (IV, p. 86, system 2, mm. 6-7) – omitted; Cantus III, mm. 88-89 (IV, p. 87, system 3, m. 7 – p. 88, system 1, m. 1) – retained; Cantus I, mm. 165-66 (IV, p. 92, system 2, mm. 4-5) – retained.

**Sanctus:**

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus I: m. 30 (IV, p. 95, system 1, m. 5) – wrong note, beat 1 (E; should be D). Bassus I: m. 27 (IV, p. 95, system 1, m. 2) – superfluous slur. Tenor I

---

3 First addressed by Hirschl (Stevenson, *Spanish Cathedral Music*, 478).
(Choir II): m. 13 (IV, p. 94, system 1, m. 1) – wrong note (G; should be F). Organ: Cantus II, m. 14 (IV, p. 94, system 1, m. 2) – did not reduce to b; Altus, m. 27 (IV, p. 95, system 1, m. 2) – reduced ornamental figure.

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Cantus I: mm. 50-51 (IV, p. 96, system 2, mm. 5-6).
- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Altus and Bassus, mm. 2-3 (IV, p. 93, system 1, mm. 2-3) – omitted; Cantus I, mm. 22-23 (IV, p. 94, system 2, mm. 4-5) – retained; Cantus I and Altus, mm. 36-37 (IV, p. 95, system 2, mm. 4-5) – retained; Bassus, mm. 51-52 (IV, p. 96, system 2, mm. 6-7) – retained; Altus, mm. 53-54 (IV, p. 96, system 3, mm. 1-2) – omitted.

Agnus Dei:
- **Errata (1600a).** Cantus III (Choir II): 8v, line 2 – G at end of second statement of “miserere nobis” added by hand. Bassus II: 7r, line 1 – text after initial “Agnus Dei” scratched out and replaced with “ij.”
- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Bassus II: mm. 26 (IV, p. 98, system 2, m. 5).
- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Cantus II, mm. 23-24 (IV, p. 98, system 2, mm. 1-2) – omitted.

*Missa Pro victoria:*

Kyrie: Organ: Tenor and Bassus, m. 36, beats 2 and 3; m. 37, beats 1 and 2; m. 40, beat 3, through m. 41, beat 2 – stems reversed for legibility.
- **Errata (1600a).** Bassus I: 8r – mensuration sign and rest are reversed at the opening of Kyrie II. Altus II: fol. 8v, line 6 – text of first two syllables of final “eleison” misaligned.
- **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus I and II: m. 22 (VI, p. 28, system 1, m. 4) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats with added rest; should be 3). Tenor II: m. 17 (VI, p. 27, system 2, m. 5) – omitted dotted figure on downbeat. Organ: Cantus, m. 10 (VI, p. 27, system 1, m. 4) – did not reduce Gs; Cantus, m. 22 (VI, p. 28, system 1, m. 4) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats with added rest; should be 3); Tenor and Bassus, m. 25 (VI, p. 28, system 2, m. 2) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats with added rest; should be 3); Bassus, m. 39 (VI, p. 29, system 1, m. 4) – second C, beat 3 should be 8va; Bassus, m. 40 (VI, p. 29, system 2, m. 1) – wrong note, beat 2 (F-F; should be F-G).
- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Cantus I: mm. 28-29 (VI, p. 28, system 2, mm. 5-6); mm. 31-32 (VI, p. 28, system 3, mm. 2-3). Cantus II (Choir I): m. 13 (VI, p. 27, system 2, m. 1); mm. 20-21 (VI, p. 28, system 1, mm. 2-3); m. 41 (VI, p. 29, system 2, m. 2). Altus I: mm. 20-21 (VI, p. 28, system 1, mm. 2-3); mm. 30-31 (VI, p. 28, system 3, mm. 1-2). Bassus I: mm. 32-34 (VI, p. 28, system 3, mm. 3-5). Cantus III (Choir II): mm. 41-42 (VI, p. 29, system 2, mm. 2-3). Altus II: mm. 15-16 (VI, p. 27, system 2, mm. 3-4). Tenor II: mm. 9-10 (VI, p. 27, system 1, mm. 3-4).

Gloria:
- **Errata (1600a).** Cantus II (Choir I): fol. 2r, line 12 (m. 73) – wrong note, beat 4 (changed by hand from A to B). Altus I: fol. 9v, line 3 (mm. 25-28) – second syllable of
“patris” and *ij.* inserted by hand. **Tenor I:** mm. 39-41 (VI, p. 34, system 1, mm. 1-3) – rhythm incorrect in vocal book (did not fit; this edition differs from Pedrell’s realization) – *m* rest at beginning of phrase (line 5) altered to *sb* rest to align rhythm with other voices and organ, and rhythm of second statement of “deprecationem nostram” altered to fit. **Bassus I:** m. 66 – 8v, line 6 (VI, p. 36, system 2, m. 1) – final pitch notated as *sm* rather than *f* (second syllable of first “Dei”).

- **Errata (Pedrell).** **Cantus I:** m. 4 (VI, p. 30, system 1, m. 4) – wrong note, beat 1 (F; should be A). **Tenor II:** m. 6 (VI, p. 30, system 2, m. 2) – aligned rhythm with Altus II, rather than Cantus III/Bassus II. **Organ:** Cantus, mm. 22-23, beat 2 (VI, p. 32, system 1, mm. 3-4) – doubles Cantus I, rather than Cantus II; Altus, m. 39 (VI, p. 34, system 1, m. 1) – final pitch doubles Cantus (C), rather than Altus (A); Cantus, m. 41 (VI, p. 34, system 1, m. 3) – Pedrell includes rest on beat 1; Bassus, m. 51 (VI, p. 35, system 1, m. 5) – incorrect rhythm (*sb-sb*; should be *sb-m-m*); Bassus, m. 62 (VI, p. 36, system 1, m. 4) – incorrect rhythm (*sb* rest-*b*; should be *b-sb* without rest).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** **Organ:** Tenor, mm. 18-19 (VI, p. 31, system 2, mm. 4-5) – retained; Tenor, mm. 36-37 (VI, p. 33, system 2, mm. 3-4) – retained.

**Credo:**

- **Errata (1600a).** **Cantus I:** 9v, line 7 (m. 14; VI, p. 38, system 2, m. 2) – second pitch of “Patre” corrected by hand from C to D; 10v, line 4 (m. 148; VI, p. 49, system 2, m. 4) – flat omitted (E). **Bassus I:** 9r, lines 7-8 (mm. 51-59; VI, p. 42, system 1, m. 1 – system 2, m. 4), 9v, line 7 (mm. 129-131; VI, p. 48, system 1, mm. 2-4), and 9v, line 8 (mm. 137-138; VI, p. 48, system 2, mm. 4-5) – most of opening of Crucifixus incorrect, missing mensuration change, line 7 (more music than given space. In this edition, all three sections are altered to align with organ; Pedrell did the same). **Cantus III:** 10r, line 9 (m. 111; VI, p. 46, system 2, m. 4) – superfluous dot on A. **Altus II:** 10r, line 2 (m. 86; VI, p. 44, system 2, m. 3) – incorrect rhythm (*sm-sm*; should be *f-f*); 10r, line 3 (m. 112; VI, p. 46, system 2, m. 5) – final pitch of “prophetas” hand-corrected from *sb* to *b*. **Bassus II:** 8r, line 8 (m. 16; VI, p. 38, system 2, m. 4) – missing flats.

- **Errata (Pedrell).** **Cantus I and II, Altus I, (Choir I):** m. 99 (VI, p. 45, system 2, m. 6) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats; should be 3). **Cantus II (Choir I):** m. 67 (VI, p. 42, system 3, m. 7) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats; should be 3). **Altus I:** m. 46 (VI, p. 41, system 2, m. 3) – indicated natural as obligatory; m. 130 (VI, p. 48, system 1, m. 2) – flats included as obligatory. **Tenor I:** m. 105 (VI, p. 46, system 1, m. 4) – incorrect rhythm, beat 1 (*sb*; should be *m-m*); m. 130 (VI, p. 48, system 1, m. 2) – wrong notes, beats 3-4 (B and F; should be single B). **All, Choir II:** m. 87 (VI, p. 45, system 1, m. 1) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats; should be 3). **Bassus II:** m. 85 (VI, p. 44, system 2, m. 2) – wrong note (F, first syllable of “Dominum;” should be E). **Organ:** Altus and Bassus, m. 46 (VI, p. 41, system 2, m. 3) – accidentals indicated as obligatory; Tenor, mm. 47-48 (VI, p. 41, system 2, mm. 4-5) – did not sub-divide C; Bassus, m. 52 (VI, p. 42, system 1, m. 2) – wrong note,
beats 3-4 (F-G; should be G-G); 4 Tenor and Bassus, m. 59 (VI, p. 42, system 2, m. 5) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats; should be 3); Cantus, m. 67 (VI, p. 42, system 3, m. 7) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats; should be 3); Cantus and Altus, m. 99 (VI, p. 45, system 2, m. 6) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats; should be 3); Tenor, m. 105 (VI, p. 46, system 1, m. 4) – reduced downbeat; Altus, m. 127 (VI, p. 47, system 2, m. 6) – omitted G on downbeat; Tenor, m. 128 (VI, p. 47, system 2, m. 7) – second pitch incorrect (A; should be F).

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Cantus II (Choir I): m. 21 (VI, p. 39, system 1, m. 4). Tenor I: mm. 104-105 (VI, p. 46, system 1, mm. 3-4). Bassus I: m. 93 (VI, p. 45, system 1, m. 7).

**Sanctus:**
- **Errata (1600a).** Cantus II (Choir I): 3r, line 2 (m. 147; VI, p. 49, system 2, m. 3) – note on “et” corrected by hand (from A to B).

**Errata (Pedrell).** All, Choir I: m. 47 (VI, p. 54, system 1, m. 3) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats; should be 3). Altus I: m. 45 (VI, p. p. 54, system 1, m. 1) – wrong note (F-E-E; should be F-F-E). Altus II, Tenor II, and Bassus II: m. 25 (VI, p. 52, system 1, m. 6) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats; should be 3); m. 51 (VI, p. 54, system 2, m. 1) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats; should be 3). Cantus III (Choir II): mm. 24 and 28, mm. 50 and 54 (VI, p. 52, system 1, m. 5 and system 2, m. 2; p. 54, system 1, m. 6 and system 2, m. 4) – incorrect pattern in each instance:

```
1600a:   Pedrell:  
Ho-san-na          Ho-san-na
```

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: mm. 33-34 (VI, p. 52, system 2, mm. 7-8) – retained. 

**Agnus Dei: Organ:** Tenor and Bassus, m. 16, beat 2 – m. 17, beat 3; m. 19, beat 3; m. 20, beats 3 and 4 – stems reversed for legibility.

---

4 First noted by Hirschl (Stevenson, *Spanish Cathedral Music*, 478).
• **Errata (1600a).** Cantus III (Choir II): 11v, line 2 (m. 25; VI, p. 58, system 2, m. 1) – top pitch due to missing ledger line (E or F; chose F).

• **Errata (Pedrell).** Tenor II: m. 19 (VI, p. 57, system 1, m. 1) – incorrect rhythm, beat 3 (repeated dotted figure from previous iteration of phrase, rather than even division between G and A). Organ: Cantus and Altus, m. 7 (VI, p. 55, system 1, m. 7) – did not reduce from 2 sb to b; Tenor, m. 11 (V, p. 55, system 2, m. 4) – did not subdivide b into 2 sb; Altus, m. 21 (VI, p. 57, system 2, m. 1) – did not re-articulate F, beat 3; Tenor, m. 22, beat 1 (VI, p. 57, system 2, m. 2) – did not reduce to match Bassus.

• **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Cantus III (Choir II): m. 25 (VI, p. 58, system 2, m. 1).

• **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Altus, mm. 20-21 (VI, p. 57, system 1, m. 2 – system 2, m. 1) – retained.

**Missa Laetatus sum:**

Bassus II: 10r – mislabeled as Bassus II, Choir II (should be Choir III).

**Kyrie:**

• **Errata (1600a).** Organ: Tenor, 18v, end of system 2 (m. 60) – b on downbeat amended by hand (to m).

• **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus II: m. 36 (VI, p. 62, system 1, m. 5) – wrong note, beat 1 (G; should be F). Altus III: mm. 19-20 (VI, p. 61, system 1, mm. 4-5) – wrong notes (C-C-B; should be D-D-C). Organ: Altus, m. 21 (VI, p. 61, system 1, m. 6) – did not reduce; Tenor, m. 61 (VI, p. 64, m. 6) – tied two Gs together.

• **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Cantus II: mm. 26-28 (VI, p. 61, system 2, mm. 3-5). Cantus III (Choir II): mm. 8-10 (VI, p. 60, mm. 1-3). Altus II: m. 8 (VI, p. 60, m. 1). Tenor II: mm. 57-58 (VI, p. 64, mm. 2-3).

• **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Tenor II: mm. 62-63 (VI, p. 64, mm. 7-8) – added. Organ: Cantus, mm. 4-5 (VI, p. 59, mm. 4-5) – omitted; Tenor, mm. 47-48 (VI, p. 62, system 2, mm. 6-7) – retained; Cantus, mm. 57-58 (VI, p. 64, mm. 2-3) – retained.

**Gloria:**

• **Errata (1600a).** Cantus III (Choir II): 5r, line 1 (m. 14) – incorrectly placed sharp before second F, rather than first;

• **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus I: m. 89 (VI, p. 72, m. 6) – replaced dot with rest. Tenor I: mm. 26-27 (VI, p. 68, system 1, mm. 6-7) – added tie. Altus II: mm. 87-90 (VI, p. 72, mm. 5-8) – wrong notes (transposed up a third to begin on A; should begin on F). Cantus IV (Choir III): m. 61 (VI, p. 69, system 3, m. 3) – wrong note, beat 4 (A; should be G). Altus III: m. 73 (VI, p. 70, m. 7) – wrong note (dotted quarter = G; should be B). Tenor III: m. 102 (VI, p. 74, m. 4) – incorrect rhythm (dotted sm-f; should be 2 sm); mm. 103-104 (VI, p. 74, mm. 5-6) – superfluous tie. Organ: Altus, m. 23 (VI, p. 68, system 1, m. 3) – did
not reduce beats 3-4 to \( sb \); Altus, m. 92 (VI, p. 73, m. 2) – wrong note, beats 2-3 (G; should be B).

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus III: m. 103 (VI, p. 74, m. 5). Tenor III: mm. 92-93 (VI, p. 73, mm. 2-3); mm. 103-104 (VI, p. 74, mm. 5-6).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: mm. 10-11 (VI, p. 66, mm. 4-5) – retained; Cantus, mm. 19-20 (VI, p. 67, mm. 6-7) – retained.

**Credo:**

- **Errata (1600a).** Cantus III (Choir II): 6r, line 3 (m. 158) – sharp applied to second F, rather than first. Tenor III: 12r, line 6 – mensuration sign amended by hand (from common to cut time). Bassus II (Choir III): 10v, line 7 (m. 60) – badly bled hand correction (assumed correction is \( b, F \)); 11r, line 5 (m. 171) – badly bled hand correction, second note of ligature (assumed C as original; corrected to D). Organ: Cantus, 20v, system 2 – superfluous pitch after final “Amen” (marked out by hand).

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Altus I: m. 8 (VI, p. 76, m. 1) – wrong note, beat 3 (G; should be F); m. 133 (VI, p. 86, m. 5) – final pitch incorrect (F; should be E). Tenor I: m. 17 (VI, p. 77, m. 3) – incorrect rhythm (patterns on beats 1-2 and 3-4 reversed); m. 41 (VI, p. 80, m. 4) – incorrect rhythm, beats 2-3 (reduced to \( sb \)); m. 171 (VI, p. 91, m. 3) – omitted sharp. Bassus I: m. 122 (VI, p. 85, system 2, m. 2) – incorrect octave (F2; should be F3). Cantus III (Choir II): mm. 180-184 (VI, p. 92, mm. 4-8) – wrong notes (F-E-F; should be A-G-A). Altus II: mm. 85-86 (VI, p. 84, system 1, mm. 5-6) – incorrect rhythm (m. 85, beat 3 through m. 86, beat 1 = \( sb-m \); should be \( m-sb \)). Tenor II: m. 17 (VI, p. 77, m. 3) – superfluous tie; m. 154 (VI, p. 89, m. 2) – dot omitted. Bassus II (Choir III): m. 147 (VI, p. 88, m. 3) – wrong note (C; should be D). Organ: Cantus, m. 137 (VI, p. 87, m. 1) – first note incorrect (C; should be A); Bassus, m. 137 (VI, p. 87, m. 1) – did not reduce to \( b \); Bassus, m. 149 (VI, p. 88, m. 5) – retained dotted figure from voice part; Cantus, m. 165 (VI, p. 90, m. 5) – second pitch incorrect (G; should be A).

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus I: m. 43 (VI, p. 80, m. 6). Cantus III (Choir II): m. 63 (VI, p. 83, system 1, m. 1). Tenor II: m. 17 (VI, p. 77, m. 3). Cantus IV (Choir III): mm. 48-52 (VI, p. 81, mm. 4-8).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Cantus IV (Choir III): mm. 48-49 (VI, p. 81, mm. 4-5) – omitted. Organ: Tenor, mm. 23-24 (VI, p. 78, mm. 2-3) – retained; Cantus, mm. 48-49 (VI, p. 81, mm. 4-5) – omitted; Cantus, mm. 130-131 (VI, p. 86, mm. 2-3) – retained; Cantus, mm. 176-177 (VI, p. 91, m. 8 – p. 92, m. 1) – omitted.

**Sanctus:**

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Tenor I: m. 23 (VI, p. 96, system 1, m. 2) – pitches and rhythm incorrect (final pitch, C; should be D. \( m-m-m \); should be \( m\)-dotted \( m-sm \)); m. 55 (VI, p. 97, system 2, m. 3) – final pitch incorrect (C; should be D). Organ: Bassus, m. 8 (VI, p. 94, m. 1) – retained dotted figure from voice; Cantus and Altus, mm. 18-19 (VI, p. 95, mm. 4-5) – tie across barline is in Altus (should be Cantus).
• **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Tenor II: mm. 26-27 (VI, p. 96, system 1, mm. 5-6) – superfluous tie.

**Agnus Dei:**

• **Errata (Pedrell).** Tenor I: m. 8 (VI, p. 99, m. 1) – incorrect rhythm on “tollis” (m-m; should be dotted m-sm). Altus II: m. 17 (VI, p. 100, m. 3) – final pitch incorrect (A; should be C). Altus III: m. 7 (VI, p. 98, m. 7) – first pitch incorrect (E; should be D). Tenor III: m. 2 (VI, p. 98, m. 2) – pitches incorrect (A; should be C); m. 7 (VI, p. 98, m. 7) – first pitch incorrect (C; should be B). **Organ:** Altus, m. 8 (VI, p. 99, m. 1) – omitted entire measure.

• **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Cantus, mm. 25-26 (VI, p. 101, mm. 4-5) – retained; Tenor, mm. 26-27 (VI, p. 101, mm. 5-6) – retained; Bassus, mm. 27-28 (VI, p. 101, mm. 6-7) – retained.

**Magnificat sexti toni (a12):**

• **Errata (1600a).** Cantus I: 14r, line 6 (m. 169) – sharps omitted. Altus I: 14r, line 1 – superfluous rest marked out by hand.

• **Errata (Pedrell).** Altus I: m. 44 (III, p. 97, m. 8) – incorrect rhythm, beats 2-4 (sb-m; should be m-sb); m. 46 (III, p. 98, m. 2) – second pitch incorrect (C; should be D). Cantus II: m. 55 (III, p. 98, system 2, m. 3) – flat omitted, beat 3; m. 179 (III, p. 105, m. 6) – changed B-flat to natural (ficta). Altus II: m. 80 (III, p. 99, system 3, m. 3) – wrong note, beat 1 (C; should be A). Tenor III: m. 107 (III, p. 108, system 1, m. 3) – second pitch incorrect (C; should be B). **Organ:** Tenor, mm. 191-192 (III, p. 100, system 1, m. 6) – wrong note (F; should be C); Cantus, m. 169 (III, p. 104, system 2, m. 4) – indicated sharp with ficta; Cantus, m. 184 (III, p. 106, m. 2) – placed dot on first pitch, rather than including sb + m rest.

• **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Bassus I: mm. 85-86 (III, p. 100, mm. 2-3). Tenor II: mm. 37-38 (III, p. 97, mm. 1-2).

• **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Altus, mm. 34-35 (III, p 96, system 2, mm. 6-7) – omitted; Altus, Tenor, and Bassus, mm. 42-43 (III, p. 97, mm. 6-7) – retained; Altus, mm. 134-135 (III, p. 102, system 2, m. 9 – p. 103, system 1, m. 1) – omitted; Altus, mm. 139-140 (III, p. 108, system 1, mm. 5-6) – retained; Cantus, mm. 187-188 (III, p. 106, mm. 5-6) – omitted.

**Dic nobis Maria [Veni creator Spiritus]:**

• **Errata (1600a).** Cantus I: 14v, line 6 (m. 25; VII, p. 149, system 2, m. 2) – second syllable of “mea” (F) inked over to amend from E to F (natural applied with ficta; obligatory accidental in Pedrell). **Organ:** fol. 22v, system 3, Cantus II (m. 4; VII, p. 147, m. 4) – natural omitted (indicated by parenthesis in this edition; included as obligatory in Pedrell); fol. 22v, system 3, Cantus I, (m. 10; VII, p. 148, system 1, m. 4) – sharp applied
to second F, but not first (indicated by parenthesis; obligatory in Pedrell); 24r – Scimus Christum mismarked “12 voc.”

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus I: m. 8 (VII, p. 148, system 1, m. 2) – included obligatory sharp. Altus II: m. 40 (VII, p. 150, system 2, m. 5) – wrong note (G; should be A).

**Veni Sancte Spiritus:**

- **Errata (1600a).** Altus I: 16r, line 6 (mm. 60-63) – *ij.* added by hand.
- **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus I: m. 44 (VII, p. 144, system 2, m. 1) – omitted natural. Organ: Altus and Bassus, m. 21 (VII, p. 142, system 2, m. 7) – did not reduce beats 3-4; Altus, m. 30 (VII, p. 143, system 2, m. 2) – retained rhythm of voice part; Tenor, m. 33 (VII, p. 143, system 2, m. 5) – retained pitches of voice part (D-D; should be G-A); Tenor and Bassus, m. 34 (VII, p. 143, system 2, m. 6) – wrong notes (G and B; should be two Gs); Altus, m. 57 (VII, p. 145, system 1, m. 7) – did not reduce to *b*; Altus, m. 58 (VII, p. 145, system 2, m. 1) – did not sub-divide first pitch to *m-m*; Tenor, m. 59 (VII, p. 145, system 2, m. 2) – did not simplify; Altus, mm. 62-63 (VII, p. 145, system 2, mm. 5-6) – did not reduce rhythm; Altus, mm. 68-72 (VII, p. 146, system 1, m. 4 – system 2, m. 2) – rhythms incorrect:

```
1600a:
\begin{verbatim}
\text{Pedrell:}
\end{verbatim}
```

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Tenor II: m. 78 (VII, p. 144, system 1, m. 5). Bassus II: m. 42 (VII, p. 144, system 1, m. 7).
- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Bassus, mm. 32-33 (VII, p. 143, system 2, mm. 4-5) – retained; Cantus, Altus, and Bassus, mm. 51-52 (VII, p. 145, system 1, mm. 1-2) – retained; Cantus, Altus, and Bassus, mm. 55-56 (VII, p. 145, system 1, mm. 5-6) – retained; Cantus, mm. 56-57 (VII, p. 145, system 1, mm. 6-7) – omitted; Altus and Bassus, mm. 60-61 (VII, p. 145, system 2, mm. 3-4) – retained; Altus, mm. 65-67 (VII, p. 146, system 1, mm. 1-3) – omitted; Tenor, mm. 68-69 (VII, p. 146, system 1, mm. 4-5) – retained; Bassus, mm. 70-71 (VII, p. 146, system 1, m. 6 – system 2, m. 1) – retained; Bassus, mm. 71-72 (VII, p. 146, system 2, mm. 1-2) – omitted.
Lauda Sion:

- **Errata (1600a).** Bassus I: 15v, line 9 – text marked out and replaced with *ij*. Bassus II: 14r, line 3 (m. 20) – *sb* (C) should not be colored.
- **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus I: m. 40 (VII, p. 138, system 2, m. 1) – wrong note, first syllable of “capis” (C; should be B); m. 53 (VII, p. 139, system 1, m. 9) – wrong note, beat 3 (A; should be G). Altus I: m. 33 (VII, p. 137, system 2, m. 6) – wrong note (G; should be E). Altus I, Tenor I, and Bassus I: mm. 53-54 (VII, p. 139, system 1, m. 9 – system 2, m. 1) – incorrect rhythm (*b*-dotted *sb*-m-*b*; should be *b*-sb-sb-*b*). Bassus II: m. 37 (VII, p. 138, system 1, m. 4) – wrong note (B; should be G); m. 39 (VII, p. 138, system 1, m. 6) – incorrect rhythm (*sm* + 4 *m*; should align with Tenor).

O Ildephonse:

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Altus II: m. 8 (I, p. 153, system 2, m. 2) – incorrect rhythm, beats 1-2 (dotted *m*-f-*f*; should be *m*-sm-*sm*). Tenor II: mm. 51-52 (I, p. 156, system 2, m. 7) – wrong note (A; should be G).5 Organ: Cantus I, m. 27 (I, p. 155, system 1, m. 2) – did not reduce beat 4 to *m*.
- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Tenor II: mm. 25-28 (I, p. 154, system 2, m. 6 – p. 155, system 1, m. 3).
- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Tenor II: mm. 25-26 (I, p. 154, system 2, mm. 6-7) – omitted. Organ: Altus, mm. 3-4 (I, p. 153, system 1, mm. 3-4) – omitted; Cantus I, mm. 11-14 (I, p. 153, system 2, m. 5 – p. 154, system 1, m. 1) – omitted; Cantus II, mm. 17-18 (I, p. 154, system 1, mm. 4-5) – omitted.

Magnificat primi toni (a8):

Organ: Cantus I and II, m. 30, beat 3, to m. 32, beat 2 – stem directions reversed for clarity.

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus II (Choir I): m. 141 (III, p. 90, system 2, m. 1) – indicated flat with ficta. Altus I: m. 32 (III, p. 82, system 3, m. 4) – incorrect rhythm (*m*-m-*sm*-m-*sm*; should be *m*-sm-*m*-sm); mm. 116-117 (III, p. 88, system 2, mm. 2-3) – omitted naturals on downbeats. Tenor I: m. 115 (III, p. 88, system 2, m. 1) – omitted natural (B; ficta); m.

180 (III, p. 92, system 1, m. 3) – indicated dot on beat 3, rather than rest. Bassus (Choir II): m. 16 (III, p. 81, system 3, m. 6) – placed pitch 8vb. Organ: Cantus II and Altus, m. 32 (III, p. 82, system 3, m. 4) – did not subdivide beats 2-3; Tenor, m. 91 (III, p. 86, system 2, m. 2) – did not reduce beats 1-2; Tenor, m. 115 (III, p. 88, system 2, m. 1) – omitted natural (B); Altus, m. 116-117 (III, p. 88, system 2, mm. 2-3) – omitted naturals (Bs); Cantus I, mm. 211-212 (III, p. 93, system 2, mm. 8-9) – retained rhythm from voice book; Altus and Tenor, m. 215 (III, p. 94, system 1, m. 3) – retained dotted rhythm from voice parts; Cantus I, m. 218 (III, p. 94, system 1, m. 6) – did not reduce to b; Cantus I, mm. 223-226 (III, system 2, mm. 2-5) – retained rhythm of voice part.

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Cantus I: m. 89 (III, p. 86, system 1, m. 6). Tenor I: mm. 199-201 (III, p. 93, system 1, mm. 5-7). Bassus (Choir II): m. 129 (III, p. 89, system 2, m. 4); m. 155 (III, p. 91, system 2, m. 2).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Cantus I and Tenor, mm. 26-27 (III, p. 82, system 2, mm. 4-5) – retained; Cantus II, mm. 28-29 (III, p. 82, system 2, m. 6 – system 3, m. 1) – retained; Cantus I and II, mm. 90-91 (III, p. 86, system 2, mm. 1-2) – omitted; Altus, mm. 101-102 (III, p. 86, system 3, m. 6 – p. 87, system 1, m. 1) – omitted; Altus, mm. 121-122 (III, p. 89, system 1, mm. 2-3) – omitted; Cantus II, mm. 211-213 (III, p. 93, system 2, m. 9 – p. 94, system 1, m. 1) – omitted; Cantus II, mm. 215-216 (III, p. 94, system 1, mm. 3-4) – omitted; Altus and Tenor, mm. 217-218 (III, p. 94, system 1, mm. 5-6) – retained.

**Letaniae de Beata Virgine:**

- **Errata (Pedrell).** All, Choir I: m. 70, 76, 80 (VII, p. 156, system 1, m. 1, 7; system 2, m. 3) – rhythm should extend full duration of measure. Cantus I: m. 157 (VII, p. 167, system 2, m. 2) – incorrect rhythm (m-m-dotted sb; should be sb-m-dotted m). Bassus I: m. 87 (VII, p. 157, system 1, m. 2) – wrong note (B; should be C). Organ: Altus, m. 47 (VII, p. 154, system 2, m. 2) – wrong note (E; should be D); Tenor, m. 67 (VII, p. 155, system 2, m. 6) – did not subdivide beats 2-3; All, m. 70 (VII, p. 156, system 1, m. 1) – pitches should extend the full duration of the measure; Bassus, m. 90 (VII, p. 157, system 1, m. 5) – did not reduce beats 3-4 to sb; Altus, m. 99 (VII, p. 157, system 2, m. 7) – did not subdivide beats 2-3.

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus I: m. 128 (VII, p. 159, system 2, m. 6); mm. 163-164 (VII, p. 161, system 2, mm. 8-9). Tenor II: m. 133 (VII, p. 158, system 2, m. 5).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Bassus I: mm. 164-165 (VII, p. 153, system 1, mm. 5-6) – omitted.

---

6 First mentioned by Hirschl (Stevenson, *Spanish Cathedral Music*, 478).
Ave Maria:

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Altus I: m. 92 (I, p. 152, system 2, m. 7) – beats 1-2 incorrect (C and G, m-m; should be C, sb). Altus I, Tenor I, Cantus II, Bassus II: m. 63 (I, p. 150, system 2, m. 7) – pitches should extend the full duration of the measure. Organ: Altus, m. 55 (I, p. 150, system 1, m. 6) – sharp omitted.

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus I: m. 82 (I, p. 152, system 1, mm. 3-4). Tenor I: mm. 24-25 (I, p. 148, system 1, mm. 3-4); mm. 34-36 (I, p. 148, system 2, m. 6 – p. 149, system 1, m. 1); mm. 85-86 (I, p. 152, system 1, m. 7 – system 2, m. 1). Tenor II: mm. 22-23 (I, p. 148, system 1, mm. 1-2).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Altus, mm. 1-2 (I, p. 146, mm. 1-2) – omitted; Cantus, mm. 4-5 (I, p. 146, mm. 4-5) – omitted; Altus, mm. 92-93 (I, p. 152, system 2, mm. 7-8) – retained.

Alma redemptoris mater:

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Tenor I: m. 41 (VII, p. 76, system 1, m. 3) – wrong notes (Gs; should be Fs). Altus II: m. 77 (VII, p. 78, system 2, m. 2) – wrong note (C; should be G). Bassus II: m. 76 (VII, p. 78, system 2, m. 1) – incorrect rhythm (dotted sb-m; should be sb-sb); mm. 110-111 (VII, p. 80, system 2, mm. 7-8) – pitch incorrectly placed 8vb. Organ: Tenor, m. 42 (VII, p. 76, system 1, m. 4) – wrong note, beat 3 (B; should be D); Tenor, m. 43 (VII, p. 76, system 1, m. 5) – second pitch incorrect (D; should be E); Tenor, m. 76 (VII, p. 78, system 2, m. 1) – retained rhythm from voice part.

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Tenor I: m. 86 (VII, p. 79, system 1, m. 4).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Altus, mm. 16-17 (VII, p. 74, system 2, mm. 1-2) – omitted; Tenor, mm. 32-33 (VII, p. 75, system 2, mm. 1-2) – retained; Tenor, mm. 60-61 (VII, p. 77, system 1, mm. 6-7) – retained; Tenor, mm. 86-87 (VII, p. 79, system 1, mm. 4-5) – retained; Altus, m. 98 (VII, p. 80, system 1, m. 2) – retained tie between beats 2-3; Tenor, mm. 100-101 (VII, p. 80, system 1, mm. 4-5) – retained; Cantus and Tenor, mm. 102-103 (VII, p. 80, system 1, mm. 6-7) – retained; Cantus, mm. 108-109 (VII, p. 80, system 2, mm. 5-6) – retained.

Ave Regina caelorum:

- **Errata (1600a).** Organ: Bassus, 31v, system 3 (m. 60) – sb rest added by hand.

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Bassus I: m. 56 (VII, p. 89, system 1, m. 1) – shortened b to sb to match the rest of the voices and organ. Organ: Altus, m. 53 (VII, p. 88, system 2, m. 7) – did not subdivide beats 2-3 (C); Bassus, m. 60 (VII, p. 89, system 1, m. 5) – incorrect rhythm (b; should be sb-sb rest).

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus I: m. 54 (VII, p. 88, system 2, m. 8). Tenor I: mm. 48-49 (VII, p. 88, system 2, mm. 2-3). Bassus II: m. 34 (VII, p. 87, system 2, m. 6); mm. 44-45 (VII, p. 88, system 1, mm. 7-8).
Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell). Organ: Altus, mm. 9-10 (VII, p. 86, system 1, mm. 2-3) – omitted; Tenor, mm. 80-81 (VII, p. 90, system 1, m. 9 – system 2, m. 1) – retained.

Regina caeli:
Organ: Cantus I and II, m. 9 – m. 10, beat 2; m. 43; m. 113: stem directions reversed for clarity.

Errata (1600a). Cantus III (Choir II): fol. 21v, line 2 (m. 71: VII, p. 100, system 1, m. 2) – dot should be rest. Bassus (Choir II): 19v, line 2 (m. 27: VII, p. 97, system 1, m. 6) – rhythm corrected by hand (to b; original value illegible).

Errata (Pedrell). Cantus I: mm. 26-27 (VII, p. 97, system 1, mm. 5-6) – incorrect rhythm, beats 1-2 (sb; should be m-m). Cantus II (Choir I): m. 80 (VII, p. 100, system 2, m. 4) – incorrect:

Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell). Cantus I: mm. 26-27 (VII, p. 97, system 1, mm. 5-6); mm. 83-84 (VII, p. 100, system 2, m. 7 – p. 101, system 1, m. 1). Cantus II (Choir I): mm. 13-14 (VII, p. 96, system 1, mm. 6-7); mm. 21-22 (VII, p. 96, system 2, m. 7 – p. 97, system 1, m. 1); mm. 80-86 (VII, p. 100, system 2, m. 4 – p. 101, system 1, m. 2). Altus I: mm. 3-4 (VII, p. 95, mm. 3-4); mm. 62-64 (VII, p. 99, system 1, m. 7 – system 2, m. 2); m. 124 (VII, p. 103, system 2, m. 6). Tenor I (Labeled “Bassus I” by Pedrell): mm. 3-5 (VII, p. 95, mm. 3-5); mm. 25-27 (VII, p. 97, system 1, mm. 4-6); m. 81 (VII, p. 100, system 2, m. 5); m. 96 (VII, p. 101, system 2, m. 6); mm. 122-24 (VII, p. 103, system 2, mm. 4-6). Cantus III (Choir II): mm. 30-31 (VII, p. 97, system 2, mm. 1-2); mm. 121-26 (VII, p. 103, system 2, mm. 3-8). Altus II: mm. 78-79 (VII, p. 100, system 2, mm. 2-3). Tenor II: m. 6-7 (VII, p. 95, mm. 6-7); m. 22 (VII, p. 97, system 1, m. 1); m. 22 (VII, p. 97, system 1, m. 1). Bassus (Choir II): mm. 6-8 (VII, p. 95, m. 6 – p. 96, system 1, m. 1).

Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell). Organ: Tenor, mm. 9-10 (VII, p. 96, system 1, mm. 2-3) – omitted; Cantus I and II, mm. 12-13 (VII, p.
96, system 1, mm. 5-6) – retained; Cantus II, mm. 17-18 (VII, p. 96, system 2, mm. 3-4) – omitted; Cantus II, mm. 20-21 (VII, p. 96, system 2, mm. 6-7) – retained; Altus, mm. 33-34 (VII, p. 97, system 2, mm. 4-5) – added; Altus, mm. 63-64 (VII, p. 99, system 2, mm. 1-2) – retained; Cantus I, mm. 81-82 (VII, p. 100, system 2, mm. 5-6) – retained; Altus, mm. 91-92 (VII, p. 101, system 2, mm. 1-2) – retained; Altus, mm. 92-93 (VII, p. 101, system 2, mm. 2-3) – omitted.

**Salve Regina:**

- **Errata (1600a).** Tenor I (Choir II): 22r, line 1 (mm. 20-21) – stems added to ligature (by hand). Organ: 34v, system 2, first pitch of Bassus (m. 131) – wrong note (D; retained F from vocal book).

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus I: m. 12, m. 54 (VII, p. 120, system 2, m. 6; p. 122, system 2, m. 6) – accidental indicated with *ficta*; m. 108 (VII, p. 125, system 1, m. 7) – wrong note (C-sharp; should be C-natural); m. 192-93 (VII, p. 130, system 1, mm. 7-8) – reversed rhythms (*sb-b*; should be *b-sb*); mm. 199-201 (VII, p. 130, system 2, mm. 6-8) – incorrect rhythm (Pedrell shortened *b* to *sb*, m. 199, then lengthened *sb* to *b* in m. 201 to compensate). Cantus II (Choir I): m. 18 (VII, p. 120, system 3, m. 6) – natural indicated with *ficta*; m. 148 (VII, p. 127, system 3, “Varia lectio finalis,” m. 1) – incorrect rhythm and pitch omitted, beats 3-4 (C, *sb*; should be C-B, dotted *m-sm*). Altus I: m. 149 (VII, p. 127, system 3, “Varia lectio finis,” m. 2) – included obligatory sharp. Bassus I: (VII, p. 120, system 2) – flat in key signature placed on second space rather than third; m. 188 (VII, p. 130, system 1, m. 3) – doubled organ, rather than providing single F (*b*). Cantus III (Choir II): m. 72 (VII, p. 123, system 2, m. 2) – added sharps to all Fs; m. 64 (VII, p. 123, system 1, m. 2) – added sharp to F (*ficta*); m. 66 (VII, p. 123, system 1, m. 4) – indicated sharp with *ficta*. Altus II: m. 58 (VII, p. 122, system 3, m. 4) – omitted natural (B, beat 2). Tenor I (Choir II): mm. 83-84 (VII, p. 123, system 3, mm. 5-6) – omitted sharps (Cs), natural (B; *ficta*); m. 103 (VII, p. 125, system 1, m. 2) – omitted natural (B); m. 112 (VII, p. 125, system 2, m. 4) – indicated sharp (C) with *ficta*; m. 171 (VII, p. 129, system 1, m. 3) – wrong note (B; should be G); m. 190 (VII, p. 130, system 1, m. 5) – wrong note (B; should be G); m. 202 (VII, p. 130, system 2, m. 9) – natural added (*ficta*). Bassus II: mm. 185-86 (VII, p. 129, system 2, m. 9 – p. 130, system 1, m. 1) – incorrect rhythm (*b*; should be *l*). Organ: Cantus II, m. 18 (VII, p. 120, system 3, m. 6) – indicated natural with *ficta*; Bassus, m. 51 (VII, p. 122, system 2, m. 3) – did not alter first two beats from dotted *m-sm* to *m-m*; Altus, m. 81 (VII, p. 123, system 3, m. 3) – incorrect rhythm (*b*; should be *sb*); Altus, m. 118 (VII, p. 126, system 1, m. 2) – doubled rhythm from voice part; Altus and Bassus, mm. 123-24 (VII, p. 126, system 2, mm. 1-2) – changed left-hand clef to treble, but pitches are still notated as
if in bass clef;\(^7\) Altus, m. 124 (VII, p. 126, system 2, m. 2) – wrong note, beat 4 (B; should be A); Cantus I, m. 139 (VII, p. 127, system 1, m. 5) – first pitch incorrect (D; should be B);\(^8\) Altus, m. 148 (VII, p. 127, system 3, “Varia lectio finalis,” m. 1) – added sharp (F); Cantus I, m. 148 (VII, p. 127, system 3, “Varia lectio finalis,” m. 1) – added flat (E; \textit{ficta}); Altus, m. 154 (VII, p. 128, system 1, m. 4) – wrong note (G; should be B); Cantus I, mm. 200-01 (VII, p. 130, system 2, mm. 7-8) – incorrect rhythms (doubled incorrect rhythm from Cantus I book).

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Cantus II (Choir I): m. 133 (VII, p. 126, system 3, m. 5). \textit{Altus I}: mm. 2-3 (VII, p. 120, system 1, mm. 1-2); mm. 46-47 (VII, p. 122, system 1, mm. 4-5); mm. 123-127 (VII, p. 126, system 2, mm. 1-5); mm. 136-39 (VII, p. 127, system 1, mm. 2-5); mm. 187-88 (VII, p. 130, system 1, mm. 2-3). \textit{Bassus I}: mm. 4-5 (VII, p. 120, system 1, mm. 3-4); mm. 97-98 (VII, p. 124, system 2, mm. 4-5). \textit{Tenor I} (Choir II): mm. 23-24 (VII, p. 121, system 1, mm. 5-6).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Cantus I: mm. 97-98 (VII, p. 123, system 2, mm. 4-5) – added. \textit{Organ}: Bassus, mm. 13-14 (VII, p. 120, system 3, mm. 1-2) – retained; Cantus II, mm. 53-54 (VII, p. 122, system 2, mm. 5-6) – retained; Altus, mm. 131-32 (VII, p. 126, system 3, mm. 3-4) – omitted; Cantus II and Bassus, mm. 142-43 (VII, p. 127, system 2, mm. 2-3) – retained.

**Dixit Dominus:**

- **Errata (1600a).** \textit{Organ}: fol. 36r, system 1, Tenor (final pitch; m. 44) – incorrect value (\textit{sb}; should be \textit{b}).

- **Errata (Pedrell).** \textit{Cantus I}: m. 28 (VII, p. 3, system 1, m. 5) – omitted dot; m. 36 (VII, p. 3, system 2, m. 5) – indicated natural with \textit{ficta}; m. 127 (VII, p. 9, system 2, m. 1) – indicated sharp with \textit{ficta} (first C), then obligatory on following note. \textit{Altus I}: m. 72 (VII, p. 6, system 1, m. 1) – indicated sharp (F) with \textit{ficta}. \textit{Tenor I}: m. 130 (VII, p. 9, system 2, m. 4) – added sharp. \textit{Bassus I}: m. 32 (VII, p. 3, system 2, m. 1) – incorrect rhythm (dotted \textit{sb-sm-sm}; should be \textit{sb-m-m}); m. 116 (VII, p. 8, system 2, m. 6) – omitted second pitch. \textit{Cantus II}: m. 121 (VII, p. 9, system 1, m. 3) – omitted sharps (Cs) and natural (B; \textit{ficta}). \textit{Altus II}: m. 82 (VII, p. 6, system 2, m. 3) – omitted sharp; m. 100 (VII, p. 7, system 2, m. 6) – omitted natural; m. 130 (VII, p. 9, system 2, m. 4) – added sharp (F). \textit{Tenor II}: mm. 97-98 (VII, p. 7, system 2, mm. 3-4) – wrong notes (B-B-B-G; should be D-D-D-B). \textit{Bassus II}: mm. 67-68 (VII, p. 5, system 2, mm. 4-5) – pattern reversed (\textit{sb-sb-sb}; should be \textit{b-sb-sb}). \textit{Organ}: Cantus, m. 19 (VII, p. 2, system 2, m. 4) – omitted natural; Bassus, m. 34 (VII, p. 3, system 2, m. 3) – transcribed C below middle C only (did not leap from 8va); Tenor, m. 130 (VII, p. 9, system 2, m. 4) – added sharp (F); Altus, m. 142 (VII, p. 10, system 2, m. 2) – did not divide \textit{b} into 2 \textit{sb}.

---

\(^7\) First noted by Hirschl (Stevenson, Spanish Cathedral Music, 478)

\(^8\) First mentioned in May, 152.
• Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell). Altus I: mm. 34-35 (VII, p. 3, system 2, mm. 3-4). Tenor I: m. 52 (VII, p. 4, system 2, m. 5). Bassus I: mm. 116-18 (VII, p. 8, system 2, m. 6-8). Cantus II: mm. 19-20 (VII, p. 2, system 2, mm. 4-5). Altus II: m. 35 (VII, p. 3, system 2, m. 4); mm. 117-18 (VII, p. 8, system 2, mm. 7-8). Tenor II: mm. 117-18 (VII, p. 8, system 2, mm. 7-8).

• Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell). Cantus II: mm. 19-20 (VII, p. 2, system 2, mm. 4-5) – omitted. Organ: Cantus and Altus, mm. 69-70 (VII, p. 5, system 2, mm. 6-7) – omitted; Bassus, mm. 97-98 (VII, p. 7, system 2, mm. 3-4) – omitted; Bassus, mm. 122-23 (VII, p. 9, system 1, mm. 4-5) – retained; Altus and Tenor, mm. 123-24 (VII, p. 9, system 1, mm. 5-6) – omitted; Tenor, mm. 132-33 (VI, p. 9, system 2, mm. 6-7) – omitted; Tenor and Bassus, mm. 134-35 (VI, p. 10, system 1, mm. 1-2) – retained; Tenor, mm. 139-40 (VII, p. 10, system 1, mm. 6-7) – omitted.

Laudate pueri:

• Errata (1600a). Cantus I: 24r, line 1 – flat of signature placed on third line of staff (should be fourth). Cantus II (Choir I): 24v, line 4 (m. 114) – wrong note, beat 1 (B; changed to A). Cantus III (Choir II): 24r, line 2 (m. 18) – ink bled onto ligature, rendering it partially illegible. Organ: 37v, All – clefs and signatures omitted from print (added by hand).

• Errata (Pedrell). Cantus II (Choir I): m. 95 (VII, p. 17, system 1, m. 2) – incorrect rhythm (m-m; should be dotted m-sm); Tenor I: m. 82 (VII, p. 16, system 1, m. 3) – wrong note (G; should be F). All, Choir II: m. 98 (VII, p. 17, system 1, m. 5) – incorrect rhythm (3 beats; should be 2 beats + sb rest). Cantus III (Choir II): m. 61 (VII, p. 14, system 4, m. 5) – added dot and omitted corresponding rest; m. 85 (VII, p. 16, system 1, m 6) – first pitch incorrect (D; should be E). Altus II: m. 33 (VII, p. 13, system 2, m. 4) – wrong notes, beats 3-4 (B-A; should be single B, sb); m. 112 (VII, p. 18, system 1, m. 5) – wrong note, beat 3 (F; should be B); mm. 137-38 (VII, p. 19, system 2, m. 8) – wrong note (C; should be A). Tenor II: mm. 85-86 (VII, p. 16, system 1, mm. 6-7) – added pitch, beat 3 (D3, m; should be m rest); m. 116 (VII, p. 18, system 2, m. 2) – natural omitted. Bassus (Choir II): m. 60 (VII, p. 14, system 4, m. 4) – incorrect rhythm, beats 3-4 (sb; should be m-m). Organ: Cantus I, m. 32 (VII, p. 13, system 2, m. 3) – did not divide B into 2 m; Altus, mm. 34-35 (VII, p. 13, system 2, mm. 5-6) – incorrect rhythm (Fs: sb-dotted sb; should be sb-m-sb); Altus, m. 78 (VII, p. 15, system 2, m. 6) – retained rhythm from voice book; Cantus II, m. 114 (VII, p. 18, system 1, m. 7) – wrong note, beats 2-3 (A; should be G); Cantus I, mm. 123-24 (VII, p. 19, system 1, mm. 2-3) – retained b from vocal book, rather than sb; Tenor, m. 134 (VII, p. 19, system 2, m. 5) – second note incorrect (F; should be D).

---

9 First noted in May, 152.
- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Tenor I: mm. 106-7 (VII, p. 17, system 2, mm. 6-7). Tenor II: mm. 85-86 (VII, p. 16, system 1, mm. 6-7).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Organ: Cantus I, mm. 6-7 (VII, p. 11, mm. 6-7) – retained; Cantus I and II, mm. 26-27 (VII, p. 13, system 1, m. 4-5) – omitted; Cantus I, mm. 34-35 (VII, p. 13, system 2, mm. 5-6) – omitted.

**Nisi Dominus:**

Pedrell transcribed the 1576 version of the psalm, but incorporated the organ part from 1600a. General notes: mm. 58-69 (VII, p. 47, systems 1-2) – Pedrell assigned this section to Choir I, rather than Choir II. The 1600a version transitions into this section without break, and skips repetition of the text “filii, merces, fructus ventris” (VII, p. 46, system 4, mm. 3-7). Measures 58-69 are almost entirely altered from what is in Pedrell; mm. 70-72 are a second statement of “Beatus vir” for Choir I, not found in the 1576 version (alternate version of opening of “Beatus vir” – VII, p. 52, system 1, mm. 1-3); mm. 99-104 (VII, p. 49, system 1, m. 7 – system 2, m. 6) – passage is one sb longer in Pedrell (resulting music is similar).

- **Errata (1600a).** Cantus III (Choir II): 25r, line 2 (mm. 18-19) – rests added by hand. Tenor II: line 6 (mm. 117-18: “erat”) – dot missing. Organ: 38v, system 2, Altus (mm. 128; VII, p. 51, system 2, mm. 1-2) – sb missing (D; Pedrell transcribed slightly different rhythm).

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus I: m. 36 (VII, p. 45, system 3, m. 4) – indicated natural with *ficta.* Cantus II (Choir I): m. 4 (VII, p. 43, m. 4) – incorrect rhythm (adopted dotted pattern of other voices); m. 33-34 (VII, p. 45, system 3, mm. 1-2) – incorrect rhythm, m. 33, beats 2-4, through m. 34, beat 1 (*sm-sm-sm-sm sb*; inserted extra G after first pitch of phrase); mm. 85-86 (VII, p. 48, system 1, m. 7 – system 2, m. 1) – entire phrase transposed down a third (to begin on F); m. 109 (VII, p. 50, system 1, m. 3) – wrong note (F; should be D). Altus I: m. 132 (VII, p. 51, system 2, m. 5) – added natural (*ficta*) to second E. Tenor I: labeled as Bassus I. Cantus III (Choir II): m. 47 (VII, p. 46, system 2, m. 3) – incorrect rhythm (dotted *sb-m*; should be *sb-sb*). Altus II: m. 25 (VII, p. 45, system 1, m. 5) – wrong note, beat 3 (A; should be C); m. 94 (VII, p. 49, system 1, m. 2) – ornamental figure (should be single G, b); m. 105 (VII, p. 49, system 2, m. 7) – wrong note (C; should be A). Tenor II: mm. 20-22 (VII, p. 44, system 2, m. 7 – p. 45, system 1, m. 2) – incorrect rhythms: 

```
1600a:

Pedrell:
```

m. 54 (p. 46, system 3, m. 4) – incorrect rhythm (dotted *sm-m*; should be *sm-sm*). Organ: Cantus II, m. 89 (VII, p. 48, system 2, m. 4) – omitted flat (E); Cantus I and II, m. 115 (VII, p. 50, system 2, m. 2) – did not alter rhythm from voice.
• Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell). Cantus II (Choir I): mm. 32-33 (VII, p. 45, system 2, m. 5 – system 3, m. 1). Altus I: mm. 40-43 (VII, p. 46, system 1, mm. 2-5). Altus II: mm. 140-41 (VII, p. 52, system 1, mm. 6-7). Tenor II: mm. 21-22 (VII, p. 45, system 1, mm. 1-2); mm. 78-79 (VII, p. 47, system 3, m. 7 – p. 48, system 1, m. 1).

• Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell). Altus II: mm. 140-41 (VII, p. 52, system 1, mm. 6-7) – added. Tenor II: mm. 78-79 (VII, p. 47, system 3, m. 7 – p. 48, system 1, m. 1) – added. Organ: Tenor, mm. 11-12 (VII, p. 44, system 1, mm. 5-6) – omitted; Cantus II, mm. 138-39 (VII, p. 52, system 1, mm. 4-5) – omitted; Cantus I, mm. 139-40 (VII, p. 52, system 1, mm. 5-6) – omitted.

Laudate Dominum omnes gentes:

• Errata (1600a). Cantus I: 26r, line 1 – flat missing from signature (added by hand).

• Errata (Pedrell). Cantus I: m. 49 (VII, p. 23, system 2, m. 3) – added natural (B; ficta); m. 81 (VII, p. 25, system 2, m. 5) – added sharp (F; ficta); m. 91 (VII, p. 26, system 2, m. 1) – indicated first sharp with ficta. Altus I: m. 50 (VII, p. 23, system 2, m. 4) – added natural (second E; ficta); m. 65 (VII, p. 24, system 2, m. 3) – replaced rest, beat 3, with D. Bassus I: m. 49 (VII, p. 23, system 2, m. 4) – added flat (E; ficta). Cantus II: m. 64 (VII, p. 24, system 2, m. 2) – extended value to sb; m. 92 (VII, p. 26, system 2, m. 2) – omitted natural. Altus II: m. 28 (VII, p. 22, system 1, m. 5) – added sharp (F; ficta); m. 36 (VII, p. 22, system 2, m. 5) – included sharp as obligatory (second F); m. 54 (VII, p. 23, system 2, m. 8) – omitted flat (first E), but added natural (ficta) to second E. Bassus II: m. 53 (VII, p. 23, system 2, m. 7) – added flat (E; ficta). Organ: Cantus and Bassus, m. 49 (VII, p. 23, system 2, m. 3) – added ficta (B, Cantus; E, Bassus); Altus, m. 60 (VII, p. 24, system 1, m. 6) – wrong note (E; should be D); Cantus, m. 81 (VII, p. 25, system 2, m. 5) – added sharp (F; ficta).

• Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell). Altus I: m. 65 (VII, p. 24, system 2, m. 3).

• Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell). Organ: Altus, mm. 4-5 (VII, p. 20, mm. 4-5) – omitted; Altus, mm. 11-12 (VII, p. 21, system 1, mm. 4-5) – omitted; Altus, mm. 14-15 (VII, p. 21, system 1, mm. 7-8) – omitted; Altus, mm. 42-43 (VII, p. 23, system 1, mm. 4-5) – retained; Altus, mm. 87-88 (VII, p. 26, system 1, mm. 4-5) – retained.

Ecce nunc benedicite:

• Errata (1600a). Tenor I: 26v, line 4 – flat placed on fourth line instead of third space.

• Errata (Pedrell). Choir I and Organ: m. 49 (VII, p. 66, system 2, m. 7) – incorrect rhythm (2 beats; should be 3). Altus II: m. 16 (VII, p. 64, system 2, m. 3) – wrong note, beat 4 (E; should be D). Tenor II: m. 5 (VII, p. 63, m. 5) – added natural (B; ficta). Bassus II: m. 36 (VII, p. 66, system 1, m. 1) – beats 1-2 should be 8vb. Organ: Tenor, m. 22 (VII, p. 65, system 1, m. 2) – did not divide D into 2 m.
• **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** *Cantus II:* mm. 9-10 (VII, p. 64, system 1, mm. 3-4). *Bassus II:* mm. 50-51 (VII, p. 67, system 1, mm. 1-2).

• **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** *Organ:* Tenor, mm. 42-43 (VII, p. 66, system 1, m. 7 – system 2, m. 1) – retained.

**Super flumina Babylonis:**

• **Errata (1600a).** *Tenor I:* 27r, line 5 – first note of “illie” corrected by hand (original note illegible). *Organ:* 41r, system 3, Cantus II, last note (m. 77) – wrong note, beat 2, corrected by hand (B to A); 41v, system 1, Altus (m. 84) – *sm* corrected by hand (F to E).

• **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus I and II (Choir I): mm. 1-29 (VII, p. 53 – p. 55, system 1) – positions temporarily reversed (Cantus I inserted in position of Cantus II and labeled as such, and vice versa). *Altus I:* m. 3 (VII, p. 53, m. 3) – omitted natural (B; *ficta*). *Altus II:* m. 55 (VII, p. 57, system 1, m. 4) – final pitch incorrect (F; should be A); m. 76 (VII, p. 58, system 2, m. 4) – indicated flat (E) with *ficta*. *Bassus (Choir II):* m. 40 (VII, p. 56, system 2, m. 1) – Fs should be 8va, beats 1-2; m. 62 (VII, p. 57, system 2, m. 4) – wrong note, beat 4 (C; should be E). *Organ:* Altus and Tenor, m. 33 (VII, p. 55, system 2, m. 4) – did not subdivide sb to 2 m.

• **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** *Cantus II (Choir I):* m. 3 (VII, p. 53, m. 3).

**Laetatus sum:**

• **Errata (1600a).** *Altus I:* “Fiat pax” to the end omitted (for this edition, the section was transcribed from 1583b). *Tenor I:* 28r, line 7 (m. 87) – rhythm corrected by hand (final *sm;* should be *m*). *Tenor III:* 28r-v – mislabeled as “Tenor secundus.” *Organ:* 43r, system 2, Cantus (m. 139) – sharp omitted.

• **Errata (Pedrell).** *Cantus I:* m. 131 (VII, p. 38, m. 8) – wrong note, beat 2 (B; should be C). *Tenor I:* m. 113 (VII, p. 36, m. 5) – wrong note, beat 3 (A; should be B); m. 117 (VII, p. 37, m. 1) – indicated flat as obligatory. *Cantus II:* mm. 85-88 (VII, p. 34, system 1, mm. 5-8) – incorrect rhythm (*l-l*; should be *b-l*). *Cantus III (Choir II):* m. 139 (VII, p. 39, m. 8) – applied sharp with *ficta*. *Altus II:* m. 125 (VII, p. 38, m. 2) – wrong note, beat 3 (C; should be D); mm. 161-62 (VII, p. 42, mm. 6-7) – omitted final “Amen” (replaced with C, *l*). *Tenor II:* labeled as Bassus II (Baritonus). *Cantus IV (Choir III):* mm. 158-62 (VII, p. 42, mm. 4-7) – incorrect rhythm (final “Amen,” *b-l*; should be *l-l*). *Altus III:* m. 147 (VII, p. 40, m. 8) – wrong note, beat 2 (C; should be G). *Tenor III:* mm. 68-71 (VII, p. 32, mm. 4-7) – second statement of “in judicio” should be 8vb. *Bassus II (Choir III):*

---

10 First mentioned in May, 152.
labeled Bassus III; m. 144 (VII, p. 40, m. 5) – first pitch incorrect (D; should be B).

Organ: Altus and Tenor, m. 15 (VII, p. 27, system 3, m. 4) – retained dotted $m$, beats 2-3, rather than dividing into $m$-$sm$; Altus, m. 73 (VII, p. 33, m. 1) – retained dotted $m$, rather than altering to $m$-$sm$.

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus I: mm. 5-6 (VII, p. 27, system 1, m. 5 – system 2, m. 1). Tenor I: mm. 159-60 (VII, p. 42, mm. 5-6). Altus II: mm. 25-27 (VII, p. 28, system 2, mm. 3-5). Cantus IV (Choir III): mm. 39-40 (VII, p. 28, system 4, mm. 5-6). Altus III: mm. 157-58 (VII, p. 42, mm. 3-4).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Tenor I: mm. 159-60 (VII, p. 42, mm. 5-6) – added. Organ: Cantus, mm. 11-12 (VII, p. 27, system 2, m. 6 – system 3, m. 1) – retained; Cantus, mm. 68-69 (VII, p. 32, mm. 4-5) – retained; Tenor, mm. 82-83 (VII, p. 34, system 1, mm. 2-3) – retained; Altus, mm. 103-04 (VII, p. 35, system 2, mm. 2-3) – retained; Tenor, mm. 158-59 (VII, p. 42, mm. 4-5) – retained.

**Te Deum:**

- **Errata (1600a).** Tenor: 11v, line 2 (m. 12) – figure misprinted as $sm$-$f$ (should be $f$-$f$); 12v, line 3 (m. 57) – rhythm corrected by hand ($m$-$sm$-$m$; should be $m$-$m$-$m$), and pitch of $sm$ changed by hand (C; to B).

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Altus: mm. 18-19 (V, p. 104, system 3, mm. 3-4) – incorrect rhythm ($b$-$b$; should be $sb$-$l$); mm. 68-69 (V, p. 106, system 3, mm. 5-6) – incorrect:

  1600a: \[\text{\textbf{ri} \ a \ Pa \ - \ tris, Pa}\]  
  Pedrell: \[\text{\textbf{ri} \ a \ Pa \ - \ tris, Pa}\]

  Tenor: mm. 16-19 (V, p. 104, system 3, mm. 1-4) – incorrect rhythm ($sb$ rest-dotted $sb$-$m$-$sb$-$sb$-$l$); m. 64 (V, p. 106, system 3, m. 1) – first pitch incorrect (G; should be A).

- **Incorrect Retention or Omission of Ties Across Barlines (Pedrell).** Tenor: mm. 51-52 (V, p. 105, system 4, mm. 4-5) – added.

**Veni creator Spiritus:**

Pedrell transcribed from 1581b; second verse aligns with 1600a.

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus: mm. 23-24 (V, p. 35, system 1, mm. 1-2). Tenor: mm. 27-28 (V, p. 35, system 1, mm. 5-6); mm. 30-31 (V, p. 35, system 2, mm. 3-4). Bassus: mm. 31-32 (V, p. 35, system 2, mm. 4-5).
**Pange lingua:**

Pedrell transcribed from 1581b; second verse aligns with what is in 1600a.
- **Errata (1600a).** Tenor: 35v, line 3 (m. 45) – pitch corrected by hand (from D to F).
- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus: m. 20 (V, p. 95, system 2, m. 7).

**Ave Maris Stella:**

Pedrell transcribed from 1581b; second verse aligns with 1600a.
- **Errata (Pedrell).** Cantus: m. 35 (V, p. 48, system 1, m. 6) – B-flat in Pedrell (natural in 1600a). Altus: m. 14 (V, p. 47, system 2, m. 2) – sharp (C) indicated with ficta. Bassus: m. 16 (V, p. 47, system 2, m. 4) – sharp (F) indicated with ficta.
- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Altus: m. 27 (V, p. 47, system 3, m. 7); m. 33 (V, p. 48, system 1, m. 4). Tenor: mm. 7-10 (V, p. 47, system 1, mm. 3-6).

**Asperges me, Domine:**

- **Errata (Pedrell).** Altus: m. 40 (VII, p. 132, system 3, m. 4) – sharp indicated with ficta; m. 49 (VII, p. 132, system 4, m. 6) – wrong note (B; should be D). Tenor: m. 22 (VII, p. 131, system 4, psalm verse) – first pitch of “mei” incorrect (E; should be D).
- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Bassus: m. 4 (VII, p. 131, system 1, m. 3).

**Vidi aquam:**

- **Incorrect Text Underlay (Pedrell).** Tenor: m. 46 (VII, p. 134, system 1, opening of psalm verse).
Dedication Text

PHILIPPO III. ORBIS UTRIUSQUE MONARCHAE MAXIMO
Tho. Ludo. a Victoria S. Caes. Maiestatis Capellanus S.
Sciunt omnes, Rex maxime, eandem tibi in animo volupatem Concentus Musici fuisse, que olim
Magno illi Alexandro, quem perhibent non minus pangendi carminis et pulsandae lyrae studio,
quam gerendi belli cupiditate teneri, quod ipsum de Achille Homerus prodit, et de plerisque
ducibus ac Regibus Plutarchus. Faciebant hoc Duces illi maximi, ac potentissimi Reges, ut
curarum sollicitudines avorterent, ac potius lenirent tam nobili oblectamento. Quo fiebat, non
solum ut ipsi musica suavitate dederectarentur [sic], sed ut ipsa invicem ornamenti plurimum
acciperet a magnis Regibus, ea est enim Regalis dignitas, ut ipsa per se satis sit, ad quascumque
mortalium exercitaciones cohonestandas. Cum ergo musica delectatio alii principibus multum
debeat, tibi adeo plurimum, qui illam interdum soles gravissimis de Regno curis miscere, ut iam
hinc sorores reliquas, quas vocant liberales, tanti Regis patrocinio procul dubio superet. Facis
hoc pene dicam necessario: nam quae alia gratior fuga querellarum, quae praeferri ad Reges
solent, quam Musica. Nam quemadmodum haec tota consistit in concordi quodam sono vocum
discordium, sic una civium charitas diversos illorum mores ita coniungit, ut gratum quidpiam, ac
pene dicam caeleste Regum auribus adsonent. Haec me impulere, ut tibi hos hymnos dicarem,
haec Missarum solemnia, et cantic. Nullum enim a me exspectari munus magis idoneum erga te
poterat, a me (inquam) sacratiss. Augustae Aviae tuae Capellano, erga, Pium, atque
Ecclesiasticis rebus addictissimum Regem, qui saepe illis soleas cum magna animi voluptate
 interesse, inde in tuas devotionem et pietatem transfundis. Te munus hoc accipiente fiet, non
modo ut tutum sit ab omni linguarum procaitate, sed etiam ut qui Missarum solemnia Hymnis,
et Canticis peragunt in clarissimo hoc Templo Augustissimae Amitae tuae Ioanne [sic] alacriores
quotidie ad veri numinis cultum reddantur.
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Missa Alma redemptoris: Gloria

Et in terra pax hominis
Lauda-mus te.

Et in terra pax hominis
Lauda-mus te.

Et in terra pax hominis
Lauda-mus te.

Et in terra pax hominis
Lauda-mus te.

Bo nae volunta-tis.
Lau

Bo nae volunta-tis.
Lau

Bo nae volunta-tis.
Lau

Bo nae volunta-tis.
Lau
C. I


A. I


T. I


B. I


C. II

Be-ne-di-ci-mus te. Ad o-ra-mus te. Gra-ti-as a-

A. II

Be-ne-di-ci-mus te. Ad o-ra-mus te. Gra-ti-as a-

T. II

Be-ne-di-ci-mus te. Ad o-ra-mus te. Gra-ti-as a-

B. II

Be-ne-di-ci-mus te. Ad o-ra-mus te. Gra-ti-as a-
Gratias agimus tibi propter magnum glori-um tu-am.
Domine Deus, Agnus Dei: Choir I

C.I
Do - mi - ne De - us, Do - mi - ne De - us, A - gnus De -

A.I
- - i, Fi - li - us Pa - tris,

T.I
- - i, Fi - li - us Pa - tris,

C.I
Fi - li - us Pa - tris, Fi - li - us Pa - tris.

A.I
- - i, Fi - li - us Pa - tris, Fi - li - us Pa - tris.

T.I
Pa - tris, Fi - li - us Pa - tris.
Qui tollis: a8

Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di,

Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di,

Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, sus

Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di,

Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, mi-se-re-re no-bis.

Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, mi-se-re-re no-bis.

Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, mi-se-re-re no-bis.

Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, mi-se-re-re no-bis.
Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus Altissimus.

Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus Altissimus.

Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus Altissimus.

Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus Altissimus.

Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus Altissimus.
C. I
mus, Cum Sancto Spiritu

A. I
mus, Cum Sancto Spiritu

T. I
-mus, Cum Sancto Spiritu

B. I
mus, Cum Sancto Spiritu

C. II
tis-si-mus, Jesu Christe. Cum Sancto Spiritu

A. II
tis-si-mus, Jesu Christe. Cum Sancto Spiritu

T. II
tis-si-mus, Jesu Christe. Cum Sancto Spiritu

B. II
tis-si-mus, Jesu Christe. Cum Sancto Spiritu

Org.


Missa Alma redemptoris: Credo

Fa - cto-rem cae-li et ter - rae, et in

Pa - trem o-mni-pot - en - tem, vi-si-bi-li-um o-mni-um,
vi-si-bi-li unum. Et in u-num Do-mi-num Je-sum Chri-stum,
C. I
-cuala.
lu-men de-lumi-ne,

A. I
-cuala.
lu-men de-lumi-ne,

T. I
-cuala.
lu-men de-lumi-ne,

B. I
-cuala.
lu-men de-lumi-ne,

C. II
De-um de De-o,
De-um ve-rum de De-o ve-

A. II
De-um de De-o,
De-um ve-rum de De-o ve-

T. II
De-um de De-o,
De-um ve-rum de De-o ve-

B. II
De-um de De-o,
De-um ve-rum de De-o ve-

Org.
Germinatio non factum, consubstantiam Patris: per

Germinatio non factum, consubstantiam Patris: per

Germinatio non factum, consubstantiam Patris: per

Germinatio non factum, consubstantiam Patris: per

ro.

ro.

ro.

ro.

per quem omnia

per quem omnia

per quem omnia

per quem omnia

Org.
C. I

quem omnia facta sunt. et propter nostram salutem

A. I

quem omnia facta sunt. et propter nostram salutem

T. I

quem omnia facta sunt. et propter nostram salutem

de-

C. II

facta sunt. Qui propter nos homines,

A. II

facta sunt. Qui propter nos homines,

T. II

facta sunt. Qui propter nos homines,

B. II

facta sunt.

Org.
tem descendit de caelis.

tem descendit de caelis, de caelis.

deescendit de caelis, de caelis.

deescendit de caelis, de caelis.

deescendit de caelis, de caelis.

deescendit de caelis, de caelis.
Crucifixus: CI (canon ad unisonum), CH (resoluto), AI, TI

C. I

Crucifixus etiam pro nobis

C. II

Crucifixus etiam pro nobis

A. II

sub Pontio Pilato

T. II

sub Pontio Pilato

Org.

C. I

Sus, et sepultus est. Et resurrectit tertia die,

C. II

sus, et sepultus est. Et resurrectit tertia die,

A. II

to: sus, et sepultus est. Et resurrectit tertia die,

T. II

to: sus, et sepultus est. Et resurrectit tertia die,

Org.
C. I

secundum Scripturas. Et ascendit in caelum:
sedet ad dextoram Patris.

C. II

secundum Scripturas. Et ascendit
in caelum: sedet ad dextoram Patris.

A. II

secundum Scripturas, secundum Scripturas. Et ascendit
in caelum: sedet ad dextoram Patris.

T. II

die, secundum Scripturas. Et ascendit in caelum:
sedet ad dextoram Patris.

Org.
C. I
nìs, non e - rit fi - nìs.

C. II
nìs.

A. II
fi - nìs, non e - rit fi - nìs.

T. II
e - rit fi - nìs, non e - rit fi - nìs.

Org.
Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum, qui ex Patre Filium:

Et vivificantem:

Et vivificantem:

Et vivificantem:

Et vivificantem:
C. I
ad o- ra- tur et con-glo- ri-fi- ca - tur: qui lo-cu-tus est per Pro-phe-tas.

A. I
ad o- ra- tur et con-glo- ri-fi- ca - tur: qui lo-cu-tus est per Pro-phe-tas.

T. I
ad o- ra- tur et con-glo- ri-fi- ca - tur: qui lo-cu-tus est per Pro-phe-tas.

B. I
ad o- ra- tur et con-glo- ri-fi- ca - tur: qui lo-cu-tus est per Pro-phe-tas.

C. II
simul ad o- ra- tur et con-glo- ri-fi-ca - tur: qui lo-cu-tus

A. II
simul ad o- ra- tur et con-glo- ri-fi-ca - tur: qui lo-cu-tus

T. II
simul ad o- ra- tur et con-glo- ri-fi-ca - tur: qui lo-cu-tus

B. II
simul ad o- ra- tur et con-glo- ri-fi-ca - tur: qui lo-cu-tus

Org.
Et unam, sanctam, catholica
et apostoli ecclesiam

est per Prophetas. Et unam, sanctam, catholica

Con
Confiteor unum baptisma en remissione

Confiteor unum baptisma in remissione

Confiteor unum baptisma in remissione

Confiteor unum baptisma

Confiteor unum baptisma

Confiteor unum baptisma

Confiteor unum baptisma

Confiteor unum baptisma
null
orum. Et vitam ven- 

tu-ri sae-

culi. A-

- 

orum. Et vitam ven-tu-

ri sae-

culi. A-

- 

orum. Et vitam ven-

tu-

ri sae-

culi. A-

- 

orum. Et vitam ven-

tu-

ri sae-

culi. A-

- 

orum. Et vitam ven-

tu-

ri sae-

culi. A-

- 

orum. Et vitam ven-

tu-

ri sae-

culi. A-

- 

orum. Et vitam ven-

tu-

ri sae-

culi. A-

- 

orum. Et vitam ven-

tu-

ri sae-

culi. A-

- 

orum. Et vitam ven-

tu-

ri sae-

culi. A-

- 

orum. Et vitam ven-

tu-

ri sae-

culi. A-

-
Missa Alma redemptoris: Sanctus

Cantus I

Altus I

Tenor I

Bassus I

Cantus II

Altus II

Tenor II

Bassus II

Organ
Dominus Deus Sabbath.
a. Hosanna in ex-cel-sis.
Benedictus: Ti, CH, AI, TII, BH

\begin{align*}
\text{T.I} & \quad \text{Be\,ne\,di\,ctus,} \\
\text{C.II} & \quad \text{Be\,ne\,di\,ctus,} \\
\text{A.II} & \quad \text{Be\,ne\,di\,ctus,} \\
\text{T.II} & \quad \text{Be\,ne\,di\,ctus,} \\
\text{B.II} & \quad \text{Be\,ne\,di\,ctus,} \\
\text{Org.} & \quad \text{Be\,ne\,di\,ctus,} \\
\text{T.I} & \quad \text{be\,ne\,di\,ctus} \\
\text{C.II} & \quad \text{be\,ne\,di\,ctus} \\
\text{A.II} & \quad \text{be\,ne\,di\,ctus} \\
\text{T.II} & \quad \text{be\,ne\,di\,ctus} \\
\text{B.II} & \quad \text{be\,ne\,di\,ctus} \\
\text{Org.} & \quad \text{be\,ne\,di\,ctus} \\
\end{align*}
T. I
- san - na in ex - cel - sis,

C. II
ni. Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis,

A. II
ni. Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis,

T. II
Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis,

B. II
san - na in ex - cel - sis,

Org.
Missa Ave Regina: Kyrie
Kyrie II: a8

C. I

Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son

A. I

Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son

T. I

Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son

B. I

Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son

C. II

Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son

A. II

Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son

T. II

Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son

B. II

Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son

Org.

Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son, Kyrie e-lei-son
Missa Ave Regina: Gloria

**Cantus I**

Et in terra pac homini-bus

Laudamus

**Altus I**

Et in terra pac homini-bus

Laudamus

**Tenor I**

Et in terra pac homini-bus

Laudamus

**Bassus I**

Et in terra pac homini-bus

Laudamus

**Cantus II**

bo nae volunta-tis.

**Altus II**

bo nae volunta-tis.

**Tenor II**

bo nae volunta-tis.

**Bassus II**

bo nae volunta-tis.

**Organ**
C. I

\[\text{Benedicimus te.} \quad \text{Adoramus te.}\]

A. I

\[\text{Benedicimus te.} \quad \text{Adoramus te.}\]

T. I

\[\text{Benedicimus te.} \quad \text{Adoramus te.}\]

B. I

\[\text{Benedicimus te.} \quad \text{Adoramus te.}\]

C. II

\[\text{Laudamus te.} \quad \text{Adoramus te.} \quad \text{Glorifie}\]

A. II

\[\text{Laudamus te.} \quad \text{Adoramus te.} \quad \text{Glorifie}\]

T. II

\[\text{Laudamus te.} \quad \text{Adoramus te.} \quad \text{Glorifie}\]

B. II

\[\text{Laudamus te.} \quad \text{Adoramus te.} \quad \text{Glorifie}\]
Domine Deus Rex caele-

bi propter ma gnam gloriam tu-

am.

C. I

A. I

T. I

B. I

C. II

A. II

T. II

B. II

Org.
C. I

Do-mi-ne Fi-li uni-ge-ni-te, Je-su Chi-

A. I

Do-mi-ne Fi-li uni-ge-ni-te, Je-

T. I

Do-mi-ne Fi-li uni-ge-ni-te, Je-

B. I

De-us Pa-ter o-mni-pot-ens.

C. II

De-us Pa-ter o-mni-pot-ens.

A. II

De-us Pa-ter o-mni-pot-ens.

T. II

De-us Pa-ter o-mni-pot-ens.

B. II

De-us Pa-ter o-mni-pot-ens.

Org.
C. I

tris._

Qui tol-vis pec-ca-ta mun-di, mi-se

A. I

tris._

Qui tol-vis pec-ca-ta mun-di, mi-se

T. I

us Pat-tris._

Qui tol-vis pec-ca-ta mun-di, mi-se-re

B. I

tris._

Qui tol-vis pec-ca-ta mun-di, mi-se

C. II

Pat-tris._

A. II

Pat-tris._

T. II

Pat-tris._

B. II

Pat-tris._
C. I
re-re no-bis. sus-ci-pe

A. I
re-re-no-bis. sus-ci-pe

T. I
no-bis, no-bis. sus-ci-pe

B. I
re-re-no-bis. sus-ci-pe

C. II
Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, sus-ci-pe de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem

A. II
Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, sus-ci-pe de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem

T. II
Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, sus-ci-pe de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem

B. II
Qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, sus-ci-pe de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem

Org.
Cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris.
In gloria Dei Patris. Amen, Amen.
ante omnia saecula.
Deum verum Deo verum.

ante omnia saecula.
Deum verum Deo verum.

ante omnia saecula.
Deum verum Deo verum.

ante omnia saecula.
Deum verum Deo verum.

na-tum
Deum deo, lu-men de lu-mi-ne,
Geni

na-tum
Deum deo, lu-men de lu-mi-ne,
Geni

na-tum
Deum deo, lu-men de lu-mi-ne,
Geni

na-tum
Deum deo, lu-men de lu-mi-ne,
Geni
propter nos homines,

et propter nostram salutem,

dedecem.
C. I
De-s- c-en-dit de cae-lis.

A. I
De-s- c-en-dit de cae-lis.

T. I
De-s- c-en-dit de cae-lis.

B. I
De-s- c-en-dit de cae-lis.

C. II
tem de-s- c-en-dit de cae-lis.

A. II
tem de-s- c-en-dit de cae-lis.

T. II
tem de-s- c-en-dit de cae-lis, de cae-lis.

B. II
scen-dit de cae-lis, de cae-lis.

Org.
C. I
Et incarnatus est

A. I
Et incarnatus est

T. I
Et incarnatus est

B. I
Et incarnatus est

C. II
de Spiritu Sancto

A. II
de Spiritu Sancto

T. II
de Spiritu Sancto

B. II
de Spiritu Sancto

Org.
Et in Spiritum: a8

Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum,
Qui cum Patre et Fili o simul ad oratur et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-

...
Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem pecaminos.
Et expecto resurrectionem
miserationem peccatorum.


116

C. I

\text{tu - ri sae - cu - li. A - men, A - men.}

A. I

\text{tam ven - tu - ri sae - cu - li. A - men.}

T. I

\text{tu - ri sae - cu - li. A - men, A - men.}

B. I

\text{ven - tu - ri sae - cu - li. A - men, A - men.}

C. II

\text{vi - tam ven - tu - ri sae - cu - li. A - men.}

A. II

\text{vi - tam ven - tu - ri sae - cu - li. A - men.}

T. II

\text{vi - tam ven - tu - ri sae - cu - li. A - men, A - men.}

B. II

\text{vi - tam ven - tu - ri sae - cu - li. A - men.}

Org.
Missa Ave Regina: Sanctus
C. I  
- ri - a t u - a. Ho-san-na in ex - cel -

A. I  
-ra glo - ri - a t u - a. Ho-san-na in ex - cel -

T. I  
- glo - ri - a t u - a. Ho-san-na in ex - cel -

B. I  
-a, glo - ri-a t u - a. Ho-san-na in ex - cel -

C. II  
-ra glo - ri-a t u - a.

A. II  
glo - ri-a t u - a.

T. II  
- ri - a t u - a.

B. II  
glo - ri-a t u - a.
Ho-san-na in ex-cel-sis.

Ho-san-na in ex-cel-sis.

Ho-san-na in ex-cel-sis, in ex-cel-sis.

Ho-san-na in ex-cel-sis, Ho-san-na in ex-cel-sis.

Ho-san-na in ex-cel-sis, Ho-san-na in ex-cel-sis.
Benedictus: Al, CH, AlI, ThI, BII
A. I
qui venit in nomine

C. II
qui venit in nomine

A. II
ve - nit in nomine

T. II
ne - dictus qui venit, qui venit in

B. II
qui venit in

Org.

A. I
-mi - ni, in

C. II
ne Do - mi ni, in

A. II
in no - mi-ne

T. II
no - mi - ne

B. II
ni, in

Org.
Missa Ave Regina: Agnus Dei

Cantus I

Agnus Dei, Agnus Dei,

Altus I

Agnus Dei, Agnus Dei,

Tenor I

Agnus Dei, Agnus Dei,

Bassus I

Agnus Dei, Agnus Dei,

Cantus II

A-

Altus II

A-

Tenor II

A-

Bassus II

A-

Organ

A-
C. I

qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-

A. I

qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-

T. I

qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta

B. I

qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-

gnus De-

A. II

agnus De-

T. II

gnus De-

B. II

agnus De-

Org.
Missa Salve Regina: Kyrie

Cantus I

Ky - ri - e e -

Cantus II

Ky - ri - e e - lei - son, Ky - ri - e e -

Altus I

Ky - ri - e e - lei - son, Ky - ri - e e -

Bassus I

Ky - ri - e e - lei - son, Ky - ri - e e -

Cantus III


Altus II


Tenor I


Bassus II

Ad quartam inferiorem.

Organ
Kyrie II: a8

C. I

Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-

C. II

Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-

A. I

Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-

B. I

Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-

C. III

Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-

A. II

Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-

T. I

Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-

B. II

Ky-ri-e e-lei son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-

Org.
Missa Salve Regina: Gloria

Et in terra

Et in terra pacem hominem, et in terris pacem hominem, pacem.
bonae voluntatis, bonae voluntas

pax homini bus

terra pax homini bus

bonae voluntas
as agimus tibi
-
tias a gi-mus ti - bi
-
tias a gi-mus ti - bi
-
tias a gi-mus ti - bi
-
tas a gi-mus ti - bi propter magnum glori-
-
tas a gi-mus ti - bi propter magnum glori-
-
tas a gi-mus ti - bi propter magnum glori-
-
tas a gi-mus ti - bi propter magnum glori-
C. I

\[ \text{Domine Deus, Rex caelestis,} \]

C. II

\[ \text{Domine Deus, Rex caelestis,} \]

A. I

\[ \text{Domine Deus, Rex caelestis,} \]

B. I

\[ \text{Domine Deus, Rex caelestis,} \]

C. III

\[ \text{am tu} \quad \text{am.} \quad \text{Deus} \]

A. II

\[ \text{am tu} \quad \text{am.} \quad \text{Deus} \]

T. II

\[ \text{am tu} \quad \text{am.} \quad \text{Deus} \]

B. II

\[ \text{am tu} \quad \text{am.} \quad \text{Deus} \]

Org.
Suscipe, suscipe deprecatio-nem no-

muni-di, suscipe deprecatio-nem no-

ca-ta mun-di, suscipe deprecatio-nem no-
C. I

stram. Qui se-des ad dex-te-rum Pa-tris, mi-se-re-re no-

C. II

stram. Qui se-des ad dex-te-rum Pa-tris, mi-se-re-re no-

A. I

stram. Qui se-des ad dex-te-rum Pa-tris, mi-se-re-re no-

B. I

stram. Qui se-des ad dex-te-rum Pa-tris, mi-se-re-re no-

C. III

stram. mi-se-re-re no-

A. II

stram. mi-se-re-re no-

T. II

stram. mi-se-re-re, mi-se-re-re no-

B. II

stram. mi-se-re-re no-

Org.
Tu solus Dominus. Tu solus Altissimus.

Quoni am tu solus sanctus. Tu solus Dominus. Tu
in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.
Missa Salve Regina: Credo
um omnium, et invisibilibum.

vi-si-bi-li-um o-mni-um, Et in u-num Do-mi-num Je-sum

vi-si-bi-li-um o-mni-um, Et in u-num Do-mi-num Je-sum

vi-si-bi-li-um o-mni-um, Et in u-num Do-mi-num Je-sum

vi-si-bi-li-um o-mni-um, Et in u-num Do-mi-num Je-sum

vi-si-bi-li-um o-mni-um, Et in u-num Do-mi-num Je-sum

vi-si-bi-li-um o-mni-um, Et in u-num Do-mi-num Je-sum
C. I
\[\text{Fili-um De-}i\text{ uni-ge-}ni-
\]

C. II
\[\text{Fili-um De-}i\text{ uni-ge-}ni-
\]

A. I
\[\text{Fili-um De-}i\text{ uni-ge-}ni-tum.}

B. I
\[\text{Fili-um De-}i\text{ uni-ge-}ni-tum.}

C. III
\[\text{Christum,}

A. II
\[\text{Christum,}

T. I
\[\text{Christum,}

B. II
\[\text{Christum,}

Org.
C. I

\[ \text{De - o, lu - men de lu - mi - ne,} \]

\[ \text{Ge - ni} \]

C. II

\[ \text{De - o, lu - men de lu - mi - ne,} \]

\[ \text{Ge - ni} \]

A. I

\[ \text{De - o, lu - men de lu - mi - ne,} \]

\[ \text{Ge - ni} \]

B. I

\[ \text{De - o, lu - men de lu - mi - ne,} \]

\[ \text{Ge - ni} \]

C. III

\[ \text{lu - men de lu - mi - ne, De - um ve - rum de De - o ve - ro.} \]

A. II

\[ \text{lu - men de lu - mi - ne, De - um ve - rum de De - o ve - ro.} \]

T. I

\[ \text{lu - men de lu - mi - ne, De - um ve - rum de De - o ve - ro.} \]

B. II

\[ \text{lu - men de lu - mi - ne, De - um ve - rum de De - o ve - ro.} \]

Org.
C. I

\[\text{tum non factum, per quem omnia facta}\]

C. II

\[\text{tum non factum, per quem omnia facta}\]

A. I

\[\text{tum non factum, per quem omnia facta}\]

B. I

\[\text{tum non factum, per quem omnia facta}\]

C. III

\[\text{con-substantalem Patri; per quem omnia facta}\]

A. II

\[\text{con-substantalem Patri; per quem omnia facta}\]

T. I

\[\text{con-substantalem Patri; per quem omnia facta}\]

B. II

\[\text{con-substantalem Patri; per quem omnia facta}\]

Org.
de-scen - dit de cae - lis.

des-cen - dit de cae - lis, de cae - lis.

des-cen - dit de cae - lis.

sa - lu - tem de-scen - dit de cae - lis.

sa - lu - tem de-scen - dit de cae - lis.

stram sa - lu - tem de-scen - dit de cae - lis.

sa - lu - tem de-scen - dit de cae - lis.
Et incarnatus est

de Spiritu Sancto
ex Maria Virgine: et
ex Maria Virgine: et
ex Maria Virgine: et
ex Maria Virgine: et
ceto Et homo factus
ceto Et homo factus
ceto Et homo factus
ceto Et homo factus
Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum, qui ex...
Pa - tre Filio - que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum Pa - tre et Fil -
o simul adora tur et con glori fic tur: 

o simul adora tur et con glori fic tur: 

o simul adora tur et con glori fic tur: 

o simul adora tur et con glori fic tur: 

Fi li o simul adora tur qui lo 

Fi li o simul adora tur qui lo 

Fi li o simul adora tur qui lo 

Fi li o simul adora tur qui lo 

quelle
Et unam, sanctam, catholicae

cudus est per prophetas.

cudus est per prophetas.
et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

et apostolicam Ecclesiam

Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem

Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem

Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem

Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem

Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem

Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem

Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem
C. I
Et vitam venturi

C. II
Et vitam venturi

A. I
Et vitam venturi saeculi

B. I
Et vitam venturi saeculi

C. III
rum. Et vitam venturi

A. II
rum. Et vitam venturi saeculi

T. I
rum. Et vitam venturi saeculi

B. II
rum. Et vitam venturi

Org.
Missa Salve Regina: Sanctus

Cantus I

Sanctus, Sanctus,

Cantus II

Sanctus,

Altus I

Sanctus,

Bassus I

Sanctus,

Cantus III

Sanctus,

Altus II

Sanctus,

Tenor I

Sanctus,

Bassus II

Sanctus,

Organ

Sanctus,
A. I

Deus Sabaoth. Ple-ni sunt caeli et ter-

B. I

Deus Sabaoth. Ple-ni sunt caeli et ter-

C. III

Do-mi-nus Deus Sabaoth. Ple-ni sunt caeli et t

A. II

Do-mi-nus Deus Sabaoth, Sabaoth. Ple-ni sunt caeli et

T. I

Do-mi-nus Deus Sabaoth. Ple-ni sunt caeli et

B. II

Do-mi-nus Deus Sabaoth. Ple-ni sunt caeli et

Org.
C. I

\[ C. I \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{terra gloria tua, tua - t a.}
\end{array}
\]

C. II

\[ C. II \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ra gloria tua, gloria tua - t a.}
\end{array}
\]

A. I

\[ A. I \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ter-ra gloria tua, gloria tua - t a.}
\end{array}
\]

B. I

\[ B. I \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ra gloria tua, gloria tua - t a.}
\end{array}
\]

C. III

\[ C. III \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ter-ra gloria tua, gloria tua - t a.}
\end{array}
\]

A. II

\[ A. II \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ter-ra gloria tua, gloria tua - t a.}
\end{array}
\]

T. I

\[ T. I \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ter-ra gloria tua, gloria tua - t a.}
\end{array}
\]

B. II

\[ B. II \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ter-ra gloria tua, gloria tua - t a.}
\end{array}
\]

Org.

\[ \text{Org.} \]
Hosanna in excelsis, Hosanna in excelsis,
Hosanna in excelsis, Hosanna in excelsis,
Hosanna in excelsis, Hosanna in excelsis,
Hosanna in excelsis, Hosanna in excelsis,
Hosanna in excelsis, Hosanna in excelsis,
Hosanna in excelsis, Hosanna in excelsis,
Benedictus: Choir I

C.I

\[\text{Benedictus qui venit,} \]

C.II

\[\text{Benedictus qui venit,} \]

A.I

\[\text{Benedictus qui venit,} \]

B.I

\[\text{Benedictus,} \]

Org.

\[\text{Benedictus qui venit,} \]

\[\text{Benedictus qui venit,} \]

\[\text{Benedictus qui venit,} \]

\[\text{Benedictus qui venit,} \]

\[\text{Benedictus qui venit in nomi} \]

\[\text{Benedictus qui venit in nomi} \]

\[\text{Benedictus qui venit in nomi} \]

\[\text{Benedictus qui venit in nomi} \]
Missa Salve Regina: Agnus Dei

Cantus I

Cantus II

Altus I

Bassus I

Cantus III

Altus II

Tenor I

Bassus II

Organ

Agnus Dei
[Musical notation and text transcribed from the image]
Missa Pro victoria: Kyrie

Ky - ri - e - lei - son,
Ky - ri - e - lei - son,
Ky - ri - e - lei - son,
Ky - ri - e - lei - son,
Ky - ri - e - lei - son,

Ky - ri - e - lei - son,
Christe: Choir I

C. I

Christe eleison,

C. II

Christe eleison,

A. I

Christe eleison, Christe eleison, Christe eleison,

T. I

Christe eleison, Christe eleison, Christe eleison,

B. I

Christe eleison, Christe eleison,

Org.
Kyrie II: a9

C. I

Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e

C. II

Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e

A. I

Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son

T. I

Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son

B. I

Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son

C. III

Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-

A. II

Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son

T. II

Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son

B. II

Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e e-lei-son, Ky-ri-e

Org.
Missa Pro victoria: Gloria

Et in terrā pax homi-ni-bus bo-nae vo-lun ta -

Et in terrā pax ho-mi-ni-bus, ho mi-ni-bus bo-nae vo-lun ta -

Et in terrā pax ho-mi-ni-bus, et in terrā pax ho-mi-ni-bus bo-nae vo-lun ta -

Et in terrā pax ho-mi-ni-bus bo-nae vo-lun ta -

Et in terrā pax ho-mi-ni-bus bo-nae vo-lun ta -
Domine Deus, Rex caelestis,

Domine Deus, Rex caelestis,

Domine Deus, Rex caelestis,

Domine Deus, Rex caelestis,

Domine Deus, Rex caelestis,

Domine Deus, Rex caelestis.
le - stis, Domi-ne Fi-li un-i-ge ni

Rex cae-le-stis, Domi-ne Fi-li un-i-ge ni

Rex cae-le-stis, Domi-ne Fi-li un-i-ge ni

le-stis, Domi-ne Fi-li un-i-ge ni

De-us Pa-ter om-ni-pot-ens.

De-us Pa-ter o-mni-pot-ens.

De-us Pa-ter o-mni-pot-ens.

De-us Pa-ter o-mni-pot-ens.
Cata mundi, qui tollis pec-cta mundi, qui
tollis pec-cta mundi, pec-cta mundi,
Qui tollis pec-cta mundi,
 Qui tollis pec-cta mundi,
qui tollis pec-ca-ta mundi, mi se-re-no-
qui tollis pec-ca-ta mundi, mi se-re-no-
qui tollis pec-ca-ta mundi, mi se-re-no-
qui tollis pec-ca-ta mundi, mi se-re-no-
qui tollis pec-ca-ta mundi, mi se-re-no-
qui tollis pec-ca-ta mundi, mi se-re-no-
C. I

\[\text{tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, sus-ci-pe, sus-ci-pe}\]

C. II

\[\text{qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, sus-ci-pe, sus-ci-pe}\]

A. I

\[\text{qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, sus-ci-pe, sus-ci-pe}\]

T. I

\[\text{qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, sus-ci-pe, sus-ci-pe, sus-ci-pe}\]

B. I

\[\text{qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di, sus-ci-pe, sus-ci-pe}\]

C. III

\[\text{bis. sus-ci-pe, sus-ci-pe}\]

A. II

\[\text{bis. sus-ci-pe, sus-ci-pe}\]

T. II

\[\text{bis. sus-ci-pe, sus-ci-pe, sus-ci-pe}\]

B. II

\[\text{bis. sus-ci-pe, sus-ci-pe}\]
de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, qui

de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, qui

de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, qui

de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, qui

de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, qui

de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, qui

de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, qui

de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, qui

de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, qui

de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, qui

de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram, qui

C. I

C. II

A. I

T. I

B. I

C. III

A. II

T. II

B. II

Org.
C. I
stram, qui se des ad dextra-ram Patris, misere-re nobis. Quo-

C. II
qui se des ad dextra-ram Patris, misere-re nobis. Quo-

A. I
stram, qui se des ad dextra-ram Patris, misere-re nobis. Quo-

T. I
stram, qui se des ad dextra-ram Patris, misere-re nobis. Quo-

B. I
stram, qui se des ad dextra-ram Patris, misere-re nobis. Quo-

C. III
se-des ad dextra-ram Patris, misere-re nobis. Quo-

A. II
se-des ad dextra-ram Patris, misere-re nobis. Quo-

T. II
se-des ad dextra-ram Patris, misere-re nobis. Quo-

B. II
se-des ad dextra-ram Patris, misere-re nobis. Quo-

Org.
C. I

- ni-am

Tu so-lus Do-mi-nus.

C. II

- ni-am

Tu so-lus Do-mi-nus. Tu so-lus Al-

A. I

- ni-am

Tu so-lus Do-mi-nus.

T. I

- ni-am

Tu so-lus Do-mi-nus.

B. I

- ni-am

Tu so-lus Do-mi-nus.

C. III

am tu so-lus san-

cus.

Tu

A. II

am tu so-lus san-

cus.

Tu

T. II

am tu so-lus san-

cus.

Tu

B. II

am tu so-lus san-

cus.

Tu

Org.
Tu solus Altissimus, Jesu Christe.

tis-simus, Tu solus Altissimus, Jesu Christe.

Tu solus Altissimus, Jesu Christe.

Tu solus Altissimus, Jesu Christe.

so-lus Altissimus,

so-lus Altissimus,

so-lus Altissimus,

so-lus Altissimus,
in glori-a Dei Pa-tris, Dei Pa-tris, in

in glori-a Dei Pa-tris, Dei Pa-tris, in

in glori-a Dei Pa-tris, Dei Pa-tris, in

in glori-a Dei Pa-tris, Dei Pa-tris, in

in glori-a Dei Pa-tris, Dei Pa-tris, in

in glori-a Dei Pa-tris, Dei Pa-tris. A-men.In


C.

Dei Patris, Dei Patris. Amen, Amen. In gloria Dei

C.

Dei Patris, Dei Patris Amen, Amen. In gloria Dei

A.

Dei Patris, Dei Patris. Amen. In gloria Dei

T.

Dei Patris, Dei Patris. Amen. In gloria Dei

B.

Dei Patris, Dei Patris. Amen, Amen. In gloria Dei
Missa Pro victoria: Credo

Pa - trem o-mni-pot - en - tem, vi - si - bi - li-um

Pa - trem o-mni-pot - en - tem, vi - si - bi - li-um

Pa - trem o-mni-pot - en - tem, vi - si - bi - li-um

Pa - trem o-mni-pot - en - tem, vi - si - bi - li-um

Pa - trem o-mni-pot - en - tem, vi - si - bi - li-um

fa-cto-rem cae - li et ter - rae,

fa-cto-rem cae - li et ter - rae,

fa-cto-rem cae - li et ter - rae,

fa-cto-rem cae - li et ter - rae,
omnium, et in unum Dominum Jesus Christum

omnium, et in unum Dominum Jesus Christum

omnium, et in unum Dominum Jesus Christum

et invisibilium

et invisibilium

et invisibilium

et invisibilium
C. I

Et ex Patre natali ante omnia saecula. De-

C. II

Et ex Patre natali ante omnia saecula. De-

A. I

Et ex Patre natali ante omnia saecula. De-

T. I

Et ex Patre natali ante omnia saecula. De-

B. I

Et ex Patre natali ante omnia saecula. De-

C. III

Dei unigenitum. Et ex Patre natali ante omnia saecula.

A. II

Dei unigenitum. Et ex Patre natali ante omnia saecula.

T. II

Dei unigenitum. Et ex Patre natali ante omnia saecula.

B. II

Dei unigenitum. Et ex Patre natali ante omnia saecula.

Org.
C. I
um de De - o,
De-um ve - rum de De o
C. II
um de De - o,
De-um ve - rum de De-o ve -
A. I
um de De - o,
De-um ve - rum de De-o ve -
T. I
um de De - o,
B. I

C. III
lu-men de lu - mi - ne,
A. II
lu-men de lu - mi - ne,
T. II
lu - men de lu - mi ne,
B. II
lu - men de lu - mi - ne,
ve - ro. Geni-tum, non fa-

- ro. Geni-tum, non fa-

- ro. Geni-tum, non fa-

Ge - ni-tum, non fa - ctum,

Ge - ni-tum, non fa - ctum,

Ge - ni-tum, non fa - ctum, con-sub-stan-

Ge - ni-tum, non fa - ctum, con-sub-stan-

Ge - ni-tum, non fa - ctum, con-sub-stan-

Ge - ni-tum, non fa - ctum, con-sub-stan-

Ge - ni-tum, non fa - ctum, con-sub-stan-

Ge - ni-tum, non fa - ctum, con-sub-stan-

O r - ro. Gen - itum, non fa - ctum,

O r - ro. Gen - itum, non fa - ctum,

O r - ro. Gen - itum, non fa - ctum,
C. I
ctum, con-sub-stan-ti-a-lem Pa - tri: per quem o - mni-a fa -

C. II
ctum, con-sub-stan-ti-a-lem Pa - tri: per quem o - mni-a fa -

A. I
ctum, con-sub-stan-ti-a-lem Pa - tri: per quem o - mni-a fa -

T. I
con-sub-stan-ti-a - lem Pa - tri: per quem o - mni-a fa -

B. I
ctum, con-sub-stan-ti-a-lem Pa - tri: per quem o - mni-a fa -

C. III
a - lem Pa - tri: per quem o - mni-a fa -cta sunt, fa -

A. II
a - lem Pa - tri: per quem o - mni-a fa -

T. II
Pa - tri: per quem o - mni-a fa -cta sunt, fa -

B. II
a - lem Pa - tri: per quem o - mni-a fa -

Org.
C. I

et homo factus est.

C. II

-ctus est, et homo factus est.

A. I

-ctus est, et homo factus est.

T. I

est, et homo factus est, factus est.

B. I

-ctus est, et homo factus est.

C. III

Et homo factus est.

A. II

Et homo factus est.

T. II

Et homo factus est.

B. II

Et homo factus est.

Org.
C. II

resur-rectit tertia die, et resur-rectit tertia di-
est. Et resur-rectit tertia die, et resur-rectit ter-
est.

A. I

T. I

B. I

Org.

Et ascen-dit in cae-
ter-tia die, Et a-scen-dit in cae-

organum

cun-dum Scri-

pitu-

ras. Et a-

scen-dit in cae-

organum

cun-dum Scri-

pitu-

ras. Et a-

scen-dit in cae-

organum

secun-
dum Scri-

pitu-

ras. Et a-

scen-dit in cae-

organum

cae-

lum:

organum

lum:
C. II

non e - rit fi - nis, non e - rit fi - nis.

A. I

non e - rit fi - nis, non e - rit fi - nis.

T. I

cu - jus re - gni non e - rit fi - nis, non e - rit fi - nis.

B. I

cu - jus re - gni non e - rit fi - nis, non e - rit fi - nis.

Org.
Et in Spiritum Sanctum: a9
num, et vi-vi-fi-can - tem:

qui ex Pa - tre Fi-li-o-que pro - ce - dit.

qui ex Pa - tre Fi-li-o-que pro - ce - dit.
C. I

si-mul ad-o-ra-tur, si-mul ad-o-ra-tur et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

C. II

si-mul ad-o-ra-tur, si-mul ad-o-ra-tur et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

A. I

si-mul ad-o-ra-tur, si-mul ad-o-ra-tur et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

T. I

Fi-li-o si-mul ad-o-ra-tur et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

B. I

- li-o si-mul ad-o-ra-tur et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

C. III

si-mul ad-o-ra-tur et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur: qui lo-

A. II

si-mul ad-o-ra-tur et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur: qui lo-

T. II

si-mul ad-o-ra-tur et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur: qui lo-

B. II

si-mul ad-o-ra-tur et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur: qui lo-

Org.
qui locutus est per Prophetas.
Et unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Eclipheitas.

Et unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Eclipheitas.

Et unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Eclipheitas.

Et unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Eclipheitas.

Et unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Eclipheitas.

Et unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Eclipheitas.

Et unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Eclipheitas.
Et vitam venutri saeculi. Amen.

Et vitam venutri saeculi. Amen.
men, A - men. Et vitam ven - tu - ri

men, A - men. Et vitam ven - tu - ri

A - men. Et vitam ven - tu - ri sae - cu - li


Missa Pro victoria: Sanctus

Cantus I

Cantus II

Altus I

Tenor I

Bassus I

Cantus III

Altus II

Tenor II

Bassus II

Organ

Do - mi - nus De - us Sa - ba - oth, San - ctus, San -
San - ctus, San - ctus, San - ctus, San -
Do - mi - nus De - us Sa - ba - oth, San - ctus, San -
Do - mi - nus De - us Sa - ba - oth, San - ctus, San -
San - ctus, San -
San - ctus, San - ctus, San - ctus, San - ctus, San - ctus, San -
San - ctus, San - ctus, San -
San - ctus, San - ctus, San -
San - ctus, San - ctus, San -
San - ctus, San - ctus,
Pleni sunt caeli,
ni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua.

pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua.

pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua.

li, pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua, gloria

ni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua, gloria tua, gloria

ni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua.

caeeli et terra gloria tua, gloria tua.

ni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua.
C. I
- na in ex - cel - sis, Ho - san - na in ex - san - na in ex - cel - sis, Ho - san - na

C. II

A. I
Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis, Ho - san - na

T. I
Ho - san - na

B. I
Ho - san - na in

C. III
Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis, Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis, Ho - san - na

A. II
Ho - san - na

T. II
Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na

B. II
Ho - san - na

Org.
in no-mi-ne Do-mi-ni, in no-mi-ne Do-mi-ni, in no-mi-ne Do-mi-ni,
Missa Pro victoria: Agnus Dei

Agnus Dei, Agnus Dei,
C. I  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{di, qui tollis pec-cata mundi: dona nobis pacem,}
\end{align*}
\]

C. II  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{di, qui tollis pec-cata mundi: dona nobis pacem,}
\end{align*}
\]

A. I  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{di, qui tollis pec-cata mundi: dona nobis pacem,}
\end{align*}
\]

T. I  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{di, qui tollis pec-cata mundi: dona nobis pacem,}
\end{align*}
\]

B. I  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{di: dona nobis pacem, dona}
\end{align*}
\]

C. III  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{dona nobis pacem, dona nobis}
\end{align*}
\]

A. II  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{dona nobis pacem, dona nobis}
\end{align*}
\]

T. II  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{dona nobis pacem, dona nobis}
\end{align*}
\]

B. II  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{dona nobis pacem, dona nobis}
\end{align*}
\]
do-na no-bis pa-cem, do-na no-

do-na no-

C. I

do-na no-bis pa-

do-na no-

C. II

C. III

A. I

A. II

T. I

T. II

B. I

B. II

Org.
Missa Laetatus sum: Kyrie
Christe a3: Cantus I, Cantus II, Cantus IV

C. I

C. II

C. IV

Christe eleison. Christe eleison.

Christe eleison.

Christe eleison. Christe eleison.
Kyrie II: a12

C.I

Kyrie, Kyrie eleison. Kyrie

A.I

Kyrie, Kyrie eleison. Kyrie

T.I

Kyrie, Kyrie eleison. Kyrie

B.I

Kyrie, Kyrie eleison. Kyrie

C.II

Kyrie, Kyrie eleison.

C.III

Kyrie, Kyrie eleison.

A.II

Kyrie eleison. Kyrie eleison.

T.II

Kyrie, Kyrie eleison. Kyrie

C.IV

Kyrie eleison. Kyrie eleison.

A.III

Kyrie eleison. Kyrie eleison.

T.III

Kyrie eleison. Kyrie eleison.

B.II

Kyrie eleison. Kyrie eleison.

Org.
Kyrie eleison.

Kyrie eleison.

Kyrie eleison.

Kyrie eleison.

Kyrie eleison.

Kyrie eleison.

Kyrie eleison.

Kyrie eleison.
Missa Laetatus sum: Gloria
C. I
fi-ca-mus te, propter ma-gnam glo-
ri-fi-ca-mus te, propter ma-gnam glo-
ri-fi-ca-mus te, propter ma-gnam glo-
ri-fi-ca-mus te, propter ma-gnam glo-
C. II
Gra-ti-as a-gi-mus ti-bi propter ma-gnam
C. III
Gra-ti-as a-gi-mus ti-bi propter ma-gnam
A. II
Gra-ti-as a-gi-mus ti-bi propter ma-gnam
T. II
Gra-ti-as a-gi-mus ti-bi propter ma-gnam
A. III
ri-fi-ca-mus te, propter
te. Glo-ri-fi-ca-mus te, propter
T. III
ri-fi-ca-mus te, propter
te. Glo-ri-fi-ca-mus te, propter
B. II
ri-fi-ca-mus te, propter
te. Glo-ri-fi-ca-mus te, propter
Org.
am tu - - - - am, pro - pter ma -
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
ri - am tu - - - - am, pro - pter
Domine Deus, Rex: Choir II

C. II

Do - mi - ne De - us, Rex cae - le -

C. III

Do - mi - ne De - us, Rex cae - le - stis, De -

A. II

Do - mi - ne De - us, Rex cae - le - stis, De -

C. II

stis, De - us Pa - ter omni - pot - ens. Do - mi - ne Fi -

C. III

us Pa - ter omni - pot - ens. Do - mi - ne Fi -

A. II

us Pa - ter omni - pot - ens. Do - mi - ne Fi -

C. II

li u - ni - geni - te, Je - su Chri - ste.

C. III

li u - ni - geni - te, Je - su Chri - ste.

A. II

li u - ni - geni - te, Je - su Chri - ste.
Domine Deus, Agnus Dei: Choir I

A.1

Do - mi - ne De - us, A - gnus De - i,

T.1

Do - mi - ne De - us, A - gnus De - i, Fi - li-

B.1

Do - mi - ne De - us, A - gnus De - i, Fi - }

A.1

Fi - li - us Pa - tris, Fi - li - us Pa - tris.

T.1

us Pa - tris, Fi - li - us Pa - tris, Fi - li - us Pa - tris.

B.1

li - us Pa - tris, Fi - li - us Pa - tris, Fi - li - us Pa - tris.
Qui sede di, susci-pe de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-stram. Qui se-des,
des ad dextra-ram, ad dextra-ram Pa - tris.

qui se - des ad dextra-ram Pa - tris, mi-se-re - re

qui se - des ad dextra-ram Pa - tris, mi-se-re - re no

Qui se - des ad dextra-ram Pa - tris, mi-se-re - re

Qui se - des ad dextra-ram Pa - tris, mi-se-re - re

Qui se - des ad dextra-ram Pa - tris, mi-se-re - re

Qui se - des ad dextra-ram Pa - tris,
C. I

A. I

T. I

B. I

C. II

C. III

A. II

T. II

C. IV

A. III

T. III

B. II

Org.

Cum Sancto Spiritu, cum

so-lus Al-tis-si-mus, Je-su Chri-ste.

Cum Sancto Spiritu

so-lus Al-tis-si-mus, Je-su Chri-ste.

Cum Sancto Spiritu

so-lus Al-tis-si-mus, Je-su Chri-ste.

Cum Sancto Spiritu

so-lus Al-tis-si-mus, Je-su Chri-ste.

Cum Sancto Spiritu
Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen. Cum Sancto

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen. Cum Sancto

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen. Cum Sancto

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen. Cum Sancto

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen. Cum Sancto

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen. Cum Sancto

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen. Cum Sancto

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen. Cum Sancto

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen. Cum Sancto

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen. Cum Sancto

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.
Missa Laetatus sum: Credo

Cantus I

Altus I

Tenor I

Bassus I

Cantus II

fa·cto·rem cae·li et ter·-

Cantus III

fa·cto·rem cae·li et ter·-

Altus II

fa·cto·rem cae·li et ter·-

Tenor II

fa·cto·rem cae·li et ter·-

Cantus IV

Pa·tre·m o·mni-pot·en·tem,

Altus III

Pa·tre·m o·mni-pot·en·tem,

Tenor III

Pa·tre·m o·mni-pot·en·tem,

Bassus II

Pa·tre·m o·mni-pot·en·tem,
visibilibum omniunum, Jesus
visibilibum omniunum, Jesus
visibilibum omniunum, Jesus
visibilibum omniunum, Jesus
visibilibum omniunum, Jesus
Et in unum Domiunum
Et in unum Domiunum
Et in unum Domiunum
Et in unum Domiunum
et invisibilibum
et invisibilibum
et invisibilibum
et invisibilibum
et invisibilibum
Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum. ante omnia

Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum. ante omnia

Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum. ante omnia

Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum. ante omnia

Filium Dei unigenitum.

Filium Dei unigenitum.

Filium Dei unigenitum.

Filium Dei unigenitum. Et ex Patre natum

Filium Dei unigenitum. Et ex Patre natum

Filium Dei unigenitum. Et ex Patre natum

Filium Dei unigenitum. Et ex Patre natum
factus est, et homo factus est.

factus est, et homo factus est.

factus est, et homo factus est.

factus est, et homo factus est.

factus est, et homo factus est.

factus est, et homo factus est.

factus est, et homo factus est.

factus est, et homo factus est.

factus est, et homo factus est.

factus est, et homo factus est.
C. II

se-cun-dum Scri-pu-ras, se-cun-dum Scri-pu-ras. Et

C. III
di-e, se-cun-dum Scri-pu-ras, et a-scen-dit

A. II

a di-e, se-cun-tum Scri-put-ra-s.

T. II

Et a-scen-

C. II

a-scen-dit in cae-lum: se-det ad dex-te-

C. III

in cae-lum: se-det ad dex-te-ram Pa-

A. II

se-det ad dex-te-ram Pa-tris, Pa-tris.

T. II

dit in cae-lum: se-det ad dex-te-ram Pa-

C. II

ram Pa-tris. Et i-te-rum ven-tu-rus

C. III

- tris. Et i-te-rum ven-tu-rus

A. II

Et i-te-rum ven-tu-rus est, et i-te-rum ven-

T. II

- tris. Et i-te-rum ven-tu-rus est, et i-te-rum ven-tu-rus
est cum glori-a, ju-di-ca-re vi-vos et mor-tu-os: non e-rit

est cum glori-a, ju-di-ca-re vi-vos et mor-tu-os: cu-just re-gni non

est cum glori-a, ju-di-ca-re vi-vos et mor-tu-os: cu-just re-gni

est cum glori-a, ju-di-ca-re vi-vos et mor-tu-os: non e-rit fi-nis, non e-rit fi-nis.

est cum glori-a, ju-di-ca-re vi-vos et mor-tu-os: cu-just re-gni non e-rit fi-nis, non e-rit fi-nis.
qui ex Pa - tre Fi - li - o-que pro - ce - - -

C. II

vi-fi-can - tem:

C. III

vi-fi-can - tem:

A. II

vi-fi-can - tem:

T. II

vi-fi-can - tem:

C. IV

A. III

T. III

B. II

Org.
et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:

et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur:


Et vitam ven- tu- ri sae- cu - li. A-

Et vitam ven- tu- ri sae- cu - li. A-

Et vitam ven- tu- ri sae- cu - li. A-

Et vitam ven- tu- ri sae- cu - li, Et vi-
tam ven-tu- ri sae- cu - li,

Et vitam ven- tu- ri sae- cu - li, Et vi-
tam ven-tu- ri sae- cu - li,

Et vitam ven- tu- ri sae- cu - li, Et vi-
tam ven-tu- ri sae- cu - li,

Et vitam ven- tu- ri sae- cu - li,
Missa Laetatus sum: Sanctus
C. I
ctus, Domi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt cae-li,

A. I
ctus, Domi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt cae-li,

T. I
ctus, Domi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt cae-li,

B. I
ctus, Domi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt cae-li,

C. II
Do-mi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt cae-li et ter-

C. III
Do-mi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt cae-li et ter-ra, et

A. II
Do-mi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt cae-li et ter-

T. II
Do-mi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt cae-li et ter-

C. IV
Do-mi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth, Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt

A. III
Do-mi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth, Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt

T. III
Do-mi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth, Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt

B. II
Do-mi-nus De-us Sa-ba-oth, Sa-ba-oth. Ple-ni sunt

Org
Hosanna II. a12

C. I

A. I

T. I

B. I

C. II

ne Domini, Domini, Do

C. III

no-mi-ne Domini, Domini.

A. II

_in no-mi ne Do

T. II

no-mi-ne Domini, Domini.

C. IV

Ho-san-na in ex-cel-

A. III

Ho-san-na in ex-cel-

T. III

Ho-san-na in ex-cel-

B. II

Ho-san-na in ex-cel-

Org.
Missa Laetatus sum: Agnus Dei

Cantus I

Agnus Dei, Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata

Altus I

Agnus Dei, Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata

Tenor I

Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata

Bassus I

Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata

Cantus II

Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mun-

Cantus III

Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mun-

Altus II

Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mun-

Tenor II

Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mun-

Cantus IV

Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mun-

Altus III

Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mun-

Tenor III

Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mun-

Bassus II

Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mun-

Organ
Magnificat sexti toni

Cantus I: Magnificat:

Anima mea: Choir I

C. I

A. I

T. I

B. I

Org.

C. I

A. I

T. I

B. I

Org.
Et exultavit: Choir II

C. II

Et ex-ul-ta-vit spi-

C. III

Et ex-ul-ta-

A. II

Et ex-ul-ta-

T. II

Et ex-ul-ta-

C. II

-ri-tus me-

C. III

us, spi-

A. II

ritus me-

T. II

us, spi-

C. II

-us, in De-

C. III

o, in De-

A. II

o, in De-

T. II

o, in De-

C. II

-o, in De-

C. III

-o, in De-

A. II

-o, in De-

T. II

-o, in De-
Deo salutari meo.

C. III

C. II

A. II

T. II

tari meo.
Quia respexit: a12

ancilae super humilitatem

ancilae super humilitatem

ancilae super humilitatem

ancilae super humilitatem

Qui a respe xit

Qui a respe xit

Qui a respe xit

Qui a respe xit

Qui a respe xit

Qui a respe xit

Qui a respe xit
ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc be-tam me di-cent

ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc be-tam me di-cent

ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc be-tam me di-cent

ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc be-tam me di-cent

ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc be-tam me di-cent

ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc be-tam me di-cent

ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc be-tam me di-cent

ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc be-tam me di-cent
Quia fecit: Choir II

C. II

53

Qui-a fecit mi-hi ma-gna qui-po-tens

C. III

Qui-a fecit mi-hi ma-gna qui-po-tens

A. II

Qui-a fecit mi-hi ma-gna qui-po-tens

T. II

Qui-a fecit mi-hi ma-gna qui-po-tens

58

est: et san-ctum no-men e-jus.

C. III

est: et san-ctum no-men e-jus.

A. II

est: et san-ctum no-men e-jus.

T. II

est: et san-ctum no-men e-jus.
Et misericordia (a3): Choir III

A. III

Et mi-se-ri-cor-di-a e - jus a pro-ge-ni-e in

T. III

Et mi-se-ri-cor-di-a e - jus a pro-ge-ni-e in pro-

B. II

a____ pro-ge-ni-e in_

A. III

pro-ge-ni-es: ti-men-ti-bus e-

T. III

pro-ge-ni-es:____ ti-men-ti-bus e-

B. II

pro-ge-ni-es: ti-men-ti-bus____ e-

A. III

um, ti-men-ti-bus e-

T. III

um, ti-men-ti-bus e-

B. II

um, ti-men-ti-bus____ e-

768
Fecit potentiam: Choir I & II

Fe - cit po - ten - ti - am
disper - sit su - per - bos,
di-

Fe - cit po - ten - ti - am
disper - sit su - per - bos,
di-

Fe - cit po - ten - ti - am
disper - sit su - per - bos,
di-

Fe - cit po - ten - ti - am
disper - sit su - per - bos,
di-

in brac-chi - o su - o: disper - sit su-per -

in brac-chi - o su - o: disper - sit su-per -

in brac-chi - o su - o: disper - sit su-per -
superbos, dispersit superbos

superbos

superbos, dispersit superbos

superbos, dispersit superbos

superbos, dispersit superbos

superbos, dispersit superbos

superbos, dispersit superbos, dispersit superbos
Deposuit: Choir III

91

C. IV

De - po - su - it po-

A. III

De - po - su - it po-

T. III

De - po - su - it po-

ten - tes de se - de: et ex - al - ta -

B. II

De - po - su - it po-

ten - tes de se - de, de se - de: et ex - al -

ten - tes de se - de: et ex - al -

ten - tes de se - de: et ex - al -

98

vit hu - mi - les, et ex - al - ta - vit hu - mi - les,

103

vit hu - mi - les, et ex - al - ta - vit hu - mi - les,

ex - al - ta - vit hu - mi - les, et ex - al - ta - vit

ex - al - ta - vit hu - mi - les, hu - mi - les, et ex - al - ta - vit
et exalavit humiles.

les, et exalavit humiles.

humiles, humiles.
et di-vi-tes di-mi-sit i-na-

et di-vi-tes di-mi-sit i-na-

et di-vi-tes di-mi-sit i-na-

et di-vi-tes di-mi-sit i-na-

et di-vi-tes di-mi-sit i-na-

et di-vi-tes di-mi-sit i-na-

et di-vi-tes di-mi-sit i-na-

et di-vi-tes di-mi-sit i-na-

et di-vi-tes di-mi-sit i-na-
Suscept: Choir I

C. I

Sus - ce-pit Is - ra-el, sus-ce-pit Is - ra-el

A. I

Sus - ce-pit Is - ra-el, sus - ce - pit Is-ra-el

T. I

Sus - ce - pit Is-ra-el

B. I

Sus - ce - pit Is-ra-el

Org.
Gloria patri: a12

et Spiritu Sancto. Sic ut

et Spiritu Sancto. Sic ut

et Spiritu Sancto. Sic ut

et Spiritu Sancto. Sic ut

et Fili o, Sic ut e-

et Fili o, Sic ut e-

et Fili o, Sic ut e-

et Fili o, Sic ut e-

Gloria Patri, Sic ut e-

Gloria Patri, Sic ut e-

Gloria Patri, Sic ut e-

Gloria Patri, Sic ut e-

Org.
erat in principi o, et nunc, et sem per,
et in saecula saeculorum. Amen. Sae-
et in saecula saeculorum. Amen, A-
et in saecula saeculorum. Amen. Sae-
et in saecula saeculorum. Amen,
saeclorum. Amen. Saeclorum. A-
saeclorum. Amen, A-
saeclorum. Amen, A-
C.I
\[\text{c} \text{u} - \text{lo} - \text{rum. } \text{A - men,} \]

A.I
\[\text{c} \text{u} - \text{lo} - \text{rum. } \text{A -} \]

T.I
\[\text{s} \text{a} \text{c} - \text{u} - \text{lo} - \text{rum. } \text{A - men,} \]

B.I
\[\text{A -} \]

C.II
\[\text{A -} \]

C.III
\[\text{A -} \]

A.II
\[\text{A -} \]

T.II
\[\text{s} \text{a} \text{c} - \text{u} - \text{lo} - \text{rum.} \]

C.IV
\[\text{A -} \]

A.III
\[\text{A -} \]

T.III
\[\text{s} \text{a} \text{c} - \text{u} - \text{lo} - \text{rum. } \text{A - men,} \]

B.II
\[\text{A -} \]

Org.
Dic nobis Maria [Victimae paschali laudes]
Sepulcrum Christi: Choir I


Angelicos: Choir I

Surrexit: Choir I

Sur-re-xit Chri-stus spes me- a: prae-ce-det vos in Ga-li-la-e-am.

Sur-re-xit Chri-stus spes me-a: prae-ce-det vos in Ga-li-la-e-am.

Sur-re-xit Chri-stus spes me-a: prae-ce-det vos in Ga-li-la-e-am.

Sur-re-xit Chri-stus spes me-a: prae-ce-det vos in Ga-li-la-e-am.

Die nobis ut supra
tu nobis victor Rex, misere re, misere re. Alleluia,

Tu nobis victor Rex, misere re, misere re. Alleluia,

Tu nobis victor Rex, misere re, misere re. Alleluia,

Tu nobis victor Rex, misere re, misere re. Alleluia,
Veni sancte Spiritus

Cantus I: Veni, Sancte Spiritus,

Altus I: Veni, Sancte Spiritus, Et emitte caeli-

Tenor I: Et emitte caeli-

Bassus I: Et emitte caeli-

Cantus II: 

Altus II: 

Tenor II: 

Bassus II: 

Organ: 

Lu
Veni, lumino cordiunum,
dator munernum, Veni, lumino cordiunum,
Conso-la-tur opti-me,
lu-men cor-di-um.
Conso-la-tur opti-me,
cor-di-um.  Conso-la-tur opti-me,
Dul-cis
dul-cis
Dul-cis
Dul-cis

ve-ni, lu-men cor-di-um.
ve-ni, lu-men cor-di-um.
ve-ni lu-men cor-di-um.
ve-ni, lu-men cor-di-um.
dulce refri-gerium.

ho-spes ani-mae, dulce refri-gerium. O lux be-

ho-spes ani-mae, dulce refri-gerium. O lux be-

ho-spes ani-mae, dulce refri-gerium. O lux be-

ho-spes ani-mae, dulce refri-gerium. O lux be-

ho-spes ani-mae, dulce refri-gerium. O lux be-
um. La - va quod est sor - di - dum,

um. La - va quod est sor - di - dum,

um. La - va quod est sor - di - dum,

um. La - va quod est sor - di - dum,
te confiden
tibus, Sacrum septenar

tibus, Sacrum septenar

us, sacram septem
um, sa-crüm se-p-te-na-ri-um. Da vir-tu-tis me-ri tum,
Da perenne gaudium, da perenne gaudium,
Da perenne gaudium, da perenne gaudium,
Da perenne gaudium, da perenne gaudium,
Da perenne gaudium, da perenne gaudium,
Da perenne gaudium, da perenne gaudium,
gaudi-um, da per-ene gau-di-um.
da per-ene gau-di-um.
gau-di-um, da per-ene gau-di-um.
gau-di-um, da per-ene gau-di-um.

um, da per-ene gau-di-um.
__ per-ene gau-di-um.

um, da per-ene gau-di-um.
__ per-ene gau-di-um.
Lauda Sion

Cantus I

Lau - da Si - on Sal - va - to - rem,

Altus I

Lau - da Si - on Sal - va - to - rem,

Tenor I

Lau - da Si - on Sal - va - to - rem,

Bassus I

Lau - da Si - on Sal - va - to - rem,

Cantus II

Lau - da du - cem

Altus II

Lau - da du -

Tenor II

Lau - da du - cem

Bassus II

Lau - da du -

Organ

Lau - da du -
In hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
in hymnis et canticis,
hymnis et canticis, et canticis.

in hymnis et canticis, in hymnis et canticis.

in hymnis et canticis, et canticis.

hymnis et canticis, et canticis.

cis, in hymnis et canticis. Quan tum

cis, in hymnis et canticis. Quan -

cis, in hymnis et canticis. Quan -

cis, in hymnis et canticis. Quan -
ra Men-tis ju-bi-la-ti-o. Quod non ca-pis,
ra Men-tis ju-bi-la-ti-o. Quod non ca-pis,
ra Men-tis ju-bi-la-ti-o. Quod non ca-pis,
ra Men-tis ju-bi-la-ti-o. Quod non ca-pis,
ra Men-tis ju-bi-la-ti-o. Quod non ca-pis,
ra Men-tis ju-bi-la-ti-o. Quod non ca-pis,
ra Men-tis ju-bi-la-ti-o. Quod non ca-pis,
ra Men-tis ju-bi-la-ti-o. Quod non ca-pis,
quod non vidēs, A-ni-mo-sa fīr-mat fī-des, Prae-
non ca-pis, quod non vidēs, A-ni-mo-sa fīr-mat fī-des,
non ca-pis, quod non vidēs, A-ni-mo-sa fīr-mat fī-des,
non ca-pis, quod non vidēs, A-ni-mo-sa fīr-mat fī-des,
ter re-rum ordinem. Bone pastor, panis vere, Jesus,
no-stri mi-se-re-re: Tu nos pas-ce, nos tu-e-re,

no-stri mi-se-re-re: Tu nos pas-ce, nos tu-e-re,

no-stri mi-se-re-re: Tu nos pas-ce, nos tu-e-re,

no-stri mi-se-re-re: Tu nos pas-ce, nos tu-e-re,
O Ildephonse
per te Domina mea vivit,

Ildefonse, per te Domina mea vivit,

Ildefonse, per te Domina mea
praeparatam susceptisti, susceptisti
praeparatam susceptisti, susceptisti
praeparatam susceptisti, susceptisti
praeparatam susceptisti
praeparatam susceptisti
Ma-ni-bus praeparatam susceptisti quam
Ma-ni-bus praeparatam susceptisti quam
Ma-ni-bus praeparatam susceptisti quam
Ma-ni-bus praeparatam susceptisti quam
quam defendendo, quam defendendo ejus virginitatem,
de defendendo ejus virginitatem,
de defendendo ejus virginitatem,
C. I

Virgo merui-

C. II

Virgo merui-

A. I

Virgo merui-

B. I

Virgo merui-

C. II

Virgo merui-

A. II

Virgo merui-

T. II

Virgo merui-

B. II

Virgo merui-

Org.
Al-le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia.
Et exultavit: Choir I

Et exultavit spiritus meus, spiritus meus: in Deo salutari meo, in Deo salutari meo,
De - o sa-lu-ta-ri me - o, sa-lu-ta-ri me - o.

in De - o sa-lu-ta-ri me - o.

in De - o sa-lu-ta-ri me - o, sa-lu-ta-ri me - o.

in De - o sa-lu-ta-ri me - o, sa-lu-ta-ri me - o.
Quia respexit: a8

humilitatem ancilae su-

humilitatem ancilae su-

humilitatem ancilae su-

hu-mi-li-ta-tem an-cil-la-

hu-mi-li-ta-tem an-cil-la-

hu-mi-li-ta-tem an-cil-la-

qui-a re-spe-xit

qui-a re-spe-xit

qui-a re-spe-xit

qui-a re-spe-xit
-ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc omnes

ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc omnes

-ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc omnes

ae: ecce e-nim ex hoc omnes

ecce e-nim ex hoc beatae me dicent

ecce e-nim ex hoc beatae me dicent

ecce e-nim ex hoc beatae me dicent

ecce e-nim ex hoc beatae me dicent

ecce e-nim ex hoc beatae me dicent
Quia fecit mihi: Choir II

C. III

A. II

T. II

B.

Qui a fecit mihi magna, mihi magna qui potent

Qui a fecit mihi magna

Qui a fecit mihi magna qui potent

 Qui a fecit mihi magna qui potent

qui potent est: et sanctum nomen e

qui potent est: et sanctum nomen e

qui potent est: et sanctum nomen e

qui potent est: et sanctum nomen e

no-men e

no-men e

no-men e

no-men e

jus,
jus,
jus,
jus,
et sanctum nomen e- jus.

Et misericordia: Choir I

Et mi-se-ri-cor-di-a e-

Et mi-se-ri-cor-di-a e-

Et mi-se-ri-cor-di-a e-

Et mi-se-ri-cor-di-a e-

et sanctum nomen e- jus,

et sanctum nomen e- jus,

et sanctum nomen e- jus,
C. I

C. II

A. I

T. I

Org.

= C. I

- C. II

- A. I

- T. I

- Org.

-
Fecit potentiam: a8

C. I

\[\text{di-sper-sit su-per-bos,}\]

C. II

\[\text{di-sper-sit su-per-bos, di-}\]

A. I

\[\text{di-sper-sit su}\]

T. I

\[\text{di-sper-sit su-per-bos, di-}\]

C. III

Fe-cit po-ten-ti-am in brac-chi-o su-o:

A. II

Fe-cit po-ten-ti-am in brac-chi-o su-o:

T. II

Fe-cit po-ten-ti-am in brac-chi-o su-o:

B.

Fe-cit po-ten-ti-am in brac-chi-o su-o:

Org.
di - sper - sit su - per - bos
men - te cor - dis su - i, men - te cor - dis

sper - sit su - per - bos
men - te cor - dis su - i, men - te cor - dis

per - bos, di - sper - sit su - per - bos
men - te cor - dis su - i, men - te cor - dis

sper - sit su - per - bos, su - per - bos
men - te cor - dis su - i, men - te cor - dis

men - te cor - dis su - i, men - te cor - dis su - i,

men - te cor - dis su - i, men - te cor - dis su - i,

men - te cor - dis su - i, men - te cor - dis su - i,

men - te cor - dis su - i, men - te cor - dis su - i,
De posuit potentes: Choir II

C. III

De posuit potentes de se de: et exalta vit humiles.

A. II

De posuit potentes de se de: et exalta vit humiles.

T. II

De posuit potentes de se de: et exalta vit humiles.

B.

De posuit potentes de se de: et exalta vit humiles.
Esurientes implebit bonis: et di-vites di

Esurientes implevit bonis: et di-vites di

Esurientes implevit bonis: et di-vites di

Esurientes implevit bonis: et di-vites di

im-ple-vit bo-nis: et

im-ple-vit bo-nis: et

im-ple-vit bo-nis, im-ple-vit bo-nis: et

im-ple-vit bo-nis: et
C. I
mi - sit i - na - nes, et di - vi - tes di -

C. II
mi - sit i - na - nes, et di - vi - tes di -

A. I
mi - sit i - na - nes, et di - vi - tes di -

T. I
mi - sit i - na - nes, et di - vi - tes di -

C. III
di - vi - tes di - mi - sit i - na - nes, et
di

A. II
di - vi - tes di - mi - sit i - na - nes, et di - vi -

T. II
di - vi - tes di - mi - sit i - na - nes, et
di

B.
di - vi - tes di - mi - sit i - na - nes, et
di

Org.
mi - sit i - na - nes.
mi - sit i - na - nes.
mi - sit i - na - nes.
mi - sit i - na - nes.
di - vi - tes di - mi - sit i - na - nes.
di - vi - tes di - mi - sit i - na - nes.
di - vi - tes di - mi - sit i - na - nes.
di - vi - tes di - mi - sit i - na - nes.

Org.
C. I
et Spiritu, et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto.

C. II
et Spiritu, et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto.

A. I
et Spiritu, et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto.

T. I
et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto.

C. III
Sancto, et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto. Sic

A. II
Sancto, et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto. Sic

T. II
Sancto, et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto.

B.
Sancto, et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut

Org.
in principio, et nunc, et semper,
in principio, et nunc, et semper,
in principio, et nunc, et semper,
in principio, et nunc, et semper,

ci - pi - o,
ci - pi - o,
ci - pi - o,
ci - pi - o,
et in saeculorum.

A. I

et in saeculorum. Amen.

T. I

et in saeculorum. Amen.

C. III

per, sae

A. II

per, saeculorum. Amen.

T. II

per, et in saecula

B.

per, saecula
A - - - men. Sae - cu - lo - rum.

Sae - cu - lo - rum. A - - -

Sae - cu - lo - rum. A - - -

Sae - cu - lo - rum. A - - -

Sae - cu - lo - rum. A - - -

Sae - cu - lo - rum. A - - -

Sae - cu - lo - rum. A - - -

Sae - cu - lo - rum. A - - -

Sae - cu - lo - rum. A - - -

Sae - cu - lo - rum. A - - -

Sae - cu - lo - rum. A - - -

Sae - cu - lo - rum.
C. I

C. II

A. I

T. I

C. III

A. II

T. II
A-men.

B.

Org.
Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.

Pater de caelis, Deus, miserere nobis.
C. I

A. I

T. I

B. I

C. II

A. II

T. II

B. II

Org.

Spiritus Sancte, Deus,

Spiritus Sancte, Deus,

Spiritus Sancte, Deus,

Spiritus Sancte, Deus,

munda, Deus, miserere nobis.

munda, Deus, miserere nobis.

munda, Deus, miserere nobis.

munda, Deus, miserere nobis.
misere-re nobis.

Sancta Tri-nitas, unus Deus.
Mi - se-re-re nobis. Sancta Ma-ri-
us, mi-se-re-re nobis.
ora pro nobis. Sancta Virgo

ora pro nobis. Sancta Virgo

ora pro nobis. Sancta Virgo

ora pro nobis. Sancta Virgo

Sancta Dei genitrix, ora pro nobis.

Sancta Dei genitrix, ora pro nobis.

Sancta Dei genitrix, ora pro nobis.

Sancta Dei genitrix, ora pro nobis.
C. I
\[\text{vir-gi-num, o-ra pro no-bis.}\]

A. I
\[\text{vir-gi-num, o-ra pro no-bis.}\]

T. I
\[\text{vir-gi-num, o-ra pro no-bis.}\]

B. I
\[\text{vir-gi-num, o-ra pro no-bis.}\]

C. II
\[\text{Ma-ter Chri-sti, o-ra}\]

A. II
\[\text{Ma-ter Chri-sti, o-ra pro}\]

T. II
\[\text{Ma-ter Chri-sti, o-ra}\]

B. II
\[\text{Ma-ter Chri-sti, o-ra}\]
Mater divinae gratiae, ora pro nobis.
Mater castissima, ora pro nobis.
Virgo praedica, o
no-
bis.

Virgo praedica, o-
nobisc.

Virgo praedica, o-
nobisc.

Virgo praedica, o-
nobisc.

Virgo praedica, o-
nobisc.

Virgo praedica, o-
nobisc.

Virgo praedica, o-
nobisc.

Virgo praedica, o-
nobisc.
ra pro nobis. Causa nostrae laetitiae,

ra pro nobis. Causa nostrae laetitiae,

pro nobis. Causa nostrae laetitiae,

ra pro nobis. Causa nostrae laetitiae,

Causa nostrae laetitiae, o ra pro nobis

Causa nostrae laetitiae, o ra pro nobis

Causa nostrae laetitiae, o ra pro nobis

Causa nostrae laetitiae, o ra pro nobis
o-ra pro no-bis, o-ra pro no-bis, o-ra pro no-bis, o-ra pro no-bis,
Stel-la ma-tu-ti-na, sa-lus in fir-mo-rum,
Stel-la ma-tu-ti-na, sa-lus in fir-mo-rum,
Regina angelorum, ora pro nobis.

Regina angelorum, ora pro nobis.

Regina angelorum, ora pro nobis.

Regina angelorum, ora pro nobis.
C. I
ra pro nobis. Regina virginitum,

A. I
ra pro nobis. Regina virginitum,

T. I
ra pro nobis. Regina virginitum,

B. I
ra pro nobis. Regina virginitum,

C. II
bis. Regina confessorum, ora pro nobis. Regina virginitum,

A. II
bis. Regina confessorum, ora pro nobis. Regina virginitum,

T. II
bis. Regina confessorum, ora pro nobis. Regina virginitum,

B. II
bis. Regina confessorum, ora pro nobis. Regina virginitum,

Org.
Re-gi-na san-cto-rum o-mni um, o-ra pro
Re-gi-na san-cto-rum o-mni um
Re-gi-na san-cto-rum o-mni um,
Re-gi-na san-cto-rum o-mni um,
Re-gi-na san-cto-rum o-mni um, o-ra pro no-bis.
Re-gi-na san-cto-rum o-mni-um,
Re-gi-na san-cto-rum o-mni-um,
Re-gi-na san-cto-rum o-mni-um,
Re-gi-na san-cto-rum o-mni-um,
Re-gi-na san-cto-rum o-mni-um, o-ra pro no-bis.
Agnus Dei, qui tollis pec-ça-ta mun-di: par-ce nö-bis Do
Agnus Dei, qui tollis pecamina mundi: exaudi nos
Ave Maria
C.I
gra-ti-a ple-na: Dom-i-nus te-

A.I
gra-ti-a ple-na: Dom-i-nus

T.I
gra-ti-a ple-na: Dom-i-nus te-

B.I
gra-ti-a ple-na: Dom-i-nus

C.II
-ri-a, gra-ti-a ple-na: Do-

A.II
- - a, gra-ti-a ple-na: Do-

T.II
a, gra-ti-a ple-na: Do-

B.II
a, gra-ti-a ple-na: Do-

Org.
in muliereibus,
in muliereibus,
in muliereibus,
in muliereibus,

-cta tu in muliereibus, in muliereibus,
-cta tu in muliereibus, in muliereibus,
-cta tu in muliereibus, in muliereibus,
Regina caeli, dulcis et piæ, Regina caeli, dulcis et piæ.
Regina caeli, dulcis et piæ, Regina caeli, dulcis et piæ.
Regina caeli, dulcis et piæ, Regina caeli, dulcis et piæ.
Regina caeli, dulcis et piæ, Regina caeli, dulcis et piæ.
Regina caeli, dulcis et piæ, Regina caeli, dulcis et piæ.
Regina caeli, dulcis et piæ.
Oratio 55

C.I

-a, O Ma-ter De-i.

A.I

O Ma-ter De-i. O-ra pro nobis pec-ca-to-ri-

T.I

O Ma-ter De-i. O-ra pro nobis pec-ca-to-

B.I

a, O Ma-ter De-i.

C.II

O Ma-ter De-i. O-ra pro nobis pec-ca-to-

A.II

a, O Ma-ter De-i.

T.II

a, O Ma-ter De-i.

B.II

O Ma-ter De-i. O-ra pro nobis pec-ca-to-

Org.
O-ra pro nobis pec-ca-to-ri-bus, o-ra pro nobis pec-ca-to-ri-bus,
bus. Ut cum ele-ctis te vi-de-amus,
ut cum electis, ut
vi-de-a-mus, ut cum electis
tum electis, ut
vi-de-a-mus, ut cum electis
tum electis, ut
tum electis, ut
vi-de-a-mus, ut cum electis
vi-de-a-mus, ut cum electis
tum electis, ut
vi-de-a-mus, ut cum electis
vi-de-a-mus, ut cum electis
Alma redemptoris mater

Cantus I

Altus I

Tenor I

Bassus I

Cantus II

Altus II

Tenor II

Bassus II

Organ
quae
per vi-a cae-

quae per vi-a cae-

quae per vi-a cae-

quae per vi-a cae-

quae per vi-a cae-

quae per vi-a cae-

quae per vi-a cae-

quae per vi-a cae-
per vi-a cae-li por-ta ma-

A. I

- li por-ta ma-

B. I

- li por-ta ma-

C. II

por-ta ma-nes,

A. II

por-ta ma-nes,

T. II

por-ta ma-nes,

B. II

por-ta ma-nes,
C. I
- - nes, por - ta ma - nes,

A. I
- - nes, por - ta ma - nes,

T. I
nes, por - ta ma - nes,

B. I
nes, por - ta ma - nes,

C. II
por - ta ma - nes, et

A. II
por - ta ma - nes, et stel - la ma -

T. II
por - ta ma - nes, et stel -

B. II
por - ta ma - nes, et stel - la ma -

Org.
Or

cadentii, surge-re, surge-re, surge-re qui

cadentii, surge-re, surge-re qui

cadentii, surge-re, surge-re qui

cadentii, surge-re, surge-re qui

cadentii, surge-re, surge-re qui

cadentii, surge-re, surge-re qui

cadentii, surge-re, surge-re qui

cadentii, surge-re, surge-re qui
C. I
-ge-re qui curat populo;

A. I
cur rate populo;

T. I
re qui cur rate populo;

B. I
cur rate populo;

C. II
sur-ge-re qui cur rate populo;

A. II
sur-ge-re qui cur rate populo;

T. II
-ge-re, sur-ge-re qui cur rate populo;

B. II
sur-ge-re qui cur rate populo;
Tu, tu quae genuisti
Tu, quae genuisti natura mirant
Tu, quae genuisti
Tu, tu, tu quae genuisti natura mirant
Tu, tu, tu quae genuisti
Tu, tu, tu quae genuisti
natūra mirantete,
ra mirantete,
na-tūra mirantete,
ra mirantete,
tuum sanctum Geni-to

- te, tuum sanctum Geni-to-
- te, tuum sanctum Geni-to-
- te, tuum sanctum Geni-to-
- te, tuum sanctum Geni-to-

Org.
tu - um sanctum Geni - to - rem, Vir - go pri -

um san - ctum Geni - to - rem, Vir - go, Vir -

tu - um sanctum Geni - to - rem, Vir - go pri -

C. II

rem, Vir - go

A. II

rem, Vir - go, Vir - go pri -

T. II

rem, Vir - go pri - us, Vir - go

B. II

rem, Vir - go, Vir - go
c. i

- us ac po ste ri-us,

a. i

go pri-us ac po-ste-ri-us,

t. i

pri-us ac po-ste-ri-us,

b. i

us ac po-ste-ri-us,

c. ii

pri-us ac po-

a. ii

us, pri-us ac po-ste-

t. ii

pri-us ac po-ste-

b. ii

pri-us ac po-ste-

org.
Ave Regina caelorum

Cantus I

Altus I

Tenor I

Bassus I

Cantus II

Altus II

Tenor II

Bassus II

Organ
8

C.I

lo - rum,

A.I

- rum, cae - lo - rum,

T.I

- lo - rum,

B.I

- lo - rum,

C.II

A - ve_ Do - mi - na An - ge-lo -

A.II

A - ve_ Do - mi -

T.II

A - ve_ Do - mi - na An - ge-lo - rum,

B.II

A - ve_ Do - mi -

Org.
Sal - ve, sal - ve, sal - ve, ra - dix

Sal - ve, ra - dix san - rum, An - ge - lo - rum:

Sal - ve,

-an - na An - ge - lo - rum:

Sal - ve,

An - ge - lo - rum:

Sal - ve,

-na An - ge - lo - rum:

Sal - ve,
C. I
sancta,

A. I
cita, radix sancta,

T. I
radix sancta,

B. I
sancta,

C. II
ex qua mun-

A. II
ex qua mun-

T. II
ex qua mun-

B. II
ex qua mun-

Org.
gau-de glori-o-sa, Su-per o-mnes

gau-de glori-o-sa, Su-per o-mnes spe-ci-

C.I

A.I

T.I

B.I

C.II

A.II

T.II

B.II

Org.
co - ra,  Et pro no - bis,  et pro no - bis sem - per
co - ra,  Et pro no - bis,  et pro no - bis sem - per
- - ra,  Et pro no - bis,  et pro no - bis sem - per
  
val - de de - co - ra,  Et pro no - bis,
val - de de - co - ra,  Et pro no - bis,
val - de de - co - ra,  Et pro no - bis,
val - de de - co - ra,  Et pro no - bis,
Regina caeli

Cantus I

Re-gi-na cae-li lae-ta-re,

Cantus II

Re-gi-na cae-li lae-

Altus I

Re-gi-na cae-li lae-

ta-re,

Tenor I

Re-gi-na cae-li lae-

ta-re,

Cantus III

Lae-

Altus II

Re-

Tenor II

Re-

Bassus

Re-

Organ

Re-

lae-

rae-

rae-

rae-

rae-

rae-

rae-

rae-
C. I  
- le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia: Qui a quem

C. II  
- le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia:

A. I  
- le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia: Qui

T. I  
- le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia: Qui

C. III  
Al-le-lu-ia:

A. II  
Al-le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia:

T. II  
Al-le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia:

B.  
Al-le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia:

Org.  

C. I
re, portare, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia,

C. II
re, portare, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia,

A. I
re, portare, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia,

T. I
re, portare, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia,

C. III
portare, Alleluia, Alleluia,

A. II
portare, Alleluia, Alleluia,

T. II
portare, Alleluia, Alleluia,

B.
portare, Alleluia, Alleluia,

Org.
Seconda pars

C. I

le-lu-ia. Resur-re-xit, sic-ut

C. II

le-lu-ia. Resur-re-xit, sic-ut di-

A. I

le-lu-ia. Resur-re-xit,

T. I

le-lu-ia.

C. III

le-lu-ia. Res-

A. II

le-lu-ia.

T. II

le-lu-ia.

B.

le-lu-ia.

Org.
C. I
75

di - xit,  Al-le-lu-

C. II
di - xit,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al-

A. I
di - xit,  Al - le - lu - ia,

T. I
di - xit,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al-

C. III
di - xit,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al - le - lu - ia,

A. II
di - xit,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al - le - lu - ia,

T. II
di - xit,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al - le - lu - ia,

B.
di - xit,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al - le - lu - ia,  Al - le - lu - ia,

Org.
Ora pro nobis
Ora pro nobis, ora pro nobis
Ora pro nobis
Ora pro nobis Deum,
Ora pro nobis Deum,
Ora pro nobis Deum,
Ora pro nobis Deum,
Al-le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia, Al-le-lu-ia,
Salve Regina

Cantus I & II

Choir I

Sal - ve

Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -

Re - gi - na, Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -

Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -

Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -

Org.

Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -

Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -

Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -

Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -

Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -

Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -

Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -

Re - gi - na, ma - ter mi - se - ri -
Seconda parte: Coro II
Tertia pars: Choir I

C. I

Ad te clama-

C. II

Ad te clama-
mus, ad te clama-

A. I

Ad te clama-
mus, ad te clama-

B. I

Ad te clama-
mus, ad te clama-

Org.
ta nostra,

cata nostra,

ta nostra,

vo-cata nostra,

ta nostra, illos misericordes occupa

ta nostra, illos misericordes occupa

cata nostra, illos misericordes occupa

cata nostra, illos misericordes occupa
-te, ad nos, ad nos con ver - te,
ad nos con-verte, ad nos, ad nos con-verte.
C. I
-ctum ventris tu-

C. II
fructum ventris tu-

A. I
tu-

B. I
tum ventris tu-

Org.

C. I
no-

C. II
bis post hoc ex-

A. I
bis post hoc ex-

B. I
no-

Org.
Septima pars: a8

O__ cle-mens, O__ cle-

O__ cle-mens;

O cle-mens: O__ pi-

O__ cle-mens, O__ cle-mens:

O cle-mens, O cle-mens:

O, O____

O cle-mens, O cle-mens:

O cle-mens, O cle-mens:

O cle-mens, O cle-mens:
C. I
172
Mar - ri - a, O dul - 

C. II
ri - a, O dul - cis Vir -

A. I
ri - a, O dul - cis

B. I
ri - a, O dul - cis

C. III
Virgo Mar - ri - a, O dul - 

A. II
Virgo Mar - ri - a, O, O dul-cis

T. I
Vir - go Mar - ri - a, O dul - 

B. II
Virgo Mar - ri - a, O dul - cis

Org.
C. I
"- cisc Vir - go Ma - ri - a,"

C. II
"go Ma - ri - - - a,"

A. I
"Vir - go Ma - ri - a, Ma - ri - a,"

B. I
"Vir - go Ma - ri - a,"

C. III
"cis Vir - go Ma - ri - a, O"

A. II
"Vir - go Ma - ri - - - a, O"

T. I
"- cisc Vir - go Ma - ri - a, O dul"

B. II
"Vir - go Ma - ri - a, O"

Org.
C. I

200

-go Ma-ri-a.

C. II

ri-

A. I

ri-a, Ma-ri-a.

B. I

Ma-

C. III

go Ma-ri-a.

A. II

T. I

go Ma-ri-a.

B. II

Ma-

Org.

Ma-

Ma-

Ma-

Ma-

Ma-

Ma-

Ma-

Ma-

Ma-
do - mi - na - re in me - di -

do - mi - na - re in me - di -o in -

do - mi - na - re in me - di -o in -

do - mi - na - re in me - di -o in -

do - mi - na - re in me - di -

do - mi - na - re in me - di -

do - mi - na - re in me - di -

do - mi - na - re in me - di -

do - mi - na - re in me - di -

do - mi - na - re in me - di -

do - mi - na - re in me - di -
in splendo-ri-bus

cum principium in die virtutis tuae,

cipium in die virtutis tuae,

Te cum principium in die virtutis tuae,

cipium in die virtutis tuae,
sanctorum: ex utero
sanctorum: ex utero
sanctorum: ex utero
sanctorum: ex utero
ex utero
ex utero
ex utero
ex utero
ex utero
ante Luciferm genu
ante Luciferm genu
ante Luciferm genu
ante Luciferm genu
C. I
ra-vit Do-mi-nus, et non poe-ni-te-bit e-um:

A. I
Ju-ra-vit Do-mi-nus, et non paen-i-te-bit e-

T. I
Ju-ra-vit Do-mi-nus, et non paen-i-te-bit e-

B. I
Ju-ra-vit Do-mi-nus, et non paen-i-te-bit e-

C. II
te.
Tu es sa-

A. II
te.
Tu es sa-cer-

T. II
te.
Tu es sa-

B. II
te.
Tu es sa-

Org.
cer - dos in aet - ternum se cun - dum or-di-nem Mel -

cer - dos in aet - ternum se cun - dum or-di-nem Mel chi -

cer - dos in aet - ternum se cun - dum or-di-nem Mel chi -

cer - dos in aet - ternum se cun - dum or-di-nem Mel -
Dominius a dextris tu is, a dextris dech. Dominius a dextris tu is, a dextris dech. Dominius a dextris tu is, a dextris dech. Dominius a dextris tu is, a dextris dech.
bit ru i nas: con qua bit ca pi ta

im-ple-bit ru i nas: con qua-bit ca-pi-

im-ple-bit ru i nas: con qua-sa-bit ca-pi-

ple-bit ru i nas: con qua-sa-bit ca-pi-

bit ru i nas:

ple-bit ru i nas:

im-ple-bit ru i nas:

bus, im-ple-bit ru i nas:
C. I

in ter-ra mul-to-rum.

A. I

ta in ter-ra mul-to-rum.

T. I

ta in ter-ra mul-to-rum.

B. I

ta in ter-ra mul-to-rum.

C. II

De tor-ren-te in

A. II

De tor-ren-te in

T. II

De tor-ren-te in vi-

B. II

De tor-ren-te in

Org.
al-ta-bit ca-put. Glo-ri-a Pa-tri, et Fi-li-o,

al-ta-bit ca-put. Glo-ri-a Pa-tri, et Fi-li-o,

al-ta-bit ca-put. Glo-ri-a Pa-tri, et Fi-li-o,

al-ta-bit ca-put. Glo-ri-a Pa-tri, et Fi-li-o,
C. I

et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto.

A. I

et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto.

T. I

et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto.

B. I

et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto.

C. II

et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut e-

A. II

et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut e-

T. II

et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut e-

B. II

et Spiritu, et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut e-

Org.
Sic ut erat in principio,
Sic ut erat in principio,
Sic ut erat in principio,
Sic ut erat in principio,
Sic ut erat in principio,
Sic ut erat in principio,
C. I  
ci - pi-o, et nunc, et sem - per,  

A. I  
ci - pi-o, et nunc, et sem - per,  

T. I  
ci - pi-o, et nunc, et sem - per,  

B. I  
ci - pi-o, et nunc, et sem - per,  

C. II  
et nunc, et sem - per,  

A. II  
et nunc, et sem - per,  

T. II  
et nunc, et sem - per, et in  

B. II  
et nunc, et sem - per,  

Org.
in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

Amen.

Amen.

Amen.
Laudate pueri
da-te no-men Do-mi-ni.
da-te no-men Do-mi-ni.
da-te no-men Do-mi-ni.
da-te no-men Do-mi-ni.
Sit no-men Do-mi-ni
Sit no-men Do-mi-ni be-
Sit no-men Do-mi-ni be-
Sit no-men Do-mi-ni be-
C. I

- sum, usque ad occasum: laudabili

C. II

- sum, usque ad occasum: laudabili

A. I

- sum, ad occasum: laudabili

T. I

usque ad occasum: laudabili

C. III

laudabili

A. II

laudabili

T. II

laudabili

B.

laudabili

Org.
le no men, laudabile no men Domini.

le, laudable, laudabile no men Domini.

le, laudabile no men Domini.

laudabile no men Domini.

laudabile no men Domini.

laudabile no men Domini.
Excelsus: Choir I (a3)

C. I

Ex-cel-sus su-per o-mnes gen-tes Do-mi-nus: et su-per

cae-lo-s glo-ri-a e-jus, glo-ri-a e-jus.

C. II

Ex-cel-sus su-per o-mnes gen-tes Do-mi-nus: et su-per

cae-lo-s glo-ri-a e-jus, glo-ri-a e-jus.

A. I

Ex-cel-sus su-per o-mnes gen-tes Do-mi-nus: et su-per

cae-lo-s glo-ri-a e-jus, glo-ri-a e-jus.

Org.
Quis sicut: Choir II

Quis sic-ut Do-mi-nus De-us no-ster, qui in al-tis ha-bi-tat: et hu-mi-li-a re-spi-cit, hu-mi-

Quis sic-ut Do-mi-nus De-us no-ster, qui in al-tis ha-bi-tat: et hu-mi-li-a re-

Quis sic-ut Do-mi-nus De-us no-ster, qui in al-tis ha-bi-tat: et hu-mi-li-a re-

Quis sic-ut Do-mi-nus De-us no-ster, qui in al-tis
Suscipiens: a8

C. I

Su-sci-tans a ter-ra in-o-pem: et de ster-co-

C. II

Su-sci-tans a ter-ra in-o-pem: et de ster-co-

A. I

Su-sci-tans a ter-ra in-o-pem: et de ster-co-

T. I

Su-sci-tans a ter-ra in-o-pem: et de ster-co-

C. III

et de ster-co-re

A. II

et de ster-co-re

T. II

et de ster-co-re

B.

et de ster-co-re

Org.
Ut colligit eum cum principibus: cum erigens pauperem.
C. I
lorum. Amen. Sae-

C. II
lorum. Amen. Sae-

A. I
lorum. Amen. Sae-

T. I
lorum. Amen. Sae-

C. III
sae- lorum. Amen.

A. II
sae- lorum. Amen.

T. II
sae- lorum. Amen.

B.
sae- lorum. Amen.

Org.
Nisi Dominus

Cantus I

Nisi Dominus aedificare vitam: in

Cantus II

Nisi Dominus aedificare vitam: in

Altus I

Nisi Dominus aedificare vitam: in

Tenor I

Nisi Dominus aedificare vitam: in

Cantus III

in varnum,

Altus II

in varnum,

Tenor II

in varnum,

Bassus

in varnum,

Organ
va-num la-bo-ra-ve-runt qui ae-di-fi-cant

va-num la-bo-ra-ve-runt qui ae-di-fi-cant e-

va-num la-bo-ra-ve-runt qui ae-di-fi-cant e-

in va-num la-bo-ra-ve-runt

in va-num la-bo-ra-ve-runt

in va-num la-bo-ra-ve-runt

in va-num la-bo-ra-ve-runt
Ni-si Do-mi-nus cu-sto-di-er-it ci-vi-ta-tem:

fru-

cant e-am.

fru-

fru-

fru-

fru-

fru-
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Vanum est vobis: Choir I (a3)

C. I

Va - num est vo - bis an-te lu-cem sur -

C. II

Va - num est vo - bis an-te lu-cem sur -

A. I

Va - num est vo - bis an-te lu-cem sur -

Org.

C. I

- ge-re: sur-gi-te, sur-gi-te, post quam se - de - ri -

C. II

- ge-re: sur-gi-te, sur-gi-te, post quam se - de - ri -

A. I

- ge-re: sur-gi-te, sur-gi-te, post quam se - de - ri -

Org.
C. I

\begin{align*}
\text{tis, qui man-du-ca} & \text{- tis pa-nem} \text{ do-lo ris.}
\end{align*}

C. II

\begin{align*}
\text{tis, qui man-du-ca} & \text{- tis pa-nem} \text{ do-lo ris.}
\end{align*}

A. I

\begin{align*}
\text{tis, qui man-du-ca} & \text{- tis pa-nem do-lo ris.}
\end{align*}

Org.

\begin{align*}
\text{tis, qui man-du-ca} & \text{- tis pa-nem do-lo ris.}
\end{align*}

\[\text{Cum dederit: Choir II}\]

C. III

\begin{align*}
\text{Cum de-de-rit di-le-ctis su-is} & \text{ so-mnum: ec-ce}
\end{align*}

A. II

\begin{align*}
\text{Cum de-de-rit di-le-ctis su-is} & \text{ so-mnum: ee-ce,}
\end{align*}

T. II

\begin{align*}
\text{Cum de-de-rit di-le-ctis su-is} & \text{ so-mnum: ee-ce, ee-ce,}
\end{align*}

B.

\begin{align*}
\text{di-le-ctis su-is} & \text{ so-mnum: ec-ce, ec-}
\end{align*}
hae-re-di-tas Dom-i-ni,

ec-ce hae-re-di-tas Dom-i-ni, fi-li:-me-rces fru-

hae-re-di-tas Dom-i-ni, fi-li:-me-rces fru-

Sic-ut sa-git-tae in ma-nu po-

Sic-ut sa-git-tae in ma-nu po-

ven-tris. Sic-ut sa-git-

tis: i-ta fi-li-i ex-

Asmus Riccini: Officium diurnum: Sancta Salisburgi pars II (1580)
Beatus vir, beatus vir, qui imm...
non confundetur

confundetur

cum loquetur

cum loquetur

cum loquetur

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in

in
in - i-mi-cis su - is in por - ta, non con-fun-
- i-mi-cis, in - i-mi-cis su - is in por - ta, non con-fun-

in - i-mi-cis, in - i-mi-cis su - is in por - ta, non con-fun-

in - i-mi-cis su - is in por - ta, non con-fun-

in - i-mi-cis su - is in por - ta,
C. I
\[ \text{cis su - is in por - ta. Glo\-ri - a Pa - tri, et} \]

C. II
\[ \text{in - i-mi-cis su - is in por - ta. Glo\-ri - a Pa - tri, et} \]

A. I
\[ \text{cis, in - i-mi-cis su - is in por - ta. Glo\-ri - a Pa - tri, et} \]

T. I
\[ \text{su - is in por - ta. Glo\-ri - a Pa - tri, et} \]

C. III
\[ \text{su - is in por - ta.} \]

A. II
\[ \text{- i-mi-cis su - is in por - ta.} \]

T. II
\[ \text{is, in - i\-mi\-cis su - is in por - ta.} \]

B.
\[ \text{in - i-mi-cis su - is in por - ta.} \]
et nunc, et semper,
et nunc, et semper,
et nunc, et semper,
et nunc, et semper,
et nunc, et semper,
et nunc, et semper,
et nunc, et semper,
et nunc, et semper,
et nunc, et semper,
et nunc, et semper,
et nunc, et semper,
et nunc, et semper,
_ in sae-cu-la sae-cu-lo-rum. Amen._

sae-cu-la sae-cu-lo-rum._

sae-cu-la sae-cu-lo-rum. Amen._

et_ in sae-cu-la sae-

et_ in sae-cu-la sae-

et_ in sae-cu-la

et_ in sae-cu-la

et_ in sae-cu-la
C. I


C. II


A. I


T. I

Sae-cu-lo-rum.

C. III


A. II


T. II


B.


Org.
Laudate Dominum omnes gentes
C. I

T. I

B. I

C. II

A. II

T. II

B. II

Org.

tes: o mnes populi.
tes: o mnes populi.
tes: o mnes populi. Quo-
tes: o mnes populi.
tes: laudate eum, o mnes populi.
tes: laudate eum, o mnes populi.
tes: laudate eum, o mnes populi.
tes: laudate eum, o mnes populi.
tes: laudate eum, o mnes populi.
Quoniam confirmata est suppler
et veritas Domini

Do - mi - ni ma - net in ae - ter - num,
C. I
ma - net in a e - ter - num,

A. I
ma - net in a e - ter - num,

T. I
ma - net in a e- ter - num,

B. I
ma - net in a e- ter - num,

C. II
et ve - ri-tas Do-mi-ni ma - net in a e- ter -

A. II
et ve - ri-tas Do-mi-ni ma - net in a e- ter -

T. II
et ve-ri-tas Do-mi-ni ma - net in a e- ter -

B. II
et ve - ri-tas Do-mi-ni ma - net in a e- ter -

Org.
manet in aeternum, manet in aeternum,
manet in aeternum, manet in aeternum,
manet in aeternum, manet in aeternum,
manet in aeternum, manet in aeternum,
manet in aeternum, manet in aeternum,
C.I
-\textit{li-o, et Spi-ri-tu-i San-}

A.I
-\textit{li-o, et Spi-ri-tu- - -}

T.I
Fi-li-o, et Spi-ri-tu-i San-

B.I
Fi-li-o, et Spi-ri-tu-

C.II
\textit{Glo-ri-a Pa-tri, et Fi-li-o,}

A.II
\textit{Glo-ri-a Pa-tri, et Fi-li-o,}

T.II
\textit{Glo-ri-a Pa-tri, et Fi-li-o,}

B.II
\textit{Glo-ri-a Pa-tri, et Fi-li-o,}
sem - - - per, et in sae - cu - la

sem - - - per, et in sae - cu - la

sem - - - per, et in sae - cu - la

sem - - - per, et in sae - cu - la

et in sae - cu - la sae - cu - lo - rum.

et in sae - cu - la sae - cu - lo - rum.

et in sae - cu - la sae - cu - lo - rum.

et in sae - cu - la sae - cu - lo - rum.
Ecce nunc benedicite

Ecce nunc benedicite Dominum:

Ecce nunc benedicite Dominum:

Ecce nunc benedicite Dominum:

Ecce nunc benedicite Dominum:

Ecce nunc benedicite Dominum:
omnes ser- vi Do - mi - ni. Qui sta - tis in do-mo
num: o - mnes ser - vi Do - mi - ni. Qui sta - tis
num: o - mnes ser - vi Do-mi - ni. Qui sta - tis
num: o - mnes ser - vi Do - mi - ni. Qui sta - tis
num: o - mnes ser - vi Do - mi - ni. Qui sta - tis
num: o - mnes ser - vi Do - mi - ni. Qui sta - tis

Domini: in aтриs do-mus De-i no-stri. In no-ci-bus

Domini: in aтриs do-mus De-i no-stri. In no-ci-bus

Domini: in aтриs do-mus De-i no-stri. In no-ci-bus

in do-mo Do-mi-ni: In no-ci-bus ex-tol-li-

in do-mo Do-mi-ni: In no-ci-bus ex-tol-li-

in do-mo Do-mi-ni: In no-ci-bus ex-tol-li-

in do-mo Do-mi-ni: In no-ci-bus ex-tol-li-

in do-mo Do-mi-ni: In no-ci-bus ex-tol-li-
C. I

ex-tol-li-te ma-nus ve-stras in san-cta,

A. I

ex-tol-li-te ma-nus ve-stras in san-cta,

T. I

ex-tol-li-te ma-nus ve-stras in san-cta,

B. I

ex-tol-li-te ma-nus ve-stras in san-cta,

C. II

te ma-nus ve-stras in san-cta, et be-ne-di-ci-te Do

A. II

te ma-nus ve-stras in san-cta, et be-ne-di-ci-te Do

T. II

te ma-nus ve-stras in san-cta, in san-cta, et be-ne-di-ci-te Do

B. II

te ma-nus ve-stras in san-cta, et be-ne-di-ci-te Do

Org.
caelum, qui fecit caelum et terram, et terram.
C. I
Gloria Patri, et Filio, Sic ut erat

A. I
Gloria Patri, et Filio, Sic ut erat

T. I
Gloria Patri, et Filio, Sic ut erat

B. I
Gloria Patri, et Filio, Sic ut erat

C. II
et Spiritu Sancto. in_

A. II
et Spiritu Sancto. in_

T. II
et Spiritu Sancto. in_

B. II
et Spiritu Sancto. in_

Org.
et in saecula
rat
et in saecula
et in saecula
principio, et nunc, et semper, sae-
principio, et nunc, et semper, sae-
principio, et nunc, et semper, sae-
principio, et nunc, et semper, sae-
Super flumina Babylonis
nostro, or-ga-na nostro:
nostro, or-ga-na nostro:
nostro, or-ga-na nostro:
nostro, or-ga-na nostro:
orga-na, or-ga-na nostro:
orga-na, or-ga-na nostro:
or-ga-na, or-ga-na nostro:
or-ga-na, or-ga-na nostro:
Qua illic: Choir I
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C. I

qui - a il - lic in - ter - ro - ga - ve - runt nos,

C. II

qui - a il - lic in - ter - ro - ga - ve - runt nos, qui cap - ti - vos

A. I

qui - a il - lic in - ter - ro - ga - ve - runt nos, qui cap - ti - vos

T. I

qui - a il - lic qui cap - ti - vos

Org.

35

C. I

ver - ba can - ti - o - num, ver - ba can - ti - o - num;

C. II

du - xe - runt nos, ver - ba can - ti - o - num, ver - ba can - ti - o - num;

A. I

du - xe - runt nos, ver - ba can - ti - o - num, ver - ba can - ti - o - num;

T. I

du - xe - runt nos, ver - ba can - ti - o - num;

Org.
et qui abduxerunt: Choir II

et qui abduxerunt nos: hymnum cantate nobis,

et qui abduxerunt nos: hymnum cantate nobis,

et qui abduxerunt nos: hymnum cantate nobis,

et qui abduxerunt nos: hymnum cantate nobis,

hymnum cantate nobis de canticis

hymnum cantate nobis de canticis

hymnum cantate nobis de canticis

hymnum cantate nobis de canticis

Si - on, de canticis Si - on.

Si - on, de canticis Si - on.

Si - on, de canticis Si - on.

Si - on, de canticis Si - on.
Quomodo cantabimus, quomodo cantabimus can
C. I
ni, can - ti - cum Do - mi-ni in ter-ra a-li-e - 

C. II
ni, can - ti - cum Do - mi-ni in ter-ra a-li-e - 

A. I
can - ti - cum Do - mi-ni in ter-ra a-li-e - 

T. I
-mi-ni in ter-ra a-li-e - 

C. III
Do - mi-ni, can - ti-cum Do - mi-ni

A. II

T. II
cum Do - mi-ni

B.
cum Do - mi-ni

Org.
in terra aliena,
in terra aliena,
in terra aliena,
in terra aliena,
in terra aliena, in terra aliena,
in terra aliena, in terra aliena,
in terra aliena, in terra aliena,
C. I

na, in terra aliena,

C. II

na, in terra aliena,

A. I

na, in terra aliena,

T. I

na, in terra aliena,

C. III

in terra aliena, in terra aliena,

A. II

in terra aliena, in terra aliena,

T. II

in terra aliena, in terra aliena,

B.

in terra aliena, in terra aliena,

Org.
C. I

---

C. II

---

A. I

---

T. I

---

C. III

---

A. II

---

T. II

---

B.

---

Org.

---
Laetatus sum

Cantus I
Lae-tus sum, lae-tus sum in his quae di-cta sunt mi-

Altus I
Lae-tus sum in his quae di-cta sunt mi-

Tenor I
Lae-tus sum in his quae di-cta sunt mi-

Bassus I

Organ

C. I
-hi: in do-mum Do-mi-ni i-bi-mus, in

A. I
-hi: in do-mum Do-mi-ni i-bi-mus, in do-mum

T. I
-hi: in do-mum Do-mi-ni i-bi-mus, in do-mum Do-

B. I

in do-mum Do-mi-ni i-

Org.
Stantes: Choir II

C. II

Stan - tes e - rant pe - des no - stri: in a - tri-

C. III

Stan - tes e - rant pe - des no - stri: in a - tri - is tu - is,

A. II

Stan - tes e - rant pe - des no - stri: in a - tri - is

T. II

Stan - tes e - rant pe - des no - stri: in a - tri - is tu -

C. II

is tu - is, Je - ru - sa - lem.

C. III

_ Je - ru - sa - lem, Je - ru - sa - lem.

A. II

tu - is, Je - ru - sa - lem.

T. II

is, Je - ru - sa - lem.
Il·luc enim: a12

Il - luc e-nim a-scen - de - runt

Il - luc e-nim a-scen - de - runt

Il - luc e-nim a-scen - de - runt

Il - luc e-nim a-scen - de - runt
no - mi - ni Do - mi - ni.

no - mi - ni Do - mi - ni.

no - mi - ni Do - mi - ni.

no - mi - ni Do - mi - ni.

C. II

Do - mi - ni.

Qui - a il - lic se - de - runt

C. III

Do - mi - ni.

Qui - a il - lic se - de - runt

A. II

Do - mi - ni.

Qui - a il - lic se - de - runt

T. II

Do - mi - ni.

Qui - a il - lic se - de - runt

C. IV

no - mi - ni Do - mi - ni.

A. III

no - mi - ni Do - mi - ni.

T. III

no - mi - ni Do - mi - ni.

B. II

no - mi - ni Do - mi - ni.

Org.
sedes super do-mum David,
C. I

T. I

B. I

C. II

C. III

A. II

T. II

C. IV

A. III

T. III

B. II

Org.
Fiat pax: a.12

C. I

Fi - at pax, fi - at pax, fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a:

A. I

Fi - at pax, fi - at pax, fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a:

T. I

Fi - at pax, fi - at pax, fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a:

B. I

Fi - at pax, fi - at pax, fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a:

C. II

Fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a:

C. III

Fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a:

A. II

Fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a:

T. II

Fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a:

C. IV

Fi - at pax, fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a: et ab-un

A. III

Fi - at pax, fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a: et ab-un

T. III

Fi - at pax, fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a: et ab-un

B. II

Fi - at pax, fi - at pax in vir-tu-te tu - a: et ab-un

Org.
Proppter fratre meos et

Proppter fratre meos

Proppter fratre meos et

Proppter fratre meos et

dantia in turribus tuiris.

dantia in turribus tuiris.

dantia in turribus tuiris.

dantia in turribus tuiris.

Org.
quae-si-vi bo-na ti-bi, quae-si-vi bo-

A.
quae-si-vi bo-na ti-bi, quae-si-vi bo-

T.
quae-si-vi bo-na ti-bi, quae-si-vi bo-

B.
quae-si-vi bo-na ti-bi, quae-si-vi bo-

c.
bo-na ti-bi, quae-si-vi bo-na ti-bi, quae-si-vi bo-

c.
bo-na ti-bi, quae-si-vi bo-na ti-bi, quae-si-vi bo-

a.
bo-na ti-bi, quae-si-vi bo-na, quae-si-vi bo-

t.
bo-na ti-bi, quae-si-vi bo-na ti-bi, quae-si-vi bo-

C.
quae-si-vi bo-na ti-bi.

A.
quae-si-vi bo-na ti-bi.

T.
quae-si-vi bo-na ti-bi.

B.
quae-si-vi bo-na ti-bi.
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in
C. I
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in
A. I
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in
T. I
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in
B. I
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in prin
ceto.
C. II
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in prin
ceto.
C. III
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in prin
ceto.
A. II
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in prin
ceto.
T. II
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in prin
ceto.
C. IV
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in prin-
cipio,
A. III
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in prin-
cipio,
T. III
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in prin-
cipio,
B. II
et Spiritui Sancto. Sic ut erat in prin-
cipio,
Tu ad libera-dum suscepturus hominem, non horru-

istvi

i

ishi

Vir

i

ni

is u

te

terum

Vir

i

ni

is u

te

terum

Vir

i

ni

is u

te

terum

Vir

i

ni

is u

te

terum

Tu ad dex-teram Dei se-des: in

Tu ad dex-teram Dei se-des: in glo-

Tu ad dex-teram Dei se-des: in
Gloria P - tris, P - tris.

Verse 20

Te ergo quae-s - mus, fa - mulis tu - is sub - ve - ni:

Te ergo quae-s - mus, fa - mulis tu - is sub - ve - ni:

Te ergo quae-s - mus, fa - mulis tu - is sub - ve - ni:

Te ergo quae-s - mus, fa - mulis tu - is sub - ve - ni:

Quos pre-ti - o - so san-gui - ne re - de - mi - sti.

Quos pre-ti - o - so san-gui - ne re - de - mi - sti, re - de - mi - sti.

Quos pre-ti - o - so san-gui - ne re - de - mi - sti.

Quos pre-ti - o - so san-gui - ne re - de - mi - sti.
Verse 22

C.
Sal vum fac, sal vum fac po pu-lum tu-um, Do mi ne: et

A.
Sal vum fac, sal vum fac po pu-lum tu-um, Do mi ne: et

T.
Sal vum fac po pu-lum tu-um, Do mi ne: et be ne-

B.
Sal vum fac po pu-lum tu-um, Do mi ne: et

Verse 24

C.
Per sin gu los di es, be ne di- ci-mus te.

A.
Per sin gu los di es, be ne di- ci-mus te.

T.
Per sin gu los di es, be ne di- ci-mus te.

B.
Per sin gu los di es, be ne di- ci-mus te.
nos, quem-ad-mo-dum spe-ra-vi-mus in te.
**Veni creator Spiritus**

Tenor:

Ve-ni Cre-a-tor Spi-ri-tus, Men-tes tu-o-rum vi-si-ta,

T.:

Im-ple su-per-na gra-ti-a Quae, tu cre-a-sti pec-to-ra.

C.:

Qui Pa-ra-cli-tus di-ce-

A.:

Qui Pa-ra-cli-tus di-ce-

T.:

Qui Pa-ra-cli-tus di-

B.:

Qui Pa-ra-cli-tus di-

C.:

Do-num De-i al-tis-

A.:

Do-num De-i al-tis-

T.:

Do-num De-i al-tis-

B.:

Do-num De-i al-tis-
C.  
\begin{align*}
\text{si-mi, Fons vi-vus i- gnis,} & \\
\text{si-mi, Fons vi-vus i- gnis ca-ritas, Fons vi-vus i- gnis} & \\
\text{mi, Fons vi- vus, i- gnis,} & \\
\text{mi, Fons vi- vus i- gnis ca-ritas,} & \\
\end{align*}

A.  
\begin{align*}
\text{Et spi- ri-ta-lis un-} & \\
\text{Et spi-ri-ta-} & \\
\text{Et spiri-} & \\
\text{Et spi-ri-} & \\
\end{align*}

B.  
\begin{align*}
\text{Et spi-ri-ta-} & \\
\text{Et spi-ri-} & \\
\text{Et spi-ri-} & \\
\text{Et spi-ri-ta-} & \\
\end{align*}

C.  
\begin{align*}
\text{c-ti-o, et spi- ri-ta-} & \\
\text{c-ti-o, et spi-ri-ta-} & \\
\text{c-ti-o, et spi-ri-ta-} & \\
\text{c-ti-o, et spi-ri-ta-} & \\
\end{align*}

A.  
\begin{align*}
\text{lis un-} & \\
\text{lis un-} & \\
\text{lis un-} & \\
\text{lis un-} & \\
\end{align*}

T.  
\begin{align*}
\text{ta-} & \\
\text{ta-} & \\
\text{ta-} & \\
\text{ta-} & \\
\end{align*}

B.  
\begin{align*}
\text{cti-o, et spi-ri-ta-} & \\
\text{cti-o, et spi-ri-ta-} & \\
\text{cti-o, et spi-ri-ta-} & \\
\text{cti-o, et spi-ri-ta-} & \\
\end{align*}
Pange lingua [more hispano]

Tenor

\[ \text{Pan-ge lingua glo-ri-o-si, Cor-po-ris my-ste-ri-um,} \]

T.

\[ \text{San-gui-nis-que pre-ti-o-si, Quem in mun-di pre-ti-um,} \]

T.

\[ \text{Fru-ctus ven-tris ge-ne-ro-si, Rex ef-fu-dit gen-ti-um.} \]

C.

\[ \text{No-bis da-tus, no-bis na-tus} \]

A.

\[ \text{No-bis da-tus, no-bis} \]

T.

\[ \text{No-bis da-tus, no-bis} \]

B.

\[ \text{No-bis da-tus, no-bis} \]

C.

\[ \text{-tus, no-bis na-tus Ex in-} \]

A.

\[ \text{na-tus, no-bis na-tus Ex in-ta-cta Vir-} \]

T.

\[ \text{na-tus, no-bis na-tus Ex in-ta-cta Vir-} \]

B.

\[ \text{bis na-tus} \]
C. -mine, Su-i moras in-cola-tus, in-
A. se-mine, Su-i mo-ras in-co-la-tus, in-
T. ne, Su-i mo-
B. se-mine, Su-i moras in-co-la-

C. -co-la-tus Mi-ro clau-sit or-di-ne, 
A. co-la-tus Mi-ro clau-sit or-di-ne, 
T. ras in-co-la-tus Mi-ro clau-sit 
B. -tus, in-co-la-tus Mi-ro 

C. mi-ro clau-sit or-di-ne, mi-
A. mi-ro clau-sit or-di-
T. - - - di-ne, mi-ro clau-sit 
B. clau-sit or-di-ne, mi-ro clau-
Ave Maris Stella

Tenor

Ave Maris Stella, Dei Mater alma,

3

Atque semper Virgo, Felix caeli porta.

5

Sumens ilud Ave, sumens ilud A-

A.

Sumens ilud Ave, sumens ilud A-

T.

Sumens ilud Ave, sumens ilud A-

B.

Su-mens ilud A-

C.

Su-mens ilud A-
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-ve Gabrieli-sis ore, Gabri-

A.

-ve Ga-bri-eli-sis ore, Ga-bri-e-

T.

-ve Ga-bri-eli-

B.

-ve Ga-bri-eli-sis ore,
Nunc Dimittis

Nunc dim-it-tis ser-vum tu-um, Do-mi-ne: se-cun-dum ver-bum tu-um in pa-ce.

Verse 2

 Qui-a vi-de-run oc-u-li me-i:

 Qui-a vi-de-run oc-u-li me-i: sa-lu-ta-re

 Qui-a vi-de-run oc-u-li me-i: sa-lu-ta-re tu-um, sa-lu-ta-re tu-um, sa-lu-ta-re tu-um

Verse 4

 Lu-men ad re-ve-la-ti-o-nem gen-ti-um: et glo-ri-am ple-bis tu-ae Is-ra-e-l

 Lu-men ad re-ve-la-ti-o-nem gen-ti-um: et glo-ri-am ple-bis tu-ae Is-ra-e-l
Asperges me, Domine

Tenor

\[ \text{A - sper - ges me} \]

C.

\[ \text{Do - mi - ne hys-so - po,} \]

A.

\[ \text{Do - mi - ne hys-so-po, et mun da -} \]

T.

\[ \text{Do - mi - ne hys-so-po,} \]

B.

\[ \text{Do - mi - ne hys-so-po, et mun da -} \]

C.

\[ \text{et mun da - bor: La -} \]

A.

\[ \text{bor, hys-so-po, et mun da - bor: La -} \]

T.

\[ \text{hys-so-po, et mun-da -} \]

B.

\[ \text{so-po, et mun-da -} \]

C.

\[ \text{va - bis me, la -} \]

A.

\[ \text{va - bis me, et su -} \]

T.

\[ \text{va - bis me, et su -} \]

B.

\[ \text{va - bis me, et su -} \]
Vidi aquam

Tenor

Vi - di - a - quam

C.

E - gre - di - en - tem de tem -

A.

E - gre - di - en - tem, e - gre - di - en - tem de tem -

T.

E - gre - di en - tem, e - gre - di - en - tem de tem -

B.

E - gre - di - en - tem de tem -

C.

-plo, a la - te - re dex - tro: Al - le-lu - ia, Al - le-lu -

A.

-plo, a la - te - re dex - tro: Al - le-lu - ia, Al - le-lu -

T.

-plo, a la - te - re dex - tro: Al - le-lu - ia,

B.

-plo, a la - te - re dex - tro: Al - le-lu - ia, Al - le-lu -

C.

ia, Al - le-lu - ia, Al - le - lu - ia: et o - mnes ad

A.

ia, Al - le-lu - ia, Al - le - lu - ia: et o - mnes, ad quos per - ve - nit a - qua

T.

Al - le-lu - ia, Al - le - lu - ia: et o - mnes, ad quos per - ve - nit a - qua i -

B.

ia, Al - le-lu - ia, Al - le - lu - ia: et o - mnes
C. quos per-ve-nit a-qua i-sta, sal-vi fa-cti sunt,
A. i-sta, ad quos per-ve-nit a-qua i-sta, sal-vi fa-cti sunt, et
T. -sta, ad quos per-ve-nit a-qua i-sta, sal-vi fa-cti sunt, et di-
B. ad quos per-ve-nit a-qua i-sta, sal-vi fa-cti sunt, et


T. Con-fi-te-mi-ni Do-mi-no Quo-ni-am bo-nus:

C. Quo-ni-am in sae-cu-lum mi-seri-cor-di-a e-jus.
A. Quo-ni-am in sae-cu-lum mi-seri-cor-di-a e-jus.
T. Quo-ni-am in sae-cu-lum mi-seri-cor-di-a e-jus.
B. Quo-ni-am in sae-cu-lum mi-seri-cor-di-a e-jus.

Sic-ut e-rat in prin-ci-pi-o, et nunc, et sem-

Sem-per, et in sae-

la sae-

Sae-

la sae-
Et misericordia ejus pro Magnificat primi toni

Canon ad unisonum iii voc.

Et mi-se-ri-cor-di-a e-jus a pro-ge-ni-

Resoluto pro Magnificat primi toni. B. voc. si placet.

Et mi-se-ri-cor-di-a e-jus

iii. voc. Pro Magnificat primi toni, si placet.

Et mi-se-ri-cor-di-a e-

In pro-ge-ni-ces, in pro ge-ni-es ti-men-ti-bus e-

A pro-ge-ni-e in pro-ge-ni-ces, in pro ge-ni-es

-jus a pro-ge-ni-e in pro-ge-ni-ces, in pro-ge-ni-ces ti-men-ti-bus e-

um, ti-men-ti-bus e-

um, ti-men-ti-bus e-

um, ti-men-ti-bus e-

um, ti-men-ti-bus e-

um, ti-men-ti-bus e-

um, ti-men-ti-bus e-

um, ti-men-ti-bus e-

um, ti-men-ti-bus e-

um.