



**Conformación y retórica de los repertorios musicales
catedralicios en la Nueva España**

INSTITUTO DE INVESTIGACIONES ESTÉTICAS

Director

Renato González Mello

Secretaria Académica

Geneviève Lucet

Coordinador de Publicaciones

Jaime Soler Frost

DREW EDWARD DAVIES
Coordinador
LUCERO ENRÍQUEZ RUBIO
Editora

**Conformación y retórica de los repertorios musicales
catedralicios en la Nueva España**



INSTITUTO DE INVESTIGACIONES ESTÉTICAS
UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL AUTÓNOMA DE MÉXICO
MÉXICO 2016

Catalogación en la fuente Dirección General de Bibliotecas, UNAM
ML3015.2.C65 2016
LIBRUNAM 1899855

Conformación y retórica de los repertorios musicales catedralicios en la Nueva España / Drew Edward Davies, coordinador; Lucero Enriquez Rubio, editora – Primera edición. México: UNAM, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, 2016.
184 pp., ils.

ISBN 978-607-02-8424-3

1. Música sacra – México. 2. Música sacra – Nueva España. 3. Música sacra – Iglesia Católica. 4. México – Historia de la iglesia. 5. Nueva España – Historia de la iglesia. I. Davies, Drew Edward, editor. II. Enriquez Rubio, Lucero, editor.

Este libro se realizó con el apoyo del programa UNAM-Dirección General de Asuntos del Personal Académico
PAPIIT IN402009-3

Primera edición: 24 de junio 2016

D.R. © 2016 Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Avenida Universidad 3000, Ciudad Universitaria, 04510, México

Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas
Tel.: (55) 5622 7250 ext. 85026
libroest@unam.mx
www.esteticas.unam.mx

ISBN 978-607-02-8424-3

Prohibida la reproducción total o parcial por cualquier medio
sin la autorización escrita del titular de los derechos patrimoniales

Fotos del Archivo Histórico de la Arquidiócesis de la Antequera Oaxaca, Catedral de Puebla, Catedral Metropolitana de México y Museo Nacional del Virreinato: Secretaría de Cultura-INAH-Méx. Reproducción autorizada por el Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (pp. 37, 40, 56, 60-64, 68-70, 74-76, 78, 79, 103)

Impreso y hecho en México

Índice

Presentación <i>Lucero Enriquez Rubio</i>	9
Preámbulo: los repertorios musicales <i>Drew Edward Davies</i>	13
Una donación de fray Juan de Zumárraga, primer obispo de México: deconstrucción de un párrafo y construcción de un contexto <i>Lucero Enriquez Rubio</i>	17
Problemas de estilo y autoría en una <i>Salve Regina</i> 'de Victoria' conservada en la Catedral de Puebla <i>Javier Marín López</i>	33
En 'mestizo y indio': las obras con textos en lengua náhuatl del "Cancionero de Gaspar Fernández" <i>Berenice Alcántara Rojas</i>	53
Las obras con textos en lengua náhuatl del "Cancionero de Gaspar Fernández". Transcripción de la notación musical <i>Drew Edward Davies</i>	85
La nave de San Pedro en tres villancicos de Antonio de Salazar <i>Carolina Sacristán Ramírez</i>	99
El 'Nuevo portal de Belén': imaginarios urbanos en los villancicos de Joseph Gavino Leal <i>Mónica Pulido Echeveste</i>	125
Adaptation as Authorship in Eighteenth-Century Responsories for the Holy Trinity at Mexico City Cathedral <i>Dianne Lehmann Goldman</i>	139

Particularidades de un repertorio <i>doméstico</i> y <i>catedralicio</i> : los vales de óperas del Archivo del Cabildo Catedral Metropolitano de México <i>Analía Cherñavsky y Gabriel S.S. Lima Rezende</i>	155
Siglas y acrónimos	171
Fuentes	173

Adaptation as Authorship of Eighteenth-Century Responsories for the Holy Trinity at Mexico City Cathedral*

Dianne Lehmann Goldman**

Although there was a tradition at Mexico City Cathedral of chapelmasters adapting works by previous composers, there are hardly any documented cases of a piece being reworked multiple times. However, one such instance which has recently come to light is a late sixteenth-century motet by Tomás Luis de Victoria (1548-1611) that was updated by two composers in the eighteenth century, Antonio de Salazar (c. 1650-1715) and Matheo Tollis de la Rocca (1714-1781), both of whom adapted the piece to fit current performance standards and aesthetic expectations. Salazar changed the structure of the piece from a motet to a responsory, added four voices, and placed the work within a cycle of the eight Matins responsories for the feast of the Holy Trinity. Tollis de la Rocca took Salazar's cycle (including the Victoria piece) as a template upon which he added a pair of violins and continuo. In this way, Victoria's motet had one of the longest documented performance histories at Mexico City Cathedral, remaining in the living repertoire for over two hundred years.

This study will use a variety of primary sources, including correspondence between chapelmasters and the *cabildo*, four inventories of the cathedral's library, a funeral sermon, the cathedral's 1751 ceremonial, and the music manuscripts themselves, to trace the "life story" of the motet and its later incarnations in order to understand how genre and stylistic expectations, as well as the techniques used to meet those expectations, evolved over the eighteenth century in Mexico City Cathedral. These topics will be examined vis-à-vis the complex confluence of performance practice, ownership, and authorship issues that this group of works presents.

During the sixteenth century, many polyphonic compositions were imported from Spain in the manuscript and printed choirbooks that the

* I would like to offer my thanks to Drew Edward Davies, Javier Marín López, and Robert Kendrick, who read early versions of this article and offered insightful and helpful criticism.

**Ph D. in Musicology from Northwestern University.



Cathedral acquired.¹ By the end of the century, the cathedral had accumulated an impressive musical archive, as documented in an inventory dated 1589² which listed fifteen published choirbooks among its 208 entries.³ Among the publications was Tomás Luis de Victoria's *Motecta festorum totius anni* (Rome, 1585), which included a motet setting of the Introit for Holy Trinity, *Benedicta sit Sancta Trinitas*. Also included was a motet setting of *Duo Seraphim* designated for performance on the feast of St. Michael Archangel and later adapted by Antonio de Salazar for inclusion in his Trinity cycle. By 1601, the cathedral had also acquired a setting of the Vespers hymn for Trinity, *Jam sol recedit*, by Francisco Guerrero. The choirbooks, including Victoria's *Motecta*,⁴ were recopied as they wore out from use.

Through most of the first century and a half of the viceroyalty, composing polyphonic Matins responsories for Holy Trinity and other feasts was not a high priority for the chapelmasters at Mexico City Cathedral. The tradition of composing large-scale works for Matins did not flourish until after 1750 when Ignacio Jerusalem (1707-1769) became chapelmaster. However, the genre's tradition had roots as far back as the mid sixteenth century. The first known performance of a polyphonic responsory in Mexico City occurred in 1559 as part of the exequies for Charles V. Francisco Cervantes de Salazar, professor of rhetoric at the Royal and Pontifical University of Mexico, chronicled his experience at the occasion by noting that the

antiphons, a psalm, and at least one responsory (*Qui Lazarum*) was sung in *canto de órgano*.⁵ The funeral service featured a mix of works, some that had been imported from Europe and others that had been composed locally. Although the earliest locally-composed responsories, also for the Office of the Dead, date from the period of Hernando Franco (fl. 1575-1585), he set only three of the texts. Similarly, the second composer to whom extant responsories can be attributed, Francisco López Capillas (fl. 1654-1674), wrote three responsories in the form of motets—one for Quadragesima Sunday and two for Holy Friday.

During the 1680s, responsories began to increase in importance and quickly became a musical focus in Mexico City. This was also a period when the tradition of donating to the church in the form of *aniversarios* became more important. Before his death in 1682, Don Juan de Chavarria Valera, Knight of the Order of St. James and *Capitán* (president) of the *Santísimo Sacramento* confraternity, endowed the mass, sermon, and Matins service of the Feasts of the Holy Trinity and the Immaculate Conception as part of a series of donations to churches and convents in Mexico City. On the one-year anniversary of Chavarria's death, Antonio Núñez de Miranda preached a sermon in his honor about the virtue of giving generously to the church. Among the examples Núñez cited were Chavarria's donations to Mexico City Cathedral:

Qué iglesia es esta, sino esta Metropolitana, a quien sobre otras obsequiosas y preciosas presentallas sirvió con dos festivos aniversarios; el uno de la Augustísima Trinidad de quien era capital-

mente devoto, como al primero y principal misterio de nuestra fe... El otro, a la Purísima Concepción de la Virgen que era toda su ternura. El uno y otro con *matines*, misa, y sermón. Y en los de la Trinidad, cuyo que en lugar de los villancicos que se suelen cantar, entre lección y lección, por los responsorios, se cantasen estos puestos en gravísima y suavísima música, por ser más eclesiásticos y propios del misterio...⁶

In viceregal Mexico, men and women of the upper classes often asked for Requiem masses to be said in their honor in certain chapels on select dates. Some went as far as to endow an entire service for the feast day of their particular devotion. No one, however, surpassed Chavarria Valera in the number and breadth of donations of all kinds to religious life in Mexico City. Endowing two Matins services for the Cathedral, Chavarria Valera was adamant that for Holy Trinity he wanted the proper responsory texts for the day set in polyphony, not replaced by, or in addition to, the villancicos that were typically performed. It is no coincidence that the responsories for the Holy Trinity and the Immaculate Conception were among the first cycles to be elaborated in Mexico City.

During the chapelmastership of Antonio de Salazar (fl. 1688-1715), the number of services that included polyphonic responsories increased. Whereas all his predecessors combined composed only six extant and attributable responsories, Salazar produced no fewer than fifteen, including settings for the Holy Trinity, St Ildephonsus,⁷ and a series of pieces that served for both the Nativity

and Immaculate Conception of the Virgin. It is clear, from the comparatively large number of responsories that Salazar wrote, that a new emphasis had been placed on the performance of Matins responsories in polyphony. His works preceded, by about sixty years, the tradition that flourished in the second half of the eighteenth century, when setting a cycle of responsories became the norm rather than the exception (Table 1).

Although an autograph manuscript of Salazar's Holy Trinity cycle is not extant, the adapted version by the later eighteenth-century composer Matheo Tollis de la Rocca⁸ still exists in full, as do a set of older parts dated 1732, for six of the eight responsories. These parts confirm that Salazar composed the piece and show that Tollis took Salazar's cycle as his starting point without changing the voice parts. In addition, a *guión* part for *Duo Seraphim* likely added by Salazar's successor, Manuel de Sumaya (fl. 1715-1739), is archived with Tollis de la Rocca's version. Performance parts for the first and third responsories made from Tollis' work also confirm the attribution to Salazar. Therefore, the circumstantial evidence strongly suggests that Salazar appropriated Victoria's setting of *Duo Seraphim*, adapting it to match the style of his other responsories, and that Tollis de la Rocca then used this piece, along with the other extant, attributable Salazar responsories as the basis for his later version.

Each responsory of Salazar's cycle appears to have been newly composed for the occasion with the exception of the eighth text, *Duo Seraphim*, which is based on the Victoria motet. Although the original printed choirbook which included Victoria's work is no longer extant at Mexico City Cathedral, a manuscript copy was made during the early eighteenth century and is archived as Polyphonic Choirbook P09.⁹ The motet was listed in

¹ Javier Marín López, "The Musical Inventory of Mexico Cathedral, 1589: A Lost Document Rediscovered," in *Early Music*, vol. 36, no. 4, Winter, 2008, pp. 575-596.

² Archivo del Cabildo Catedral Metropolitano de México (hereafter ACCMM), *Inventarios*, libro 2, exp. 2, ff. 89r-92v, December 9, 1589.

³ Marín López, op. cit., p. 587.

⁴ Idem. The original choirbook was recopied between 1715 and 1730; it is this copy that is currently housed in Mexico City Cathedral (hereafter CMM), *Librería de cantorales*, P09, in *Muscat*-Libros de coro, available at www.musicat.unam.mx, accessed February 13, 2011.

⁵ Grayson Wagstaff, *Matins for the Dead in Sixteenth-Century Colonial Mexico*, Ottawa, The Institute of Medieval Music, 2007, pp. ix-xii; Wagstaff, "Los salmos en el tercer libro de coro de la Catedral de México," in *Heterofonia*, vol. 120-121, 1999, p. 27; Francisco Cervantes de Salazar, *Túmulo imperial de la gran ciudad de México*, Mexico, Antonio de Espinosa, 1560, pp. 25r-v.

⁶ Antonio Núñez, *Oración funeral, sermón de honras a las que el muy ilustre Señor Conde del Valle, etc. como su principal testamentario y único heredero hizo al muy noble y piadoso caballero su hermano el Señor Capitán Don Juan de Chavarria Valera*, Mexico, Viuda de Bernardo Calderón, 1684, ff. 22r-23v.

⁷ One of the St Ildephonsus responsories (*Inveni David*) also includes a text for St Joseph (*Ascendit Joseph*) in a different hand. ACCMM, *Archivo de música*, A1948.02.

⁸ ACCMM, *Archivo de música*, A1952.

⁹ Javier Marín López, *Música y músicos entre dos mundos. La Catedral de México y sus libros de polifonía (siglos XVII-XVIII)*.



Table 1
Antonio de Salazar's responsory settings. Entries in brackets and italics are not extant

Call Number	Feast	Nocturn, Responsory	Text	Scoring	Extant parts	Date
A1948.01	S. Ildephonsus	N. 1, R. 1	<i>Euge serve bone</i>	SATB, SATB + gui3n	SATB, SAB, gui3n (frag.)	1703
A1947.01	St. Ildephonsus	N. 1, R. 3	<i>Juravit Dominus</i>	SATB, SATB + gui3n	TB, SA	1703
A1948.02	S. Ildephonsus/ S. Joseph	N. 2, R. 1	<i>Inveni David/ Ascendit Joseph</i>	SATTBB + gui3n	all	1703
- -	[St. Ildephonsus]	[N. 2, R. 3]	[<i>Iste est qui ante Deum</i>]	[?]	none	[1703]
A1947.02	St. Ildephonsus	N. 3, R. 1	<i>Amavit eum</i>	SATTBB + gui3n	all	1703
A1945.01	Nativity/ Conception	N. 1, R. 1	<i>Hodie concepta/ nata est</i>	??TB, SATB + gui3n	TB, SATB, gui3n	1715
A1945.02	Nativity/ Conception	N. 1, R. 3	<i>Gloriosae virginis Mariae</i>	TB, SATB + gui3n	all	1715
A1945.03	Nativity/ Conception	N. 2, R. 1	<i>Conceptio/Nativitas gloriosae</i>	??TB, SATB + gui3n	TB, SATB, gui3n	1715
A1945.04	Nativity/ Conception	N. 2, R. 3	<i>Conceptio/Nativitas tua genitrix</i>	??TB, SATB + gui3n	TB, SATB, gui3n	1715
A1945.05	Nativity/ Conception	N. 3, R. 1	<i>Beatam me dicent omnes</i>	??TB, SATB + gui3n	TB, SATB, gui3n	1715
A1944.01	Holy Trinity	N. 1, R. 1	<i>Vidi Dominum</i>	SATB, SATB	all but A 1	1732
A1944.02	Holy Trinity	N. 1, R. 2	<i>Benedictus Dominus</i>	SATB, SATB	all	1732
- -	[Holy Trinity]	[N. 1, R. 3]	[<i>Benedicat nos Deus</i>]	[SATB]	none	[1732]
A1944.03	Holy Trinity	N. 2, R. 1	<i>Quis Deus magnus</i>	SATB, SATB	all	1732
A1944.04	Holy Trinity	N. 2, R. 2	<i>Tibi laus</i>	SATB	all	1732
A1944.05	Holy Trinity	N. 2, R. 3	<i>Magnus Dominus</i>	TB, SATB	all	1732
A1944.06	Holy Trinity	N. 3, R. 1	<i>Benedicamus patrem</i>	SB, SATB	S 1, T 2	1732
A1952*	Holy Trinity	N. 3, R. 2	<i>Duo Seraphim</i>	[SATB, SATB] + gui3n	gui3n	[1732]

* Gui3n part stored with the c.1775 version; the other parts are not extant.

the choirbook for performance on the Feast of St. Michael Archangel (29 September).¹⁰ Scored for two sopranos and two altos, the melodies in *Duo Seraphim* move primarily by step, dissonance is well-prepared, and Victoria uses harmonies only as exploratory as secondary dominants, as was common in his compositions.

Victoria was clever in setting the text of the motet. In carefully selected spaces there is a hint of wordpainting, particularly when imitation can be involved. For example, "Duo Seraphim clamabant alter ad alterum" is set for two voices offset by a semibreve. Directly following this passage, the other two voices briefly respond with the substance of the angels' cry, "Sanctus," after which the entire four voice texture is employed. The rhythms slow drastically and the voices sustain their pitches during the text, "Plena est omnis terra," creating a rich and full sound. Nearly the entire "second section" of the motet, beginning with the text "Tres sunt," is set for three voices. The same is true for the section "et hi tres unum sunt," although at this point the meter shifts to ternary rhythms in lieu of duple time before shifting back with the repetition of melody and text at "Sanctus."

Victoria's motet was no longer well-suited for performance at the Cathedral in the late seventeenth century. In a letter to the *cabildo* dated 1700, Salazar wrote, "...lo que se me entreg3 con t3tulo de archivo fueron unos cuantos libros hechos pedazos que estaban arrojados en uno de los rincones del dicho coro, los cuales hice aderezar y componer de modo que pudieran servir."¹¹ Salazar adapted the Victoria motet to better serve the

musical program of the cathedral in various ways, adding performance forces, shortening the piece, and changing the structure from a freely-composed motet to a responsory in order to suit his immediate needs. He reconfigured the number and layout of the original four voices to include eight voices, grouped in two equal choirs of soprano, alto, tenor, and bass which better suited the roster of musicians available to him. In these ways, Salazar both "adorned" and "composed" Victoria's motet into a piece that would serve the chapel.

As he appropriated the setting, Salazar kept Victoria's original melody and points of imitation intact, particularly the opening phrase and beginning of the second section. Although re-scored for alto and tenor voice (instead of soprano and alto) and transposed down a fourth, the unique opening section allows the two works to be easily identified and compared (Fig. 1).

The main distinctions between Victoria's setting and Salazar's adaptation are more frequent intralinear repetitions of text and the thicker voicings that were needed because of the four extra voices in Salazar's version. His newly-composed segments mimicked their surroundings well. Often in Victoria's setting only two or three voices would sound at one time; Salazar merely filled in the missing chord tones. His main addition to the work's harmony was to include a large number of suspensions, which gave the piece a feeling of forward movement. His internal repetitions either restate the melodies just heard or were continuations of the melodies in a similar style.

Perhaps the most practical adjustment that Salazar made to the Victoria setting was a change to the structure of the piece to turn the motet into a responsory. While the motet was freely composed and was not tied to any particular structure, the internal text repetition calls the responsory structure to mind. Victoria's piece is nominally divided into a first and second part, beginning with the text "Duo Seraphim" and "Tres sunt," respectively.

viii), Granada, Universidad de Granada, 2007, vol. 2, p. 291. See also Mar3n L3pez, "Cinco nuevos libros de polifon3a en la Catedral Metropolitana de M3xico," in *Historia Mexicana*, vol. 52, no. 4, April-June, 2003, p. 1091.

¹⁰ For a transcription of *Duo Seraphim*, see Felipe Pedrell, *Thomae Ludovici Victoria Abulensis opera omnia*, vol. 1, Leipzig, Breitkopf & H3rtel, 1902, pp. 36-39.

¹¹ ACCMM, *Correspondencia*, caja 23, exp. 3, doc. 36, March 9, 1700.

Fig. 1. Antonio de Salazar version, *Duo Seraphim*, measures 1-15. Edition: Dianne Lehmann Goldman.

Although not a separate section, the text “Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth” is repeated in much the same way as the response section would be repeated in a responsory; Victoria used the same melody as in the previous appearance of “Sanctus” but distributed the points of imitation differently and added a two-measure coda to reach the cadence. Therefore, the two parts end with the same text and very similar music (Table 2).

When Salazar adapted the piece, he was thus able to keep a rather similar structure. There are, however, a few important differences between the two. Salazar’s version is separated into six sections instead of Victoria’s four. The second section begins with the text “Plena est,” and ends at the “tres sunt” portion, where Victoria began his *seconda pars*. Salazar’s next major section breaks come at the shift to ternary rhythm, with “et hi tres unum sunt” in the same manner as Victoria, and back to duple at the repetition of “Sanctus.” While Victoria’s work presents the rest of the text as one unit, Salazar’s adaptation includes an additional two sections in which the responsory form is made extremely clear. After the “Sanctus” section ended, he inserted the extra verse “Gloria Patri” and then returned to Victoria’s setting with the “Plena est” repetition necessary for the expected structure of the eighth responsory. The only major section of

the adaptation that was completely original to Salazar was the “Gloria Patri,” a structural necessity of the responsory form but not the motet.

The reconfigured Victoria motet was only the last of eight texts that Salazar set in the cycle; the entire collection can be seen as a type of negotiation between Victoria’s high Renaissance style and Salazar’s more Baroque aesthetic. When composing the other responsories, Salazar seems to have tempered his usual style, making the music seem closer to Victoria’s style than to other examples of his own work. The entire cycle featured a closely related harmonic and rhythmic language and similar instances of word-painting. The question of whether Salazar began writing the cycle with the eighth responsory and matched the other seven to its hybrid style or that there is another reason for the similarities is unanswerable at this time. However, the order of composition is not the most important point. The terms of Chavarría Valera’s *aniversario* included a request for “*gravísima y suavísima música*,” perhaps as a reaction against the rhythmically active and syncopated style of a typical late seventeenth-century villancico which he specifically wanted eliminated. Victoria’s style, and the style Salazar used to compose the rest of the responsories in the cycle, fits this description.

Table 2
Comparison of Duo Seraphim texts set by Tomás Luis de Victoria and Antonio de Salazar

Tomás Luis de Victoria	Antonio de Salazar
<i>Duo Seraphim clamabant alter ad alterum</i>	<i>R. Duo Seraphim clamabant alter ad alterum</i>
<i>Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus</i>	<i>*Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus</i>
<i>Dominus Deus Sabaoth</i>	<i>Dominus Deus Sabaoth</i>
<i>Plena est omnis terra gloria ejus</i>	<i>*Plena est omnis terra gloria ejus</i>
<i>Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in caelo</i>	<i>V. Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in caelo</i>
<i>Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus</i>	<i>Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus</i>
<i>Et hi tres unum sunt</i>	<i>Et hi tres unum sunt</i>
<i>Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus</i>	<i>R. Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus</i>
<i>Dominus Deus Sabaoth</i>	<i>Dominus Deus Sabaoth</i>
<i>Plena est omnis terra gloria ejus</i>	<i>V. Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto</i>
	<i>R. Plena est omnis terra gloria ejus</i>

Salazar’s cycle remained in the performance repertoire of the Mexico City Cathedral throughout the rest of the eighteenth century. His successor, Manuel de Sumaya, wrote relatively few examples of Latin-language pieces, concentrating instead on vernacular villancicos and cantadas. However, there is evidence that he reused Latin-language works written by his predecessors, especially those by Salazar. Written on the *portada* of the *guión* part for the Conception/Nativity set is the phrase: “*Los copiaron a costa y expensas del Maestro Sumaya el año de 1715*.”¹² As noted above, the parts for the Holy Trinity cycle are dated 1732. Even though Salazar is clearly identified as the composer of the work, the date the parts were copied and performed put them squarely within Sumaya’s tenure.

Sumaya seems to have made two contributions to Salazar’s Trinity responsories. It was likely he who added the notated *guión* part for the setting of *Duo Seraphim*. Based on the roster of musicians at Salazar’s disposal, as well as a fragmentary *guión* part for his *Euge serve bone*, Salazar used bass

instruments including harp and organ to accompany his works. It is likely that his other responsories also had bass instrument parts copied for use during his time but those are no longer extant. It is also conceivable that the organ part was not written but improvised. By this later performance date, Sumaya would have needed to provide his organist with a written part. He was intimately familiar with the pieces in his role as Salazar’s composition student and personal assistant, and likely played organ when they were first performed.

Perhaps it was Sumaya’s familiarity with Salazar’s work that can be seen in his second contribution: providing the text underlay for the Bass 1 part for the sixth responsory for Holy Trinity, *Magnus Dominus*. Although Salazar’s bass parts omitted the underlay, this copy of the Bass 1 part included the text written in tiny handwriting. This implicitly suggests that during Salazar’s tenure the bass parts were played by organ, harp, and dulciana rather than sung, and that the tradition changed during Sumaya’s time as chapelmaster. The underlay was a necessary tool, if performed by a bass voice, because of the duet texture with the soprano which included short sections of imitation where the underlay may not have been obvious to the per-

¹² ACCMM, *Archivo de música*, A1945: *Hodie concepta/nata est*, “Guión general.”



former. The first few measures of the Bass 2 part also included the underlay but, singing mostly in homophony with the other voices in Choir 2, the rest of the text was not as necessary and the underlay was not continued.

After Sumaya left Mexico City, it was not until Ignacio Jerusalem (fl. 1750–1769) became chapelmaster in 1750 that a local composer again wrote responsory settings. An important difference between Jerusalem and his predecessors is the larger number of extant works attributable to him; his compositions numbered more than two hundred pieces over his nineteen-year career, including ten full cycles of responsories.¹³ Jerusalem was aware of Salazar's Trinity responsory cycle because he counted it, as well as Salazar's other responsories, in his inventory of responsory settings that were used in the choirboys' education.¹⁴

When Matheo Tollis de la Rocca (fl. 1756–1781) arrived in Mexico from Spain, the cabildo immediately hired him as an assistant composer to Jerusalem. Although working in a secondary role, by 1759 he had already composed several works including a full cycle of responsories for Christmas.¹⁵ When Jerusalem died, Tollis de la Rocca was named chapelmaster and composed many more works, including at least nine responsory cycles. A decade later, Antonio Juanas (fl. 1791–1816) continued the now strong tradition of composing responsory cycles; Juanas was easily the most prolific composer of responsories during the viceregal period in Mexico City. His inventory of works present in the archive reveals a work described as

Salazar's Holy Trinity responsory cycle in score format compiled by Tollis de la Rocca.¹⁶

Juanas's entry is misleading. Tollis did more than simply make a score of Salazar's work. Like his predecessors, Tollis performed Salazar's responsory cycle for Holy Trinity during his tenure. However, unlike those chapelmasters, Tollis made significant changes to the texture of Salazar's work. After transcribing the voice parts, he added two newly-composed violin parts to the original texture. However, his violin lines were not in the late seventeenth-century style of Salazar's original; instead, the figurations and ornaments more closely match his own galant style. The result is a fascinating combination of two distinct musical worlds.

Indeed, there was a very practical reason for this addition. The *Diario manual*, Mexico City Cathedral's ceremonial from 1751, detailed how the liturgy was to be performed on the feast, and included a sentence specifically about the Matins service: "En los *maitines* no se cantan villancicos a las lecciones sino los responsorios del oficio, son solemnes con capilla y música e instrumentos."¹⁷

Since Chavarría Valera's endowment, the performance tradition of Matins on the feast of Holy Trinity was to sing the prescribed responsories instead of pairing or replacing them with villancicos, as was the case on other important feast days during the year including Christmas, Corpus Christi, and the Assumption of the Virgin. The 1751 ceremonial also clearly indicated that, in addition, the responsories should now be concerted. In their original state, these responsories must have seemed bare to a late eighteenth-century composer like Tollis de la Rocca. All of his known works included some combination of violins, oboes, horns, trumpets, basso continuo, and tim-

pani. By the time he became chapelmaster, concerted music had already been a part of the soundscape of the cathedral for twenty years. When Tollis de la Rocca reused the Salazar cycle for Holy Trinity he needed to bring it into compliance with the most recent guidelines, adding violins to update it in a manner consistent with current musical fashion.

Tollis followed his customary division of the bass line when he wrote the organ part, which doubled the melody of the bass part of the second choir, functioning as a *basso seguente*. His *acompañamiento* line closely resembled Sumaya's *guión* part albeit with a few instances of octave displacement. The continuo part did not follow Tollis' typical galant contour of repeated eighth notes providing the foundation for slowly-changing harmonies but was, by necessity, closer to the earlier style of Salazar—much more active, sounding a different pitch at almost every quarter note. Whereas the original cycle would have included bass instruments such as harp, dulcian, and organ, during Tollis de la Rocca's period the harp and dulcian had fallen out of use in the musical chapel. The harp was replaced by the violoncello and the dulcian by the bassoon, while the organ remained part of the continuo band.

When Salazar adapted the Victoria motet to suit his needs he did not make major alterations to the style of the motet. In fact, he seems to have adjusted his own style to make the incorporated piece fit naturally. Sumaya made no changes to Salazar's version, except to add the needed *guión* part.

Both of these reworkings added textures and timbres which would not have been extremely out of place at the time Victoria wrote the motet in the late sixteenth century. Tollis de la Rocca's addition of the violin parts, however, changed the nature of the work greatly, adding a new and separate timbre foreign to the work, and doing so in a style that was strikingly different from both Victoria's style and

the style of the two early eighteenth-century composers (Fig. 2)

Throughout the adaptation of Salazar's cycle the violins play regardless of whether the choirs are singing alone or together. The added parts give continuity to the sound, resulting in a feeling of perpetual movement. This is particularly noticeable in places where the voice parts have a break between two phrases of text. The violin parts often do not cease, but instead continue the sound, pushing forward into the next phrase. Figure 3 shows how Tollis de la Rocca used this technique to bridge two sections which, in Salazar's original version, had likely been distinct.

As the rhythms in the voice parts become slower or stretched out, the violins often have shorter notes, at times repeating eighth or sixteenth notes on a single pitch. This adds a sense of agitation and excitement not present in the original work. There are quick scale and arpeggio passages and other ornaments, grace notes, and trills throughout the work. This is quite different from the original voice parts which move melodically primarily by step. Unlike Tollis de la Rocca's other works in which the first violin typically doubles the soprano, and the second violin the alto or other voice, in this piece they do not follow any particular line. The addition of the violins shifted the rhythmic pulse from smooth, spacious, and broad to more active and busy. This impacted the affect that was communicated, making it more agitated and dramatic (Fig. 4).

Salazar and Tollis de la Rocca highlighted portions of music or text they thought were important through different means. Salazar indicated these places by adding to the volume of the sound produced through use of homophony between choirs. The places he thought were important were louder, and the words easier to understand, than the surrounding texture. In his added instrumental parts, Tollis used shorter notes and trills to draw attention to what he considered important. While the chords

¹³ E. Thomas Stanford, *Catálogo de los acervos musicales de las catedrales metropolitanas de México y Puebla de la Biblioteca Nacional de Antropología e Historia y otras colecciones menores*, Mexico, INAH/Gobierno del Estado de Puebla/Universidad Anáhuac del Sur/Fideicomiso para la Cultura México-USA, 2002.

¹⁴ Although Jerusalem lists that particular work as anonymous, it is grouped with Salazar's other responsories as the only instances of that genre present in the archive. ACCMM, *Archivo de música*, A2211: 1. *Jerusalem Inventory*.

¹⁵ ACCMM, *Correspondencia*, caja 2, exp. 12, February 3, 1759.

¹⁶ "Otros ocho responsorios del M^o Salazar con borrador hecho por el M^o Roca." ACCMM, *Archivo de música*, A2213: A. *Juanas Inventory*.

¹⁷ ACCMM, *Ordo*, libro 2, "Diario manual..." f. 34r.



Alto
Choir 1
Tenor
Violin 1
Violin 2
Continuo

6
A
Cl
T
v1
v2
bc

12
A
Cl
T
v1
v2
bc

Du - o - o - du - o Se -
Du - o - o - du - o Se -
ra - phim cla - ma - bant al - ter ad
ra - phim cla - ma - bant al - ter ad al - te -
al - te - rum, al - te - rum
- rum, al - te - rum

Fig. 2. Matheo Tollis de la Rocca adaptation, *Duo Seraphim*, measures 1-15. Edition: Dianne Lehmann Goldman.

55
Soprano
Alto
Choir 1
Tenor
Bass
Soprano
Alto
Choir 2
Tenor
Bass
Violin 1
Violin 2
Continuo
Organ

-jus
-a e - jus
-jus
-ri - a e - jus
-ri - a e - jus
-ri - a e - jus Tres sunt qui tes - ti - mo - ni -
-ri - a e - jus Tres sunt qui tes - ti -
-ri - a e - jus Tres sunt qui tes - ti -

Fig. 3. Matheo Tollis de la Rocca adaptation, *Duo Seraphim*, measures 55-62. Edition: Dianne Lehmann Goldman.

73

Soprano
Spi - ri - tus San -

Alto
Choir 1
Spi - ri - tus San -

Tenor
Spi - ri - tus San -

Bass

Soprano

Alto

Choir 2

Tenor

Bass

Violin 1

Violin 2

Continuo

Organ

Fig. 4. Matheo Tollis de la Rocca adaptation, *Duo Seraphim*, measures 73-80. Edition: Dianne Lehmann Goldman.

78

S
ctus

A
ctus

Choir 1
ctus

T
ctus

B

S
et hi tres u - num

A
et hi tres u - num

Choir 2
et hi tres u - num

T
et hi tres u - num

B
et hi tres u - num

v11

v12

bc

org

(continuation)

matched Salazar's piece, the rhythms were faster paced. While Salazar's music got louder through combination of voices, Tollis de la Rocca's rhythms got faster through subdivision of the beat. This, in turn, points to the different ways these composers conceived of their music: Salazar showed important places through vertical means (harmony and texture), and Tollis de la Rocca through horizontal (melodic) means.

The feelings or affects that Salazar was trying to convey through his set of responsories may not have been as clear to a later eighteenth-century audience as it was in his time; or perhaps it was too clear, blunted by over-familiarity. In order to communicate a similar sentiment, Tollis de la Rocca needed to update the rhetorical expressions Salazar had used seventy years earlier. His finished product, then, is more of a commentary on the previous version or a dialogue with it rather than a transcription, as Antonio Juanas would seem to indicate in his inventory.

Conclusions

Salazar's responsory cycle for the Holy Trinity enjoyed a continuous performance tradition throughout the eighteenth century. Indeed a portion of his cycle, the eighth text *Duo Seraphim*, had already been a part of performances in Mexico City for almost a century by the time Salazar adapted it for inclusion in his own cycle. Between when he wrote the works and when Antonio Juanas left for Spain in the early nineteenth century and perhaps even later, his responsories were not only stored in the cathedral's archive but actively performed; they were not hidden away in a corner of the archive because they were no longer useful.¹⁸

But what exactly was Salazar doing when he adapted the Victoria motet? Perhaps he had appreciated the musical contents of the piece and wanted to use the work as a basis for his own in order to honor Victoria and show respect to his music. Or maybe Salazar was being practical—his deadline for the Holy Trinity responsories was fast approaching and he used an available setting of *Duo Seraphim*, albeit for a different feast day and context to save time in a way that was still consistent with Juan de Chavarría Valera's wishes for his *aniversario*. Without further documentary evidence, it is impossible to know what he was thinking as he appropriated the motet.

Regardless of the specific reason for which Salazar chose the piece, it is possible to draw some conclusions. As Lydia Goehr argues, "The fact that musicians did not own their music, and the fact that music was functional, meant that one musician could make use of any other's music [...] without acquiring permission from the composer, and sometimes even without permission from the owner."¹⁹ This holds true in the case of Mexico City Cathedral. The composer's music, or at least his manuscript scores, became the property of the church at the moment of execution of the function (in this case, the liturgical ceremony). Salazar could not have asked Victoria for authorization to revisit the motet. Victoria was an abstract historical figure to Salazar, his only concrete legacy the composition to which the latter composer held no personal attachment. By Salazar's time, the motet had become a tool for successive generations of chapelmasters to wield in their unique ways.

Tollis de la Rocca referenced this phenomenon in his dedication on the piece's *portada* where he wrote, "Ocho responsorios para los *maitines* de

duplicados y triplicados y otros por truncos." ACCMM, A2213: A. Juanas Inventory, f. 134r.

¹⁸ "En el estante donde se guardan los timbales se han colocado los papeles que se han apartado por insertibles, unos por largos otros por muy antiguos, otros por ser

¹⁹ Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: an Essay in the Philosophy of Music*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992, p. 181.

la SS^{ma} Trinidad, pertenecientes a la Sancta Iglesia Catedral de México". In this highly unusual dedication, Tollis makes no mention of Salazar as composer of the works. However, neither does he claim authorship of the work himself, instead vaguely referring to the cycle as the property of Mexico City Cathedral. A survey of other works in the cathedral archive that include the word "*pertenecientes*" in their description reveal that it was typically reserved for pieces that were copied, unchanged, for use at other institutions. In his description, Tollis de la Rocca answers the question of ownership. It suggests that while Salazar had changed the piece enough to be considered a new work—and had therefore signed his name to it, Tollis de la Rocca had not; he had added to it and updated it, but had not changed it.

Goehr states, "That music was designed to fit an occasion meant that it had to be adaptable [...] to resident instrumental ensembles, to the occasion, to temporal restraints, and so on [...] Composers themselves did not hesitate to make these sorts of alterations, either to their own music or to that of others."²⁰ Tollis had a habit of reworking and revising his own works and his predecessors' years after they were first composed. These revisions included simplifying the music based on the relative ability of the performers at his disposal and adding or subtracting instruments based on the current available roster of musicians. Because of the essential ignorance of the cathedral's hierarchy regarding musical mat-

ters, it would seem that the *cabildo's* first priority was that the composer put forth an acceptable polyphonic setting of the proper liturgical texts. Where he got the inspiration or material for that setting was not the *cabildo's* immediate concern.

A question that Goehr would struggle with in this case regards exactly what to call works like the Tollis de la Rocca responsories. When considering the addition or change of instrumentation of a work, she suggests "transcription," "orchestration," and "arrangement."²¹ Finally, after finding fault with each of these possibilities she settles on "version," a term which could cover all the previous proposals but does not suggest that a new and separate "work" was created. Perhaps the best choice in this case is "adaptation," a term which suggests the practicality of the changes that Tollis de la Rocca made.

Tracing the performance history of the motet and subsequent responsory has shown how different liturgical performance practices were enacted in music over time. Clearly, eighteenth-century composers considered "ancient" music a vital part of the cathedral's repertoire, a living entity that could evolve as the liturgical expectations changed. Salazar's reworking of the Victoria motet, and Tollis de la Rocca's later adaptation of Salazar's cycle, are two examples of composers adjusting a piece of music—the *same* piece of music—to suit the needs of their time and place. Indeed, Victoria's motet can be seen as a link which ties together the entire history of music in viceregal Mexico City Cathedral.

²⁰ Ibidem, pp. 180-181.

²¹ Ibidem, pp. 59-63.

Conformación y retórica de los repertorios musicales catedralicios en la Nueva España
editado por el Departamento de Publicaciones del Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas
de la UNAM se terminó de imprimir el 26 de julio de 2016, en Impresos Vacha, S.A. de C.V.
(Juan Hernández y Dávalos 47, Algarín, 06880, México), en offset, Bond blanco de 120g.
La tipografía y la diagramación son de Teresa Peyret y Carlos Orenda, en Minion Pro en 9,
9.5, 10.5 y 16 puntos. El cuidado de la edición estuvo a cargo de Itzel Rodríguez González.
El tiraje consta de 500 ejemplares.

