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ABSTRACT

Throughout its history Spain has held a special affection for the Virgin Mary. Popular devotion was reflected in the Church’s celebrations on her feast days, which were held with the utmost solemnity. The Spanish affection for the Virgin was also apparent in the devotional music written by native composers, who devoted much of their compositional output to antiphons, hymns, and motets on Marian texts.

Juan de Esquivel Barahona served the Catholic Church during a time of great change, as Spanish cathedrals began to adapt their traditional practices to the recently accepted Roman Rite. As a Spanish cleric and composer, he was exposed to both the popular traditions and the institutional requirements of Marian devotion. His understanding of the post-conciliar spirit is revealed in his close adherence to the texts and liturgical calendar of the 1602 Clement VIII breviary, but his understanding of Spanish Marian devotion appears in the use of Spanish chants and the emulation of older Spanish masters in a conscious extension of tradition.

Esquivel never traveled outside of his native Spain, but his published polyphony based on Marian texts reveals that he was keenly aware of how Spaniards in other parts of the kingdom approached the composition of music for the Marian liturgy. Esquivel composed, however, for a Church that sought to replace regional traditions with a universal liturgy. In response, he successfully created liturgical music that adhered to the reformed texts while managing to retain the Spanish character of the polyphony by employing local chants as cantus firmi, following traditions of alternatim composition, and emulating traits of older Spanish masters. Esquivel’s Marian motet cycle follows the post-Tridentine trend towards associating motets to specific feast days through the use of festal designations and carefully selected biblical and liturgical texts, but this same body of work also reveals his awareness of contemporary Mariological thought in Spain.
INTRODUCTION

Juan de Esquivel Barahona (c. 1560–after 1623) entered the service of the Catholic Church in 1568, a time of profound change in that institution. The fruits of the Council of Trent (1545–63) had begun to be codified, and the revised *Breviarium Romanum* would be published the following year. In subsequent years, as Spanish bishops began to replace local liturgies with the reformed Roman Rite during the 1570s, large parts of Spanish liturgical books were rendered obsolete. As a Spanish church musician Esquivel valued the traditional practices of his native diocese of Ciudad Rodrigo, but as a post-Tridentine composer and cleric he understood the necessity of conforming to the reformed liturgy of his day. Tradition does not pass easily, and at times Esquivel must have faced decisions between the demands of reform and the call of tradition. His published sacred music, much of which was conceived at some point before 1608, was offered to cathedrals throughout Spain with the secure knowledge that the texts adhered to the latest breviary (Clement VIII, 1602) and that the seasonal cycles of hymns, antiphons, and motets were closely connected to the festal calendar of the new Roman Rite. Spanish clergy, however, would certainly have recognized the cantus firmi of many of the works, since they carried the characteristic chants that were part of the identity of the pre-Tridentine Spanish Church in general and the Ciudad Rodrigo Cathedral in particular. Moreover, many cathedral musicians would have recognized Esquivel’s homages or simple references to those composers whom he admired most, and understood his intent to maintain a line of polyphonic tradition in the midst of liturgical change.

Esquivel likely did not know that he was among the last significant composers of sixteenth-century style sacred music in Spain. His career began as Francisco Guerrero (1528–99) and Tomás Luis de Victoria (1548–1611) were reaching the summits of their fame, and as his older contemporaries Sebastián de Vivanco (c. 1551–1622) and Alonso
Lobo (1555–1617) were becoming established in important posts in Spain. The composers of Esquivel’s generation, Pedro Rimonte (1565–1627), Juan Pujol (1570–1626), Luis de Aranda (d. 1627), and Sebástian López de Velasco (1584–1659), however, never achieved the recognition that Esquivel gained from his four substantial prints of music.¹

Esquivel’s music offers evidence of a composer who was keenly aware of the musical style of his Spanish predecessors and the universal Renaissance tradition of emulation by which composers paid homage to those musicians they respected. The practice of musical emulation was not only a means of showing deference to composers of greater fame, but also a method for a young composer to make a public artistic connection to a better-known musician’s work. Esquivel certainly had both aspects in mind when he made musical references to the works of others, but at times his motives were less obvious. In the case of his motet *Ave Maria Domine mei mater*, for example, he sought to express a religious view in a current debate that was under suppression from Rome.²

---

¹ Esquivel’s last surviving publication of sacred music (1613) is among the last Spanish prints in the pure Renaissance style. Although polyphonic Masses and Office music were composed well into the eighteenth century, composers of the seventeenth century turned their attention primarily to the religious villancico. Beginning in the sixteenth century, these popular-style polyphonic songs began to replace motets and some liturgical responses of the Office on the more joyous feast days. By the middle of the seventeenth century the genre was ubiquitous in Spain and Latin America. See Paul R. Laird, *Towards a History of the Spanish Villancico* (Warren, MI: Harmonie Park Press, 1997).

Although Esquivel worked within the expectations of a Spanish Renaissance polyphonist, his consciousness of his own place in that tradition is revealed through his use of particularly Spanish chant sources, his choices of motet texts, his emulations, and his selection of sources for his imitation Mass settings.

Finally, Esquivel was no mere parrot of the older style. He augmented the sixteenth-century Spanish style through an idiosyncratic use of chromaticism, a preference for highly paraphrased cantus firmus treatments, and an overall terseness of form, especially in the motets. Each of these characteristics is paralleled in non-Spanish music of his time. Esquivel’s contemporaries Roland de Lassus (1532–94) and the Italian-trained Englishman Richard Dering (c. 1580–1630) also experimented with noncadential chromaticism. The motets of William Byrd’s (1543–1623) Gradualia (1605–07) mirror the very concise style of Esquivel’s 1608 motets. Esquivel’s use of paraphrase in the antiphon settings, rather than placing the cantus firmus clearly in one voice, parallels a similar approach by Victoria, and may show the influence of the modern Roman school.

**Purpose of the Dissertation**

The purpose of this study is twofold. First, Esquivel’s historical place as the capstone to a century-long Spanish polyphonic tradition warrants an amplification of the meager current knowledge of his career and his music. Several important archival documents have not, until this time, been thoroughly examined for evidence of Esquivel’s activities. Several important discoveries have resulted, including the knowledge of a


During the completion of this dissertation some new biographical information has been published. To various extents, all of these publications have relied on, or
fourth, but still lost, print of music by Esquivel and a more secure date for his arrival as maestro de capilla at Ciudad Rodrigo. Second, as a means of concentrating the study of Esquivel’s music within the context of the larger Spanish tradition, his compositions on Marian texts, a subject of particular interest to Spaniards, are examined in some detail. This approach benefits from the ability to relate different musical and liturgical genres to a single set of devotional principles.

The goal of the study of the Marian works is to assess whether Spanish composers took a common approach to setting Marian texts and, if so, to learn how Esquivel adapted or avoided that common approach during a time of institutional change. That he was able to extend what will be shown to be an identifiable Spanish tradition of treating antiphons, hymns, and motets on Marian texts, while conforming to new liturgical texts and post-Tridentine Mariology, demonstrates his importance to the understanding of the entire century of Spanish religious composition. Since the existing literature on Spanish Marian polyphony as a category is not substantial, this topic will necessarily be developed before addressing Esquivel’s contributions.

State of Research

In his 1978 monograph The 1613 Print of Juan Esquivel Barahona Robert Snow states that

> Even a cursory glance at the music of Esquivel reveals that he was one of the best of the Spanish composers of the late Renaissance, but the musicological literature dealing with him and his music tells us nothing certain concerning his life other than what can be gleaned from his three known publications.⁴

---

The musicological literature available to Snow was indeed a small body of work consisting primarily of entries in Spanish musical dictionaries. The only substantial scholarly assessment of Esquivel’s music published before the Second World War was Albert Geiger’s 1918 essay on the *Missarum . . . liber primus*. Geiger’s essay, while providing a competent analysis of some of Esquivel’s works, is perhaps most valuable for its transmission of the full title of the 1608 Mass collection, along with a reproduction of the title-page illustration showing the composer kneeling before an image of the Virgin and Child (See Chapter 1, Fig. 1.1), neither of which survives in the only extant copy of that print. The only substantial biographical information on the composer published

---

5 The first reference to Esquivel of any kind after the seventeenth century is Felipe Pedrell, *Diccionario biográfico y bibliográfico de músicos españoles* (Barcelona: Imprenta de Víctor Berdos y Feliu, 1894–1897), 593–96. Only the first volume of this dictionary, A–F, and the first fascicle, G–Gaz, of the second volume were published. Pedrell based his entire entry on the introductory matter of the 1613 sacred music collection that was sent to him by an unnamed colleague. A passing reference to Esquivel is found in Rafael Mitjana, “La musique en Espagne: art religieux et art profane,” in *Encyclopédie de la musique et dictionnaire du Conservatoire*, ed. Albert Lavignac and Lionel de la Laurencie (Paris: Librairie Delagrave, 1913–31), 4: 2042. See also a short but error-laden entry in “Esquivel de Barahona, Juan,” in *Diccionario de la música Labor*, ed. Joaquín Pena and Higinio Anglés (Barcelona: Editorial Labor, 1954), 1: 843. The information from this article, also unsigned, formed the basis for an entry on Esquivel in Marc Honneger, *Diccionario biográfico de los grandes compositores*, revised and translated by Tomás Marco (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1994), 183–84; and *Diccionario de la música y los músicos*, ed. Mariano Pérez, 3 vols. (Madrid: Ediciones ISTMO, 1985), 393.


7 Badajoz Cathedral, Libro de atril no. 6 (RISM E 825/E BA). In his *MGG* article Anglés reproduces the Esquivel illustration along with some of Geiger’s assessments, although one wonders how Anglés did not recognize the error Geiger made in placing Esquivel as *maestro de capilla* in Salamanca, when Sebastián de Vivanco held that post.
before Snow’s monograph was a chapter in Robert M. Stevenson’s *Spanish Cathedral Music in the Golden Age*. It was Snow, however, who first brought to light the details of Esquivel’s biography that were not solely derived from the composer’s printed music and the problematic dictionary articles. Snow was the first to consult the seventeenth-century history of Ciudad Rodrigo, written by Antonio Sanchez Cabañas (d. 1627), a cathedral choir chaplain and contemporary of the composer. Snow relied, however, on Benito Polo’s abbreviated version of the three-volume manuscript, which excludes much of the information concerning Esquivel and the early seventeenth-century Ciudad Rodrigo Cathedral chapter. Both Snow and Stevenson have stated the need for further biographical research in those cathedrals where Esquivel was employed, as well as those places where his music is preserved today.

along with that of University chair of music.


9 Snow, 8–10.


11 In addition to locations of Esquivel’s music published in Snow and RISM, I have located two additional sources (1608 motets and a badly damaged copy of the 1613 print) at the Coria Cathedral (Extremadura).
More recent research on Esquivel and his music includes an examination of the chapter records of the Oviedo Cathedral by the former archivist, Raúl Arias del Valle, which includes a section about Esquivel’s tenure.\textsuperscript{12} Subsequent studies that provide documentary evidence concerning Esquivel’s biography, along with examinations of his music, are restricted to two pre-doctoral studies, both of which appeared in 1995 and rely heavily on Snow and Stevenson for biographical data.\textsuperscript{13} In 2001 Clive Walkley published an article in \textit{Early Music} that included updated biographical information that relied in part on research undertaken for this study.\textsuperscript{14}

The need for an amplified biography for the composer is evident. Archival sources at the cathedrals in Oviedo, Calahorra, Ciudad Rodrigo, Coria, and Ávila were consulted on location for this study. Unfortunately, only fragments of the chapter records of the Ciudad Rodrigo Cathedral for the years 1569–1641 are extant. The rest were probably lost when the city and cathedral were sacked during the Portuguese War of


\textsuperscript{14} In particular Walkley had access to my transcriptions of the Oviedo Cathedral documents and my own discovery of the location and contents of the Sánchez Cabañas history of Ciudad Rodrigo in the archive of the Universidad de Salamanca. In return Walkley provided information about the Ciudad Rodrigo chapter act that listed Esquivel’s acceptance as \textit{moço de coro} (choirboy), which was confirmed on site, as well as important information about Pedro Ponce de León, and a few secondary sources. See Clive Walkley, “Juan Esquivel: An Unknown Spanish Master Revisited,” \textit{Early Music} 39/1 (February 2001), 76–92. A report of a dissertation on Esquivel’s 1608 motets by Francisco Rodilla León has been noted, but no record of this document has yet been found.
Independence (1640–68). The lacuna in the chapter records includes all of Esquivel's years of service as maestro de capilla. Thus, the history by Sanchez Cabañas, along with Esquivel’s publications and a few references to him in the records of other cathedrals, are the only primary sources that refer to his career in Ciudad Rodrigo.

Studies devoted to the works of Esquivel are few and consist primarily of surveys of the composer’s prints, with the 1608 motet collection drawing particular interest. The exceptions are examinations of individual Masses, such as Walkley’s discussion of the Missa Gloriose Confessor Domini, this author’s study of the two Missae pro defunctis, and G. Edward Bruner’s inclusion of Esquivel’s Missa Beata Mariae in Sabbato (1613) in a dissertation on Marian devotional Masses in Spain. The need remains for studies of Esquivel’s polyphonic Office music—especially the Magnificat and hymn cycles, and the 1613 Masses. Beyond purely music literature studies, however, Esquivel’s musical style demands further comparison to sixteenth-century Spanish composers and the composers of the Portuguese “Renaissance” of the early seventeenth century. Finally, there is a need for placing Esquivel’s music into a context of Spanish


19 While other studies have incorporated comparisons to Guerrero and other Spaniards, Esquivel’s geographical and temporal proximity to the late-flowering polyphonic output of Portuguese composers (1600–50) demand further investigation.
religious thought. Borgerding has begun this process, but the scope of his work encompasses the work of many composers and focuses on reading the contents of the motet collections more than on the individual works. Moreover, his analyses of the motets emphasize primarily the contributions of Sevillian composers, such as Guerrero and Ceballos.

Methodology

The primary methodology employed for the biographical section was the study of archival documents relating to the career of Juan de Esquivel. Where available, original chapter acts and inventories, payment records, and cathedral statutes were consulted in Spain during the academic year 1998–99. These types of documents were faithfully preserved at the cathedrals in Oviedo, Calahorra, and Coria, but very few documents survive at Ciudad Rodrigo. Chapter records from Burgos were gleaned from José López-Caló’s transcriptions. In addition to the chapter records, original prints by Esquivel were examined and their contents compared to microfilms provided by Robert J. Snow and the Hispanic Society of New York. Fortunatelly, preservation of the Coria Cathedral’s copy of the 1608 motet collection had been completed and the volume was available for examination in the cathedral’s museum in time for this study. This copy is the most complete version of that print and offers new information on the music contained therein.

This study, however, will focus on Esquivel as the inheritor of the Spanish tradition.

Borgerding does examine a number of individual works as substantial evidence for his claims, but on the whole his work is a meta-study of the repertory.

A chapter’s statutes were essentially a constitution that outlined the duties, benefits, and basic salaries of chapter officers and specialists such as the maestro de capilla, the means of settling disputes, and certain local ceremonial practices for Mass, the Office, and processions.

José López-Caló, La música en la Catedral de Burgos, 10 vols, vol. 4, Documentario musical, Actas capitulares (II) (1601–1628) (Burgos: Caja de Ahorros del Círculo Católico, 1996).
The comparative musical analyses were completed by comparing published musical editions, editions in dissertations, and copies of Renaissance prints of Spanish polyphony with transcriptions of Esquivel’s music made for this study. Special attention is given to aspects that reveal trends in the Spanish approach to setting Marian texts such as chant sources and the approach to setting them as cantus firmi, the use of text variants in the Marian antiphons, and variations in *alternatim* practice. In placing Esquivel in the continuum of Spanish practice—or in a few cases, outside of it—attention is given to the points above with the addition of his text choices for motets and his choices regarding emulation of the music of other composers. The surveys of the Marian antiphons and hymns aspire to be comprehensive in order to firmly establish common practices among Spanish composers.

Chapter 1 is an updated biography of the composer based solely on primary sources, except for the information on the prefatory material in Esquivel’s 1608 Mass collection found in Geiger’s 1918 article. Chapter 2 establishes a context for Spanish Marian devotion at the time of Esquivel and then offers a discussion of Spanish tradition in the setting of Office items with Marian texts. In particular the four principal Marian antiphons designated for Compline and the Marian hymn *Ave maris stella* were surveyed for common chant sources, text variants, and polyphonic approaches. Chapter 3 provides information on the sources of Esquivel’s Marian motets and their use at Mass, during religious processions, and the *Salve* service during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The information from the provincial cathedrals where Esquivel worked, in conjunction with studies of the larger centers such as Seville and Toledo, is important for the understanding of how motets were used throughout Spain. Finally, Chapter 4 offers a close reading of the Marian motets in order to relate Esquivel’s text choices and musical exegesis to contemporary Spanish Mariology. Moreover, the chapter seeks to understand the musical relationships to motets on the same texts by other Spanish composers.
CHAPTER 1

JUAN DE ESQUIVEL BARAHONA: AN UPDATED BIOGRAPHY

Juan de Esquivel was probably born in or near Ciudad Rodrigo, a cathedral city near the Portuguese border, some ninety kilometers southwest of Salamanca.\(^1\) Although no baptismal documents have been found that record his entrance into the Catholic Church, his own publications describe him as *civitatensis*, a Latin adjective that, although not including the word “Rodrigo,” was understood in Spain to indicate that a person was a native of Ciudad Rodrigo. Esquivel is also described as *natural de esta ciudad* by Antonio Sánchez Cabañas, who wrote a history of Ciudad Rodrigo and its cathedral.\(^2\) Since the cathedral’s chapter records for the years 1569–1642 are no longer extant, Sánchez Cabañas’s history is the best primary source of information from Esquivel’s years in his native city. Although the date of his birth is not known, an entry in the cathedral’s *actas capitulares*, dated 22 October 1568, records his acceptance as a choirboy.\(^3\) This is the only surviving record from that cathedral that mentions Esquivel in any way. Unfortunately, the inconsistent use of terminology as applied to choirboys in Spanish cathedrals precludes a definitive determination of Esquivel’s birth date, but if he entered the cathedral’s service at the age of eight—a common practice in Spain—his birth year would have been 1560. This date is consistent with the only existing image of Esquivel. The woodcut likeness that appeared in the front of the 1608 *Liber primus missarum* shows a man who may be in his late forties (Fig. 1.1).

\(^1\) The See of Ciudad Rodrigo was suppressed in 1851.

\(^2\) Sánchez Cabañas, vol. 2 (ms.1709), f. 18v.

\(^3\) AC CRo 7, f. 174.
Fig. 1.1. Woodcut image depicting Juan de Esquivel from his *Missarum liber primus*
Although little is known about Esquivel’s early years, he grew up during the last years of Spanish political supremacy in Europe. By the time he began his career, the kingdom was in the midst of profound change. During the 1580s Philip II had overstretched his reach politically and financially. He had lost much of the Spanish Netherlands that he had inherited from his father, Charles V, and even Spain’s New World gold and silver were not enough to finance his attempts to reconquer those lands, slow the advance of the Ottoman Turks in Europe, and advance his religious goals inside Spain. Depopulation from the plague, emigration to the Americas, Jewish expulsion, and warfare, coupled with an agrarian crisis and a traditional attitude that valued status over work, created an economic crisis that threatened Spain’s preeminent place among European nations.  

Esquivel’s placement with the Church as a choirboy suggests that he was not the eldest son and that a career with the Church was seen as the best situation for him. His decision to become a priest during the 1580s was probably as much financially as spiritually motivated, as clergy were mostly shielded from the heavy tax burdens imposed by Philip II during the latter part of his reign. According to Sánchez Cabañas’s history, Esquivel was a student of Juan Navarro (c. 1530–80), who served as maestro de capilla at the Ciudad Rodrigo Cathedral from 1574 to 1578. Navarro’s own teacher was

---

4 Contemporary scholarship on the decline of Spanish fortunes during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is substantial. For general discussions on the effects on the Spanish Church, see Helen Rawlings, Church, Religion and Society in Early Modern Spain, European Studies Series, ed. Colin Jones and Richard Overy (New York: Palgrave, 2002); and Anthony David Wright, Catholicism and Spanish Society Under the Reign of Philip II, 1555-1598, and Philip III, 1598-1621 (Lewistown, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1991).

5 Rawlings, 120.

6 Sánchez Cabañas, vol. 2 (ms. 1709), f. 18. The author refers to Esquivel as a discipulo de Navarro. Although Esquivel entered the cathedral’s service during the tenure of a musician whom Sánchez Cabañas simply calls maestro Çuñeda [=Zuñeda], Esquivel certainly would have had his advanced compositional training with Navarro.
Cristóbal de Morales (c. 1500–53), whose influence is often evident in Esquivel’s compositional style.  

Esquivel’s first professional appointment came in 1581, when he was named maestro de capilla at the cathedral of Oviedo in the northern Spanish province of Asturias. Claiming the position, however, was no simple matter. According to the cathedral’s chapter records, the schoolmaster and a canon named Gonzalo de Solis were sent abroad in search of a capable maestro de capilla in early 1581. During their absence the chapter received a letter from Alonso Puro, maestro de capilla at Zamora, expressing his interest and willingness to come and compete with others for the post. Problems for the chapter began on 27 March, when their emissaries sent a letter from Madrid stating that they had found a suitable candidate in the person of Juan de Esquivel. Unknown to the chapter, Solis had offered Esquivel the prebend and office of maestro de capilla without opposition, a rare procedure in such matters. The chapter invited both Puro and Esquivel to come to Oviedo to compete for the position, but Esquivel appeared before the chapter on 6 May with a document stating that he had been offered the prebend and office without opposition. The matter was raised to the level of a pleito, or lawsuit, with most of the chapter and musicians siding with Puro and Solis standing by his word with Esquivel. On 11 May the chapter decided to put the matter to a vote. Alonso Puro was

---


8 Sánchez Cabañas mistakenly credits Esquivel with the position of canon at the Oviedo Cathedral. Since Esquivel’s name is not recorded in the cathedral’s Libros de limpieza de sangre, which are complete for the 1580s, he could not have held that rank. Sánchez Cabañas, vol. 2 (ms. 1709), f. 18v.

9 AC OV 17, f. 203v.

10 AC OV 17, f. 205. The letter suggests the possibility that Esquivel may have been a university student in that city in 1581.

11 AC OV 17, f. 216v.
elected *maestro de capilla*, but the vote was marred by large numbers of abstentions and one member’s casting two votes.\(^\text{12}\) Puro’s tenure as choirmaster, however, was not a long one. On 10 July the chapter, perhaps realizing that they had overstepped their authority, advised Puro to desist from using the title and office of *maestro de capilla*.\(^\text{13}\) The matter was resolved on 15 November, when the chapter received a letter from an official in León, stating that a decision had been made in Esquivel’s favor. The chapter was given three days in which to comply with the order or face excommunication.\(^\text{14}\) On 18 November an official ceremony was held to install Juan de Esquivel as the new *maestro de capilla* at the cathedral in Oviedo.\(^\text{15}\)

Esquivel’s duties at Oviedo were typical for a *maestro* of his time. He was in charge of the choir chaplains, hired singers, and instrumentalists. Although he was also required to examine and train the choirboys, the chapter’s statutes make no mention of any other duties towards the boys, such as feeding and clothing them. The *maestro* was required to teach the boys and singers along with anyone else who wished to learn plainchant, polyphony, and counterpoint. Esquivel was also required to provide polyphony for a great number of occasions.\(^\text{16}\) Although there is no evidence that the cathedral’s musical establishment performed any of Esquivel’s own compositions, it is quite likely that some of his earliest works were interspersed with the choir’s collection of music by established composers.

\(^{12}\) AC OV 17, f. 218.

\(^{13}\) AC OV 17, f. 236.

\(^{14}\) AC OV 17, f. 267.

\(^{15}\) AC OV 17, f. 269.

\(^{16}\) *Libro de los Estatutos y Constituciones de la sancta Iglesia de Oviedo, con el Ceremonial y Kalendario de sus fiestas antiguas, Ordenado por don Diego Aponte de Quiñones Obispo de la dicha Iglesia, Conde de Norveña y del consejo del Rey nuestro Señor, Juntamente con el Dean y Cabildo de su sancta Iglesia* (Salamanca: Juan Fernandez, 1588), ff. 14–16.
The Oviedo chapter records depict Esquivel as a young man with a great deal of energy and ambition for his office, who at times encountered some difficulty adhering to the strict rules of a cathedral chapter. His name is most frequently mentioned around the feasts of Christmas and Corpus Christi, when he was given extra money for expenses incurred in the presentation of *autos sacramentales*, or sacred pageants. At the same time he is usually admonished not to spend money on these productions without prior consent of the chapter.

Esquivel probably took Holy Orders in 1583. While there is no firm record of his ordination, the woodcut image of him featured on the 1608 *Missarum liber primus* shows a priest’s biretta folded on the floor and the composer dressed in full clericals. Moreover, he requested that someone from León be employed to prepare the *auto* for Corpus Christi since he was unusually occupied that year. Since there was no seminary attached to the Oviedo Cathedral, Esquivel would have undertaken his studies at the University of Oviedo. Unfortunately, the university’s sixteenth-century archive is incomplete and no student records for the 1580s are extant. In July he requested a leave of absence so that he might travel to Ciudad Rodrigo to “sing a new Mass.”

Esquivel apparently had some problems with personal finances during his tenure at Oviedo. These financial missteps, which usually related to overspending for musicians during major feasts, probably led to his sudden departure. According to chapter records, he was bankrupt and heavily in debt by the fall of 1585. The matter was slated for

---


18 Although nothing is directly mentioned of an ordination, Arias interprets these entries to mean that Esquivel’s studies prevented him from conducting the Corpus *auto* himself. Arias del Valle, 131.

19 This information was transmitted in a conversation with Augustín Hevia Ballina, director of the archive for the Diocese of Oviedo.

20 AC OV 17, f. 400v. Arias del Valle interprets the phrase *cantar missa nuevo* to mean that Esquivel wished to sing his first Mass as a priest there, but the phrase more likely refers to Esquivel’s wish to perform one of his recent compositions in his home city, perhaps as a newly ordained priest.
discussion by the chapter in October of that year, but there is no record of a decision in that month. The pressure on Esquivel, however, must have remained, because on 4 November 1585 he left his position in Oviedo without giving notice.

The timing of his departure from Oviedo coincided, or perhaps was prompted by, the availability of the choirmaster’s job at the cathedral of Calahorra, a small but very old diocese near Logroño on the lower Riojan plateau. Esquivel arrived in Calahorra on or before 12 November 1585 along with musicians from Logroño, Bilbao, and Pamplona for the competition, which took place the next day. The contest for the position included the composition of a Superius and Bassus voice to the “Et incarnatus est” from the Credo of Josquin’s Missa Faisant regretz and the composition of a motet on an antiphon for the feast of Saint Dominic. Although no winner is recorded, Esquivel is listed among the chapter members the following month. He spent the next seven years in Calahorra and during that time was responsible for the acquisition of music books by Victoria and

21 Las rremates de las rrentas y quiebras e amonestaciones del maestro de capilla e pedro Ruiz se dexa para el primero cauildo de octubre. [The closing (discussions) of the incomes, bankruptcies, and reprimands of the chapelmaster and Pedro Ruíz are scheduled for the first chapter meeting in October]. AC OV 18, f. 136.

22 AC OV 18, f. 146.

23 Only Miguel Navarro, the maestro de capilla at Pamplona, has been identified at this time. He was sought again as Esquivel’s replacement in 1591 but apparently returned to Pamplona at some later date.

24 AC CA 117, f. 186v refers to the work as la missa de Jusquin de fa re mi re. Walkley, “Juan Esquivel: An Unknown Spanish Master Revisited,” 89, cites Jeffrey Dean’s identification of the Mass with Diego Pisador’s 1555 intabulation, titled Missa Fa re mi re.

25 The antiphon must have been a local text and chant, since the Clement VIII breviary assigns the antiphon to the common of the non-papal confessor saints. No motet for St. Dominic by Esquivel survives today, but he did compose a parody Mass on Guerrero’s motet Glorioso confessor Domini. For a discussion of this work, see Walkley, “Juan Esquivel: An Unknown Spanish Master Revisited,” 82–88.

26 AC CA 117, f. 196.
Morales for the chapter.\textsuperscript{27} His duties included the preparation of music for the Mass and Holy Office and the teaching of plainchant and polyphony to the choirboys, singers, or any prebendary who desired to learn.\textsuperscript{28} He was also required to officiate over the singers at all the daily Masses, the Mass for the Trinity on Wednesdays, and the Saturday votive Mass for the Virgin. He was required to teach the boys and singers all of the Psalm verses, antiphons, and other items for the celebration of Vespers. He was also required to compose or provide villancicos and music for the feasts of Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and Corpus Christi.\textsuperscript{29}

The Calahorra chapter records offer the usual types of information about the maestro de capilla, such as requests for leave and fines incurred. During the first months of 1588 the chapter sent Esquivel on an extended trip to hire an organist in Ávila and to purchase some works by Morales in Medina del Campo.\textsuperscript{30} On 8 April 1591 Esquivel requested, and was granted, permission to travel. The cathedral records do not indicate his destination, but he probably went directly to Ciudad Rodrigo. Perhaps Esquivel had heard that the post of maestro de capilla at the cathedral where he had once served as a choirboy had become available, since Alonso de Tejeda had left for a similar position in León in February.\textsuperscript{31} On 27 May 1591 the Calahorra chapter received a letter from

\textsuperscript{27} The book by Victoria may have been the 1585 motet collection. \textit{Dí al maestro de capilla quatro reales por los porter del libro que se trajo de madrid de las obras de vitoria} [I gave the chapelmaster four reales for transporting the book of works by Victoria that he brought from Madrid.]. LF CA 193, no foliation.

\textsuperscript{28} Est CA, f. 213. The Calahorra chapter statutes make no mention of a group of singers other than the mozos del choro, suggesting that all the singers, men and boys, were grouped under this term.

\textsuperscript{29} Est CA, f. 213.

\textsuperscript{30} AC CA 118, f. 145v.

\textsuperscript{31} See Dionisio Preciado, \textit{Alonso de Tejeda} (Madrid: Editorial Alpuerto, 1974), 22.
Esquivel in Ciudad Rodrigo indicating that he wished to resign his position in Calahorra upon a certainty of receiving a prebend in his native city.\textsuperscript{32}

Sánchez Cabañas states that Esquivel “was called” by the cathedral of Ávila sometime before his return to Ciudad Rodrigo, but there is no record at the Ávila Cathedral that refers to the chapter’s interest in Esquivel.\textsuperscript{33} Instead, the chapter records clearly show that Sebastián de Vivanco was \textit{maestro de capilla} there from 1587 until 1602, with only a brief pause in 1588, when he left for Seville to assume the post of master of the choirboys on a trial basis.\textsuperscript{34} The possibility that Esquivel worked for a short time in one of the other churches in Ávila is remote at best, since he left Calahorra in April 1591 and accepted the post in Ciudad Rodrigo the very next month. The only possibility is that Esquivel auditioned for the post at Ávila during his trip to that city in 1588, but the cathedral’s documents record no such event.

The title of Esquivel’s 1613 print confirms that he was a \textit{racionero}, or prebendary, and \textit{maestro de capilla} at the Ciudad Rodrigo Cathedral. Sánchez Cabañas confirms that the two \textit{raciones enteras}, or full prebendaries who were not canons, were the \textit{maestro} and the organist. Each received 600 ducats for the year, as well as the room and board to which all of the prebendaries were entitled.\textsuperscript{35} This figure is supported by an entry in the \textit{Archivo secreto vaticano}, which states that in 1622 the salary for \textit{racioneros} at the Ciudad Rodrigo Cathedral was indeed 600 ducats per year.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{32} AC CA 118, f. 294.

\textsuperscript{33} Sánchez Cabañas, vol. 2 (ms. 1709), f. 18v.

\textsuperscript{34} Stevenson, “Spanish Polyphonists,” 94–95.

\textsuperscript{35} Sánchez Cabañas, f. 18v.

\textsuperscript{36} Archivo Secreto Vaticano, \textit{Procesos consistoriales civitatensis}, leg. 18, f. 36. Cited in Justo García Sánchez, \textit{Procesos consistoriales civitatensis: Miróbriga en los siglos XVII y XVIII} (Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, Universidad de Oviedo, 1994), 43. . . . que el valor de las rentas de las dignidades de la catedral sobrepasaban los mil cuatrocientos ducados; los canonicatos, los mil; las raciones tenían una renta de seiscentos, y las capellanías cuatrocientos.
Esquivel’s Published Music

Three publications of music by Juan de Esquivel survive in at least one copy. Sánchez Cabañas accurately describes them in a section devoted to Esquivel:

The works that were printed in his name are the following: a book of Masses, another of motets for the entire year, and another large book that contains three volumes, the first of fabordones, the second of hymns, the third of Magnificats and Masses.

In an added margin note Sánchez Cabañas reports a fourth publication:

[During] the year 1623 he brought to light another book, printed in Salamanca, of songs for ministriles, fabordones, hymns, and motets. It is a curious book and learned in style.

The first of Esquivel’s publications was a book of six Masses that appeared in March 1608 from the press of Arthur Taberniel, the official printer of the University of Salamanca. In addition to the Mass settings, Esquivel included a setting of the sprinkling rite antiphon Asperges me and the antiphon In paradisum, sung as the recessional of the Missa pro defunctis. The Masses are printed in an order that apparently had some meaning for Esquivel. By placing the Missa Ave Virgo Sanctissima à 5, based on a motet by Francisco Guerrero, as the first Mass setting, Esquivel was certainly paying

---

37 Fabordones refer to a series of simple, polyphonic formulas for intoning psalms. Composed psalm settings in Spain were usually only slightly more elaborate, prompting Sánchez Cabañas to employ the term in this case.

38 Las obras que andan impresas de su nombre son estas[.] un libro de misas y otro de motetes de todo el año y otro grande que contiene tres tomos el primero de fabordones el segundo de hymnos el tercero de magnificas y misas. Sánchez Cabañas, f. 18v.

39 El año 1623 saco otro libro a luz impresso en Salamanca de cançiones para ministriles y favordones himnos y motetes. Es libro curioso y de estudio. Sánchez Cabañas, f. 18v. This author was the first to encounter this citation.

40 Missarum Ioannis Esquivelis in alma ecclesia Civitatensi portionarii, et cantorum praefecti, liber primus superiorum permisso, Salmantice, ex officina typographica Arti Taberniel Antverpiani, anno a Christo nato M.DC.VIII (Salamanca: Artur Taberniel, 1608).
tribute to the late Sevillian composer. The placement of the *Missa pro defunctis à 5* at the end of the volume reflects the placement of the Requiem Mass near the end of the Tridentine *Missale Romanum*.\(^{41}\) Esquivel’s admiration of Guerrero was such that, of the six Masses in the collection, three are parodies of Guerrero motets.\(^{42}\) The idea for Esquivel’s *Missa Batalla à 6*, based on Clément Janequin’s chanson “La bataille de Marignan,” may have come from Guerrero’s own *Missa de la batalla escoutez* from that composer’s *Missarum liber secundus* (1582). The remaining Mass is a *Missa hexachordum à 8*, which takes its name from its cantus firmus formula.

On 5 July 1608 Esquivel published a book of seventy-two motets, although the first item is actually a six-voice canon on the words “Ave Maria.”\(^{43}\) Since the title page does not survive in any of the four extant copies of this collection, the title must be derived from the catalog of the Leipzig antiquarian Karl W. Hiersemann, from whom the Hispanic Society of America purchased its copy. The entry in the catalog suggests that part of the full title was *Motecta festorum et dominicarum cum communi sanctorum, IV, V, VI, et VIII vocibus concinnanda*, or “Motets for Feasts and Sundays with the Commons of the Saints for 4, 5, and 8 Voices Singing Together.”\(^{44}\) This is probably a partial title, since Esquivel included his name in the titles of all his other publications. The motets are organized into two groups, corresponding to the *Sanctorale* and the

\(^{41}\) Spanish precedent for this practice can be seen in Morales’s second book of Masses and the first (1566) and second (1582) Mass collections by Guerrero.

\(^{42}\) The *Missa Ave Virgo Sanctissima à 5*, *Missa Ductus est Jesus à 4*, and the *Missa Gloriose Confessor Domini à 4*.

\(^{43}\) The number of items has, until recently been in question. In 1995, however, a copy of the 1608 motets was discovered at the Cathedral of Coria (Cáceres) by the RISM-España project. This copy, although missing the title page and any possible dedicatory material, contains all of the numbered pages with music. See Antonio Ezquerro Esteban, “Memoria de actividades de RISM-España/1995,” *Anuario musical* 51 (1996): 247–69.

\(^{44}\) Snow, 94.
Esquivel did not include any motets for Saints that were specific to those cathedrals where he had been employed. If he ever composed motets in honor of the patron saints of Oviedo (Saint Eulalia) or Calahorra (Saints Emeterio and Celedonio), they are no longer extant. The motet for Saint Idephonsus, the patron of Ciudad Rodrigo, is the only item that Esquivel included for a distinctly Spanish saint. The text, however, does not refer to the Spanish belief that the Virgin descended to earth to invest Ildephonsus (607–67), then bishop of Toledo, with the holy chasuble. The omission of a motet for the feast of St. Dominic is puzzling in light of the fact that Esquivel’s bishop at the time was a Dominican who was the dedicatee of a later collection.

On 5 March 1613 Esquivel published what remains the largest collection of polyphony produced by a Spanish press before 1700. The print, which spans 593 numbered pages, is divided into sections for psalms, hymns, Magnificats (divided into First and Second Vespers), Marian antiphons (along with five miscellaneous items), Masses, and items for the Office of the Dead. This first part of this huge collection resembles Juan Navarro’s _Psalmi, hymni, ac Magnificat totius anni_ (Rome, 1590) in its goal of providing Office music for the entire Tridentine Church year. Contained in the prefatory material, which survives in one of the two extant copies of this print, are an approbation by Vincente Espinel, a license to print, and the dedication. The print is

45 The Temporale and Sanctorale are the two simultaneous cycles of feasts that make up the Church year. The Temporale, or Proper of Time, organizes the principal feasts of the church year that are based on the life and ministry of Jesus. These include all the moveable feasts that are based on the date for Easter, as well as Advent, Christmas, and a few saints’ feasts that fall in December. The Sanctorale, or Proper of the Saints, organizes the yearly cycle of feasts for the saints, the Virgin, and a few fixed-date feasts based on the life of Christ such as the Transfiguration (August 6).

46 _Ioannis, Esquivel, Civitatensis, et eiusdem sanctæ ecclesiæ portionarii, psalmorum, hymnorum, magnificarum et B. Mariae quatuor antiphonarum de tempore, necnon et missarum tomos secundus_ (Salamanca: Francisco de Cea Tesa, 1613).

47 See Appendix A for complete indices of the 1608 and 1613 publications.
dedicated to Pedro Ponce de León (d.1615), the bishop of the Ciudad Rodrigo diocese from 1605 to 1610, whose coat of arms is featured on the title page of the print.\footnote{Diocese of Ciudad Rodrigo, \textit{Estadística de la Diócesis de Ciudad Rodrigo} (Salamanca: Nuñez, 1975), 83.} This bishop, an ardent Dominican and former rector of the University of Salamanca, was the son of Luis Cristóbal Ponce de Léon (1518–73), Duke of Arcos, who had been a patron to both Morales and Guerrero.\footnote{Pedro Ponce de León, a member of the ducal family of Arcos de la Frontera, was educated at the University of Salamanca, and eventually became a rector there. He entered the Dominican Order at the Convento de San Esteban, and he was Prior of the convents of Palencia and Buytrago before being named to the See of Ciudad Rodrigo in 1605, the same date as his ordination as bishop. He transferred to the diocese of Zamora in 1609, but found that the climate in that city aggravated his poor health. He accepted a transfer to the diocese of Badajoz, but died before taking possession. Gil González Dávila, \textit{Teatro Eclesiástico de las Iglesias Metropolitanas y Catedrales de los Reynos de las Castillas, Vida de sus Arzobispos y Obispos y cosas memorables de sus sedes, tomo segundo, que contiene las iglesias de Sevilla, Palencia, Ávila, Zamora, Coria, Calahorra, y Plasencia} (Madrid: Pedro de Horna y Villanueva, 1647), II: 421–22. \textit{I would like to thank Clive Walkley for directing me to this source.}} Esquivel’s dedication, the only known document in his own voice, acknowledges the bishop, who was by then in Zamora, for encouraging him to publish some of his works, and praises the nobleman for his kindness and leadership.\footnote{While Esquivel calls the bishop “my patron in all things” in the dedication of the 1613 print, but Pedro was certainly not the direct dedicatee of the 1608 publications, since only in 1613 does Esquivel cite his long desire to dedicate something to him.}

Esquivel’s dedication bears some resemblances to the dedication that Francisco Guerrero made to Don Pedro’s father in the \textit{Sacrae cantionem}.\footnote{\textit{Sacrae cantiones, quae vulgo moteta nuncupantur} (Seville: Martín de Montesdoca, 1555).} Esquivel may have believed that Don Pedro would notice and be pleased by the parallels to his father’s dedication. There is no reason to doubt that the composer, who had created parody Masses on several of Guerrero’s motets, might also take the older master’s dedication as
a model for his own. For the sake of comparison, Guerrero’s dedication is provided here.\(^52\)

To the most illustrious and excellent Don Luis Cristóbal Ponce de Léon [1518–1573], Duke of Arcos, Marquis of Zahara, Count of Casares, Lord of Marchena and other dependencies: greetings from Francisco Guerrero. Having sometime ago decided, most illustrious Sir, to publish certain songs suited for use during divine worship, I thought only of you among the many who delight in such pleasures as the lofty person to whom I should wish to dedicate the fruits of my vigils. First among the reasons for so desiring to dedicate these sacred songs was the knowledge that if you with your excellent taste approved, public approbation would necessarily follow. Then again I knew that it has been a long-honored custom in your family to devote such time as remained after serious pursuits, to the enjoyment of music. For, leaving out of account still earlier ancestors, no one needs to be reminded that your father\(^53\) nurtured you from your earliest years in all those subjects that belong to the education of a truly noble prince such as you: who are now the ornament of this age. In addition to being a valiant warrior he was so consummate a scholar that he undertook narratives in Latin, the style of which is above censure. Moreover, he so enjoyed music that not only did he listen long and lovingly to skilled singers with beautiful voices but also learned to sing himself in a very creditable manner. He was incited to pursue music by the examples of such renowned heroes of old as Achilles, who acknowledged its healing powers, and Alexander, who sought no other recreation from cares of state. I could go on with praises of your father but conclude with his having engendered so accomplished and courageous a prince as you, who are like him in every way. I well know, most learned Sir, how eagerly you pursue all those humane studies in which you were initiated by the erudite Greek preceptor of your youth, Alphonsus of Molyvo,\(^54\) and would not now entice you from these other studies did not I know that any after-hours spent with music will not interfere with them. Receive, then, most illustrious duke, these small songbooks with my best wishes that they may alleviate the sadness of any unoccupied hour, and in so doing recall to your mind Cristóbal de Morales, who received the greatest benefits at your hands.

\(^{52}\) The translation of Guerrero’s dedication is reproduced from Stevenson, “Seville’s Sixteenth-Century Cynosure,” 59–61.

\(^{53}\) Rodrigo Ponce de León (1488–1530) reigned as duke of Arcos from 1492 until his death.

\(^{54}\) Island of Lesbos.
Although from the same family, Esquivel’s patron was a prince of the Church, and his dedication exalts that vocation and rank in somewhat similar fashion to Guerrero’s greeting:

To the Most Illustrious Lord, Brother Don Pedro Ponce de Léon, Most Worthy Bishop of Zamora, Juan Esquivel, Citizen of Ciudad Rodrigo, Prebendary of the Cathedral and Director of Music, sends Greetings in Our Lord.

Esquivel’s closer relationship with the bishop allows him to be slightly more personal in tone, but he, like Guerrero, mentions his long-held desire to dedicate a book to his patron:

In former years, O most distinguished patron, when you had taken over governance of this church [Ciudad Rodrigo Cathedral], Divine Grace effecting it, and you had won over all your people by a distinct and outstanding expression of love, the special gentleness of your spirit and your mildness so drew me to you that I chose you thereafter to be my patron in all things. This present occasion makes an end to my long abiding desire to give you some example of respect and gratitude for this. I did not long debate that I should set to print a certain volume of church music, and submit it to the patronage of a certain Prince, as is now the custom—indeed many reasons made themselves evident—easily induced me to prefer your patronage over others.\(^{55}\)

While Guerrero avoided a panegyric to his duke’s family, Esquivel decides to sing the praises of his bishop’s ancestry:

For I ponder the antiquity of your family: I call to mind your ancestors’ good deeds over the last six hundred years in their efforts to spread the Christian religion. Histories themselves show quite clearly their victories that were happily

\(^{55}\) Praeclarissimo Domino Fratri D. Petro Ponze de Leon, Camorensi Episcopo Dignissimo, Ioannes Esquivel Almae Civitatensis Ecclesiae Portionarius, Musicaeque Praefectus S.P.D. Superioribus annis cum ad hanc regendam Ecclesiam, divina id efficiunte gratia, assumptum esses, clarissime Praesul, universumque populum praecipuam quadem amoris significacione tibi conciliasses, me imprimis tua animi mansuetudo, et lenitas sic sibi devinit, ut te mihi in omnibus patronum, ac Meoconatem iam inde elegerim. Cuius observantiae, et gratitudinis specimen aliquod cum enixe dare Cuius observantiae, et gratitudines specimen aliquod cum enixe dare optarem, diuturni desiderii finem praesens fecit occasio. Volenti enim mihi volumen quoddam de concentu Ecclesiastico typos mandare, illudque aliquidus Principis praedisio, recepta iam consuetudine, committere, non fuit diutius deliberandum; multae siquidem sese obtulerunt causae, quae me ad patrocinium tuum caeteris anteponendum facile perpulerunt.
reported from Granada and Moorish Africa. Their pious and religious monuments bear witness to what lands and possessions enriched the many temples of their gods. Since it is well known that all these have been returned to the worship of the true God and to the faithful work of their kings, your ancestors not only ruled over Arcos de la Frontera, Zadar, Ulzio, Gazzo, and other towns as their rewards, but also worthily obtained by a fortunate marriage union the joint alliance of the Counts of Toulouse and Narbonne, and of the kings in Aragon. But since these things may perchance have faded away with the passage of so many years, it is wonderful to tell with what ardour of spirit and courage in these recent years did that most excellent Duke Rodrigo, your brother, surrounded by a most outstanding band of his subjects, with the rest of the nobility of all Andalusia cowering, proceed to drive the perfidious English from Cadiz, and avenge the desecration of sanctuaries and holy images of the Virgin, such that the very tidings of his hastening approach were able to rout from that terrified and ravaged city those enemies who stood transfixed in awe of such might.

---

56 Archobriga, today called Arcos de la Frontera, is located thirty-one miles northeast of Cadiz. Formerly under Moorish rule as Medina-Arkosh, the town was captured by Alfonso X during the thirteenth century.

57 Zara or Zadar is today a Croatian port on the Adriatic Sea on the Dalmatian coast, seventy miles northwest of Split. During Esquivel's time, it was a possession of the Venetian Republic.

58 Rodrigo Ponce de Léon’s valor is confirmed by the historian Gonzalo Argote de Molina in 1588. D. Rodrigo Ponce de Léon, . . . habiendo heredado juntamente con el nombre la grandeza de ánimo, resucita en Africa la memoria de sus hazañas señalándose en Orán en escaramuzas con los moros [Don Rodrigo Ponce de Leon, . . . having inherited together with the name (Rodrigo, Duke of Arcos, from his grandfather) the nobility of spirit, the memory of his deeds is revived in Africa, distinguishing himself in Oran (Algeria) in skirmishes with the Moors.] Gonzalo Argote de Molina, Nobleza de Andalucia (Seville, 1588), ed. Manuel Muñoz y Garnica (Jaén: Francisco Lopez Viscaino, 1866); reprint edition (Jaén: Riquelme y Vargas Ediciones, 1991), 443.

59 1596.

60 Considero namque tuae familiae antiquitatem: tuorum progenitorum pro amplificanda Christiana religione a sexcentis annis res bene gestas in mente revoco. Quas ex Granatensisibus, Africanisque Mauris victorias feliciter reporaverint historiae ipsae haud obscure manifestant. Quibus denique praediiis, quibus possessionibus multa Divorum Templa ditaverint, pia eorum, et religiosa monimenta testantur. Quae omnia cum ad veri Dei cultum, suorumque Regum fidelem operam revocata esse constet, inde factum est, it non solum Archobrigae, Zarae, Martiae, Gaditum, aliorumque oppidorum dominum merito obtinere, verum etiam Tolosanorum, Narbonensiumque Comitum
As Guerrero exalted first father and then son, Esquivel then turns to the virtues of the bishop:

Lest any one ignorantly judge you in any way inferior to these things, I believe that you had been exalted with the inspiration of divine will when, exchanging a soft and delicate tunic, resisting that coarse purple, for the hair-shirt and more austere habit of the Dominican order, you chose the stricter life of religion: for while your ancestors attained, amidst the clanging of trumpets and the clashing of armor and the echo of the bombard, a human and therefore transitory and perishable glory by their great ascent to the realm of the Spanish kings, you excelled in deeds not at all lesser than these. For when you learned to submit to the power of the Heavenly Kingdom by assiduous reading of the Holy Scriptures, you girded youself for the task, determined to conquer it, armed with every weapon of virtue: indeed, content with voluntary poverty, amidst continual mortification of the flesh, deprivations of fasting, tireless vigils, stripped of your own will. Thus with public sermons for the people and the private confidences of confession did you console yourself and your Christian flock, so that no man may doubt that by your labors you had procured an eternal glory in Heaven, and countless sons and daughters for Christ the King of Kings.

Esquivel, like Guerrero, reveals that he composed during the late night hours:

Therefore, since these things are true, more aptly and judiciously [do I add] the fruits of my nocturnal undertakings, worked upon with more zeal than before through my celebrating the Divine Office all the more solemnly, and with diligence that I ought to attribute to you, by whose worship of greater things, and respect owed to God the increaser of all things, we accept that there was nothing ever more dear or more ancient than sound tradition; and you who thus always appointed the whole course of your life and all your actions so that you might be devoted tirelessly to the enriching and propagation of the orthodox faith, by the calling of your profession.

---

*insitam nobilitatem felici Legionis, et Aragonia Regum affinitate cumulare meruerint. Sed quia haec in tantis temporum intervallis forte exoleta esse possent, mirum est dictu, quanto animi ardore, ac fortitudine his proximis annis excellenissimus Dux Rothericus frater tuus, caeteris totius Boeticae dynastis perterritis, ad pellendos Gadibus perfidos Anglos, Templorim et sacrarum virginum ulciscendas inuiiras fulgentissima suorum subditorum stipatus caterva processerit: ita ut eius accelerationis fama hostes ipsos tantae virtutis stupore defixos ex pavida et directa urbe potuerit exturbare.*

61 Of a Cardinal.
Therefore accept, most illustrious patron, this little volume of psalms, hymns, Magnificats, and Masses, a small measure encompassing the insignificance of its author; but if you suffer to issue it under the protection of your greatest name, I will think that perfect reward to have been the end of my labor. What remains is for God the Best and Greatest to preserve your leadership as long as possible, to the glory of His name and the distinction of His Church.62

The structural similarities to Guerrero’s dedication are evident, and the dedicatees were both members of the same noble family. Guerrero, writing to a secular prince, adroitly points out his family’s musical sophistication in a very humanistic tone, but Esquivel’s patron, the younger of Cristóbal’s sons, took the unusual path for a nobleman of the regular clergy, and Esquivel was sure to praise this choice. At the same time, he took great pains to associate Don Pedro’s accomplishments with those of his better-known ancestors.

62 Ne autem quis te illis aliqua ex parte inferiorem ignoranter iudicet, divini numinis instinctu effectum fuisse credo, ut mollis et delicata tunicula cilicio, rentente purpura rudi, et aspero Dominicae familiae vestitu committata, arctiori Religionis vitam elegris: nam si illi inter tubarum clangorem, inter armorum strepitum, bombardaeque rebaudum humanam, atque ideo fluxam et perituram gloriam, magna Hispanorum Regum Imperio accessione facta, sunt adepti, tu nequaquam his minora praestitisti: cum enim Regnum Coelorum vim pati ex assidua sacrarum Literarumlectione didiceris, illud expugnandum ratus, omni virtutum armatura munitus, operi te accinxisti: voluntaria siquidem paupertate contentus, inter continuas corporis verberationes, ciborum abstinentias, indefessas vigilias, propia priatus voluntate, publicus ad populum concionibus, privatis confessionum colloquiis, sic tibi, Christianoque gregi consulisti, ut tuis laboribus gloriam non deficiemem in coelis, et Regi Regum Christo innumerous filiios te peperisse nemo dubitet. Cui igitur, cum haec vera sint, aptius, consultiusque meam lucubrationum foetus divino Officio solemniter celebrando multo maiore, quam ante studiostudio, et diligentia elaboratos, quam tibi destinare debui, cuui maioribus cultu, et observantia Deo omnium largitori debita nihil unquam aut charius au antiquius fuisse minime dubia tradierandis, et qui totam vitae seriem, cunctasque actiones sic semper insituisisti, ut Orthodoxae fidei augmento et propagationi, de tuae Religionis more, indefesse inservieris. Suscipe, igitur, praecellarissime Praesul, opusculum hoc Psalmorum, Hymnorum, Magnificarum, et Missarum modulus pro sui authoris tenutate complectens, quod si sub amplissimis tui nominis protectione prodire patieris, satis cumulatum praemium labori meo persoluto esse arbitrabor. Quod reliquum est Dominationem tuam Deus Optimus Maximus ad sui nominis gloriam, Ecclesiaeque ornamentum quam diutissime tueatur incolorem.
Until 1999, only three publications of sacred music by Esquivel were known. Sánchez Cabañas, in a marginal note near the information concerning Esquivel, mentions that in 1623 the composer published one final collection of music in Salamanca. He offers little information about its contents, simply stating that it contained *cançiones para ministrioles* (songs for instrumentalists), *fabordones*, hymns, and motets. The *cançiones* may refer to a group of untexted motet or villancico settings intended for the cathedral’s instrumental ensemble, or it is possible that Esquivel composed some instrumental works based on Italian models such as the canzon or ricercar. The hymns and *fabordones* (psalms) were probably intended for secondary feasts, since Esquivel published a complete cycle of Vespers hymns and psalms for the major feasts in his 1613 print. Among the motets may be those cited as “missing” above. Sánchez Cabañas refers to the 1623 print as curious. Perhaps Esquivel had by that time pursued his chromatic style to even greater lengths than is evident in the compositions from the 1613 print. Only the recovery of a copy of this print will shed light Sánchez Cabañas’s remark.

Further seventeenth-century references to Esquivel are found in the chapter records of those cathedrals that purchased his music. These records reveal that copies of Esquivel’s music were sent to Badajoz, Burgos, Burgo de Osma, Coria, Calahorra, Oviedo, and Seville. Manuscript copies, most of which were copied in the eighteenth century, have been found in Oviedo, Plasencia, Mexico City, and Vila Viçosa (Portugal). There is no doubt that his music was once preserved at the Ciudad Rodrigo.

---

63 One further reference comes from a 1627 Zamora Cathedral inventory of sacred music, which refers to four large books of polyphony by Esquivel. No doubt the presence of Esquivel’s former benefactor, Pedro Ponce de León, as bishop was the reason for that cathedral’s full set of prints. Alejandro Luis Iglesias, “El maestro de capilla Diego Bruceñas (1567/71–1623) y el impreso perdido de su *Libro de Misas, Magnificats y Motetes* (Salamanca: Susana Muñoz, 1620),” in *Encomium musicæ: Essays in Honor of Robert Snow* (Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon, 2000), 459.

64 The Oviedo Cathedral preserves ten motets from the 1608 *Motecta festerorum* in Libro de atril no. 4, ff. 69v–100, and Esquivel’s motet *O vos omnes* in Libro de atril no. 3, ff. 14–15. Plasencia Ms. 1 (PlasC 1), dated 1776, contains sixty-four of the seventy-two motets published in the 1608 collection, along with works by Fray Manuel de León and Victoria. The Valdéz Codex in Mexico City contains Esquivel’s *Missa Ductus est*
Cathedral and, due to its proximity, Salamanca. If Esquivel obeyed the stipulation in the printing license of the 1613 print, he sent two copies of that volume to the Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial.\footnote{These volumes, however, are not among the extant holdings of the monastery. See Michael J. Noone, “Music and Musicians at the Escorial, 1563–1665” (Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University, King’s College, 1991).}

Not all of the peripheral references to Esquivel concern the acquisition of his publications. In 1601 and 1602, respectively, Esquivel was approached by the Burgos and Salamanca chapters as a possible candidate for maestro de capilla at those institutions.\footnote{Esquivel never traveled to Burgos for the position. He did, however, use their interest to sell all three of his publications to the cathedral by 1613. This information is important, since it finally puts to rest any claims that Esquivel worked in Salamanca in the first decade of the seventeenth century. José López-Calo, La música en la Catedral de Burgos, Vol. 4, Documentario musical, Actas capitulares (II) (1601–1628) (Burgos: Caja de Ahorros del Círculo Católico, 1996), 19, 19, 130, 132, 148, 166, 168. Walkely cites a 1602 entry in the Salamanca chapter acts regarding a decision to contact Esquivel about the position of maestro de capilla, which was eventually won by Sebastián de Vivanco. Walkely, “Juan Esquivel: An Unknown Master Revisited,” 79.}

His stature is also evident in an entry in the Coria Cathedral records from 20 September 1608 stating that the chapter received a letter from “the respected maestro de capilla at Ciudad Rodrigo,” recommending Juan Ruíz, a musician from Toro, for the position of maestro de capilla at Coria.\footnote{María Pilar Barrios Manzano, “La música en la catedral de Coria (Cáceres)” (Ph.D. diss., Universidad de Extremadura, 1993), 125. According to Barrios Manzano, Ruíz was eventually named to that post. Further accounts from Coria include Esquivel’s offer of the 1613 print to the chapter, which the chapter declined on 27 September of that year, stating that they had sufficient polyphony on hand. AC CO 876, f. 253.}

The available evidence suggests that Juan de Esquivel occupied his post until the end of his life, but there can be no firm date set for his death. The lacuna in the Ciudad Rodrigo chapter records extends well beyond when the composer may reasonably have expected to live. Esquivel is the last *maestro de capilla* that Sánchez Cabañas mentions in his history, and fortunately the author had the habit of indicating the year in which he was writing. In the section that mentions Esquivel, Sánchez Cabañas states that year was 1622, and in a margin note he refers to Esquivel’s 1623 publication. The composer may have died shortly after 1623, since, two folios later, while describing the duties of one of the chaplains, Sánchez Cabañas states:

The holy temple [Ciudad Rodrigo Cathedral] has twenty-eight altars and one of them privileged. That is the one that is dedicated to Saint Ildephonsus on which a Requiem Mass is said in order to take a soul out of Purgatory by applying the indulgence *per modum sufragi*. On this altar, every Monday of the year, a Mass is said for chapelmaster Juan de Esquivel, and for the souls of his parents, over their tomb, which is endowed there.

Sánchez Cabañas wrote about events as late as 1626, but he makes no mention of Esquivel’s successor. The post may have remained vacant for some time after Esquivel’s death, but the only secure conclusion is that Esquivel died sometime after 1623 but before 1626.

A final point that arises concerning Esquivel's biography is the proper form of the composer’s full name. There remains some disagreement in contemporary scholarship over this issue, a confusion that dates to the early dictionary articles concerning Esquivel. Pedrell gives the composer’s full name as “Juan de Esquivel Barahona,” while Mitjana uses the form “Juan Barahona de Esquivel.” The former was certainly derived from the

---

68 *Viví este año mill seiscientos y veinte y dos. . . .* Sánchez Cabañas, f. 18v.

69 *Tiene este santo templo veinte altares y uno dellos privilegiado ques el questa dedicado a san Ylefonso en el qual diciendo misa de rrequiem se saca un anima de purgatorio aplicando al difunto la indulgencia per modum sufragi en este altar se dicen todos los lunes de el año una misa por el maestro de capilla Juan desquivel y por las animas de sus padres y sobre su sepultura questa alli dotada[.]* Sánchez Cabañas, f. 19v.
references to Esquivel in the 1613 print, which was the primary information source for Pedrell’s entry; the latter is an obvious mistake by Mitjana or his publisher. When Samuel Rubio brought to light the PlasC 1 copy of Esquivel’s 1608 motets in a 1950 article for *Anuario musical*, he used the form “Juan Esquivel de Barahona,” which is the form that appears on the manuscript.\(^70\) Although this version appears in a Burgos chapter record in 1601, the form “Joán de Esquivel Barahona” is used in the same source the following month.\(^71\) “Juan Esquivel de Barahona” was also used by the editors of the *Diccionario de la música Labor*, perhaps at the suggestion of Rubio. This form, which suggests that Esquivel was of noble birth, could easily be dismissed, had not Rubio continued its use in his contribution to the series *Historia de la música española*, one of the most popular Spanish-language sources dedicated to Spain’s music history.\(^72\)

The name forms found in the titles and introductory material of two publications where a name is included, are *Ioannis Esquivelis* (1608), and *Ioannis Esquivel* (1613). The Latin forms of his name, however, are not so useful in determining the composer’s preference. The “de” does not appear on the title pages of prints by Cristóbal de Morales either. Perhaps the best evidence is found in less formal contexts. The chapter records of the cathedrals from Oviedo, Badajoz, Burgos, and Calahorra, as well as in the printing


\(^71\) *Leyóse en este cabildo una carta de Juan Esquivel de Barahona, mastriescuela [sic] de la ciudad de Rodrigo . . .* (fol. 476v, 13-6-1608). Joán de Esquivel Barahona. *Este día mandó el Cabildo que se le responda a Juan de Esquivel, maestro de capilla de Ciudad Rodrigo.* López-Calo, 130, 132.

license and approbation of the 1613 print, use the form “Juan de Esquivel” or “Juan de
Esquivel Barahona.” The word “de” in these cases appears to have been a mark of
courtesy, but it is possible that many of Esquivel’s contemporaries referred to him in this
manner; Sánchez Cabañas consistently uses this form in his history of Ciudad Rodrigo.
The name “Barahona” appears in Vincente Espinel’s approbation for the 1613 print as
“Juan de Esquivel Barahona.” The printing license that immediately follows the
approbation uses the identical form with the exception of the spelling of Esquivel’s first
name (Joan). Thus, as Snow first suggested, “Barahona” was probably a maternal name,
and Esquivel’s full name must have been “Juan Esquivel Barahona.” Due to the
ubiquitous use of the courtesy “de” in references to the composer, however, the form
“Juan de Esquivel Barahona” must be considered the form that the composer would have
most recognized.

73 Vincente Espinel, a highly esteemed seventeenth-century Spanish poet and
novelist, was also an accomplished musician and maestro de capilla. See George Haley,
Vincente Espinel and Marcos de Obregón: A Life and Its Literary Representation

74 Snow, 9.

75 One intriguing possibility is that Esquivel was a member of a converso Jewish
family that had been enobled. Barahona appears in Inquisition records from Spain and the
de Viento), 1998. Bonnin does not provide dates for each name listed.
CHAPTER 2
MARIAN DEVOTION AND MUSIC FOR THE OFFICE IN SPAIN

The rich development of devotion to the Virgin Mary was one of the most important aspects of both popular and institutional religious life in medieval and Renaissance Europe.\(^1\) Mary’s position as first among all saints and the most influential advocate for humanity developed from an increased appreciation by medieval theologians for her role in human salvation. Institutional and popular devotion to Mary led to the development of a Marian theology, or Mariology.\(^2\) While considered a theological discipline, the results of Mariological study have yielded practical applications, appearing in homilies and influencing religious art and music. The early seventeenth century was a rich period of Spanish Mariological inquiry, and the Marian compositions of Juan de Esquivel, especially the motets, were informed to a great degree by that inquiry. In order


\(^2\) This theological discipline is based on Aristotelian principles of scientific discovery, and the deductions that arrive from its study have formed the foundation of several important points of Catholic dogma as well as popular devotion. Excellent introductions to Mariology as a theological discipline include Juniper B. Carol, *The Fundamentals of Mariology* (New York: Benziger, 1956); Cyril Vollert, *A Theology of Mary* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965); Antonio Royo Marín, *La Virgen María: teología y espiritualidad marianas* (Madrid: Editorial Católica, 1968); Mark Miravalle, *Introduction to Mary: The Heart of Marian Doctrine and Devotion* (Santa Barbara, CA: Queenship, 1993).
to form a context for Esquivel’s work, a brief survey of the development of Marian devotion in Europe—especially in Spain—is useful.

**Medieval Marian Devotion in Europe**

Mary’s role in human salvation was appreciated during the pre-Constantine Christian Church, but the genesis of a Marian devotion in its own right is generally traced to the writings of Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons (fl. 177–91), who first fashioned the dichotomy of Eve and Mary as the vessels of humanity’s fall and redemption. Patristic writers, such as Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine further clarified Mary’s privileges, but the work of two Eastern theologians stands out as particularly formative for Mariology. Epiphanius of Salamis (c. 315–403) was the first to suggest that Mary was assumed into Heaven, body and soul, and Ephrem of Syria (c. 306–373), who emphasized the importance of Mary’s virginity, made the connection between the imagery of Mary’s assumption into Heaven and the “woman” of the Book of Revelation. This attention to Mary’s life and her role in salvation by these Eastern writers was at the heart of the decision by the Council of Ephesus to declare Mary *Theotókos*, or “Mother of God,” in 431.

Marian religious thought and devotional practices were mostly confined to monastic circles in the early Western Church, but an increased interest in Mary began to develop during the Merovingian and Carolingian eras. The establishment of the feasts of Mary’s Nativity, the Annunciation, the Purification, and the Assumption, occurred during these periods, prompting the erection of the first churches in her honor in the French and German kingdoms.

The eleventh and twelfth centuries saw the rapid development, especially among Cistercian theologians, of the understanding of Mary’s role as advocate for humanity.

---

3 Warner, 60.


5 Thurston, 459.
Odilo of Cluny (962–1049) dedicated his life to the Virgin, calling her “my most merciful advocate,” and Hugh of Cluny (1024–1109) developed the Saturday Marian Mass during the decade 1060–70. The towering figures of Western Mariology during the Middle Ages, however, were Anselm of Canterbury (1033–1109) and Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153). Anselm’s writings reflect the culture of his time, portraying Mary in the imagery of a feudal lady of the court. He emphasized Mary’s motherhood of God in such a way as to give her partial credit for humanity’s salvation, and his views corresponded with, and perhaps supported, the growing popular attitudes that projected Mary’s influence in all matters and processes of the natural world. Bernard, one of the most powerful clergymen of his day, attributed his very life to drops of breast milk from the Virgin that were given to him as a child. He shared Anselm’s view that Mary continued to serve as a “channel” from humanity to God, but he promoted her as an even more immediate and personal intercessor.

Late medieval devotion to Mary emphasized her humanity through her suffering and joys in such a way that she became the most approachable and influential of saints. This view of Mary was promoted by the mendicant orders as a way of introducing laypeople to a more human Jesus. Mary as protective and grieving mother in the Pietà images connected easily to a population dealing with the plague and constant war with the Ottoman Empire. The popular devotion to Mary reached such proportions that

6 Misericordissima advocatrix mihi.


8 Cunneen, 149–50, sees Mary’s popularity rising partially from her replacement of pagan goddesses in newly Christianized cultures.

9 Cunneen, 186–88.
Desiderius Erasmus (1469–1536) responded by creating mocking stories of popular devotional practices, especially those he observed at the shrine in Walsingham, in his *Colloquia* (1518) and *Moriae Encomium* (1509). These attacks on the exaggerated worship of the Virgin, however, did little to slow the rise of Mary’s status among the faithful. Her popularity reached such a point among both the clergy and the laity that Protestant reformers of the early sixteenth century, many of whom drew from Erasmus, pointed to Marian devotion as one of the principal corruptions of the Roman Church.

In the minds of Catholic theologians the Reformation served only to reinforce the accumulated Marian privileges. For the most part, the Council of Trent simply affirmed those practices that Protestants attacked. The most important defense of Marian devotion during this time was Peter Canisius’s (1520–97) *De Maria Virgine incomparabili, et Dei Genitrice sacrosancta* (Ingolstadt, 1577). In the end, the humanist atmosphere that surrounded the Council did lead to an official renunciation of popular Marian mythology. Among the directives of the council was a prohibition of artistic works that portrayed events from apocryphal stories of Mary or local legends.

**Spanish Marian Devotion**

Spanish devotion to the Virgin began early and had an intensity unmatched in other parts of Europe. A legend of Mary’s appearance in the Spanish city of Saragossa in 40 C.E. is certainly the earliest example of a Marian apparition, occurring during a time when she is traditionally believed to have been still living. The legend states that she appeared to St. James the Greater standing on a pillar carried by angels. She encouraged

---


11 Cunneen, 194–96.

12 Cunneen, 209.
the apostle, whose missionary morale was flagging, and requested that he build the first church dedicated in her honor, known today Santa María del Pilar.  

While apparitions of the Virgin in Spain were numerous, if often undocumented by the official Church, Spanish soil yielded a number of Marian images that became important focal points for popular devotion and pilgrimage. Two images in particular, one in the eastern part of the peninsula and the other in west, spawned influential centers of religious activity. The remote monastery at Montserrat, just west of Barcelona, was constructed around a small black statue of the Virgin and Child, a popular artistic form of the early Middle Ages. The icon was revealed to a group of shepherds after the Moorish retreat from Barcelona in 888 and was reported to have special powers with regard to fertility and healing. The monastery constructed to house the icon remains one of the oldest continuous Marian devotional centers. The town of Guadalupe in the western province of Extremadura was the site of a discovery in 1326, by a cowherd named Gil, of a small casket with a statue of the Virgin and Child. Church authorities deemed that the image was the one given by Pope Gregory I to the bishop of Seville, which was lost during a retreat from Muslim forces in the seventh century. A monastery was built on the site of the discovery, and its importance was such that it was chosen as the location for the ceremonial signing of Columbus’s charter in 1492. A further connection to the Americas was reinforced in 1531 when the Aztec Juan Diego reported that Mary had appeared to him and claimed (in his native Nahuatl) to be the Virgin of Guadalupe. The image of Mary surrounded by the sun that appeared on the Aztec’s cloak in the presence of the clergy was considered a miracle and became the central icon for Marian devotion in the Spanish colonies in America. The popularity of these devotional

13 Warner, 95.

14 Warner, 274, claims that the popularity of Black Madonnas stems from the Song of Songs 1:5 “I am black but comely, O ye daughters of Jerusalem.” Warner, 274.

15 Warner, 274–75, posits that the frequent discovery of Marian images by shepherds, the same class of men to whom Mary and Jesus were first revealed, gave weight to the claims of authenticity of those images for the institutional Church.
centers and shrines among the Spanish people reflect the popular regard in which particular, and usually local, apparitions of Mary were held.\textsuperscript{16}

Mary’s ability to intercede on behalf of human activities was especially important to Spaniards in times of conflict. Her aid to Christian military forces in battle was reported frequently. The first attribution of victory to Mary came at the onset of the \textit{Reconquista}, when Pelayo (c. 690–737), a Visigothic chieftain, defeated an Umayyad (Muslim) army at the Battle of Covadonga in Asturias in 722.\textsuperscript{17} Pelayo attributed the victory to an image of the Virgin on a cave wall in the Covadonga valley. The pivotal naval battle in the Gulf of Lepanto against the Ottoman Turks in 1571, fought principally by Spaniards and Venetians, was led by a Spanish general. Pope Pius V asked all of Rome to pray the rosary during the battle, and following the unlikely Christian victory he established the Feast of the Rosary (7 October) to commemorate the Virgin’s help.

Important Counter-Reformation figures in Spain, partially in response to humanist pressures and the fear of Protestantism, sought a more theologically sound devotion to Mary that was not as centered on apparitions and miraculous interventions. Ignatius of Loyola (1491–1556), a soldier who famously left his sword and dagger at an altar of the Virgin in order to begin his preaching career, and Teresa of Ávila (1515–82) both placed Mary at the center of their teaching. Both saw Mary as the representative of humanity, the model Christian, and the paragon of chastity, not the quasi-divine figure of medieval popular devotion. In no way, however, did this mean that Mary’s star was fading in Spain during the sixteenth century. Quite the contrary, her devotees marshalled most of their arguments and resources towards the establishment of the doctrine of Mary’s


\textsuperscript{17} Esquivel was certainly well aware of the story during the time he served at the Oviedo Cathedral in Asturias. St. Pelayo was a regional hero, and the Asturians prided themselves on being the only Spaniards not conquered by the Moors.
Immaculate Conception as Church dogma. Although the effort was not immediately successful, the amplified interest in Mary’s attributes generated a substantial number of treatises and shorter devotional tracts.

The foremost Spanish theologian who took up the question of Mary’s place in human salvation was Francisco Suárez (1548–1617), a Jesuit who was considered the preeminent Catholic theologian and philosopher of his day. Widely known for his new branch of scholastic theology, often called “Suarism,” his Mariology is advanced in his *Mysterium vitæ Christi* (1592). One of the tenets of his scholastic approach stated that the final grace of Mary was superior to that of all the angels and saints combined. His finer points and preference for the greatest possible dignity for Mary influenced all aspects of Spanish Marian devotion during the seventeenth century.

**Music for the Marian Office**

By the time Juan de Esquivel began to compose music on Marian texts, the Church had focused official Marian devotion on a cycle of Marian feast days, the Saturday votive Office and Mass, and a Common Office of the Virgin, along with its

---

18 A discussion of the polemic over the Immaculate Conception is provided in Chapter 4.


reduced form, the Officium parvuum, or “Little Office.” The use of polyphony varied, depending on the rank of the feast and its appropriateness to the Hour. The revised breviary of Pius V (1568) listed the principal Marian feasts as follows:

- Conception (8 December)
- Purification (2 February)
- Annunciation (25 March)
- Visitation (2 July)
- St. Mary of the Snows (5 August)
- Assumption (15 August)
- Nativity (of Mary) (8 September)
- Presentation (21 November)

In addition to these universal Marian feasts, the Expectation, celebrated on 18 December, was reserved as a feast particular to Spain, appearing in a section of the breviary titled Proprium Sanctorum Hispanorum. The standardization of feasts and the transition from a local to the Roman liturgical calendar was, for some Spanish cathedrals, a gradual process. A 1577 entry in the Calahorra Cathedral libro de fabrica, for example, lists the important feasts of the year, but it excludes the Visitation, Presentation, and the feast of the Snows, while including the Expectation.21

All the Roman Marian feasts held the duplex rank—the Assumption and the Nativity also carried an octave—making the use of polyphonic music appropriate, especially at Mass and Vespers. Although information on how polyphony was used in Spanish churches during this period is minimal, the surviving polyphonic music and related ceremonial documents do provide some useful information. An examination of Esquivel’s polyphonic music for Marian Vespers in the context of extant documentation from the cathedrals in Oviedo, Calahorra, and Ciudad Rodrigo, the rubrics of the Clementine breviary of 1602, and other competing Spanish settings offers a clearer picture of how one composer provided music for Marian devotion that conformed to the Tridentine liturgy while consciously maintaining a close connection to pre-Tridentine Spanish compositional traditions.

---

21 LF CA 193, ff. 101v–102v.
Music for Marian Vespers and Compline

Vespers was the most elaborate and most public office of the day. On special feasts a great deal of polyphony may have been expected for this service as well as Compline, which often followed immediately. The surviving Spanish repertoire reveals that the psalms, hymn, and Magnificat of Vespers, along with the seasonal Marian antiphon and Benedicamus of Compline were frequently set in polyphony, but surviving cathedral records do not offer enough data to conclude securely that all these items were regularly sung polyphonically in a single service. Many of these items were composed to be sung in alternatim style, a manner of performance that alternated verses of chant with polyphonic verses. Moreover, in Spain and other regions of Europe, the organ or instrumental group often played in place of the cantores during predetermined verses of those items sung in alternatim. A precise understanding of this performance practice is difficult, since when evidence exists, it is often cryptic and obviously intended as a reminder to those who already knew the performance traditions.

Juan de Esquivel’s Music for Marian Vespers

Juan de Esquivel provided a significant amount of music for Marian Vespers and Compline in his 1613 print. This mammoth volume, which also contains a set of six

---

22 The hymn Ave maris stella was used exclusively for Marian Vespers.


24 The Spanish term cantores will be used throughout to denote the professional singers who were responsible for singing polyphony, in order to distinguish them from the coro, who were the minimally trained choir of canons and clergy nominally responsible for chanting the liturgy.

25 For a full description of this source see Chapter 1.
Masses and items for the Officium defunctorum, includes all of the polyphonic music that may have been expected for a Marian Vespers at the Ciudad Rodrigo Cathedral. The first part of the collection is a set of eight four-voice psalms and a setting of the Compline canticle Nunc dimittis. Although this set seems incomplete, Snow determined that the psalms actually represented a complete collection of the first, third, and fifth psalms sung at Vespers I on Sundays and feasts of duplex rank. These include the psalms Dixit Dominus, Beatus vir, and Lauda Jerusalem, which are sung at all the principal Marian feasts. The lack of settings for the second and fourth psalms suggests that these were regularly sung monophonically, or to falsobordone formulas.

Esquivel followed the psalm set with a collection of thirty Vespers hymns for feasts of duplex rank, although the final item, Te lucis ante terminum (To Thee before the close of day), is actually the hymn for Compline. The hymns are followed by a complete cycle of Magnificats for Vespers I and II along with a four-part setting of the Benedicamus Domino. This in turn is followed by the four seasonal Marian antiphons for use at Compline, a setting of the Te Deum, the Benedictus or “Canticle of Zachary” for use at Lauds, the antiphons Vidi aquam and Asperges me for use at Mass, and a motet that could be used for any saint’s feast. The balance of the print consists of the Missarum tomus secundus and a collection of items for the dead. Drawing only from this

---

26 The 1613 collection is unusual among printed collections in its combination of music for different uses. The title, however, offers evidence that it is a collation of three pre-existing books that were most likely in manuscript form before 1613. Vincente Espinel’s approbation on the first page of the collection refers to his examination of “three collections of music composed by Juan de Esquivel Barahona [tres cuerpos de Musica compuesto por Juan de Esquivel Barahona].” and Antonio Sánchez Cabañas, listing Esquivel’s publications, says, “and another large [book] that contains three volumes, the first of falsobordones, the second of hymns, the third of Magnificats and Masses [y otro grande que contiene tres tomos el primero de fabordones el segundo de hymnos el tercero de magníficas y misas].” Sánchez Cabañas, 1709, f. 18v.


28 Sánchez Cabañas, 1709, f. 18v.

29 For a description of the contents and transcription of the items pro defunctis, see O’Connor, “The 1608 and 1613 Requiem Masses.”
collection and assuming that only the first, third, and fifth psalms were traditionally sung polyphonically, the Ciudad Rodrigo Cathedral chapter was able to celebrate Vespers on Marian feasts with polyphonic music completely composed by Esquivel.

**Marian Antiphons for Compline**

Pius V’s reformed *Breviarium Romanum* of 1568 extended to all the Church a seasonal cycle of Marian antiphons to be sung after Compline (see Table 2.1).\(^{30}\)

**Table 2.1:** Seasonal schedule for the singing of Marian antiphons according to the Tridentine breviary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>Season</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Alma Redemptoris mater</em></td>
<td>Vespers I of Saturday before Advent I to Vespers II of Purification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ave Regina cælorum</em></td>
<td>Compline of Purification to None of Holy Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Regina cæli</em></td>
<td>Compline of Holy Saturday to None of Saturday after Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salve Regina</em></td>
<td>Vespers I of Holy Trinity to None of Saturday before Advent I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before the acceptance of the Roman Rite, however, many Spanish churches had only sung the *Salve Regina* after Compline.\(^{31}\) Even after the installation of the new liturgy, the Spanish tradition of singing the *Salve* antiphon during Lent was especially strong,

---


persisting in some churches well into the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{32} With this reliance on the \textit{Salve Regina} antiphon there was little need for polyphonic settings of the other three principal Marian antiphons in most Spanish cathedrals. This situation is reflected in the lack of Marian antiphon cycles by Spanish composers before 1575.\textsuperscript{33}

Esquivel entered the Church just before most Spanish cathedrals had accepted the Tridentine reforms, but his first compositions were worked out during the early years of the new liturgy. His enthusiasm for the Tridentine reforms is evident in his publication of a complete cycle of Marian antiphons for the liturgical year, joining Guerrero, Victoria, and Juan Navarro as the only Spanish composers to do so. Although Esquivel’s antiphons were certified to be in accordance with the Roman liturgy with regard to text, vestiges of older Spanish traditions manifest themselves in his use of local variants of the \textit{Salve Regina}, \textit{Ave Regina cœlorum}, and \textit{Regina cœli} and his musical references to settings by those composers he admired. A survey of these antiphons reveals how Esquivel integrated his zeal for the reforms of the post-Tridentine era with a desire to maintain traditional Spanish practices and pay homage to those composers whom he admired from the previous generation.

\textit{Salve Regina}

The most popular of the four Marian antiphons in Spain, and indeed in many parts of Europe, was \textit{Salve Regina}.\textsuperscript{34} The antiphon’s origin remains unknown, but it may have originated during the late eleventh century, when Mary’s role as merciful advocate for

\textsuperscript{32} Snow points to the pre-Tridentine breviaries of Jaén and Santiago de Compostela that sang several antiphons throughout the year, but sang \textit{Salve Regina} during Lent. Snow, \textit{A New-World Collection}, 67.

\textsuperscript{33} The date 1575 is significant, as the Seville Cathedral voted on 7 January of that year to accept the Roman Rite in that cathedral. The Sevillian decision was followed immediately by many cathedrals in Spain and Latin America that regularly followed the lead of Seville. Snow, \textit{A New-World Collection}, 13, 68.

\textsuperscript{34} For a comprehensive relation of the history of the antiphon and its use as a cantus firmus in Renaissance music, see Ingram, but also see Johannes Maier, \textit{Studien zur Geschichte der Marienantiphon Salve Regina} (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1939).
humanity was becoming defined. Moreover, the Saturday Marian devotion also
developed during this time, a situation that likely explains the widespread singing of
Salve Regina during that devotion. Huglo and Halmo, however, point to the literary style
and devotional sentiments of the text and propose that the antiphon may have been
composed as late as the early twelfth century. This corresponds with the earliest known
eample, which dates to the 1150s.35

The mode 1 melody and text of the Salve Regina antiphon remained relatively
intact to the sixteenth century, with only minor variations to each. Both were
standardized in the Breviarum Romanum of 1569, but in Spain melodic and textual
variants continued until well after 1575. Textually, the principal pre-Tridentine variants
(Table 2.2) include the omission of “et” in v. 2 and the addition of “semper” in v. 7b, the
exclusion of both words, and the inclusion of both words.36

Table 2.2: The Tridentine form of the Salve Regina with verse numbers. Spanish
variations, including the deletion of “et,” indicated by parentheses, and the addition of
“semper,” indicated in brackets, are included here.

1. Salve Regina, mater misericordiæ.
2. Vita, dulcedo, (et) spes nostra, salve.
3. Ad te clamamus, exules, filii Hevæ.
4. Ad te suspiramus, gementes et flentes in hac lacrimarum valle.
5. Eia ergo, Advocata nostra, illos tuos misericordes oculos ad nos converte.
6a. Et Jesum benedictum fructum ventris tui, 6b. Nobis post hoc, exsilium
ostende.

35 Michel Huglo and Joan Halmo, “Antiphon, §5(v): Marian Antiphons,” in The
New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, second edition, ed. Stanley Sadie and
John Tyrrell (London: Macmillan, 2001), 1: 745–47; and Jeannine S. Ingram and Keith

36 The numbering of verses follows Snow, rather than the traditional nine-verse
system. Snow groups verses by complete sentence, rather than by poetic line, dividing
traditional verses 6–9 as 6a–b and 7a–b. Snow, A New-World Collection, 75.
Among the chant sources from Toledo (1515), Saragossa (1548), Seville (1565), Mexico City (1584), and Grenada (no date) surveyed by Snow, only one, Toledo, includes the two possible textual variants from the Tridentine version. The only other variant reading of the text is the Sevillian source that adds “semper” to v. 7b, a situation that is also reflected in the polyphonic settings from that area.

A clearer picture of textual variation appears when the cantus firmi of polyphonic settings are included in the survey. The known polyphonic settings are shown in Table 2.3. A survey of the Renaissance settings of *Salve Regina* by Spaniards reveals that those composers who worked primarily in Italy, along with those who composed settings after 1575, naturally set the Tridentine text. The variations occur in those settings composed in Spain before the promulgation of the Pius V breviary in that country. The largest number of variant settings include both “et” and “semper.” These include settings by Juan de Anchieta, Pedro de Escobar, Pedro Fernández de Castilleja (c. 1480–1574), Diego Ortiz (c. 1510–c. 1570), and Francisco Guerrero. The antiquity of most of these compositions suggests that the practice of adding “semper” to v. 7b predated the removal of “et” from v. 2.
Table 2.3: Polyphonic settings of *Salve Regina* by Spanish and Latin American composers between 1500 and 1630. Text variants: (1) “semper” added to v. 7b and “et” omitted from v. 2; (2) “et” omitted from v. 2; (3) “semper” added to v. 7b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Text var.</th>
<th>Alternatim var.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Anchieta</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>c. 1500–25</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>v. 6b poly; v. 7a “O pia” chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro de Escobar</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>c. 1500–25</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>v. 5 poly; v. 7a “O pia” chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernand Pérez de Medina</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>c. 1500–24</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>n/a³⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Ponce</td>
<td>3vv</td>
<td>c. 1500–20</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>v. 7a “O pia” chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Fernández de Castilleja</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>c. 1525–50</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>v. 7a “O pia” chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristóbal de Morales</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>c. 1535–37</td>
<td>Full-text</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristóbal de Morales</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>c. 1550</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo de Ceballos</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>c. 1550–1553</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Guerrero</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>Full-text</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Alternatim</em> in GuatC 4, odd vv. in polyphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous BarBC 1967</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>1540–1560</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>n/a³⁸</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³⁷ The *Salve Regina* setting by Fernand Pérez de Medina survives only in a manuscript at the Seville Cathedral (SevC 5-5-20). V. 6a is reproduced in Robert M. Stevenson, *Spanish Music in the Age of Columbus* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960): 182. The remainder was not available for this study.

³⁸ The manuscripts BarcBC 1166 and 1967 taken together form what José María Llorens named the *Cançoner de Gandía*. Nelson rejects this title based on her proposed origin for the manuscripts and has suggested a revised foliation as a single manuscript. Bernadette Nelson, “The Court of Don Fernando de Aragón, Duke of Calabria in Valencia, c. 1526–c. 1550: Music, Letters and the Meaning of Cultures,” *Early Music* 32/2 (May 2004), 206–13. The settings of these antiphons were not available for this study.
Table 2.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Text var.</th>
<th>Alternatim var.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diego Ortiz</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>Full-text</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Ortiz</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>Full-text</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Guerrero</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>\textit{Alternatim}</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{39}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melchor Robledo</td>
<td>6vv</td>
<td>c. 1566–86</td>
<td>\textit{Alternatim}</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 6b poly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melchor Robledo</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>c. 1566–86</td>
<td>\textit{Alternatim}</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria</td>
<td>6vv</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Full-text</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>\textit{Alternatim}</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 6b poly, v. 7a “O clemens” chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria</td>
<td>8vv\textsuperscript{40}</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Full-text</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando de las Infantas</td>
<td>4vv (i)</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>n/a\textsuperscript{41}</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando de las Infantas</td>
<td>4vv (ii)</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>\textit{Alternatim}</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{39} Guerrero altered the text of his four-voice motet to adhere to the Roman Rite and republished the setting in 1584.

\textsuperscript{40} Victoria’s eight-voice \textit{Salve Regina} is set for two choirs with organ \textit{basso seguente}.

\textsuperscript{41} Infantas’s two settings of \textit{Salve Regina} were published in \textit{Don Fernandi de las Infantas, patritii cordubensis Sacrarum varii styli Cantionum tituli Spiritus sancti, Liber primus cum quatuor vocibus} (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1578) and were not available for this study. The \textit{alternatim} nature of (ii) is suggested by the changes in vocal texture for each parte listed in José María Lloréns Cistero, “La música española en la segunda mitad del siglo XVI: Polifonía, música instrumental, tratadistas,” in \textit{España en la música de occidente}, ed. Emilio Casares Rodicio, Ismael Fernández de la Cuesta, and José López-Calvo, 189–287 (Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, Instituto Nacional de las Artes Escénicas y de la Música, 1987).
Table 2.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Final Text var.</th>
<th>Alternatim var.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mateo Flecha, the Younger</td>
<td>n/a(^{42})</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>Full-text</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicosia Zorita</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>n/a(^{43})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrés de Villalar</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>c. 1567–93</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>n/a(^{44})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando Franco</td>
<td>4vv (i)</td>
<td>c. 1575–84</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>v. 6b poly, v. 7a chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando Franco</td>
<td>4vv (ii)</td>
<td>c. 1575–84</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D 1</td>
<td>v. 6b poly, v. 7a chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando Franco</td>
<td>4vv (iii)</td>
<td>c. 1575–84</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D 1</td>
<td>v. 6b poly, v. 7a chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando Franco</td>
<td>4vv (iv)</td>
<td>c. 1575–84</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D 1</td>
<td>v. 6b poly, v. 7a chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando Franco</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>c. 1575–84</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D 1</td>
<td>2 alt. versions of v. 6a–b, v. 7a chant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{42}\) Flecha’s *Salve Regina* setting appeared in his *Divinarum Completarum Psalmi, Lectio Brevis et Salve Regina, cum Aliquibus Motetis* (Prague: Jorge Negrino, 1581), which survives only in three partbooks at the University of Warsaw Library (WarU SDM 103), two of which are fragmentary, and was not available for this study. Stevenson, “Spanish Polyphonists,” 37.

\(^{43}\) The five-voice *Salve Regina* by Zorita survives only in a manuscript at the Saragossa Cathedral (SaraP 34). In addition, a solitary setting of v. 2 of *Salve Regina* appeared in Nicosia Zorita’s *Liber primus . . . Motectorum quae partim quaternis, partim quinis vocibus concinantur* (Barcelona: Humbert Gotard, 1584), which survives in only three partbooks, the superius and altus books at Segorbe Cathedral and the bassus book at Bogotá Cathedral in Colombia. Neither work was available for this study.

\(^{44}\) The *Salve Regina* by Andrés de Villalar exists only as a fragment (v. 6a) in the Diego Sánchez Codex in Vallodolid (VallaP s.s.) and was not available for this study.
Table 2.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Final Text var.</th>
<th>Alternatim var.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebastián Raval</td>
<td>6vv</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Bermúdez</td>
<td>4vv (i)</td>
<td>c. 1597–1602</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Bermúdez</td>
<td>4vv (ii)</td>
<td>c. 1597–1602</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Bermúdez</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>c. 1597–1602</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Bermúdez</td>
<td>6vv</td>
<td>c. 1597–1602</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Navarro</td>
<td>4vv–6vv</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous GuatC 4</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>c. 1602</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Esquivel</td>
<td>4vv–5vv</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>v. 7b expands to 5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Navarro</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Alternatim</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>alt. 3vv poly for v. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastián López de Velasco</td>
<td>8vv</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Full-text</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45 The six-voice *Salve Regina* by Sebastián Raval was published in his *Cantus motectarum quinque vocum . . . Liber primus* (Rome: Francisco Coattino, 1593), a collection that, despite the title’s claim, contains works for four, five, six, and seven voices. Only the cantus and tenor partbooks survive (Conservatorio di Musica Santa Cecila, Rome). These were not available for this study.

46 López’s eight-voice *Salve Regina* is set for two choirs.
The continuation of the practice in Guerrero and Ortiz suggests that these composers were constructing their settings on older chant sources, a plausible conclusion considering the Salves of both composers were associated with the chapels of local noblemen, rather than cathedrals.47

The second textual group among the Spanish polyphonic settings is formed by those that omit “et” in v. 2 and include “semper” in v. 7b. This variant appears in settings by Morales (5vv), Guerrero (1570), and two settings in the seventeenth-century Guatemala Cathedral manuscript (GuatC 4)48: one anonymous and one by Hernando Franco (1532–1585), who was the maestro de capilla at the Guatemala Cathedral from 1570 to 1575.49 These settings suggest a connection to Seville and that city’s well-known influence over New World churches.50 The final variant, which omits both “et” and “semper,” can only be explained as a Sevillian “first-step” towards adherence to the Roman text by discontinuing the use of “semper” in v. 7b. Morales (4vv setting), Juan Navarro, and Rodrigo de Ceballos (c. 1525/30–1581), all have close connections to Seville, and Pedro

47 Ortiz was in the service of the Fernando Alvarez de Toledo, the Third Duke of Alba and Spanish Viceroy of Naples (r. 1556–1558). Guerrero’s 1555 collection of Sacrae cantiones was dedicated to Luis Cristóbal de León, the Duke of Arcos (1518–73) and father to Esquivel’s patron bishop, Pedro Ponce de León. The five elaborate partbooks published by Martín de Montedesca of Seville suggest that they were intended for use in a small noble chapel. Stevenson, “Francisco Guerrero (1528–1599), 60.

48 Guatemala Cathedral, Archivo Capitular, Music MS 4.

49 Snow, A New-World Collection, 11.

50 Among the works in this group is Morales’s five-voice Salve Regina, which survives only in mss. VatS 17, ToleBC 17, and SevBC 1. The text of SevBC 1 places this work into the Sevillian text group, but the earliest source is Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Capella Sistina MS 17 (VatS 17), which dates from c. 1535–37, around the time when Morales joined the Papal Chapel. Higinio Anglés, who edited the work for Monumentos de la Música Española, was unable to consult this copy and left no critical comment that would indicate that Morales’s Salve featured a Roman version of the text.
Bermudez (c. 1558–c. 1605) was also an Andalusian, who served as Guatemala Cathedral maestro from 1598 to 1603.

The melody of the *Salve Regina* varied noticeably from diocese to diocese in Spain. Snow’s comparison of *Salve* chants from Toledo, Saragossa, Seville, Mexico City, and Granada reveals that the differences occur principally during the short melismas that appear in each verse and other ornamental figures.\(^{51}\) The Spanish versions of the *Salve* chant bear a resemblance to the Roman chant, but several distinctive differences appear. The most apparent of these occurs at the ends of each verse, where the Roman chant rises to the final from a step below, while most of the Spanish chants descend to the final from a step above (E\(_3\)–D\(_3\)). In addition, the opening phrases of vv. 3–4, and 6a–7b of the Spanish chant contrast the Roman chant’s rising thirds with an upper-neighbor figure and stepwise descent to the final. Ex. 2.1 compares the Roman chant with a Toledan chant from 1515. Although the Roman and Spanish *Salve* chants are related, an examination of the cantus firmi in Spanish polyphonic settings reveals that Spanish clergy chose to continue using local chant melodies for nearly a half century after the Roman Rite was accepted in most of Spain.\(^{52}\) For Spanish churches, the preservation of local chant melodies was a legitimate means of retaining a measure of local liturgical identity within the universal Roman Rite.


\(^{52}\) The practice of combining local chant melodies and Roman Rite texts in a cantus firmus is also apparent in the *Missa pro defunctis*. See Michael O’Connor, “Death and Tradition: The Two Requiem Masses of Juan Esquivel,” *Yearbook of the Alamire Foundation* 4 (2000), 433–45.
Ex. 2.1: Comparison of Roman⁵³ and Spanish⁵⁴ *Salve Regina* chants.

⁵³ *Liber Usualis*, 276.

⁵⁴ *Intonarium Toletanum* (Alcalá de Henares: Arnao Guillén de Brocar, 1515), ff.
Ex. 2.1 (continued)

Ex. 2.1 (continued)

The Polyphonic Salve Regina in Spain

Esquivel’s polyphonic Salve Regina was composed in the alternatim approach that had been popular in Spain since the late fifteenth century. It conforms to the standard alternatim pattern found in most of the Spanish settings, providing polyphony for vv. 2, 4, 6a, and 7a–b. Indeed, the practice of setting the antiphon in this manner dates to the earliest known polyphonic settings in the Trent Codices. Northern composers, however, also composed a significant number of works that set the full text of the antiphon in

---

55 For a full transcription of Esquivel’s Salve Regina, see Appendix D.

polyphony, often in a manner that organizes the text into a three-part arrangement.\(^{57}\)
Although several Spaniards set the entire text of the antiphon, the vast majority of Spanish examples appear in *alternatim* with polyphony for only verses 2, 4, 6a, and 7a–b, leaving verses 1, 3, 5, and 6b to be sung monophonically. The desire to create *alternatim* settings of the *Salve Regina* certainly originated in the transfer of an antiphonal monophonic tradition that is also evident in the majority of polyphonic *Magnificats* and hymns.

There was also variation within the tradition of *alternatim* composition in Spain. These variants, with one exception, occur in vv. 6a–b and 7a–b. The one exception is actually one of the earliest settings of the antiphon in Spain. Along with the even verses Pedro de Escobar (c. 1465–after 1535) set the final phrase of v. 5, starting with “illos tuos.”\(^{58}\) The most common variant among the Spanish settings, however, is the provision of polyphony for v. 6b. This practice appears in the setting by Melchor Robledo (c. 1510–86) and in the four four-voice settings by Hernando Franco (1532–85).\(^{59}\) Juan de Anchieta (1462–1523)\(^{60}\) and Victoria, in his 1576 five-voice setting, set v. 6b polyphonically, but

\(^{57}\) In setting the full text of the antiphon, some northern composers constructed three-part structures in which verses 1–4 constituted part 1, verse 5 alone forms part 2, and verses 6–7 made part 3. Wagstaff attributes the few Spanish settings that employed this tripartite structure to the influence of Josquin’s five-voice *Salve Regina* of which the notable examples include the settings by Morales (5vv) and Guerrero (4vv). Victoria’s three full-text settings show some influence of this style, but they are not organized in a strictly tripartite manner. G. Grayson Wagstaff, “Mary’s Own: Josquin’s Five-Part *Salve Regina* and Marian Devotions in Spain,” *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 52/1 (2002), 3–34.


\(^{60}\) Anchieta’s *Salve Regina* appears in modern edition in Freis, 470–79.
these examples include other variations, as well. The only other common variant is the absence of polyphony for v. 7a, in whole or in part. The oldest Spanish settings of *Salve Regina* by Anchieta, Escobar, and Pedro Fernández de Castilleja (c. 1480–1574) leave “O pia” from v. 7a in chant, while Victoria’s 1576 setting leaves “O clemens” to chant. Franco’s four-voice settings are the only compositions that leave all of v. 7a to chant.

Spanish settings of the antiphon all retain the mode 1 character of the source chant, but while about half of the known settings retain the D final of the chant, the other half transpose the chant up a fourth to a G final. The transposed examples include both settings by Guerrero, the five-voice setting by Morales, all three settings by Victoria, and Esquivel’s setting. Spanish composers also tended to place the cantus firmus of the *Salve* in long note values in the uppermost voice of the polyphonic texture.

A significant number of Spanish settings of *Salve Regina* change texture by reducing or expanding the number of voices for particular verses. Most of the settings in which this occurs feature a reduction of the voices for either v. 4, 6a–b, or 7a–b. The variety of vocal textures that result from this practice suggests that composers understood that the changing of texture was traditional, but that particular verse and voice distribution allowed for variation. Indeed, Hernando Franco offered different three-voice scorings (SSA, ATB, SAT, ATT) for v. 6a–b in four of his five four-voice *Salve Regina* settings. Moreover, he provided three alternate scorings for the same section of his five-voice *Salve* (SSAT, ATB, SATB). The most changes of texture in a single setting occur in the four-voice, full-text setting of *Salve Regina* by Diego Ortiz (c. 1510–c. 1570). The composer first reduces v. 3 to three voices (SAT), and then, as if to answer the higher voices, he calls for ATB in v. 4. Ortiz then sets v. 5 to SSAT before returning to SATB for the remaining verses.

---


62 *Didaci Ortiz Toletani ... Musices liber primus hymnos, magnificas, salves, motecta, psalmos, aliaque diversa cantica complectens* (Venice: Antonio Gardano, 1565),
A few Spanish composers expanded the vocal texture for the final verse of the antiphon. Both the Escobar and Anchieta examples in TarazC 2 expand from four to five voices in v. 7b. Juan Navarro’s 1590 setting expands from four to six voices (SSATTB), also in v. 7b. Esquivel and Franco, however, expanded the texture in v. 7a.

**Juan de Esquivel’s *Salve Regina* á 4**

Esquivel’s setting of *Salve Regina* is certainly a product of the traditional Spanish practice. He sets vv. 2, 4, 6a, and 7a–b polyphonically, following the pattern of the majority of Spanish examples. He, like Juan Navarro, changed the vocal texture to SSAT texture for v. 4, but then expanded to SSATB in v. 7a. Esquivel’s awareness of tradition is evident in his placement of the cantus firmus in long note values in the superius for much of the composition. His preference for paraphrase, however, is evident throughout the work with chant motives appearing in each of the four voices, and in the case of v. 6a, shifting entirely to the bassus voice.

The chant source for Esquivel’s *Salve* was most likely unique to Ciudad Rodrigo, but it shares several important motives with other Spanish chants. The melody in v. 2, at ff. 117v–129. Microfilm of the original in the Civico museo bibliografico musicale, Bologna (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Library Photoduplication Service, 1973).

*Juan* Navarro’s *Psalmi, Hymni, ac Magnificat Totius Anni, Secundum ritum Sacntæ Romanae Ecclesiae, Quator, Quinque ac Sex vocibus concinendi. Necnon Beate semperq. Virg. Dei Genetricis Mariae, Diversorum Temporum Antiphonæ in fine Horarum dicendæ* (Rome: Jacob Torneri, 1590) was published posthumously. Much of Navarro’s music was composed during his time as maestro de capilla in Ávila (1564–66), Salamanca (1566–74), and Ciudad Rodrigo (1574–78). The illness he experienced in his final years in Placencia (1578–80) may have limited his production to revisions of his earlier works. See Stevenson, “Polyphonists in the Age of the Armada,” 68–82.

Franco’s five settings are not numbered in GuatC 4. He expands v. 7a in the setting that appears fifth in the manuscript. Snow, *A New-World Collection*, 421–34.

A complete transcription of Esquivel’s *Salve Regina* appears in Appendix D.
the text “et spes nostra,” however, is closer to the Roman version of the chant. Moreover, Esquivel highlights this new phrase with a point of imitation that is characterized by an anacrusis of two minims on “et spes.” The aural effect is a continuous string of “et spes” from the bassus upwards through all the voices. The composer presents four full iterations of the phrase “et spes nostra salve,” first as a duet in the altus and tenor, twice in rising imitation, then as cadential phrase at the end with the rhythmic motive in the superius and bassus set against counterpoint in the altus and tenor. Esquivel’s reason for repeating the text is not readily apparent, but the repetitions may have had a practical application. For many Spanish clergy, the addition of the word “et” to this phrase began only after the acceptance of the Tridentine breviary. Learning a slightly new version of the Salve Regina text may have been more than a minor inconvenience for some Spanish clergy. Esquivel’s repetitions of this phrase then may have been as much didactic as artistic. In v. 7b Esquivel abandons the chant entirely to offer his own homorhythmic setting of the text “O dulcis Virgo Maria.” The word “dulcis” is underlined with vertical harmony on the lowered sixth degree of the mode (E-flat), which appears frequently in the setting.

An unusual chromatic moment occurs in m. 19 between the tenor and superius causing the voices to move in parallel fourths. While not a direct contravention of contrapuntal rules of the time—Palestrina occasionally wrote in parallel fourths—both Zarlino and Lippius disapproved of the practice on the grounds that fourths were also perfect concords.66 What is unusual is Esquivel’s use of chromaticism to attain the parallel motion. The effect is certainly startling in this context, resembling the medieval double leading-tone cadence. The chromatic movement cannot be discounted as printer’s error, since this type of parallelism appears in a number of Esquivel’s compositions. Indeed the effect can be seen as a characteristic of the composer’s mature style. His Salve

*Regina* is slightly unusual in that these moments most often occur during the first moments of a work.\(^\text{67}\) Esquivel’s motive for using this antiquated voice leading is not yet fully understood, since his use of it does not always appear with the type of emotionally evocative texts that prompted his Italian contemporaries to turn to harmonic dissonance, and he rarely employs the device more than once in a composition.

**The Salve Service**

The Spanish tradition of singing *Salve Regina* after Compline extended to more than reciting the antiphon. An entire self-contained service had grown up around the *Salve*. These Salve services,\(^\text{68}\) as they are now known, first appear in the records of the Flemish church of St. Joris in Antwerp in 1340.\(^\text{69}\) Early records indicate that the devotion was held primarily on Saturdays and Marian feast days. The popularity of the service with noblemen and lay confraternities led to endowments of daily Salve services in several chapels in Brussels. The liturgy of the service varied widely from church to church, but by the late fifteenth century a complete service with orations, responses, antiphons, and Marian motets had grown up around the central *Salve Regina* text.\(^\text{70}\)

\(^{67}\) For a discussion of Esquivel’s use of consecutive parallel motion in the context of the Propers of his two *Missa pro defunctis* settings, see O’Connor, “The 1608 and 1613 Requiem Masses,” 61–97.

\(^{68}\) The Salve service has only recently attracted the attention of scholars. Important studies of the service in the Netherlands include Kristine K. Forney, “Music, Ritual and Patronage at the Church of Our Lady, Antwerp,” *Early Music History* 7 (1987), 1–57; and Barbara Helen Haagh, “Music, Liturgy, and Ceremony in Brussels, 1350–1500” (Ph.D, diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1988).

\(^{69}\) Haagh, 401.

\(^{70}\) Haagh, 398–99.
There is no clear evidence that points to when the Salve service arrived in Spain.\textsuperscript{71} Snow cites breviaries from Toledo, Seville, Saragossa, and Vich that include indications for the singing of the \textit{Salve} and certain accompanying prayers following the last oration of Compline.\textsuperscript{72} Borgerding points to the 1456 establishment of a Marian commemoration in Seville, but the first firm evidence of polyphonic performances comes from an endowment by Pedro de Toledo, Archbishop of Malaga, that provided for polyphony at the Saturday Salve service. Although the document is dated 1499, the archbishop stated that the practice of singing the Salve service with polyphony had been in place for fifteen years.\textsuperscript{73} The increased elaboration of the service in Seville must have been the impetus for the production of the early sixteenth-century manuscript SevC 5-5-20, containing four \textit{Salve Regina} settings and ten \textit{Motetes de la salve}.\textsuperscript{74} By 1587 the entire musical establishment of

\textsuperscript{71} The pioneering study of the structure of the Salve service in Spain and Latin America is Snow, \textit{A New-World Collection}, 65–78. Recent scholarship based on Snow’s work include Borgerding, 90–97; and Wagstaff, “Mary’s Own,” 3–34.

\textsuperscript{72} Snow, \textit{A New-World Collection}, 66–67.

\textsuperscript{73} Borgerding, 92. Borgerding reproduces the entire text of the endowment on 290–91.

\textsuperscript{74} The manuscript SevC 5-5-20 includes \textit{Salves} and motets by Fernand Pérez de Medina (fl. 1477–1524), Juan Ponce (c. 1476–after 1520), Juan de Anchieta (1462–1523), Martín de Rivafrecha (c. 1479–1528), Francisco de Peñalosa (c.1470–1528), and four anonymous items. The final two items listed in the index, \textit{Salves} by Pedro Escobar (c. 1465–after 1535), and Ribaflecha, do not actually appear there. Snow claims that the principal scribe of SevC 5-5-20 was also responsible for creating TarazC 2/3, which is also considered to have been copied in Seville. Snow, \textit{A New-World Collection}, 69, 73. Also see Emilio Ros-Fábregas, “The Manuscript Barcelona, Biblioteca de Catalunya, M. 454: Study and Edition in the Context of Iberian and Continental Manuscript Traditions” (Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1992), 1: 224–236. Ros-Fábregas concludes that the presence of predominantly Sevillian composers places the manuscript origins in Seville during the 1520s. For a summary of the relevant scholarship on this source, see Kenneth Kreitner, \textit{The Church Music of Fifteenth-Century Spain}, Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Music 2 (Woodbridge, England: Boydell Press, 2004), 140–53.
the cathedral, singers and instrumentalists, was involved in the weekly devotion. The music for these later sixteenth-century performances is preserved in SevBC 1. Copied in 1555, the manuscript includes seven polyphonic Salves, twenty motets, and three settings of the Deo dicamus gratia response that concluded the service. If SevC 5-5-20 is truly the first Sevillian manuscript devoted exclusively to music for the Salve service, then SevBC 1 reflects the polyphonic expansion of the service while updating the music to include contemporary composers.

The current understanding of the structure of the polyphonic Salve service in Spain is based on Snow’s initial reconstruction of the service from Spanish musical and liturgical sources (See Table 2.476). The outline of the service in Spain has been supported to a great degree by Borgerding’s analysis of the Seville Cathedral’s documentary evidence.77

Table 2.4: The Salve Service in Spain and Latin America. Polyphonic items identified in boldface.78

**Salve Regina** (usually in alternatim chant and polyphony)

Versicle: Ora pro nobis, sancta Dei Genitrix
Response: Ut digni efficiamur


---

75 The citation appears in Alonso Morgado’s *Historia de Sevilla* (Seville: Andrea Pescioni y Juan de Leon, 1587). Borgerding, 90–91.

76 Snow concludes that the Seville sources, in conjunction with evidence from breviaries from other regions of Europe, reveal an internationally accepted form for the Salve service by the second half of the sixteenth century. Snow, *A New-World Collection*, 73.

77 Borgerding, 90–97.

78 This outline is reproduced from Wagstaff, “Mary’s Own,” 5.
Response: Amen.

**Marian motet** appropriate to the season, feast, event, or in veneration of a painting or statue of the Virgin.

Versicle/Response and oration chosen according to the season or feast

Votive antiphon invoking St. Roch and/or St. Sebastian (possibly polyphonic)\(^7^9\)

Versicle and Response with oration depending on chosen antiphon

*Benedicamus Domino*

There is some evidence that Esquivel was responsible for providing music for Salve services.\(^8^0\) A line in the description of the *maestro’s* job in the Oviedo chapter statutes indicates that “he should provide music every Saturday at the Salves of Lent.”\(^8^1\) The term “Salve” here is used in a similar manner in the Sevillian documents to indicate the complete Salve service, so it is safe to assume that the Oviedo statutes refer to a similar, if not identical, service. The specific reference to Lent, however, suggests that the devotion was practiced only during that season, or that it was only celebrated with polyphony at that time. Moreover, when taken together with similar restrictions in the Sevillian documents, the requirement to provide music for the Saturday services also suggests that the Salve service in Spain was polyphonic only on Saturdays, even in the richly endowed Seville Cathedral. Beyond Oviedo, a manuscript book of *Salves* and motets is listed in the Calahorra Cathedral inventory from 1578. This book, which is no

\(^7^9\) The antiphons most commonly used in this context are *Ave, Roch sanctissime* and *Beatus es et bene tibi erit* (for St. Sebastian), a text that received several polyphonic settings. Snow, *A New-World Collection*, 73.

\(^8^0\) Snow, *A New-World Collection*, 65.

\(^8^1\) *Iten mas, sirua de musica todos los Sabbados á las Salues de Quaresma; AC OV, Libro de los estatutos y constituciones*, f. 15v.
longer extant, certainly shared the same purpose as SevC 5-5-20 and SevBC 1, in that it was copied as a source for Salve service music. 82 From his published collections, Esquivel could provide all the polyphonic music necessary for an elaborate Salve service at Ciudad Rodrigo. A potential Lenten Salve service at the Ciudad Rodrigo Cathedral during the early seventeenth century, featuring only polyphonic music by Esquivel, would include Esquivel’s Salve Regina á 5 (1613 print), the motet Sub tuum præsidium á 5 (1608 Motecta festerum), and the Benedicamus Domino á 4 (1613 print).

Alma Redemptoris Mater á 4

*Alma Redemptoris Mater* may be the oldest of the four principal Marian antiphons, dating possibly to the late ninth century, 83 but it was not widely sung in Spain before the late sixteenth century, except in the monasteries of the Franciscan Order. 84 This absence from Spanish breviaries certainly explains the complete lack of Spanish polyphonic settings from the earlier years of the Renaissance. The sole exception proves the rule. Andreas de Silva (c. 1487-after 1538) may have been of Spanish origin, but he spent his entire known career in Italy. 85 Aside from Silva’s setting, all the other examples were composed in conjunction with the Tridentine breviaries of Pius V and Clement VIII or by composers who held positions in Italian cities. Table 2.5 shows the dates of the antiphon publications and the cities in which those composers who were not working in Spain resided.

82 *Iten, otro libro de Salves y motetes enquadernado en pargamino*. LF CA 193, f. 103.

83 Hiley, 106.

84 Timothy Howard Thomas, “The Music of Juan Navarro Based on Pre-existent Musical Materials” (Ph.D. diss., University of Texas-Austin, 1990), 308

Table 2.5: Spanish Renaissance settings of *Alma Redemptoris Mater*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date of publication (location)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andreas de Silva</td>
<td>1532 (Rome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Ortiz</td>
<td>1565 (Naples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria (5vv)</td>
<td>1572 (Rome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando de las Infantas</td>
<td>1578 (Rome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria (8vv)</td>
<td>1581 (Rome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Guerrero</td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Navarro</td>
<td>1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastián Raval</td>
<td>1593 (Rome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Esquivel</td>
<td>1613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two most striking revelations of Table 2.5 are that only two Spanish composers who held positions in Spanish cathedrals published a setting of *Alma Redemptoris Mater* before Esquivel, and that Cristóbal de Morales was not among them.

In each of the settings the composer paraphrased the Roman chant, keeping the original mode 5 and F final for the polyphonic setting. The Spanish preference for setting a cantus firmus in unadorned, long note values in a single upper voice is seen most prominently in the Guerrero and Navarro settings, with Guerrero placing his chant melody in the uppermost voice and Navarro placing his in the *Cantus secundus*. Another similarity among the Spanish settings is that the characteristic opening melisma (Ex. 2.2) is acknowledged but not set fully to the first syllable. Rather the melisma is conflated with the first phrase of text, “Alma Redemptoris Mater.”

![Ex. 2.2: Opening melisma of *Alma Redemptoris Mater* chant.](image-url)
Esquivel approached the setting of *Alma Redemptoris Mater* in a similar manner to his setting of *Salve Regina*, by paraphrasing the antiphon chant with a concentration of phrases in the superius. He conflates the opening text and chant melisma, but he offers more of the melisma on the first syllable than any of the other Spanish settings (Ex. 2.3). To this he adds an original counterpoint in the altus and bassus. Esquivel, like other composers, could not resist the temptation to offer a musical “wink” at the word “cadenti” (Ex. 2.4). He offers more musical imagery on the text “surge genuisti populo,” by setting a rising figure that extends beyond the modal octave in each of the voices, and on the word “peccatorum,” which he emphasized with a modal shift that results from the added E-flats.

Ex. 2.3: Juan de Esquivel, *Alma Redemptoris Mater*, mm. 4–9.
Ex. 2.4: Juan de Esquivel, *Alma Redemptoris Mater*, mm. 28–32.

The single moment of homorhythm occurs at the text “Gabrielis ab ore sumens illud Ave” (You who received Gabriel’s greeting) as a bit of seasonal imagery (Ex. 2.5).

Ex. 2.5: Juan de Esquivel, *Alma Redemptoris Mater*, mm. 60–66.
**Ave Regina cœlorum**

The preference for the *Salve Regina* antiphon meant that few Spanish composers felt the need to set *Ave Regina cœlorum* polyphonically and, as in the case of *Alma Redemptoris Mater*, the few early sixteenth-century settings by Spaniards came from those who worked in Italy. The exceptions are the setting by Peñalosa in TarazC 2, and possibly Morales’s setting, which exists only in VallaP s.s., a manuscript dating from the second half of the sixteenth century. Table 2.6 provides a list of the Spanish settings before 1630.

**Table 2.6: Spanish Settings of Ave Regina cœlorum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francisco de Peñalosa</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas de Silva</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Ortiz</td>
<td>6vv</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando de las Infantas</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria (1572)</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria (1581)</td>
<td>8vv</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Guerrero (1584)</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Navarro (1590)</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonso Lobo (1602)</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Esquivel (1613)</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text of *Ave Regina cœlorum*, like that of *Alma Redemptoris Mater*, was most likely sung with psalm verses in its original form, which probably originated in the late

---

86 Silva also composed a motet that begins with the words “Ave Regina cœlorum,” but uses no more of the of antiphon text.
twelfth century. Although the antiphon is assigned to the Lenten season, its text is only mildly penitential. 

Ave Regina caelorum, Hail, Queen of heaven
Ave, Domina Angelorum: Hail, Mistress of the angels
Salve radix, salve porta, Hail root, hail gate,
Ex qua mundo lux est orta: through which light rose over the world.

Gaude Virgo gloriosa, Rejoice, glorious Virgin,
Super omnes speciosa: of unsurpassed beauty.
Vale, o valde decora, Go now, O most lovely one,
Et pro nobis Christum exora. and plead for us with Christ.

While H. T. Henry cites the sense of Mary’s role in the reopening of heaven to humanity in the third and fourth lines of the first stanza as the reason it was chosen for Lenten use, the general effect of the antiphon derives from the increasingly emphatic salutations (Ave, Salve, Gaude, Vale) to the Virgin. This escalation of greeting develops an increasing intensity of devotion, which is often matched musically in Renaissance settings.

The closest chant source for most of the Spanish polyphonic settings is found in a Processional used by the Hermits of St. Jerome, or the Hieronymites (Ex. 2.6). The order, founded by the Spaniard Pedro Fernández Pecha (1326–1402), was one of the most important religious communities in Spain during the sixteenth century. Philip II held the Hieronymites in such favor that he placed them in charge of the grand monastery-palace of San Lorenzo del Escorial. Since the order was centered in Spain, its liturgical sources tend to use chants of Spanish origin.

---

87 Huglo and Halmo, 747.

Among the Spanish settings, all but Peñalosa’s retain the mode 6 melody with B-flat in the signature. Esquivel broke from the Spanish traditional method of setting antiphon melodies clearly in long tones in an upper voice by thoroughly paraphrasing the source chant throughout all the voices. As with his approach to *Alma Redemptoris Mater*, he occasionally abandoned the source chant for a point of imitation of his own. The cantus firmus of Esquivel’s setting suggests that his source chant closely resembles Hieronymite chant, but his addition of new points of imitation, taken together with the highly paraphrased structure, allows only the conclusion that his source chant was similar to the Hieronymite example.

Esquivel’s music often reveals clear influences from earlier Spanish composers, and the setting of *Ave Regina cælorum* reveals his knowledge of a setting of the antiphon by Juan Navarro. Navarro was Esquivel’s first composition instructor, but few works by the student offer clear homage to his teacher. Rather, Esquivel’s inheritance from Navarro

---

**Ex. 2.6: Ave Regina Cælorum from 1569 Hieronymite Processional**

---

89 *Processionarium, Secundum Consuetudinem fratrem ordinis sancti Hieronymi* (Alcalá de Henares: Andrea de Angulo, 1569), f. 33v.
was a deep appreciation for Navarro’s own teacher, Cristóbal de Morales, whose influence is readily apparent in a number of Esquivel’s works. Navarro’s 1590 publication *Psalmi, Hymni, ac Magnificat Totius Anni, Secundum ritum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiae* may have inspired Esquivel also to publish a similar collection of Office music for the Roman Rite. The effect of Navarro’s setting of *Ave Regina cælorum* on Esquivel’s version appears in the number of voices, the use of a similar chant source, and the strategic placement of a few characteristic melodic-rhythmic figures that are common to only Navarro’s and Esquivel’s settings of this antiphon.

Both settings are composed for five voices and commence with an inner voice—Navarro’s in the tenor, Esquivel’s in the altus—in rhythmically close imitation (see Exx. 2.7a–b).

Ex. 2.7a: Juan Navarro, *Ave Regina cælorum*, mm. 1–6.

---

Esquivel offers a variation on Navarro’s entrances by inverting the starting pitches and placing the answering voice above rather than below the first voice. Like Navarro, Esquivel also repeats the opening statement. This adaptation of Navarro’s design suggests that Ave Regina cœlorum may have been an early work by Esquivel and that he was using his teacher’s example as a template for his own composition. Moreover, Ave Regina cœlorum offers no examples of the adventurous chromatic writing that appears in Salve Regina and the Tracts of his Missæ pro defunctis.

The most convincing connection between the two pieces, however, is a short melodic-rhythmic figure that appears in mm. 2–3 of Navarro’s tenor voice, and in m. 4 of the bassus, to the text “Regina cœlorum.” Esquivel reproduces this figure exactly to the same text in his superius II (see Exx. 2.7a–b). Another possible connection to Navarro’s work appears at the text “Gaude, Virgo gloriosa.” Navarro surrounds the source chant in

Ex. 2.7b: Juan de Esquivel, Ave Regina cœlorum, mm. 1–5.

13 (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1959), 132–36.
the tenor with a point of imitation based on the rising intervals of the chant. Esquivel’s own point of imitation at this point also treats “Gaude” to a dotted figure followed by a set of generally rising semiminims, but in a stretto-style entrance of the voices (see Exx. 2.8a–b). Esquivel, however, offers only a quick paraphrase of the chant in the superius I voice in mm. 47–49. Alonso Lobo was the only other Spanish composer to employ this natural polyphonic approach to the word “Gaude.” Lobo, however, does not prepare the semiminims with the same dotted minim-semiminim figures in the Navarro and Esquivel settings.

Ex. 2.8a: Juan Navarro, *Ave Regina cœlorum*, mm. 38–44.
Other borrowings are evident, such as a short paraphrase of the chant melody that Navarro placed in the bassus voice (See Exx. 2.9a–b). The act of emulation is evident from Esquivel’s placement of the chant paraphrase in the bassus voice at the same textual moment.

Ex. 2.8b: Juan de Esquivel, *Ave Regina cœlorum*, mm. 42–47.

Ex. 2.9a: Juan Navarro, *Ave Regina cœlorum*, bassus, mm. 55–58.

Ex. 2.9b: Juan de Esquivel, *Ave Regina cœlorum*, bassus, mm. 64–66.
Esquivel’s emulation of Navarro did not, however, extend to the use of a variant text of the antiphon that was favored, but not exclusively used, by Spaniards. Like the other Marian antiphons, the text of *Ave Regina cælorum* had remained mostly intact since its twelfth- or thirteenth-century origin, but one variant of the text that appeared in a number of Renaissance settings, even after the publication of the Tridentine breviary, is shown alongside the Tridentine version below; the lines where the variant text occurs are italicized:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant text</th>
<th>Tridentine text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave Regina cælorum,</td>
<td>Ave Regina cælorum,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave, Domina Angelorum,</td>
<td>Ave, Domina Angelorum,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salve radix sancta,</em></td>
<td><em>Salve radix, salve porta,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ex qua mundo lux est orta:</em></td>
<td><em>Ex qua mundo lux est orta:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gaude gloria</em>osa,*</td>
<td>Gaude Virgo gloria<em>osa,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Super omnes speciosa:</em></td>
<td>Super omnes speciosa:*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vale, valde decora,</em></td>
<td>Vale, o valde decora,*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Et pro nobis semper Christum exora.</em></td>
<td><em>Et pro nobis Christum exora.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variant text was popular throughout the century, with polyphonic settings spanning the years from DuFay to Victoria. It was particularly popular in Spain—of the Spanish composers listed in Table 2.6, only Peñalosa and Esquivel set the official Tridentine text—but the use of the variant does not appear to be a particularly Spanish tradition, nor is it an older form, since it appears as late as 1602 in Lobo’s setting. Esquivel’s use of the Tridentine text suggests that by 1613 the revised text had achieved widespread use in Spain. Moreover, Esquivel would have needed to use the Tridentine text in order to gain the certification of adherence to the Clement VIII breviary that appears in his 1613 print.

---

91 Henry, 149.
Regina cæli

The antiphon Regina cæli, like Ave Regina cælorum, probably originated in the late twelfth century with the modern melody appearing in the mid-thirteenth century. The text creates a syntonic strophe that relies on the accent rather than the length of the syllable as its pattern. Its assignment to the Easter season in Pius V’s breviary stems from its original use as a Magnificat antiphon for the octave of Easter and its “alleluia” refrain. This refrain, as a structurally unifying segment, undoubtedly made the antiphon popular with polyphonic composers.

Regina cæli was second only to Salve Regina as the most popular Marian antiphon text among Spanish composers, with at least twenty-one settings. As there was little need for polyphonic settings of the antiphon, most of the Spanish compositions were created for Italian institutions and employ the Roman chant melody as a cantus firmus (Table 2.7).

Table 2.7: Spanish polyphonic settings of Regina cæli.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Voice dist.</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Chant source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedro de Escobar (c. 1505–14)</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas de Silva (1535)</td>
<td>6vv</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas de Silva (1549)</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristóbal de Morales</td>
<td>6vv</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristóbal de Morales (1549)</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92 Falconer notes that, of the two melodies in the Liber Usualis, the more ornate melody on p. 275 is the older. The simpler melody on p. 278 was most likely composed in the seventeenth-century by Henri DuMont (1610–84). Kevin Falconer, “Regina cæli lætare,” in Grove Music Online ed. L. Macy http://www.grovemusic.com (Accessed 11 June 2006).


94 Morales’s six-voice Regina cæli exists only in VallaP s.s., a manuscript in which the earliest works were probably copied before 1550.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Voice dist.</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Chant source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cristóbal de Morales (1549)</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Guerrero (1555)</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo de Ceballos (c. 1557–60)</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Ortiz (1565)      95</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Ortiz (1565)                95</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Ortiz (1565)                95</td>
<td>7vv</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria (1572)</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria (1576)</td>
<td>8vv</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco de Montanos (c. 1575)</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrés de Villalar (c. 1567–93)</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando de las Infantas (1578)</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Roman?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Guerrero (1589)</td>
<td>8vv</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Navarro (1590)</td>
<td>6vv</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Raval (1593)</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Roman?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis de Aranda (1598)</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Spanish?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95 All three of Ortiz’s Regina cœli settings feature a second part on the text Resurrexit sicut dixit alleluia. Ora pro nobis Deum alleluia.

96 Only the bassus part of Montanos’s five-voice Regina cœli survives in VallaC 18; it was not available for this study. Since he worked exclusively in Vallodolid—at the cathedral and in the household of the Count of Lemos—he most likely used the Spanish antiphon chant.

97 Infantas’s Regina cœli was published in his 1578 Liber primus. The setting was not available for this study, but since his career was spent entirely in Rome, he presumably set the Roman chant melody.

98 Raval’s four-voice Regina cœli was published in his 1593 Cantus motectarum quinque vocum . . . Liber primus. The setting was not available for this study.

99 Aranda’s Regina cœli survives only in GranCR 5 and was not available for this study.
Table 2.7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Voice dist.</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Chant source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Esquivel (1613)</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spanish composers working in their native country used a particularly Spanish chant melody that, with a few minor variations, was remarkably uniform throughout the kingdom. Indeed, there is a clear similarity between the melody found in an early sixteenth-century Hieronymite processional from Seville and one transmitted in a late sixteenth-century antiphoner from Saragossa (Ex. 2.10).\textsuperscript{100} The melody bears almost no resemblance to the Roman version, except in that it is in mode 1. The use of a Spanish chant as cantus firmus in no way should be understood as a defiance of liturgical reform. The use of the Roman chant was not a requirement of the early Tridentine reforms, since the Pius V breviary contained only the texts of the antiphons and instructions on when to use them.

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Most Spanish composers placed the chant melody, whether Roman or Spanish, unadorned in the uppermost voice, in much the same way as they approached other chant-based polyphony.\(^{101}\) The exceptions include Navarro, who set his cantus firmus in the cantus II, and Guerrero, whose eight-voice setting has the cantus firmus in the altus II. Not all Spanish composers treated the *Regina caeli* chant in this traditional manner. Both Victoria and Esquivel, for example, created settings that paraphrased the chant throughout the texture, so that at times the cantus firmus is barely discernable. Most Spaniards preferred to transpose the chant to a final of F, although the Navarro and Guerrero (8vv) settings, published only one year apart, break with convention by transposing the chant to a G final. Four composers left the chant untransposed, and of these, only Esquivel was not Sevillian.

---

\(^{101}\) Spanish composers used cantus firmi in a similar way in their polyphonic Mass propers and settings of Matins for the Dead. The fidelity to the chant source, in contrast to the more liberal adaptations of some northern composers, was important to Spaniards. See G. Grayson Wagstaff, “Music for the Dead: Polyphonic Settings in the *Officium* and *Missa pro Defunctis* by Spanish and Latin American Composers Before 1630” (Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1995); and O’Connor, “The 1608 and 1613 Requiem Masses,” 61–97.
Of the four major Marian antiphons, only *Regina cœli* received canonic treatment by Spanish composers. The earliest example is found in Andreas de Silva’s six-voice setting, where the second contratenor and bassus are generated from the superius and tenor, respectively, at the lower octave (subdiapason).\(^{102}\) Morales may have encountered Silva’s work during his tenure with the Papal Chapel (1535–1545), or he may have also noticed that the chant melody allowed for canonic treatment.\(^{103}\) The use of canons in setting *Regina cœli*, however, was most likely a Roman practice. Morales’s two canonic settings of the antiphon use the Roman chant as cantus firmus.\(^{104}\) For his five-voice setting, Morales indicates that a *fuga in diapente* exists between the third (altus II) and first (cantus) voices. He employs the same interval for his six-voice setting, but this time the higher voice (cantus I) enters first, and the lower voice (cantus II) enters with a *Resolutio in subdiathesaron*.

Tradition and modernity intermingle in the opening of Esquivel’s antiphon setting. The composer nods to tradition by creating a clear cantus firmus, based on a variant of the Spanish chant in Ex. 2.10, in the superius voice (see Ex. 2.11). He contrasts the chant

---


\(^{103}\) A copy of Silva’s antiphon setting survives in Rome, Biblioteca Vaticana, Capella Sistina Cod. 46 (VatS 46), ff. 144v–148, which dates from the early sixteenth century.

melody with a chromatic point of imitation and some unconventional voice leading. The chromaticism of the point of imitation creates instability in an area where modal identity is usually most clearly established. The ambiguity arises as the tenor emphasizes the final D with an approach by leading tone, but then emphasizes G in the bassus in m. 2 through chromatic motion from F#. The tenor then immediately shifts the modal emphasis to A in the tenor in mm. 4–5, at the same time that the altus reestablishes mode 1 in m. 4. This latter move recalls the composer’s *Salve Regina* by creating clear parallel fourths between the tenor and altus (see Ex. 2.11).

Ex. 2.11: Juan de Esquivel, *Regina caeli*, mm. 1–8.

The foundation of the non-cadential chromaticism in *Regina caeli* arises from Esquivel’s desire always to raise the seventh degree of the modal octave when approaching the final (C# to D), even in non-cadential situations, a desire that may have been influenced by Guerrero’s popular setting of the work. The instability achieved by m. 3 may have prompted Esquivel’s use of a cautionary B-natural in the tenor to prevent the tenor singers
from singing B-flat, as the rules of musica ficta dictate. By including this voice leading in the first point of imitation, he may have felt the necessity to reproduce the intervals in the bassus and altus in order to stabilize the imitation. The parallel motion in m. 4 then comes as a sonic culmination of the semitone movement to that point, which is mostly abandoned afterwards in order to avoid tritones with the cantus firmus. The effect of the introduction is striking, but until more of Esquivel’s music is analyzed, this type of experimental harmonic approach can only be understood as a personal compositional trait of his mature style and a manifestation of late Renaissance mannerism.

**Hymn Cycles in Spain**

Esquivel’s cycle of Vespers hymns for the liturgical year was one of only four cycles committed to print by Spanish composers during the Renaissance. While the earliest identified polyphonic hymn cycle is credited to DuFay, dating from 1433–35, the earliest cycle of hymns by Spanish composers did not appear until the very late fifteenth century. Contained in TarazC 2 are sixteen hymns by four Spaniards and a northerner that outline a cycle from Christmas to All Saints. In addition, there are four hymns for the Commons of the Apostles, Martyrs (2), and Confessors. The composers of the TarazC 2 hymns include Pedro de Escobar (8), Alonso de Alba [Dalva] (6), Francisco de Peñalosa (4), Juan [Rodríguez] de Sanabria (1), and Juan de Urrede [=Johannes Wreede] (1). The

105 On the use of cautionary accidentals in Renaissance polyphony see Don Harrán, “New Evidence for *Musica Ficta*: The Cautionary Sign.” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 29/1 (Spring 1976), 77–98. Esquivel’s cautionary accidentals are retained in all musical examples and in the editions in Appendix D.


107 All of the TarazC 2 hymns were published in modern edition by Rudolf Gerber in *Spanisches Hymnar um 1500*, Das Chorwerk 60 (Wolfenbüttel: Möseler, 1957).

108 Johannes Wreede was a native of Bruges. Sometime after 1460 he entered the service of the Duke of Alba, García Alvarez de Toledo. From 1477 to 1482 he was
earliest hymn cycle by a single Spanish composer has only recently been revealed to have been composed by Cristóbal de Morales.\textsuperscript{109} While far from being a comprehensive cycle, the ten hymns found in Toledo, Biblioteca Capitular, Ms. B.25 (ToleBC 25) constitute an annual cycle from 25 October (Dedication of the Toledo Cathedral) to 29 June (SS Peter and Paul). Noone has shown that the hymns, all based on Toledan hymn melodies, were composed in 1545–46.\textsuperscript{110} In December 1565 Morales’s student Juan Navarro presented a manuscript book of thirty-three hymns to the Avila Cathedral.\textsuperscript{111} Navarro’s hymns, like Morales’s, concentrated on feast days of local importance. The first Spaniard to publish a hymn cycle was Diego Ortiz, who included a cycle of thirty-six hymns in his 1565 \textit{Musices liber primus}. With the standardization of the liturgy during the late sixteenth century, however, more Spaniards took up the challenge of composing hymn cycles with the expectation of wider Spanish distribution.\textsuperscript{112} In 1581 Victoria published thirty-two \textit{maestro de capilla} for Fernando’s Aragonese royal chapel. His setting of the hymn \textit{Pange lingua}, based on the Toledan melody, was widely disseminated.

\textsuperscript{109} Until 2002 there had been only a handful of hymn strophes in manuscripts credited to Morales. Michael Noone’s important work with ToleBC 25 and supporting documents from the Toledo Cathedral have revealed not only the brief hymn cycle of Morales but also a number of student works by Guerrero and unknown works by Lobo, Tejeda, and Miguel de Ambiela. Michael J. Noone, “Cristóbal de Morales in Toledo, 1545–6: ToleBC 25 and ‘New’ Works by Morales, Guerrero, Lobo, Tejeda, and Ambiela,” \textit{Early Music} 30/3 (August 2002), 341–63.

\textsuperscript{110} Noone, 359–61.

\textsuperscript{111} Navarro’s manuscript collection of hymns is preserved in an eighteenth-century manuscript, Avila Cathedral MS. 3 (AvilaC 3), which according to Gomez Pintor has been misnumbered and should be AvilaC 1. See María Asunción Gomez Pintor, \textit{Juan Navarro: Labor compositiva en Castilla y León: Estudio analítico de su producción himnódica en Ávila (1565)}, Música Española del Renacimiento, Section A, vol. 1 (Valladolid: Sociedad “V Centenario del Trabajo de Tordesillas,” 1994), 39–43. For transcriptions of all the items in AvilaC 3, see Thomas, 213–300.

\textsuperscript{112} The use of Spanish hymn melodies likely restricted the use of these publications to Spanish cathedrals.
hymns for the liturgical year, which were mostly reprinted in 1600. The need for hymns that conformed to the Tridentine liturgy is revealed in the fact that Guerrero reworked many of his earlier hymn compositions before publishing them as a cycle of twenty-six hymns in his *Liber vesperarum.* Navarro had begun a similar project for his Avila hymns, and these were published after his death.

Esquivel’s hymn cycle was one of many such collections created during the final phase of hymn cycle composition that lasted from c. 1590 to c. 1610. In Italy, the center of late Renaissance hymn production, the departure from cantus firmus settings in favor of freely composed works and the preference for publishing collections of music for a single Vespers service led to the decline of hymn cycles in the seventeenth century. This last period of Italian hymnody featured collections by Giaches de Wert, Pietro Pontio

---

113 Tomás Luis de Victoria, *Hymni totius anni secundum Sanctæ Romææ Ecclesiæ consuetudinem, qui quattuor concinuntur vocibus, una cum quattuor Psalmis, pro præcipuis festivitibus, qui octo vocibus modulantur* (Rome: Domenico Basa, 1581); and *Hymni totius anni iuxta ritum Sanctæ Romææ Ecclesiæ . . . in artem musices celeberrimo: nuper in lucem editi cum quattuor vocibus* (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1600). To the 1581 collection Victoria added a new setting of *Ave maris stella.*


115 The 1590 posthumous collection reveals that Navarro had not only reworked his 1565 hymns to accommodate the Tridentine texts but also offered additional polyphonic strophes. Only those hymns that were assigned to feasts of the Roman calendar were included.


117 Wert’s 127 hymns were never published, but they are found in a number of manuscripts from the Palatine Basilica of Santa Barbara in Mantua. Ian Fenlon, “Wert,

118 Plant, 239.


120 St. James is the patron saint of Spain, and the feast of Guardian Angels had not yet spread much beyond Spain’s borders. Snow, *The 1613 Print of Juan Esquivel Barahona*, 19.

121 Snow states that when Esquivel set strophe 1 of *Vexilla Regis* and strophe 5 of *Pange lingua*, he was following Spanish custom that emphasized these texts. Snow, *The 1613 Print of Juan Esquivel Barahona*, 19.
strophe, and the seventeenth-century practice of providing only one strophe of music, to be adapted as needed.\textsuperscript{122}

\textbf{Juan de Esquivel’s \textit{Ave maris stella} á 4}

The Clement VIII breviary assigns the hymn \textit{Ave maris stella} to Vespers I and II for all Marian feasts, the Common of the Blessed Virgin, the Saturday Marian devotion, and the “Little Office.” The sole exception was the Spanish feast of the Expectation. Since it was celebrated only a week before Christmas, the breviary assigns the Advent hymn \textit{Conditor alme siderum}.\textsuperscript{123} The hymn text consists of seven strophes of four lines, each in an unrhymed, accented pattern. The origin of \textit{Ave maris stella} is still unclear, but it belongs to the early part of the third major period of hymn composition that extended from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{124} The earliest manuscript source for the text is the ninth-century St. Gall Ms. \textit{Codex Sangallensis} 95 (SGallS 95).\textsuperscript{125} The quality of the hymn—and probably its unusual \textit{trochaic dimeter brachycataletic} meter\textsuperscript{126}—was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{122} Snow, The 1613 Print of Juan Esquivel Barahona, 19.
\item \textsuperscript{123} Breviarum Romanum (Madrid: Tomás Junta, 1620), Proprium Sanctorum Hispanorum, 8–9.
\item \textsuperscript{125} The earliest metric hymns were composed as early as the fourth century in an attempt to counter the Arian heresy, which used memorable songs for teaching purposes. Plant, 35.
\item \textsuperscript{126} Metric assignments for medieval Latin poetry came from the naming conventions of older Latin quantitative meter. \textit{Trochaic dimeter brachycataletic} meter results in three stressed-unstressed syllable pairs, similar to \textit{trochaic trimeter} in English poetry. Plant, 39–41.
\end{itemize}
sufficient to spare it from the humanistic revisions of the Urban VIII breviary of 1631, which attempted to bring medieval hymns into line with classical Latin metric forms.\textsuperscript{127}

The best-known melody for \textit{Ave maris stella} (\textit{LU} 1259) dates from the twelfth or thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{128} Spanish composers employed their own minor variant of this melody, but this too was subject to variation among the cathedrals of Spain.\textsuperscript{129} Ex. 2.12 presents the Roman chant source, followed by chants from Seville, Toledo, Saragossa, Victoria’s 1581 \textit{Hymni totius anni}, and the reduced cantus firmus of Esquivel’s 1613 setting. The Spanish version of the hymn melody bears a close resemblance to the Roman example, with variations occurring only in the first half. The variation that is common to all the Spanish variants except the Villanfranca melody is the “filled in” treatment of the third leap that appears in the Roman chant on the words “maris” and “mater.” Moreover, all of the available Spanish polyphonic settings include this feature in the cantus firmus. Except in the case of Esquivel’s cantus firmus, the short melisma on the word “stella” lacks the resolution to the reciting tone (A) of mode 1 in the Spanish chants. Finally the Spanish chants add an ornamental upper neighbor to the end of the word “alma.” Esquivel’s cantus firmus is probably a Ciudad Rodrigo variant of the Spanish hymn melody, and as with the Marian antiphon chants from that cathedral, Spanish and Roman traits emerge. For example, the ends of phrases recall the Roman melody, but the stepwise motion of “maris” and “stella” link the chant to the Spanish tradition.

\textsuperscript{127} Vincent A. Lenti, “Urban VIII and the Revision of the Latin Hymnal,” \textit{Sacred Music} 120/3 (Fall 1993), 32.

\textsuperscript{128} Glen Haydon, “\textit{Ave maris stella} from Apt to Avignon,” in \textit{Festschrift Bruno Stäblein zum 70. Geburtstag}, ed. Martin Ruhnke (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1967), 79.

\textsuperscript{129} The assessment of Spanish hymnody will be greatly enhanced upon the publication of Carmen J. Gutierrez’s volume of Spanish hymn sources in \textit{Monumenta monodica medii ævi}, vol. 10, \textit{Hymnen II} (Bärenreiter, in preparation).
Ex. 2.12: Comparison of Spanish and Roman melodies for *Ave maris stella*\(^{130}\)

\(^{130}\) (1) *Antiphonale Romanum*, Vatican edition 1912, chant reproduced in Francisco Guerrero, *Opera omnia*, vol. 12, *Himnos de Vísperas*, Monumentos de la Música Española 66, ed. José María Lloréns Cisteró (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2002), 220; (2) *Psalterium Toletanum* (uncatalogued manuscript copied by Martín Pérez, 1542), reproduced in Michael Noone, *Códice 25 de la Catedral de Toledo: polifonía de Morales, Guerrero, Ambiela, Boluda, Josquin, Lobo, Tejeda, Urede y anonimós* (Madrid: Editorial Alpuerto, 2003), 83; (3) Luís de Villanfranca, *Breve instrucción de canto llano ordenada por Luys de Villanfranca* (Seville: Sebastián de Trujillo, 1565), [no folios cited], transcribed in Guerrero, *Himnos de Vísperas*, 220; (4) [Saragossa] *Antiphonarium de sanctis . . .*, ff. 378–79; (5) Victoria included the first strophe melody for each of the hymns in *Thomæ Ludovici a Victoria, abulensis, Hymni totius anni secundum Sanctæ Romæ Ecclesie consuetudinem, qui quattuor concinitur vocibus, una cum quattuor Psalmis, pro præcipuis festivitibus, qui octo vocibus modulantur* (Rome: Domenico Basa, 1581); (6) the Esquivel cantus firmus is a reduction from the superius voice.
Ave maris stella was a popular hymn for Spanish composers, due to the frequency of its use in the Office and its rich, symbolic Marian content. Some eighteen settings have been identified in extant copies or in indices of lost music books (see Table 2.8).

Table 2.8: Spanish settings of the hymn Ave maris stella

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Polyphonic Strophes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedro de Escobar (i)</td>
<td>c. 1507–14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro de Escobar (ii)</td>
<td>c. 1507–14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melchior Robledo</td>
<td>c. 1542</td>
<td>4/4/5</td>
<td>2, 4, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Stiche</td>
<td>after 1546</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon [Stiche?] BarBC 1967</td>
<td>after 1546</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon. BarBC 681</td>
<td>c. 1500–50</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristóbal de Morales</td>
<td>1545–46</td>
<td>4/3/4/6</td>
<td>2, 4, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

131 No secure dating system has been applied to many of Escobar’s works, but the Sevillian origin of TarazC 2, his use of the Spanish hymn variant, and Seville’s intense devotion to the Virgin (see Chapter 4) suggest that he composed his Ave maris stella settings during his time as maestro de capilla at the cathedral in that city (1507–14).

132 Nelson, 213, suggests that the BarBC 1967 hymn may have been composed by Johannes Stiche [Valencian form = Joan Estich], who is credited with a setting of the first strophe of Ave maris stella in TarazC 5. The two strophes are a virtual musical concordance.

133 The anonymous BarBC 681 setting was not available for this study.

134 Morales’s Ave maris stella survives in ToleBC 25 after a number of Christmas works that he composed in December 1545 and just before his canticle for Purification, Lumen ad revelationem. Since Purification is a Marian feast, it may be assumed that Ave maris stella was a companion work, composed for the February 1546 festivities. Noone, 360–61, states that Morales also composed a separate setting of strophe 4, Monstra te esse, which was sung four times for Marian processions in Toledo, followed by Deo gracias. The high setting (SSSA), suggests that it may have been composed for the more skilled Toledan choirboys, or seises.
Table 2.8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Polyphonic Strophes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo Ceballos</td>
<td>1550–59</td>
<td>4/3/4</td>
<td>2, 4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Ortiz (i)</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>4/3/5</td>
<td>2, 4, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Ortiz (ii)</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>4/3/5</td>
<td>2, 4, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Guerrero</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>4/3/5</td>
<td>2, 4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Navarro</td>
<td>1565/90</td>
<td>4/3/5</td>
<td>2, 4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>4/3/4</td>
<td>2, 4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>4/3/4/4</td>
<td>1, 3, 5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonso Lobo</td>
<td>c. 1600</td>
<td>4/5/6</td>
<td>n/a(^{135})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastián de Vivanco</td>
<td>c. 1603</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginés Peréz de Parra</td>
<td>c. 1600–10</td>
<td>n/a(^{136})</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Esquivel</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8 reveals that most Spanish composers approached the setting of *Ave maris stella* in a similar manner as composers in other areas of Europe, especially Italy. Most composers tended to set the even-numbered strophes, although a number of settings provide additional polyphony for the doxology (strophe 7). Among Spanish composers,

\(^{135}\) No firm evidence of Lobo’s hymn is available at this time. Lloréns Cisteró cites a 1925 index by Felipe Rubio Figueras that places a setting by Lobo in ToleBC 22, ff. 47–51, along with nine other hymns by Lobo, but RISM A/II cites that only one hymn is present in this source. The information provided here is from José María Lloréns Cisteró, “La música española en la segunda mitad del siglo XVI: Polifonía, música instrumental, tratadistas,” in *España en la música de occidente*, ed. Emilio Casares Rodicio, Ismael Fernández de la Cuesta, and José López-Calvo (Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, Instituto Nacional de las Artes Escénicas y de la Música, 1987), 215. The date given assumes that Lobo composed this work while serving as maestro in Toledo.

\(^{136}\) The hymn setting by Peréz de Parra survives in Valencia Colegio y Seminario del Corpus Christi del Patriaraca ms. 20 (ValenP 20) and was not available for this study.
only Robledo and Morales set the doxology in addition to all the even strophes, although Ortiz provided polyphony for the doxology at the expense of strophe 6. Escobar, Vivanco, and Esquivel set only two strophes (2, 4). The “missing” strophes may have been sung monophonically or choirs may have been expected to adapt one of the polyphonic verses for the missing strophe. The question of whether music from earlier strophes was adapted to subsequent strophes is especially pertinent in regard to those settings that provided only one strophe, such as the two settings in BarBC 1967 or the Ávila collection by Navarro. If Snow is correct in suggesting that Esquivel’s approach represents a transition from multistrophe settings to the single-strophe settings of the seventeenth century, then perhaps the composer did expect singers to adapt strophe 6 to one of the two existing polyphonic strophes. Complicating the question is the tradition of instrumental playing on certain passages of alternatim performance. Perhaps strophe 6 was reserved for the organ or cathedral band at Ciudad Rodrigo. Unfortunately, documents that might have shed some light on this practice are no longer available.

Most Spanish composers varied the polyphonic texture of their hymn settings by reducing the number of voices for strophe 4 and then expanding the number for strophe 6 or 7. Neither Esquivel nor Vivanco altered the number of voices for their fourth strophes, but both composers did change the sonority of their works by introducing a second superius voice and silencing the bassus. Esquivel and Vivanco served cathedrals that were in close proximity and both composers had their works printed in Salamanca. The evidence found in the publication details and musical settings of the two composers suggests that Esquivel knew Vivanco’s work, and perhaps Vivanco also admired Esquivel’s abilities.\textsuperscript{137} The similar choice in texture change for the same strophe, which occurs in only these two compositions, belies coincidence. The case for the adaptation of the music for strophe 2 for strophe 6 is strengthened by the fact that both settings end with

\textsuperscript{137} See Chapter 4 for a comparison of the motet collections of Vivanco and Esquivel.
the altered scoring, SSAT, suggesting that strophe 6 should return to SATB. Effecting this adaptation is a simple matter, since the syllable count and accents are constant throughout the strophic hymn.¹³⁸ Not only is strophe 6 adaptable to the polyphony of strophe 1, but the texture may be expanded by improvising counterpoint in the superius II voice that appeared in strophe 4.¹³⁹

In three cases, composers treated the hymn melody canonically. Morales expands the texture of strophe 7 to six voices by adding a second *Tiple* (superius) voice, which generates a second altus in canon a fourth lower. Guerrero and Navarro employ canons in strophe 6, perhaps to underline the text “ut videntes Iesum semper collætemur” (so that in seeing [or finding] Jesus, we may always rejoice together), since the two “seeking” voices come together at the end. The difference in the canons lies only in the interval and voices involved; Navarro creates a canon at the octave between the cantus and its resolution in the tenor I, while Guerrero’s version creates an altus I resolution of the cantus a fourth below.

With few exceptions, Spanish polyphonic hymn composers and their counterparts in other regions of Europe placed the hymn melody in a single polyphonic voice in clear metric phrases.¹⁴⁰ The superius and tenor were the most frequent choices, but composers

---

¹³⁸ An edition of Esquivel’s *Ave maris stella* with the adapted polyphonic strophe can be seen in Appendix D. Only the final phrase of strophe 6 in the bassus requires a minor adjustment, since at this point in strophe 1, the bassus sings only the first two words of “Mutans Evæ nomen,” before singing the entire phrase.

¹³⁹ While the practice of improvising simple polyphony to a chant melody has been well documented, the practice of improvising new vocal parts to a composed polyphonic work during the Renaissance remains an area in need of investigation. See Margaret Bent, “‘Res facta’ and ‘Cantare super librum,’” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 36/3 (Autumn 1983), 371–91.

¹⁴⁰ Evidence strongly suggests that in Spain the monophonic strophes were also sung in rhythm. The topic of mensural chant in Spanish hymns is beyond the scope of this study, but see Bruno Turner, “Spanish Liturgical Hymns: A Matter of Time,” *Early Music* 23/3 (August 1995), 473–82.
often shifted the melody to another voice for an internal strophe. Victoria, for example, placed the melody in the tenor to commence his 1581 setting, but then shifted the cantus firmus to the superius for strophe 4 while reducing the texture to three voices (SAT). He then returned the melody to the tenor for strophe 6.

Although Esquivel preferred to paraphrase his chant melodies in a polyphonic fabric for his antiphon settings, he maintained the universal preference for a clear hymn setting in his *Ave maris stella*. His cantus firmus bears the occasional chromatic inflection, as do many other late Renaissance Spanish settings, but the melody appears very clearly in semibreves in the superius. He complemented the cantus firmus with a counterpoint of related points of imitation in the other voices, most often based on an inversion of the opening interval of the cantus firmus phrase, a technique employed by many others.

The chromaticism of Esquivel’s setting is sufficient evidence to conclude that *Ave maris stella* is a later work of the composer. As in his *Regina cœli* setting, he creates a characteristic parallel fourth motion near the opening of the work (Ex. 2.13). Again the stark vertical sonorities do not reinforce any emotional aspect of the text but create a double-leading tone cadence on G. As in his other works that feature this device, it is not recalled later in the composition.
Although Esquivel uses the double-leading tone figure only once, the work is chromatically adventurous in other ways. The most striking example occurs at the opening of strophe 4 with a chain of chromatic inflections that obscures the modal center by emphasizing D and then G before concluding with a clausula vera on A, the co-final of the mode (Ex. 2.14). No apparent musical imagery is created, leading to the conclusion that Esquivel was simply experimenting with the boundaries of modal identity and the possibilities of chromatic movement.

Ex. 2.13: Juan de Esquivel, *Ave maris stella*, strophe 2, mm. 1–5.
Juan de Esquivel, *Ave maris stella*, strophe 4, mm. 32–39.

Esquivel’s experiments with chromaticism must be seen as fundamentally different from the work of his contemporaries in Italy, such as Monteverdi and Marenzio, who were more concerned with the dramatic effects of dissonance and chromaticism. Rather, Esquivel’s music can be seen as manneristic in its exploration of chromatic effects for their own sake. Taking into account the years he worked and the location of Ciudad Rodrigo in the extreme western portion of Spain, he should be considered a musical colleague of early seventeenth-century Portuguese composers, who have been shown to experiment in similar types of manneristic chromaticism.\(^{141}\)

Finally, there is little evidence of emulation in Esquivel’s hymn setting, although his style certainly reveals his influences. The close of strophe 4 and its minor plagal cadence in an authentic mode, while not unusual for late Renaissance composers, is found in only one other setting of *Ave maris stella*. After a *clausula vera* on D, the modal final,

Juan Navarro offers a short minor plagal tag to the end of his setting of strophe 6 (Ex. 2.15a).

Ex. 2.15a: Juan Navarro, *Ave maris stella*, strophe 6, mm. 85–88.\(^\text{142}\)

Esquivel approaches the end of his fourth strophe in a similar manner, but rather than achieving the *clausua vera*, he offers an evaded cadence to B-flat that proceeds stepwise down to G in the tenor, retaining the B-flat in the altus and superius II to create a minor plagal extension (Ex. 2.15b). Esquivel often paid homage to his influences in subtle ways, and this may be just such an instance.

Institutional devotion to the Virgin Mary in Spain centered on the celebration of the Marian Office and Mass on each of a cycle of feast days that were regularized in Spanish churches upon the acceptance of the Tridentine Roman Rite during the late sixteenth century. The most significant change for many Spanish clergy was the installation of a seasonal cycle of Marian antiphons for use at Compline, replacing the practice of singing \textit{Salve Regina} exclusively.

Esquivel was one of only four Spanish composers to publish a complete cycle of Marian antiphons for Compline, and also one of four to publish a hymn cycle. These cycles began to appear in response to needs of Spanish musicians to provide music for the new liturgy. Surprisingly, Victoria was the sole member of the Spanish composers who spent their careers in Rome, where antiphons and hymns were sung seasonally, to have left complete cycles of antiphons and hymns. That the appearance of these cycles during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries strongly suggests that post-Tridentine liturgical needs were an important reason for their composition.
Esquivel’s music for Marian Vespers spans his entire career and reveals his knowledge of Spanish tradition as well as post-Tridentine reform. The works also offer insight into Esquivel’s approach to emulating those composers he admired most, from his obvious dependence on Navarro’s *Ave Regina cœlorum* to his passing references to Guerrero in the *Regina cæli* and Navarro in *Salve Regina*. This type of emulation must not be viewed as the derivative composition of an untalented composer, but as an expected process of emulation and intertextuality among composers of that era. Esquivel’s individual style is apparent in his approach to non-cadential chromaticism, which displays a manneristic use of the semitone.
CHAPTER 3

JUAN DE ESQUIVEL’S MARIAN MOTETS: SOURCES AND RITUAL FUNCTIONS

Juan de Esquivel served the Catholic Church during a time when composers and institutions were considering closely the role of the motet in the context of the liturgy. At the same time, contemporary documents reveal that motets continued to be used, as they had for most of the sixteenth century, during devotional activities and public processions. Taken together, the contents of the motet publications by Esquivel and his close contemporaries, along with institutional documents that reveal actual occasions on which motets were sung, offer insight into how motets were used to advance Tridentine reforms in early seventeenth-century Spanish churches. This reconciliation of tradition and reform is seen in the context of the Marian works through evidence that points to the practice of singing Marian motets during the Mass, processions, and the devotional Salve service.

Esquivel’s motets appeared in print towards the end of more than a century of Spanish Renaissance motet composition. His work reveals a deep respect for the music

of his predecessors and, through his choice of texts and occasional homage, draws inevitable comparisons to that substantial body of work. He most likely learned the craft as a choirboy under the tutelage of Juan Navarro in Ciudad Rodrigo, but his output also displays an intimate knowledge of the music of the previous generations of Spanish composers, including Morales, Guerrero, and Rodrigo de Ceballos, as well as his contemporaries Victoria and Vivanco.\(^2\) Esquivel’s connection to Morales certainly originated with his teacher, Navarro, who had studied composition with Morales while the two men were in the service of the Duke of Marchena (1549-51).\(^3\) Inventories of music books from Calahorra reveal that Esquivel also had access to the printed works of Morales, Guerrero, Victoria, and Josquin. \(^4\)
Establishing a chronology for Esquivel’s motets is difficult, since he left no manuscripts of his music and there are no records of specific performances of his works. Although cathedral sources indicate that his 1608 motet book was purchased by several institutions, no other mention is made of these works after their purchase. The survival of the manuscript copies of his motets that were made later in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, however, offers a hint that his music was considered important enough in some locations to preserve it well past the composer’s lifetime.5

Sources of the Motets

All but two of Esquivel’s extant motets were published in his Motecta festorum of 1608.6 Two other motets, O Sancte N[omite] á 4, a motet for any saint’s feast,7 and Surge propera amica mea á 3, were included in the 1613 collection. Since no index for the missing 1623 print reported by Sanchez-Cabañas has surfaced, it is impossible to know how many motets were included in that collection. In fact, only a marginal note in Sanchez-Cabañas’s history of Ciudad Rodrigo offers evidence that motets were a part of that collection.

Esquivel’s motet book was the first Spanish publication to provide festal designations for every item. He organized the works as closely as possible to the order of the Temporale and Sanctorale of the Church year.8 This connection between motet and liturgical feast was not an innovation of Esquivel, but by the time he published his

5 See Appendix B for current and historical inventories of Esquivel’s publications and surviving manuscript copies.

6 For a description of this source see Chapter 1.

7 While the title suggests that the motet might only be employed for a male saint’s feast, there can be little doubt that the word “Sancte” was changed to “Sancta” for female saints.

8 Due to the nature of moveable feast days, a strict organization is not possible.
collection, a clear need to reconcile the motet with the Tridentine liturgy had arisen. By systematically providing a book of motets that encompassed the major feasts and Sundays of the Church year in calendrical order, he sought to address this need. Esquivel’s intention to provide new music specifically for the Tridentine liturgy is underscored by the fact that the title page of his 1613 print claims that all the music contained in that volume was intended for “use with the reformed Roman Breviary of Pope Clement the Great.”

The connection between motet and liturgy appears in European collections as early as the 1530s. Borgerding points to a series of motet anthologies begun by Pierre Attaingnant in 1534 that offer motets that were loosely organized along events of the Church calendar. In Spain the gradual evolution from devotional to liturgical organization is illustrated in the successive publications by Francisco Guerrero. Of the thirty-two motets in his 1555 Sacrae cantiones, only three have festal designations and

---

9 The history of the motet as a means of promoting Tridentine liturgical reform is in its early stages, but for Spain see Borgerding, 10-60.

10 Esquivel’s inspirations for calendrical organization as well as a title no doubt came from two post-Tridentine Roman publications: Palestrina’s Motecta festorum totius anni cum Communi Sanctorum quaternis vocibus (Rome: Francisco Coattino, 1563), which was among the first motet books to follow a strictly calendrical ordering, and Victoria’s Motecta festorum totius anni, cum Communi Sanctorum (Rome: Domenico Basa, 1585).

11 Omnia ad usum Breviarii Romani per Clementem Pontificem Maximum reformati.

12 Borgerding, 11.

13 For a discussion of the move by Spanish composers from organizations that grouped motets according to voice numbers or devotional use towards those that indicated liturgical intentions for motets, see Borgerding, 10-59.
there is no sense of calendrical order. Rather, the ordering is first by voice number and then by devotional theme, reflecting the pre-Tridentine view of the motet as primarily a devotional genre. Guerrero’s subsequent publications, however, reveal a trend towards more specific festal designations and calendrical order. For example, twenty-seven of the thirty-eight motets of the 1570 Motteta have festal designations, and while the 1589 and 1597 books published by Vincentius have a lower percentage of designated motets, these books include a number of works that are unambiguously connected to Sanctorale feasts and complete cycles for Advent/Christmas and Lent/Holy Week. This gradual shift to a more liturgically oriented ordering in Guerrero’s publications coincides with his inclusion of a number of motet texts that reflect the change from the Sevillan liturgy to Roman Rite after 1575.

Esquivel’s 1608 motet collection is an example of the trend towards liturgical organization established by Palestrina, Victoria, and Guererro. He was among the first generation of Spanish composers to grow up in the post-conciliar Church, and his experience trying to work with pre-Tridentine sources in a reformed liturgy may have


15 Borgerding, 14-15.

16 Motteta Francisci Guererrr in Hispalensi Ecclesia musicorum præfecti que partim quaternis, partim quinis, alia senis, alia octonis concinuntur vocibus (Venice: Sons of Antonio Gardano, 1570); Motecta Francisci Guererrr in Hispalensi Ecclesia musicorum præfecti que partim quaternis, partim quinis, alia senis, alia octonis concinuntur vocibus. Liber secundus (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1589); Motecta Francisci Guererrr in Hispalensi Ecclesia musicorum præfecti, que partim quaternis, partim quinis, alia senis, alia octonis et duodenis concinuntur vocibus (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1597).

17 Since the Roman assignment of Gospel readings on certain feast days differed from the Sevillan Rite, Guerrero reassigned several of his motets based on Gospel texts. Borgerding, 34.
prompted him to create a collection of motets that other maestros could use in the confidence that the texts were in line with the Roman liturgy. He may have had an international market in mind for his work, since he avoided giving the collection a provincial character by including only two motets that could be closely connected to Spain.\(^{18}\)

Outside of Seville, the trend towards a closer association of motet texts to liturgical feasts is clearly seen in Esquivel’s 1608 *Motecta festorum* and Sebastián de Vivanco’s 1610 *Liber motectarum*. Both were printed in Salamanca by Taberniel and both have festal designations as well as some other more striking similarities. Each contains a total of seventy-two items, including the same number of Marian compositions (11),\(^{19}\) suggesting a consensus among Esquivel, Vivanco, and Taberniel regarding the appropriate number of items for a collection. Taberniel, the official printer of the University of Salamanca from c. 1603 to 1609,\(^{20}\) certainly knew Vivanco, who was a

\(^{18}\) These are the motets for Saints Ildephonsus and Lawrence. Ildephonus was archbishop of Toledo (657-667), and his *De virginitate perpetua sanctæ Mariae adversus tres infideles* was an influential document for supporters of the Immaculate Conception doctrine in Spain. Spanish legend relates that, in thanks for his defense of Mary’s perpetual virginity, she descended from Heaven and invested him with a holy chasuble. Esquivel’s motet, however, does not refer to the legend but offers a general devotional text that connects the saint and Virgin. Ciudad Rodrigo maintained a privileged altar for the saint where Requiems were recited each Monday for Esquivel and his parents (see Chapter 1). St. Lawrence was of particular importance to Philip II, who dedicated the Escorial (Real Monasterial de San Lorenzo) to the saint. See Appendix A for the complete index from the 1608 motet collection.

\(^{19}\) Based on the inclusion of the *Ave Maria* canon by Esquivel.

\(^{20}\) Artus Taberniel (=Arthur Tavernier) began his printing career in Antwerp in 1580. He immigrated to Salamanca sometime before 1606 the year he was named the official printer for the University of Salamanca. After his death in 1609, his widow oversaw the business until Taberniel’s son Hyacinthe (=Jacinto) was able to assume control in 1630. Sebástian de Vivanco, *Libro de motetes 1610*, ed. Dámaso García Fraile (Salamanca: Fundación Las Edades del Hombre, 2001), lxii–lxiii. An early document with information about the Tavernier family is an entry in *Biographie nationale*, ed.
prominent member of the university faculty, but there should be little doubt that Esquivel and Vivanco also knew each other. Ciudad Rodrigo lies only thirty-three kilometers from Salamanca, and one can easily imagine Esquivel making frequent trips to the larger city to oversee his publications or to recruit singers and instrumentalists. During these trips he undoubtedly made time to pay respects to an esteemed colleague.\footnote{There is no documentary evidence at present that reveals the relationship between the two composers, but their roles in the same archdiocese invariably put them in contact with each other. The connections between the two motet prints and Esquivel’s canonical approach to his 1613 Magnificats suggests at least an admiration on Esquivel’s part for Vivanco’s work.}

While the publications by Esquivel and Vivanco are remarkably similar, there are some important differences. One substantial difference is Esquivel’s integration of the Temporale and Sanctorale motets in a more strictly calendrical order. His organization begins with three items for Sundays and then proceeds with a motet for Easter, followed by a series of motets for Sanctorale feasts with the major Temporale feasts such as Pentecost, Trinity, Corpus Christi, Christmas, and Epiphany placed in their general locations. These are followed by motets for the Commons of the Saints, a Saturday Marian devotional motet, cycles for Advent, Lent, and Holy Week,\footnote{Esquivel’s cycle for Holy Week is incomplete, lacking a motet for Good Friday.} a general-use motet, and two motets for the dead. Vivanco’s book also begins with motets for general use on Sundays, but these are followed by motets for the Commons of the Saints, the dead, and then a loosely calendrical set of motets that includes a Lenten cycle, the Temporale feasts, and a few Sanctorale motets. The book closes with eight Marian motets, only two of which are assigned to particular feasts.
The Marian Motet Cycle

Esquivel’s Marian motet cycle is the natural result of the Tridentine trend towards festal designation, but it is unique among Spanish printed motet collections. Although Spanish composers frequently dealt with Marian topics in motet texts, Esquivel’s cycle is the only complete, designated collection of motets for all the principal Marian feasts. By assigning motets to specific feasts, the cycle broke with the few Spanish models that existed. In those cases where his predecessors offered designations for Marian motets, they were usually labeled simply “BVM,” suggesting that the motet might be used for any Marian occasion. Francisco Guerrero, while gradually offering more overall festal designations than his contemporaries, never assigned Marian motets to specific feasts in the course of four collections, which date from 1555 to 1597. Although many of his Marian motets, such as *Exaltata est* (Assumption), *Sancta et immaculata* (Conception), and *Conceptio tua Dei genitrix* (Conception), have unambiguous links to certain feasts, Guerrero and his publishers apparently never felt the need to offer printed festal designations for Marian motets.

In keeping with Esquivel’s overall layout of the motet book, the Marian motets fall in calendrical order from Visitation to Annunciation (Table 3.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Marian Feast</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedicta tu in mulieribus</td>
<td>Visitation (2 July)(^{24})</td>
<td>46-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In illo tempore</td>
<td>Snows (5 Aug.)(^{25})</td>
<td>56-61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{23}\) Esquivel began the collection with Easter, making the Visitation the first occurring Marian feast.

\(^{24}\) The Visitation has since been moved to 31 May for the Roman Church.

\(^{25}\) The Feast of Our Lady of the Snows is commonly abbreviated as “Snows” in English scholarship.
Table 3.1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Marian Feast</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exaltata est</td>
<td>Assumption (15 Aug.)</td>
<td>70-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Maria succure miseris</td>
<td>Nativity (8 Sept.)</td>
<td>74-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Dei genetrix</td>
<td>Presentation (21 Nov.)</td>
<td>100-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria Domini mei mater</td>
<td>Conception (8 Dec.)</td>
<td>106-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgo Dei genitrix</td>
<td>Expectation (18 Dec.)</td>
<td>110-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suscipiens Simeon</td>
<td>Purification (2 Feb.)</td>
<td>134-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce ancilla Domini</td>
<td>Annunciation (25 March)</td>
<td>140-141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub tuum præsidium</td>
<td>Saturday BMV</td>
<td>174-181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to Esquivel’s complete Marian cycle, Vivanco, with two exceptions, chose to follow the pattern of older composers such as Guerrero by simply designating most of the Marian motets as “BVM” (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2: The Marian motets in Vivanco’s 1610 collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Marian Feast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dulcissima Maria amore tuo</td>
<td>BVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Virgo benedicta</td>
<td>BVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quæ est ista quæ processit</td>
<td>Assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabat mater dolorosa</td>
<td>BVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria gratia plena</td>
<td>Annunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veni dilectæ mei egrediamur</td>
<td>BVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surge propera amica mea</td>
<td>BVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicut lilium inter spinas</td>
<td>BVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egredimini filiæ Hierusalem</td>
<td>BVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantate Domino</td>
<td>BVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adiuro vos filiæ Hierusalem</td>
<td>BVM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The principal reason for Vivanco’s avoidance of specific festal designations lies in his choice of texts. With few exceptions, Vivanco’s motet texts do not address any Marian feast in a direct manner. Only three texts can be liturgically linked to specific Marian liturgical events: *Dulcissima Maria amore tuo* (centonized text from the Saturday Marian Mass); *O virgo benedicta* (Immaculate Conception, according to older Spanish breviaries\(^\text{26}\)); *Adiuro vos filiæ Hierusalem* (Assumption octave). In addition, Vivanco’s *Assumpta est Maria* \(\text{á 6}\), which exists only in an early seventeenth-century Salamanca manuscript choirbook, is obviously associated with the feast of the Assumption.\(^\text{27}\) Two of the motets labeled as Marian have no true connections to Marian feasts at all. Vivanco’s *Stabat mater* is a setting of one verse of the important Marian sequence,\(^\text{28}\) but *Cantate Domino*, which takes its text from Psalm 97, does not refer to the Virgin at all. The plurality of Vivanco’s Marian motet texts (*Veni dilectæ mei, Surge propera amica mea, Sicut lilium inter spinas, Egredimini filiæ Hierusalem, Adiuro vos filiæ Hierusalem*) are adaptations of verses from the Song of Songs. While these texts have been linked to Mary’s Immaculate Conception, Vivanco’s texts often do not use the strongest of the Immaculatist symbols such as the closed garden, the sun, the moon, or an unblemished mirror. Instead he focuses on the less controversial symbols of Mary’s connection to the Beloved and the beautiful fragrances such as the “vines in blossom” from *Surge propera amica mea*. Vivanco’s choices of texts may have resulted from a strong Immaculatist

\(^{26}\) Matins lesson 3 for Immaculate Conception in the Quiñones Breviary of 1544, Matins lesson 1 for Immaculate Conception in the Sevillian Breviary of 1563. Borgerding, 253.

\(^{27}\) Salamanca Cathedral, *Libro de coro 1*.

\(^{28}\) Vivanco’s setting of the first versicle of the sequence suggests that the motet may have originally been intended for use as a Vespers hymn during the two feasts of the Seven Sorrows of Mary (Friday in the fifth week of Lent and the third Sunday of September). John Caldwell, “Stabat mater dolorosa,” in *Grove Music Online*, ed. L. Macy http://www.grovemusic.com (Accessed 6 August 2006).
feeling tempered by the restrictions on the discussion of the doctrine during the later decades of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{29}

By contrast, most of Esquivel’s 1608 Marian motet texts are quite closely linked to the feasts for which they are assigned (Table 3.3). The notable exceptions are the motets for the feasts of the Snows and Mary’s Nativity. The Conception and Expectation motets have only indirect connections to their assigned feasts.

Table 3.3: Esquivel’s Marian motet text sources, festal designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motet</th>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Text Source</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedicta tu in mulieribus</td>
<td>Visitation</td>
<td>Verse and Response after hymn of Vespers I for Visitation</td>
<td>BrevRom 1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In illo tempore</td>
<td>Snows</td>
<td>Lesson 7 of Matins for Snows, Common BMV</td>
<td>BrevRom 1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaltata est</td>
<td>Assumption</td>
<td>Verse and Response after hymn of Vespers I for Assumption</td>
<td>BrevRom 1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Maria succurre miseris</td>
<td>Nativity</td>
<td>Antiphon to Magnificat of Vespers I for Snows</td>
<td>AntCA 1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Dei genetrix</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Antiphon to Magnificat of Vespers I for Presentation</td>
<td>BrevRom 1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria Domini mei mater</td>
<td>Conception</td>
<td>Ave Maria gloss</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{29} See Chapter 4 for discussion of the Immaculate Conception and motet composition in Spain.
Table 3.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motet</th>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Text Source</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virgo Dei Genitrix</td>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>Verse of Gradual for Mass at Conception</td>
<td>GradRom 1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suscippiens Simeon</td>
<td>Purification</td>
<td>Verse after Lesson 6 of Matins for Purification</td>
<td>BrevRom 1620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce ancilla Domini</td>
<td>Annunciation</td>
<td>Antiphon 5 of Vespers I for Annunciation</td>
<td>BrevRom 1620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub tuum præsidium</td>
<td>Saturday BMV</td>
<td>Antiphon to Nunc dimitiss of Compline for Little Office of the Virgin</td>
<td>BrevRom 1628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Esquivel published only one subsequent motet. *Surge propera amica mea á 3*, based on Song of Songs 2:13-14, appeared in his 1613 print alongside the *Missa Beatae Mariae in Sabatto*.

Esquivel looked primarily to the Office liturgy for the texts of his Marian motets. Of the eleven items, only three texts are not found in the Marian Offices of the Clement VIII Breviary. When Esquivel did break from this pattern, he still chose texts that

---

30 Borgerding, 263.

31 See Chapter 4 for a discussion of this motet.

32 The Clementine Breviary was first issued in 1602. For this study, two Clementine Breviaries were consulted: Breviarum Romanum, Ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, PII V. Pont. Max. iussu editum. et Clementis VIII. auctoritate recognitum. Pars Hyemalis (Madrid: Ex Typographia Regia, 1620); and Breviarium romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Pii V. Pont. Max. iussu editum et Clementis VIII. auctoritate recognitum (Antwerp: Ex Officina Plantiniana, 1618).
spoke directly to the feast at hand. Moreover, two of the non-Office motets were composed for Conception and Expectation, feasts of special importance to Spaniards.\(^{33}\)

A further influence on Esquivel’s text choices may have been the choices of his predecessors and contemporaries. Stevenson notes that Esquivel was not reticent about working with texts already set by more widely disseminated composers such as Morales, Guerrero, Victoria, or Ceballos.\(^{34}\) Table 3.4 lists compositions on Esquivel’s motet texts that preceded his publications of 1608 and 1613.

**Table 3.4: Earlier settings by Spanish composers of Esquivel’s Marian motet texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer(s)</th>
<th>Date of publication/ms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedicta tu in mulieribus</td>
<td>Cristóbal de Morales</td>
<td>1541(^{35}) and 1546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In illo tempore</td>
<td>Andreas de Silva(^{36})</td>
<td>1518 and 1521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaltata est</td>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>1538?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodrigo Ceballos</td>
<td>1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franciscisco Guerrero</td>
<td>1589 and 1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alonso de Tejeda</td>
<td>c. 1572–1623(^{37})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{33}\) _Breviarum Romanum . . . Proprium Sanctorum Hispanorum_ (1620), 9.

\(^{34}\) Stevenson, 109.

\(^{35}\) Included in _Gombert excellentissimi . . . 4 voces_ (Venice: Girolamo Scotto, 1541).

\(^{36}\) The nationality of Silva is not known, but Kirsch, 238, believes that his style points to a Spanish origin.

\(^{37}\) Zamora Cathedral, Ms. 6 (ZaC 6) dates from the late seventeenth century, but the motet by Alonso de Tejeda (c. 1540-1628) may have been composed before Esquivel’s example. Esquivel may have seen manuscript versions of Tejeda’s work, since he succeeded the older musician as maestro at both Calahorra and Ciudad Rodrigo.
Table 3.4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer(s)</th>
<th>Date of publication/ms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Maria succurre miseris</td>
<td>Francisco de Peñalosa Morales</td>
<td>1500–1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>1543 and 1546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomás Luis de Victoria</td>
<td>1570 and 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Dei Genitrix</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgo Dei Genitrix</td>
<td>Ceballos(^{38})</td>
<td>1554 and 1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub tuum præsidium</td>
<td>Pedro de Escobar Morales</td>
<td>1500–1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santos de Aliseda</td>
<td>1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernando de las Infantas</td>
<td>1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals that seven of Esquivel’s ten Marian cycle texts had been published or copied into manuscripts before 1608. Of the other three texts only *Ave Maria Domini mei mater* were not set by other Spanish composers. Esquivel’s particular text of *Suscipiens Simeon* had been published by Pierre Certon in 1553,\(^{39}\) and *Ecce ancilla Domini* was set by Phillipe de Monte in 1590.\(^{40}\) In regard to the three-voice *Surge propera* from the 1613 print, other composers had employed the text that begins “Surge propera amica mea,” from Song of Solomon 2:10, but Esquivel’s text comes mostly from verses 13 and 14.

An examination of the voice distributions of Esquivel’s Marian motets reveals no discernable consistencies that mark them as a special group when compared to the rest of

---

\(^{38}\) As *secunda parte* to *Exaltata est.*


\(^{40}\) Phillipe de Monte, *Corollarium cantionum sacrarum ... studio & opera Friderici Lindneri* (Nuremberg: Catherina Gerlach, 1590).
the 1608 motets (see Table 3.5). Among the Marian motets, the majority are five-voice settings, comprising sixty percent of the cycle. In contrast, only about thirty percent of all the motets in the 1608 collection are set for five voices, most of which, but not all, are designated for important feasts. Since all of the Marian feasts are duplex in rank, the high concentration of five-voice settings reflects the relative importance of the feasts, albeit in a manner inconsistent with the rest of the feasts in the collection. Voice number and distribution also have little relation to the importance among the Marian feasts, as both four- and five-voice settings are employed within the cycle. Of note, however, is *Sancta Maria sucurre miseris* á 8 for the Nativity, one of only two Marian feasts with an octave during Esquivel’s time.\(^{41}\) Set for eight voices in two choirs, it stands as the largest and only polychoral motet in the entire 1608 collection.

### Table 3.5: Voice distributions, modes, and lengths for Esquivel’s Marian motets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Voice Distribution</th>
<th>Mode (^{42})</th>
<th>Length (^{43})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Benedicta tu in mulieribus</em></td>
<td>4vv - SATB</td>
<td>Mode 2 trans. to G</td>
<td>38 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In illo tempore</em></td>
<td>5vv - SSATB</td>
<td>Mode 6 with B-flat</td>
<td>77 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Exaltata est</em></td>
<td>5vv - SSATB</td>
<td>Mode 2</td>
<td>47 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sancta Maria succure miseris</em></td>
<td>8vv - SATB/SSAT</td>
<td>Mode 9 trans. to D</td>
<td>57 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Beata Dei genitrix</em></td>
<td>4vv - SATB</td>
<td>Mode 2</td>
<td>42 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ave Maria Domini mei mater</em></td>
<td>5vv - SSATB</td>
<td>Mode 8 mixed with 2 and trans. to G</td>
<td>38 mm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{41}\) The other is Assumption. ACO, *Libro de los estatutos y constituciones*, ff. 44v–50v.

\(^{42}\) All modal numerical designations are based on Heinrich Glarean, *Dodecachordon* (Basel: Heinrich Petri, 1547). See *Heinricus Glareanus, Dodecachordon*, translation and commentary by Clement A. Miller, Musicological Studies and Documents 6 (Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1965).

\(^{43}\) The consistent use by Esquivel and Taberniel of the C mensuration sign allows for a universal reduction of one breve = one measure in transcription.
Table 3.5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virgo Dei genitrix</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>SATB</td>
<td>Mode 8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suscipient Simeon</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>SAATB</td>
<td>Mode 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce ancilla Domini</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>SSATB</td>
<td>Mode 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub tuum præsidium</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>SATTB</td>
<td>Mode 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surge Propera (1613)</td>
<td>3vv</td>
<td>SSB</td>
<td>Mode 2 trans. to G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like most of his motets, the Marian works are quite brief, averaging only 49 mm. in transcription, with a range between 30 and 84 mm. Walkley, in his study of the 1608 motets, noticed that Esquivel preferred conciseness to elaboration, but Esquivel’s brevity should not be seen as a lack of ability to create larger structures. On the contrary, his Masses and Magnificats reveal a composer quite comfortable with large-scale works.\(^{44}\) His approach to the motet, however, reveals a preference for a very tightly-knit, concise style that may reveal that Esquivel saw brevity as an essential Tridentine value. The general avoidance of large, two- and three-part motets in late Spanish motet collections certainly suggests a move to shorter motets by 1600.\(^{45}\)

\(^{44}\) Walkley, 282.

\(^{45}\) Among the composers in Esquivel’s generation, Bernardo Clavijo del Castillo (d. 1626), Fernando de las Infantas (1534–c. 1610), Sebastian Raval (c.1550–1604), and Sebastian de Vivanco each composed only two motets with a *secunda pars*. Esquivel, Pedro Rimonte, Alonso de Tejeda (c. 1556–1628), and Nicosia Zorita (c. 1545–after 1592) each included one, while Luis de Aranda, Ambrosio Cotes (c. 1550–1603) and Alonso Lobo (1555–1617), composed no motets in multiple parts. Composers associated with large institutions continued to compose large-scale motets. Phillippe Rogier (c. 1561–96) was the head of Philip II’s chapel from 1588, Guerrero was the *maestro* of the Seville Cathedral, and Victoria was in charge of both the well-endowed Collegium Germanicum in Rome and the Real Convento de las Clarisas Descalzas in Madrid.
Ritual Function of the Marian Motets

Early seventeenth-century musical veneration of Mary in the Spanish Church occurred primarily during the services specifically devoted to her. These include the Office and Mass on her feast days, as well as the Saturday Marian votive Mass. Marian music was also heard in conjunction with quasi-liturgical events such as processions and the Salve service. In addition to the settings of Marian liturgical texts, the Marian motet provided a means of further focusing the faithful’s attention to points of Marian doctrine within the context of an established liturgy.

Unlike other types of sacred polyphony, motet texts offer only indirect evidence regarding their possible function within the liturgy. Oliver Strunk’s pioneering study classified motets according to their source texts and concluded that a motet’s function could be linked to its text, but although his classifications—sequence, antiphon, responsory—retain some usefulness, recent scholarship suggests that the motet was a highly flexible and versatile genre that could be performed in a variety of circumstances. The body of research now strongly suggests that throughout Europe motets were sung as a means of customizing the Mass and other services to the feast or season. While composers continued the early Renaissance tradition of writing motets to commemorate state occasions, such as treaties or coronations, until the middle of the


sixteenth century, even these works were most likely sung during a celebratory Mass.\textsuperscript{48} By 1600 motets were certainly a familiar part of religious life in Spanish cities as well as those in other parts of Europe.\textsuperscript{49}

**Motets at Mass**

Although composers frequently drew motet texts from the Office liturgy, little evidence has surfaced to suggest that motets were actually performed during any part of the Office on a regular basis.\textsuperscript{50} On the other hand, the incorporation of motets during the Mass is supported by some convincing evidence, and recent scholarship has begun to paint a clearer picture of the practice. This is especially true for the Capella Sistina in Rome and other Italian centers, where detailed records of performance practices have survived.\textsuperscript{51} The Capella Sistina diaries, for example, reveal that by 1616 motets were

\textsuperscript{48} In Spain there is little evidence that ceremonial motets were ever popular among native composers. This is certainly due to Charles V’s preference for Netherlandish musicians at his court, leaving the native musicians with few opportunities to compose such works. A notable exception is Cristóbal Morales’s *Jubilate Deo omnis terra á 6*, which celebrates the Treaty of Nice (1548) between Charles and François I. Also, Infantas composed a series of commemorative motets, including *Canticum Moysi: Cantemus Domino á 5*, the only known Spanish motet celebrating the naval victory over the Turks at Lepanto in 1571. Among the last ceremonial motets by a Spaniard during the Renaissance was *Mortuus est Philippus Rex* by the Valencian Ambrosio Cotes, composed for the ceremonies in Valencia upon the death of Philip II (1598).


\textsuperscript{50} For examinations of the motet’s possible role in the Office, see Strunk, 155–160; and Blackburn, 19–31.

\textsuperscript{51} The Capella Sistina has been the subject of several studies regarding the use of motets during the Mass. Cummings examines the Capella Sistina diaries from 1534–59, 1560–61, 1594, and 1616, but also see Lewis Lockwood, “A View of the Early Sixteenth-
performed frequently at the Offertory, Elevation, Communion, or the final
*Benedicamus.* Of these items only the Elevation does not have an assigned chant.
Motets may have sung as substitutes for the Propers or they may have filled the time left
after the completion of those chants. The desire to fill these moments is made clear by
Pope Julius II’s master of ceremonies in 1509, when he states that “The singers, with our
permission, shall sing one of their motets so that there will not be too much silence before
the Preface.”

In Spain the most detailed performance records of motet singing come from the
Seville Cathedral. Luque Fajardo describes a Sevillian Mass, led by Alonso Lobo, that
accompanied a celebration of the beatification of Ignatius of Loyola in 1610:

> The Mass went on . . . those same instruments that we mentioned at
> Vespers (the night before) accompanied motets, villancicos, and other
> artful compositions that the maestro (Lobo) did his utmost to realize.

---

52 Cummings, 45, 51-52.
53 . . . *cantores de consensu nostro unum suum motettum cantarent ne esset
tantum in capellam silentiam usque ad praefationem.* Richard Sherr, “The Papal Chapel
*ca.* 1492-1513 and Its Polyphonic Sources” (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1975), 94.
Cited in Cummings, 50.
54 *bajones, cornetas, flautas, y dos organos.* Luque Fajardo, *Relacion de la Fiesta
que se hizo en Sevilla a la Beatificacion del Glorioso S. Ignacio* (1610), ff. 8–12v.
Borgerding, 99 cites this document but offers no other details regarding its location.
55 *Prosiguiose la Missa, . . . los demas instrumentos della, que diximos en la
visperas, acompanhada de Motetes, Villancicos, y otras composiciones del arte, en que el
The understanding that motets were an important addition to the Mass is stated clearly in Lobo’s own 1602 book of Masses, which includes the addition of “devotional motets sung solemnly during the Mass.”

Even at less well-endowed cathedrals such as Oviedo, there is evidence that motets were regularly sung in addition to the Mass music. For example, the chapter statutes offer evidence that a motet was frequently sung after the Sanctus. The first reference appears under the job description for the maestro de capilla:

In addition, every time that a motet or other thing shall be sung after the Sanctus, he shall take into account and have discretion that it ends by the time they raise the final Hostia.

The next reference appears under the job description for the organist, instructing him to play if the usual motet is not sung:

Similarly, if there is no motet, the organ is played on those days from the end of the Sanctus to the final Hostia, because then at the end of the Sanctus the motet is (usually) sung.

The Hostia certainly refers to O Salutaris Hostia, a hymn often used for the benediction of the Blessed Sacrament immediately following the Sanctus, and which occasionally replaced the Benedictus of the Mass. The Oviedo citation suggests that, in practice, the

---


57 *Iten mas, todos las veces que se cantare motete, o otra cosa alguna despues de dicho, Sanctus, tenga cuenta y discrecion, con que se acabe para quando alçaren la ultima Hostia.* ACO, *Libro de los estatutos y constituciones*, f. 15.

58 *Ansi mesmo se tañe el organo en los dichos dias, desde que acaban de dezir los Sanctus, hasta la postrera hostia, si no vuiere motete: porque entonces á cabo de los Sanctus, se dize el motete.* ACO, *Libro de los estatutos y constituciones*, ff. 26v-27.

59 *O Salutaris Hostia* is the first line of the penultimate stanza of the Lauds hymn *Verbum supernum prodiens* that was composed by St. Thomas Aquinas for the Office of the Feast of Corpus Christi. This stanza and doxology (*Uni trinoque domino*) were taken separately to form a hymn for benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Henry ascribes to Pierre de la Rue the “indefensible” replacement of the Benedictus with the hymn. H. T.
hymn was recited by those present as the cathedral musicians engaged in a motet or organ work.

Evidence from other areas of Spain indicates that the motet often began before the conclusion of the complete Sanctus/Benedictus text. Snow noticed that many of the Sanctus movements in early seventeenth-century Spanish Masses were truncated. He concludes that the Sanctus settings were shortened in order to allow for the performance of a motet:

. . . it [the omission of part of the Sanctus text] is typical of nearly all of the Masses composed in Spain after the first decade of the seventeenth century. Most probably this curtailment of the Sanctus text was prompted by the desire to continue the well-established practice of singing a motet immediately following the Sanctus without unduly delaying the celebration of the liturgy or to permit the organist to display his skills by paraphrasing the portion not set polyphonically.  

Esquivel’s Sanctus settings from the 1608 and 1613 prints offer a view of the changing practice as it was happening. Only two Sanctus settings from the six Masses in the 1608 Missarum liber primus are truncated. The Missa Ave Virgo Sanctissima has no “Pleni sunt cæli et terra gloria tua” section, while the Missa Hexachordum is lacking the “Hosanna” section. In contrast, all but the Missa Hortus conclusus and Missa pro defunctis of the 1613 collection feature the entire Sanctus/Benedictus text, and only the Masses for the Dead set the Benedictus as a separate section. The other five Masses omit, in various combinations, the “Pleni” and/or “Hosanna” sections. Moreover, only the


60 Snow, The 1613 Print of Juan Esquivel . . . , 24.

61 Considering the amount of time that would elapse between the composition of a Mass and its appearance in print, it is reasonable to assume that several, if not most, of Esquivel’s 1608 Masses were composed in the last decade of the sixteenth century. Thus, based on Snow’s assertion, the truncated Masses must have been composed, or altered, early in the seventeenth century.
Missa Hortus conclusus, Missa pro defunctis, and Missa Hoc est præceptum meum include a Benedictus section. This inconsistency, Snow explains, reflects the situation when the practice of omitting sections of the Sanctus began. He states that there was no real agreement as to which sections were to be left out, but by 1620 Spanish Sanctus settings usually consisted only of the “Sanctus,” “Pleni,” and “Hosanna I” sections, or simply the “Sanctus” and “Pleni” sections composed as a continuous setting. The Oviedo chapter statutes, then, provide some support for Snow’s claim as well as proof that motets were an expected addition to Spanish Masses. Table 3.6 shows this practice as it appears in Esquivel’s 1608 and 1613 Mass books.

Table 3.6: Sanctus sections of Esquivel’s Masses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Sanctus</th>
<th>Pleni</th>
<th>Hosanna</th>
<th>Benedictus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Virgo Sanctissima</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battalla</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexachordum</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ductus est Jesus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorioso confessor Domini</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro defunctis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu es Petrus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


63 This table is reproduced from Snow, Table IV, 25, except for the Missa pro defunctis settings, which he omitted.

64 Esquivel regularly composed only one Hosanna section in all of his Sanctus settings. If the choir did not sing O Salutaris Hostia after the Benedictus, a repetition of the polyphonic Hosanna I section or a plainchant version were viable options.
Table 3.6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Sanctus</th>
<th>Pleni</th>
<th>Hosanna</th>
<th>Benedictus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarti toni</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Beata Virgine in Sabbato</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoc est præceptum meum</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi cedrus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortus conclusus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro defunctis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Sanctus and Pleni texts set as continuous section.

Esquivel’s 1613 print offers yet more evidence regarding the practice of replacing part of the Sanctus with a motet. *Surge propera amica mea* á 3 appears immediately following a setting of the *Missa De Beata Virgine in Sabbato*. It is one of only two motets included in the 1613 print, and its appearance among the Mass settings in the index led Pedrell, who was working only with an index of the print, to assume that it was a three-voice Mass setting, titled *Surge propera*.\(^{\text{65}}\) Snow, upon his discovery of a copy of the entire print in 1973, noticed that this item was indeed a motet and not a Mass setting.\(^{\text{66}}\) On the pages with the actual music, the motet’s designation is simply *MOTETVM Beatæ Mariae cantandum in organo*, indicating that it might be sung for any Marian occasion and that it must be sung polyphonically.\(^{\text{67}}\) Its placement immediately

\(^{\text{65}}\) Felipe Pedrell, *Diccionario biográfico y bibliográfico de músicos españoles, portugueses, é hispano-americanos antiguos y modernos, a copia de datos y documentos para servir á la historia del arte musical en nuestra nación*, vol. 1 (Barcelona: Victor Berdos y Feliu, 1894–97), 596.


\(^{\text{67}}\) The perfect passive participle *cantandum*, or “must be sung,” suggests that Esquivel did not want the motet performed with instruments in whole or in part.
following the Marian votive Mass, however, strongly suggests that Esquivel intended the motet to be used in that context.

Although *Surge propera* appears after the Agnus Dei in the print, it was probably intended for use after the Sanctus. The Sanctus of Esquivel’s Mass omits both the “Pleni” and “Benedictus” sections (see Table 3.6.) and concludes with an authentic cadence in the context of a plagal mode. The transition from Sanctus to motet would have been an easy task for a Renaissance singer. The G final of the motet’s mode is prepared by the final cadence of the Sanctus (See Exx. 3.1a–b). The initial G4 in the superius is provided by the altus I at the end of the Sanctus. The motet’s placement after the Agnus Dei in the print must reflect that fact that the singing of motets after the Sanctus, or at any time, was an option and that Esquivel or Taberniel may not have wanted to disturb the order of the Ordinary in the print. This reasoning is also in keeping with the Tridentine spirit of preserving the integrity of the Mass.

---

68 The Sanctus is in mode 8 transposed to a final of C. Bruner, 77 incorrectly assigns the Sanctus to mode 9, citing Zarlino and Glarean, but offers no musical evidence for his conclusion. The ambita of the tenor and superius voices is clearly F3–F4 and F4–F5, respectively. Taken together with the C final and B-flat signature, the mode is clearly plagal.
Ex. 3.1a: Final measures of Missa Beata Mariae in Sabbato, Sanctus.

Ex. 3.1b: Opening measures of motet, Surge propera amica mea.

The Motet in Spanish Processions

The motet was also an important musical component of the religious processions that were an integral part of late Renaissance Spanish life. The large public processions that occurred during Holy Week and Corpus Christi served as important Counter-Reformation tools for public display of Catholic beliefs and were, as they are today,
popular social activities. In large cities like Seville detailed descriptions of the processions reveal some of the musical activity, including the use of motets.

Smaller cities and cathedrals often imitated the practices of larger cities to the degree that their resources allowed. It is likely that motets were also an important part of the public processions at Oviedo, Calahorra, and Ciudad Rodrigo. The Oviedo chapter statutes mention the performance of motets specifically in the Corpus Christi procession:

And they [the clergy, musicians, and attendants] leave the church by way of the door beneath the tower, and the singers and organ perform Psalm verses, hymns and motets in *alternatim* . . . . So in the course of the aforementioned procession, as it arrives at appropriate places, where there will be altars, the clergy may desire a motet or [Psalm] verse [to be sung].

Public processions on Marian feast days were certainly important events in Spanish cities. In Seville the processions held on the feasts of the Assumption and the Visitation were among the most elaborate of the year. Processions were also held on the feasts of the Purification, Nativity, and the Annunciation. Beginning in 1578, additional splendor was added to the procession held on the feast of the Immaculate Conception,

---


70 For a description of processional practices in sixteenth-century Seville, see Borgerding, 63–91. Some of the information cited is based on cathedral documents that refer to polyphonic Marian antiphon texts rather than motets.

71 Y salen de la Iglesia por la puerta debaxo de la torre; y los cantores y el organo, van cantando alternatim a Versos, Hymnos, y Motetes. . . . Ansi en la yda de la dicha procesion, en partes competentes, como en la venida; adonde ouiere altares, los caperros haran dezir vn Motete, o Verso. ACO, Libro de los estatutos y constituciones, f. 105.

72 Borgerding, 81–85.
where the commemoration of the feast was not only devotional but political in nature.\textsuperscript{73} This is especially true after 1617, when papal restrictions on Immaculatist writings were lifted.\textsuperscript{74} Sevillian cathedral records also record smaller processions held for Marian shrines or churches.\textsuperscript{75}

Records in Esquivel’s cathedrals are not as detailed as those in Seville, but the desire to emulate the practices of Seville’s cathedral, when practical, is apparent. The only document, however, that mentions a Marian procession at any of these cathedrals survives in a Calahorra Cathedral inventory of 1577. The inventory, which includes occasionally revised lists of important feast days for that cathedral, mentions a procession on the feast of Mary’s Nativity.\textsuperscript{76} The lack of references to processions in surviving chapter records, however, is not proof that these activities did not occur. Rather, the nature of the records at these smaller establishments tended to be only basic financial records and the bare essentials of chapter meetings.

**Motets in the Salve Service**

Motets were an important component of a Marian commemoration that followed Compline in many parts of Europe.\textsuperscript{77} The Marian motet stands at the center of a three-part polyphonic fabric for the Salve service and, along with the versicle and response that follows, serves to customize the service to the season or feast. By 1608 Esquivel would have been able to provide all the polyphonic music for a Salve service, including the

\textsuperscript{73} Borgerding, 78.

\textsuperscript{74} Borgerding, 211.

\textsuperscript{75} 1578: Translation of BMV de la Antigua; 1581: Nuestra Señora de Aguas Sanctas; 1594: Miracle of Nuestra Señora de la Valle. Borgerding, 80.

\textsuperscript{76} AC CA 202, f. 103.

\textsuperscript{77} For a discussion of the Salve Service in Spain and Esquivel’s contributions to the \textit{Salve Regina}, see Chapter 2.
seasonal and festal motets. There is, however, no doubt that he frequently turned to Salve Regina settings and motets of other composers.

Conclusions

The motet’s ability to customize an occasion or service, such as the Mass, Salve service, or religious procession, made it a popular genre among post-Tridentine composers. The selection of more liturgically connected texts by Esquivel and his contemporaries underlines the shift away from the devotional texts of the pre-Tridentine era. Esquivel’s attention to the revised Liturgical Calendar is seen in his composition of a complete cycle of motets for the primary Marian feasts as well as cycles for Advent and Lent. The liturgical connection between motet text and feast in Esquivel’s collection, taken together with documentary evidence supports the claim that these motets were used at Mass. Moreover, documents also support the idea that Esquivel employed his Marian motets for processions on days in her honor and at the weekly Salve service during Lent.
CHAPTER 4
READING JUAN DE ESQUIVEL’S MARIAN MOTETS

Of all the genres of polyphony, the motet was the most direct means of expressing Marian devotion. The Renaissance practice of singing motets during Mass, religious processions, and other important occasions is evidence that Church authorities felt that these works communicated something very important and offered something that ritual music, based on standardized liturgical texts, could not fully express. Motets had the power to direct the listener’s attention to specific devotional or doctrinal messages that reflected institutional, national, or even a composer’s religious views. Moreover, the increased use of festal assignments by Spanish composers and printers during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries reveals a Tridentine acceptance of the motet as a vehicle for introducing or reinforcing Church doctrine. Conversely, the motet also offered localities a means of retaining some traditional views in the context of pressure to conform to a universal liturgy. Recent scholarship has suggested that motets worked on several levels and that for certain audiences they were meant to be read both musically and textually, in order to achieve their full spiritual potential. Dolores Pesce states that current approaches to the study of motets involve

. . . examining the social-historical situation that may have prompted the creation of a motet, whether a patron’s commission or an ideological response on the composer’s part; discovering the performance context and function of a motet, particularly with respect to the liturgy; reading the texts to uncover dual meanings possibly shared only by the composer and a select audience; reading the music to discover the attractiveness and innovative spirit it offered in its own time; and reading text and music together to uncover the ways in which composers made

---

1 The “listener” denotes the assembled clergy and those educated laity who knew Latin and had heard enough polyphony to comprehend the interactions of melodic line and vertical sonority. What effect polyphony had on the uneducated is unknown.
them serve one another to yield what can rightfully be called “music-poetic” creations.\(^2\)

Since the performance context of the motet was discussed in Chapter 3, this chapter will address the socio-historical situation and what Pesce calls the “music-poetic” aspects of Esquivel’s motets.

The motet was distinctive among Renaissance polyphonic genres in that the composer was able to select a text that focused the listener’s or reader’s attention on a single point of doctrine or devotion.\(^3\) In selecting the text for a motet, the composer could offer a statement of faith that might reflect not only the universally accepted understanding of that statement but also a local or even personal understanding.

Musically, the composer had the means to amplify or comment upon the text through the use of melodic, contrapuntal, and textural musical imagery, creating a web of musical and poetic signs that could be deciphered by experienced readers. Thus, a close reading of Esquivel’s Marian motets in this musico-poetic light, in conjunction with the Mariological attitudes of Renaissance Spanish theologians, can offer a foundation for a better understanding of institutional Marian devotional practices in Spanish cathedrals. A reading of the motets reveals that, although Esquivel composed during a time of increased pressure to conform to the doctrines and practices of Rome, Spanish attitudes towards Marian devotion continued to appear with some regularity. Esquivel’s approach to the Marian motets must then be understood in the context of this interplay among the demands of Spanish tradition, liturgical reform, and personal devotion.


Ave Maria à 7

Although not considered a motet for this study, this short canon for seven voices on the text, “Ave Maria” should be discussed, since it heads the entire collection. The canon’s festal designation is “Sundays.” The item’s actual purpose is more likely that of a canonic showpiece serving to dedicate the collection to the Virgin and possibly Don Pedro Ponce de León, Esquivel’s bishop and patron at Ciudad Rodrigo. Although no dedicatory material survives from either of Esquivel’s 1608 publications, his special devotion to Mary can be deduced from circumstantial evidence. The 1608 Missarum liber primus featured a woodcut of Esquivel kneeling before an image of Mary that bears the inscription Sancta et Immaculata virginitas, quibus te laudibus efferam nescio [O holy and immaculate virginity, with what praises I shall extol you]. Moreover, the first Mass in the collection is a parody on Guerrero’s five-voice motet Ave virgo sanctissima. Esquivel’s continued interest in Mary prompted him to construct two of the seven Masses in the 1613 Missarum liber secundus on Marian motets and to create one other for the Saturday Marian devotion.

The seven voices of the Ave Maria canon are generated from three original voices (S1, A1, B). The immediate symbolism brings to mind the Seven Sorrows of Mary, a devotion that had spread to Spain during the sixteenth century. The Servites, who

---

4 This item survives only in the Coria Cathedral (Libro cantorale no. 64) copy of the 1608 motet book.

5 This image (see Chapter 1) survives only in Geiger, 138.

6 An edition of the realized canon appears in Appendix D.

7 The devotion of the Seven Sorrows was founded by the Servite Order in the thirteenth century, and the feast of the same name reached Spain during the late sixteenth century. Rome officially granted the celebration to the Servite nuns of Valencia in 1600 and then to all of Spain in 1735. The devotion is founded on seven particular sorrows experienced by Mary over her life, all associated with her Son: 1) the prophecy of Simeon; 2) the flight into Egypt; 3) the loss of the Child for three days in Jerusalem; 4) the meeting of Jesus on the way to Calvary; 5) Mary’s standing at the foot of the cross; 6) the removal of Jesus from the cross; 7) the burial of Jesus. F. G. Holweck, “Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Feasts of the Seven,” in The Catholic Encyclopedia (New
founded the devotion, also practiced a rosary based on the Sorrows. This link to the rosary creates a possible connection to Esquivel’s Dominican patron at Ciudad Rodrigo, since the founding of the rosary devotion was thought to have originated with St. Dominic at the Battle of Muret in 1213, and the devotion was a strong component of Dominican life.8 If the placement of the canon at the head of the motet collection has any dedicatory implications, Esquivel found a clever way to pay homage to both his heavenly and earthly patrons in one work.9

Musically, all but the tenor I and bassus begin with an adjusted version of the traditional Ave Maria antiphon chant that retains the characteristic semitone movement between the chant’s fifth and sixth pitches. Unfortunately, the only surviving copy of this canon is damaged and lacks the final note of superius I part. Moreover, the printed notes

---

8 The promulgation of the rosary devotion by St. Dominic eventually led to the belief that he had founded it. Early biographies of the saint, however, make no mention of such an important attribute, suggesting that he may have revived an existing practice. Herbert Thurston, “Rosary,” in The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: Robert Appleton, 1912), 13: 189. Pérez disputes Thurston’s claim by stating that omission of the term “rosary” in those early biographies is misleading, since that term was applied to the practice in later years. Nazario Pérez, Historia Mariana de España, 2 vols. (Toledo: KADMOS, 1993), 498–502. The connection between St. Dominic and the rosary, however, held some importance to sixteenth-century Dominicans. In 1573, at the request of the Dominican Order, Gregory XIII allowed a feast for all churches that had an altar dedicated to the Holy Rosary; Thurston, 189. For a look at the antecedents of Dominic’s rosary see Anne Winston-Allen, Stories of the Rose: The Making of the Rosary in the Middle Ages (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).

9 The rosary and its attendant miracles prompted the creation of art, literature, and music in Spain. See Lorenzo Francisco Candelaria, “The ‘Rosary Cantorales’ of Early Modern Spain: An Interdisciplinary Study in Attribution” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2001).
of the superius I result in an unacceptable dissonance with the altus II, tenor I, and tenor II on the second semibreve. This problem can be resolved by commencing the superius I on F4 rather than A4. Past trimming of the volume has also removed the canonic directions for the new part generated by the superius I, although the signum congruentiae that indicates the entry of the canonic voice is preserved. By transposing the superius I down a third from its printed pitches, the superius II voice maybe created as an inverted canon at a fifth above. The apparent editorial mistake is surprising, considering the canon’s placement at the head of the book. Perhaps the faults are the reason that the canon is missing in all the other surviving copies of the 1608 motet book, and that it was not reproduced in the Plasencia manuscript copy.10

The altus I opens the canon with the principal melody, beginning with B-flat, before moving on to original material. Its canonic indication is “Trinitas in unit,” indicating that three voices derive from just one. This was a favorite canonic device for church composers, due to its obvious Trinitarian symbolism. The generated lines are the altus II (M2 above11) and the tenor II (P4 below12). The bassus voice is set in contrary motion to the Trinity canon, employing an inversion of the principal melody’s m3/M2 progression, which creates a further sense of unity with the other voices. The bassus also canonically generates the tenor I voice at a M2 above.13

The one prominent precursor to Esquivel’s canon is an eight-voice canon on the full “Ave Maria” text by Alonso Lobo (c. 1555-1617).14 Lobo’s work, however, differs in two important ways. First, he did not allude to the antiphon chant in any of the voices.

---

10 See Chapter 1.
11 *altus secunda in secunda*.
12 *tenor secundus in subdiatesaron*.
13 *tenor primus in secunda supra Bassum*.
Instead, he created a two-choir, quadruple canon, based on four newly-composed voices that are organized so that the voices of Choir II canonically generate the voices in Choir I. Second, Lobo also provided the resolutions to the canon in the printed copy, whereas Esquivel left the resolutions up to the reader. This lack of canonic resolution was standard procedure for Esquivel, who also chose not to provide the canonic voices for his 1613 Magnificat settings.

*Benedicta tu in mulieribus à 4*

Since Esquivel chose to commence his festal motet cycle with a work for Easter, the first Marian work in the collection is *Benedicta tu in mulieribus*, a motet for the feast of the Visitation (2 July). This feast celebrates the meeting of Mary and her cousin Elizabeth, an event that features Elizabeth’s recognition of the Christ Child in Mary’s womb, and Mary’s proclamation of her acceptance of God’s will in the form of Luke’s canticle. This first worldly recognition of the Incarnation and Mary’s acceptance of her role in human salvation was of supreme importance, according to the Spanish theologian Fray Luis Francisco de Acevedo (1562-1601), the author of *Marial, Discursos morales en las fiestas de la Reina del Cielo Nuestra Señora* (Vallodolid: Francisco Fernandez de Cordova, 1600). Written during his residency at the Augustinian monastery in Salamanca, Acevedo’s work is considered one of the more important Marian devotional treatises before the work of Francisco Suárez.\(^{15}\) Regarding the Visitation, he states:

\[
\begin{align*}
Oy & \text{ se le dio a la serenissima} & \text{Today [is the day when], for the first time, the most serene} \\
Virgen Maria nuestra Señora, & \text{Virgin Mary, our Lady, was} \\
la primer vez, el título y & \text{given the title and} \\
renombre soberano de madre de & \text{sovereign} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{15}\) See Tomás de Herrera, “Fr. Luis de Acevedo,” in *Historia del convento de San Augustín de Salamanca* (Salamanca: n.p., 1652). An entry on Acevedo can be found in the *Dictionary of the Literature of the Iberian Peninsula*, ed. by Germán Bleiberg, Maureen Ihrie, and Janet Pérez (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1993), 10. The entry, however, mistakenly claims that Acevedo began his *Marial* with the Feast of Mary’s Conception.
Dios, . . . name, Mother of God.\textsuperscript{16}

Esquivel’s short motet text reproduces Elizabeth’s recognition:

\textit{Benedicta tu in mulieribus:}  
\textit{et benedictus fructus ventris tui.}  

Blessed are you among women:  
and blessed is the fruit of your womb.

Liturgically, the text derives from the verse and response that follow the hymn at Vespers I for Visitation. The festal association is clear. Although the verse, “Benedicta tu in mulieribus,” recalls Gabriel’s message to Mary at the Annunciation, the response “Et benedictus fructus ventris tui” places this salutation clearly in the mouth of Elizabeth at the Visitation, firmly linking the motet and the feast. To further amplify the importance of the response, Esquivel gives it four iterations in the musical setting, comprising twenty-eight of thirty-eight measures in transcription. The verse, on the other hand, receives only a single statement.

Esquivel’s emphasis on the response text focuses attention on Christ rather than Mary, a preference that is seen in most of the composer’s Marian motet settings. Esquivel did not seek to diminish Mary’s role in human salvation, but instead he preferred to praise the Virgin for her role as Christ’s mother and her embodiment of his teachings. This view of Mary as the model Christian is firmly rooted in Counter-Reformation theology. Mary was not only preserved from original sin, but since she lived her life in a sinless state, she was the model for all Christians to emulate.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{16} Luis de Acevedo, \textit{Marial, Discursos morales en las fiestas de la Reina del Cielo Nuestra Señora: Compuestos por el padre Fray Luis de Azevedo Predicador de la orden de nuestro Padre San Augustín} (Lisbon: Pedro Crasbeeck, 1602), 143. All translations of Acevedo’s text in this chapter are by Michael O’Connor.

\textsuperscript{17} The Council of Trent’s decrees on the Virgin Mary were remarkably few. The most contentious issue, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, was tabled for later discussion, when the Council recognized the divisive effects a pronouncement might have. Hubert Jedin, \textit{A History of the Council of Trent} (London: Ernest Graf, 1961), 2: 139-142. The major pronouncement on Mary was the confirmation of the traditional view that she had been preserved from the stain of original sin. See \textit{Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent}, translated by H. J. Schroeder (Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishers, 1978), 24.
Esquivel’s Christological emphasis reflects a post-Tridentine effort to balance the authority of scripture with accumulated tradition and to educate clergy and laity in a more orthodox view of Mary’s role in salvation. Acevedo, in his seventh discurso on the Visitation, cautions his readers to view Mary’s grace as a reflection of her proximity to Christ:

\[ \textit{Pero pues la Virgen no es Sol, sino Luna, que misterio tiene.} \]

But then the Virgin is not the sun, but the moon. What a mystery this is.\(^{18}\)

The Counter-Reformation veneration of Mary through the lens of Jesus is further emphasized in the Marian disputations that Suárez included in his \textit{Mysterium vitæ Christi}. This influential work was held in particularly high esteem in Salamanca, where Suárez held an important teaching position at the university from 1592–97.\(^{19}\) Esquivel’s approach to musical Mariology is certainly in harmony with the writings of both Suárez and Acevedo, who worked in nearby Salamanca during Esquivel’s tenure as maestro in Ciudad Rodrigo. Even if Esquivel had not read the work of either theologian directly, Suárez’s Marian writings in particular were so important to Mariology in early seventeenth-century Spain that the ideas presented in them had no doubt occurred to the adult Esquivel at some point.

Esquivel’s musical setting reinforces the importance of the Visitation response text. The brief verse setting is set to a single point of imitation that dissolves midway through the word “mulieribus,” and although Esquivel sets repetitions of the text “in mulieribus” in the altus and tenor, he forgoes the “Benedicta tu” text in the bassus in order to conclude the verse as quickly as possible. The response text begins to overlap the verse as early as m. 11 of the transcription and unfolds for twenty-eight measures.

\(^{18}\) Acevedo, 173.

\(^{19}\) For a recent biography and assessment of his career see Sergio Rábade Romeo, \textit{Francisco Suárez (1548–1617)} (Madrid: Ediciones del Orto, 1997). For an examination of Suárez’s influence on Spanish theologians, see Adro Xavier, \textit{Francisco Suárez en la España de su epocha} (Madrid: Ediciones y Publicaciones Española, 1950).
The response is built on a pervasive, dotted motive on the word “benedictus” that creates little doubt that Esquivel’s purpose was to have this word repeated frequently.

Musically, the motet is highly unified. Esquivel creates new points of imitation from intervals and rhythmic figures set out in the opening motive. The minor third opening interval is reproduced in the “et benedictus” motive (mm. 11–12) and the descending dotted figure of m. 4 is recast for the response text “ventris” (see Ex. 4.1). While the unification of motives between verse and response may create a symbolic sense of the unification of mother and unborn child, it is most certainly a hallmark of Esquivel’s miniaturist motet style.

Ex. 4.1: Esquivel, *Benedicta tu in mulieribus*, mm. 1–15.
Ex. 4.1 (continued)

In illo tempore à 5

In illo tempore à 5 is designated for the feast of Our Lady of the Snows. During Esquivel’s lifetime the feast had been proclaimed universal as part of Pius V’s breviary and missal and then raised to a double feast by Clement VIII in 1602. The feast originated as the celebration of the mid-fourth-century establishment of a church on the Esquiline Hill in Rome. The legend that arose in later centuries told of a miraculous snowfall in August on that hill, leading a Roman nobleman and his wife to donate their fortune to its construction.\(^\text{20}\)

In illo tempore is one of the few narrative texts that Esquivel set for a Marian feast. Apart from the Visitation story, the text is the only other account in the Gospel that records someone praising Mary for her part in the Incarnation. The account comes from Luke 11: 27-28, where Jesus is explaining his ability to drive out demons to a group of Jewish religious leaders. A woman in the assembled crowd exclaims, “Blessed is the

\(^{20}\) The church was later rebuilt by Sixtus III and dedicated to the Virgin in response to the decision by the Council of Ephesus in 432 to define Mary as *Theotokos*, or God-Bearer. The name Santa Maria Maggiore was given to the church some time in the seventh century. Michael Ott, “Our Lady of the Snow,” in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Robert Appleton, 1912), 11: 361-62.
mother who gave you birth and nursed you.” Jesus replies, “Blessed rather are those who hear the word of God and obey it.” The text is also the basis for lesson 7 (nocturne 3) from the Matins for the feast of the Snows, which is the same as that for the Common of the BMV, except for the second nocturne of Matins, which was modified to recount the story of the miracle of the snowfall.

Like his text for the Visitation motet, Esquivel’s choice recalls a biblical passage in which praise is offered to Mary for her connection to Christ. In this case, Jesus praises his mother in turn by suggesting that she was blessed not because she was his mother but because she was one who indeed listened to the Word of God and obeyed it.

At that time, while Jesus was speaking to the crowd, a woman from the crowd called out and said to him, “Blessed is the womb that carried you and the breasts at which you nursed.” At this He replied, “Rather, blessed are those who hear the word of God and observe it.”

Esquivel might have chosen a text from the lessons of the second nocturn of Matins, which recount the story of the snowfall, but, true to the post-Tridentine nature of his collection, he preferred a text with biblical authority that focused the listener’s attention on Mary’s example of Christian obedience.

Esquivel’s choice of text may have had a local inspiration as well. In his *Marial*, Juan de Acevedo deals with the same text in the first *discurso* of the chapter devoted to the feast of the Snows. He compares the anonymous woman’s exclamation with the recognition and proclamation of Elizabeth at the Visitation:

> Con dos ejemplos notables, de dos mujeres valerosas, nos enseña el Espíritu Santo en el Evangelio, como hemos de alabar á la serenisima Virgen
>

With two notable examples of two valorous women, the Holy Spirit teaches us in the Gospel, that if we are to become a Christian, one of the most

---

21 Suárez confirms this reading in the second section of Disputation I of his *De Mysteriis Vitæ Christi*, by citing Augustine (*De sancta virginitate*) and Justin (*Ad Orthodoxos*). O’Brien, 15.
Acevedo proceeds to point out how appropriate it is that Mary is praised by women in the Gospel. He states that in both religious and secular literature, women are the ones who offer praise for victory in battle:

\[\text{y no haga novedad, que fie Dios las alabanzas de su misma madre de boca de mujeres, que cosa es muy usada en las letras humanas y divinas celebrar mujeres los vencimientos y triunfos de sus repúblicas y las victorias insignes de sus capitanes, y ansi vemos ilustrissima que dió Dios a los Israelitas contra los Egipcios, María la hermana de Moisés y otras mujeres del pueblo de Dios la celebraron ...}\]

And it is no novelty that God entrusts the praises of his own mother to the mouths of women; a device used often in secular and sacred writing is for women to celebrate vanquishings and triumphs of their republics as well as the notable victories of their leaders. Thus we see this illustrated very well when God gave (victory) to the Israelites over the Egyptians, Miriam, the sister of Moses, and other women of God’s people celebrated, . . .

Acevedo makes the point that when the women of the Gospel passage praise Mary, they also proclaim Jesus’s victory over the demons, the Jewish leaders, and eventually the death of the human soul.

Esquivel had recourse to few works of Spanish origin that he could emulate as he searched for a subject for the Snows motet; the feast was primarily a Roman celebration.

22 Acevedo, 576.

23 The appearance of women as witnesses and prophetesses has long been understood in biblical criticism. For a specific examination of women in the Gospel of John, see Robert G. Maccini, *Her Testimony is True: Women as Witnesses according to John* (Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).

24 Acevedo, 576.
until its elevation in the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{25} His first encounter with the feast may have been as a member of the Ciudad Rodrigo choir, but his first documented contact with the feast occurs in Oviedo. The chapter statutes list the feast as part of the calendar, indicating that Esquivel was expected to provide music on that day.\textsuperscript{26}

Before the publication of Esquivel’s 1608 print Victoria was the only Spanish composer to have designated a motet for the feast of the Snows. He chose the antiphon to the Magnificat for Vespers I, \textit{Sancta Maria succurre miseris},\textsuperscript{27} a text that Esquivel also employed but assigned to the feast of Mary’s Nativity.\textsuperscript{28} Although he may have known Victoria’s 1572 motet from a copy of the collection owned by the Calahorra Cathedral, he chose not to follow that particular example.\textsuperscript{29} That Esquivel composed a motet for the feast at all suggests that, at some point in his career, the feast held a higher importance than its liturgical rank suggests. Most likely he saw a need to provide a motet for a Marian feast that had not been celebrated in a large number of Spanish churches prior to their acceptance of the Roman liturgy. He was alone in this respect, since no other Spanish Renaissance motets are known to have been designated for the Snows.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{25} Seville was among the few Spanish cities that celebrated the feast before the adoption of the Roman Rite in Spain. See \textit{Breviarium Hispalensis} (Salamanca: Andrea de Portonariis, 1563), cited in Borgerding, 232, 248.

\textsuperscript{26} Although the Oviedo statutes were published in 1588, three years after Esquivel’s departure for Calahorra, they likely represent the same regulations that existed for most of the 1580s. ACO, \textit{Libro de los estatutos y constituciones}, f. 48v. No chapter information concerning the feast was found at either Calahorra or Ciudad Rodrigo.

\textsuperscript{27} Tomás Luis de Victoria, \textit{Motecta que partim quarternis, partim quinis, alia senis, alia octonis vocibus concintur} (Venice: Sons of Antonio Gardano, 1572).

\textsuperscript{28} Francisco Guerrero and Phillipe Rogier also set motets to this text, but neither motet was given a festal designation.

\textsuperscript{29} The Calahorra inventory of 1588 lists “six books of motets by Vittoria” but provides no dates. LF CA 193, f. 181.

\textsuperscript{30} Andreas de Silva is the only other composer of possible Spanish origin to have set \textit{In illo tempore loquente Jesu ad turbas}, but there is no evidence that Esquivel knew
The musical setting of *In illo tempore* relies on points of imitation, but two short sections of homorhythm stand out from this texture, perhaps offering an insight into the composer’s exegetical reading of the text. In mm. 33–35 Esquivel sets the first word of the anonymous woman’s statement, “Beatus,” homorhythmically, emphasizing what Jesus called the important gift, “blessedness.” The second moment of homorhythm occurs in m. 49 on the text “At illa,” offering a dramatic change of texture to switch from the mundane to the divine. Jesus’s words that follow are emphasized in the setting by giving them 24 of the 77 total measures in transcription. Homorhythm appears a final time at Jesus’s first word, “quinimo” (mm. 52–53). Although Jesus is speaking in the hypothetical in this statement, Esquivel hints, through textural emphasis, that Mary is foremost among those who obey the Father.

*Exaltata est à 5*

Esquivel’s five-voice setting of *Exaltata est*, for the feast for the Assumption, joined settings by Cristóbal de Morales, Francisco Guerrero, Alonso de Tejeda, and Rodrigo Ceballos of this evocative Assumption text. Esquivel, however, was the only composer of the five to provide a festal designation. The text is so closely connected to the feast of the Assumption that it is heard four times in the course of the Office and Mass for the feast.31

\[
\begin{align*}
V. & \text{ Exaltata est sancta Dei Genitrix.} & V. & \text{The Holy God-Bearer is exalted.} \\
R. & \text{Super choros Angelorum ad caelestia regna.} & R. & \text{Above the choirs of angels, unto the kingdom of Heaven.}
\end{align*}
\]

---

31 The text serves as the verse and response following the hymns at Vespers I, Lauds, and Terce, as well as (in combination) the antiphon to the first psalm of Nocturne I of Matins on the feast of the Assumption. *Breviarium romanum . . .* (Madrid, 1620), 1017.
Of the five Spanish settings of *Exaltata est*, only Esquivel chose not to augment the liturgical text with a *secunda pars*. Morales appended the text for the Vespers I antiphon to the Magnificat, while Guerrero, inspired by Morales’s example, appended the Vespers II antiphon to the Magnificat, according to the pre-Tridentine Sevillian usage. Ceballos’s motet employs the Gradual from the feast as a *secunda pars* and links the parts with a newly-composed intercessory prayer placed at the end of the *prima pars* and reprised at the end of the *secunda pars*. Tejeda’s version appends the familiar antiphon for Vespers I for Assumption, *Assumpta est Maria in cælum*, and a variant of the Tridentine antiphon to the Magnificat for Vespers II, *Hodie Maria Virgo cælos ascendit*. Table 4.1 presents a comparison of the four competitive motet texts.

---


33 *Breviarum hispalensis* (Salamanca: Andrea de Portonariis, 1563).

34 Ceballos’s motet survives in the manuscripts ToleBC 7, SevBC 1, GranCR 3, and GranC 3 (*secundar pars* only, anon.). The present study relied on Rodrigo Ceballos, *Obras completas*, vol. 1, *Motetes a quatro voces*, ed. Robert J. Snow (Granada: Junta de Andalucía, Consejería de Cultura, 1995), 109–21. The *secunda pars* is the Gradual from the Mass for Conception/Assumption.

### Table 4.1: Texts for Spanish Renaissance settings of *Exaltata est*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morales</th>
<th>Guerrero&lt;sup&gt;36&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>R. Ceballos</th>
<th>Tejeda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secunda pars</strong> Virgo prudentissima, quo progresderis, quasi aurora valde rutilans? <em>Filia Sion tota formosa et suavis es:</em> pulchra ut luna, electa ut sol.</td>
<td><strong>Secunda pars</strong> <em>Virgo Dei Genitrix,</em> <em>quem totus non capit orbis,</em> in tua se clausit viscera factus homo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Esquivel’s reluctance to join his predecessors and contemporaries in combining texts from the Assumption liturgy is consistent with his general reliance on brief texts for motets and is perhaps due to his conscious effort to adhere to the post-Tridentine call for liturgical clarity and standardization.<sup>37</sup>

Esquivel’s setting of *Exaltata est* offers an original musical reading of the Assumption antiphon text that also subtly reveals his familiarity with earlier examples. In

<sup>36</sup> Guerrero’s setting appeared first in his *Motecta liber secundus* (Venice: Jacob Vincenti, 1589) and then again in his *Motecta* of 1597 issued by the same publisher. The present study relied on Francisco Guerrero, *Opera omnia*, vol. 3, *Motetes I-XXII*, ed. José María Lloréns Cisteró, *Monumentos de la Música Española* 36 (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1978), 30–34.

<sup>37</sup> Walkley documents Esquivel’s tendency towards brevity of expression in the 1608 motets and postulates that local circumstances dictated the length of motets. Walkley, 226-27. While this may be true, Esquivel’s conciseness also harmonizes with the Counter-Reformation desire to adhere to standard texts.
Esquivel refers to the settings by Morales and Guerrero in musical and exegetical ways. Morales’s setting is the earliest of the known Spanish examples. It is the most elaborate of all the corresponding settings in length and number of voice parts; all but Esquivel’s employ only four voices. Morales unites his first and second parts by placing an ostinato, set to the first line of the *secunda pars* text, in the cantus II throughout the work (Ex. 4.2a). The ostinato, based on the antiphon chant melody (Ex. 4.2b), also reinforces the mode 1 (transposed to G) quality of the work by alternating starting pitches on G and D throughout the polyphonic setting.

Ex. 4.2a: Ostinato in cantus II from Morales’s *Exaltata est*.  
Ex. 4.2b: Transposed opening melody and text of Vespers I antiphon for Assumption.

While other Spaniards took up the *Exaltata est* text, none paid such direct homage to Morales’s work as Francisco Guerrero. Guerrero also chose the transposed mode 1, but the relation to Morales’s motet is most clearly perceived in the borrowing of motives

---

38 The date range of VatS 64 extends from 1538 to 1576. Morales’s motet was most likely copied into the manuscript during his time at the papal chapel (1535-45).


40 Chant source is the Saragossa *Antiphonarium de sanctis* (127) 221.
in the style of the parody Mass.\footnote{This is quite unusual in Spanish motet composition. Pietro Cerone states his displeasure with the practice in Book 12 of his Melopeo y Maestro (Naples: J. B. Gargano and L. Nucci, 1613) under “The Manner to Be Observed in Composing a Motet.” Rule 5 states “the invention of the motet should be completely new, although many have composed motets upon the matter or principal motives of a madrigal, chanson, or tiento [ricercar], a thing not wholly pleasing to me.” Oliver Strunk, Source Readings in Music History: The Renaissance (New York: W.W. Norton, 1965), 74.} From the opening point of imitation, the influence of Morales is obvious (Exx. 4.3a–b).

\begin{figure}[h]
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**Ex. 4.3a:** Morales, *Exaltata est*, tenor, opening motive, mm. 1–7.
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**Ex. 4.3b:** Guerrero, *Exaltata est*, altus II, opening motive, mm. 1–6.

Guerrero’s rhythms and melodic contour are strikingly similar to, but not an exact replication of, Morales’s opening point of imitation. This allows Guerrero to reference Morales’s work without directly quoting it. He also works with Morales’s second point of imitation on the text “super choros Angelorum” (Ex. 4.3a–b).
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**Ex. 4.4a:** Morales, *Exaltata est*, bassus, motive 2, mm. 29–32.
Again, the similarity is just enough to recall Morales without quoting him. Guerrero borrows Morales’s third point, as well, leading the reader to believe that Guerrero is creating a type of “parody motet.” The similarities cease, however, at the end of the response text, where the texts diverge.

Guerrero’s shift to a different antiphon text after so much homage to the Morales model may have been prompted by the theological climate of the late sixteenth century. Morales’s secunda pars text employs several words and phrases from the Canticum Canticorum that had become associated with the promotion of the Immaculate Conception doctrine. Phrases such as “tota formosa,” “pulchra ut luna,” and “electa ut sol” may have been too overtly Immaculatist to emulate during the 1580s. Instead, Guerrero, who had been a musical voice for the Immaculatist cause in his 1555 and 1570 publications, avoided direct reference to Mary’s purity. His choice may have been influenced by the 1583 papal bull that sought to cool the arguments over the doctrine, but another, perhaps stronger reason was an aesthetic change in the arts regarding the old connections between Immaculate Conception and Assumption iconography. The Jesuit


43 For a concise history of the promotion of the belief that Mary was conceived without Original Sin in the arts in Spain and Europe, see Suzanne L. Stratton, The Immaculate Conception in Spanish Art (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

44 Borgerding, 177.
theologian and iconographer Johannes Molanus gave voice to this change in 1568, when he called for a separation of the imagery used in the artistic representation of the Assumption and Conception. Guerrero replaces the Immaculatist symbols of Morales’s text with the unambiguous imagery of Mary’s assumption into heaven and her reunion with Christ. Through the obvious references to Morales’s version, however, readers and listeners might still recall Morales’s *secunda pars* and all its Immaculatist references. As a result, Guerrero fashioned a work that offers a complex set of musical and politico-religious associations.

Esquivel was obviously inspired by Guerrero’s homage to Morales. He set his own Assumption motet in a manner that acknowledged the motets by Morales and Guerrero. At the same time, he set his own version of *Exaltata est* apart from the earlier models in three important ways. First, he composed his work for five voices, a choice that suggests an avoidance of direct comparison. Esquivel also avoided the transposed mode 1 of the Morales and Guerrero works. Finally, his opening motive does not directly refer to the original Morales opening that was imitated by Guerrero. Instead Esquivel set the obligatory rising motive in hemiola, creating the illusion of ternary meter, especially in the lower voices (see Ex. 4.5).

---

45 *De historia SS imaginum et picturarum, por vero earum usu contra abusus, libri quatuor*, 1568. Cited in Stratton, 54-55.
Nonetheless, Esquivel offers subtle comparisons immediately. The opening motive in the two superius voices recalls Morales’s opening motive in rhythmic contour and melodic direction (See Ex. 4.2a), while his altus melody at the text “Sancta Dei” is similar to Guerrero’s first motive (Ex. 4.2b).

Esquivel rarely indulged in heavy repetition of text, but his four-fold repetition of “super chorus angelorum” offers a brief moment of musica reservata by portraying the arrayed hosts of angels accompanying the Virgin to Heaven. This is underlined by the dense texture of shorter melodic figures, most of which are based on the syncopated, rhythmic motto formed by a semibreve followed by minim. Again, Esquivel sets his version apart from the models of Morales and Guerrero, whose corresponding “super choros” sections received the shortest settings in comparsion to the other phrases. The extended “super choros” section also serves an exegetical function. Esquivel focuses the listener’s attention closely on this specific aspect of the Assumption imagery, an image that reflects a theme in Luis de Acevedo’s Marial. For the feast of the Assumption, Acevedo returns several times to the imagery of the angel chorus. They first appear at the death of Mary:

Ex. 4.5: Juan de Esquivel, Exaltata est, mm. 1–8.
The Virgin died without pain, burned as the evening Phoenix in the love of God. In attendance at her death was her very precious son, accompanied by thousands of angels, and all the sacred apostles were present to receive her.

Mary’s subjects in Heaven are also primarily Angels:

The most holy and exalted Virgin was raised to Heaven in order to make known that she was the Empress of Heaven, and exalted over all the choirs of angels, seated at the right hand of her son in order to intercede and advocate for sinners.

In fact, Acevedo constantly refers to Mary as the Most Serene Queen of the Angels throughout his Marial, and Esquivel’s motet, in its own way, asks the listener or reader to meditate on a particular part of the Assumption imagery.

Sancta Maria, succurre miseris à 8

Sancta Maria, succurre miseris à 8, for the feast of Mary’s Nativity, is Esquivel’s only known double-choir motet. The scale of this work in vocal forces and length stands in sharp contrast to the rest of his Marian motets. His preference for four- and five-voice motets is in harmony with the brevity and conciseness of his motet style. Sancta Maria, however, is a reminder that the composer was capable of working in larger settings, as is also demonstrated by his Magnificat settings.

Esquivel drew the motet’s text from the Magnificat antiphon for the feast of the Snows according to the Roman Rite, but it also appears in the same location for the Common of the Virgin. The feast of Mary’s Nativity, like her Conception, has no clear biblical foundation, but the Office for the feast does offer more clearly focused texts than the one chosen by Esquivel for his motet. One such example is the verse and response following the hymn at Vespers I:
V. Nativitas est hodie sanctæ Mariæ virginis.
R. Cuius vita inclyta cunctas illustrat Ecclesias.

Moreover, all the antiphons that precede the psalms also mention the birth of Mary. Esquivel’s choice of Sancta Maria succurre miseris underlines his predilection for setting texts that had already been set by composers he admired. In this case, Francisco de Peñalosa (c. 1470-1528), Morales, Guerrero, and Victoria had composed versions of Sancta Maria, succure miseris before 1575. Philippe Rogier (c.1561-1596), the leader of Philip II’s chapel, had also set the text. In fact, the text was very popular among Northern composers during the middle part of the century.\(^{46}\) The text, with its direct call for Mary’s aid for the laity and the clergy, must have been attractive to those composers who, like Esquivel, held a special regard for the Virgin. Although the text of Esquivel’s Nativity motet does not directly mention the festal event, his choice does reflect the traditional Spanish view of Mary as an advocate for the frail:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sancta Maria,} & \quad \text{Holy Mary,} \\
\text{succurre miseris,} & \quad \text{Succor the wretched,} \\
\text{juva pusillanimes,} & \quad \text{Help the faint-hearted,} \\
\text{refove flebiles,} & \quad \text{Revive the weeping,} \\
\text{ora pro populo,} & \quad \text{Pray for the people,} \\
\text{interveni pro clero,} & \quad \text{Intervene for the clergy,} \\
\text{intercede pro devoto femineo sexu.} & \quad \text{Intercede for the faithful feminine sex.} \\
\text{sentiant omnes tuum juvamen} & \quad \text{May whomsoever celebrates your} \\
\text{quicunque celebrant} & \quad \text{commemoration,} \\
\text{tuam sanctam commemorationem.} & \quad \text{feel your help.}
\end{align*}
\]

Of course, Spain was not the only region that saw Mary as an intercessor, but Spaniards in particular felt that Mary could be called upon in situations grave or mundane.

Two pieces of evidence point to the possibility that Sancta Maria, succure miseris was one of Esquivel’s earliest motets. First, Esquivel’s substitution of the word “commemorationem” for the more standard “festorum,” suggests that he was working from a local variant of the text that had not changed by the 1580s. The locality in

\(^{46}\) Northern composers who left settings of Sancta Maria succure miseris include Jean Lheritier, Phillipe Verdelot, Nicolas Gombert, Pierre Certon, and Jacobus Clemens non Papa.
question may have been Calahorra, since a 1577 entry in the cathedral’s *Libro de fabrica* makes special mention of a procession on the feast of Mary’s Nativity. Esquivel’s motet does indeed have a processional character in its avoidance of dense polyphonic texture and clear tactus on the semibreve. As a double-choir work, however, it was probably performed in a *cori spezzati* fashion at one of the important stations on the procession route.

If Esquivel’s inspiration for *Sancta Maria succurre miseris* came from earlier settings of this text, his music reveals little of that influence. His is the only double-choir setting of the text among the known examples and the only version for more than four voices. Unlike his Spanish predecessors Morales and Guerrero, Esquivel eschews the chant melody for his own melodic material. If the motet exhibits any outside influence at all, it is in the application of *cori spezzati*, a sixteenth-century Italian practice that Esquivel most likely observed in the music of Victoria.

Rather than use the familiar chant melody as a cantus firmus, Esquivel chose to focus the listener’s attention on the textual divisions by dividing the text between the choirs. The text is presented below with italicized text representing those words that are sung simultaneously in the two choirs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primus Chorus</th>
<th>Secundus Chorus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sancta Maria</strong></td>
<td>Succurre miseris,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>juva pusillanimes,</strong></td>
<td><strong>juva pusillanimes,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ora pro populo,</strong></td>
<td><strong>ora pro populo,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>interveni pro clero,</strong></td>
<td><strong>interveni pro clero,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>intercede pro devoto femineo sexu,</strong></td>
<td><strong>intercede pro devoto femineo sexu,</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

47 LF CA 202, f. 103. The entry occurs after a list of the feasts celebrated by the cathedral on an annual basis.

The alternation of text follows grammatical divisions, but both choirs sing certain phrases. Those lines sung by both choruses suggest an emphasis on the petitions for aid to the people, clergy, and women, but Esquivel’s purpose is more architectural than expressive in this motet. The work begins with an exchange of phrases, then a combined choir texture at “juva pusillanimes.” Another exchange is followed by the extended section of combined choirs beginning with “ora pro populo.” This middle section is followed by an antiphonal exchange before the two-fold repetition of “commemorationem” that concludes the motet. The result is a textural separation of those verses that request aid for those in specific need from the more general petitions for prayer and intervention. The emphasis on the latter may also reflect a particularly Spanish appreciation for these lines. Guerrero sets these very versicles for the second part of his six-voice setting of Beata Dei genitrix Maria.49

For Esquivel, a motet composer of notable brevity, repeated words or text phrases certainly reveal poetic emphasis. The repetition of the word “commemorationem” emphasizes the devotional quality of the motet, but the most obvious case of repetition occurs at “ora pro populo,” a call for Mary’s prayers for all people. The text receives three statements in most of the voices. While one may look for spiritual symbolism in repetition, here it is more madrigalian than devotional. Esquivel is offering some musical imagery to create a sense of the faithful multitude, a technique that the Spanish theorist Juan Bermudo (c.1510-c. 1565) promoted in his Declaración de instrumentos (1555). He

---
49 In his 1589 Mottecta liber secundus, Guerrero replaces the final versicle with “Alleluia” in order to conclude both parts of the motet with the same exclamation.
advises composers that “. . . all that is said in the text, that singing can imitate, should be imitated in the composition.”

**Beata Dei genetrix Maria à 4**

With *Beata Dei genitrix Maria*, the motet assigned to the feast of the Presentation of the Virgin, Esquivel again had no available biblical imagery with which to work. Instead, he chose text that amplified the theme of Mary’s role as the model Christian. The feast was founded on a story from the Protoevangelium, or “Infancy Gospel,” of James, that relates how Mary’s parents vowed to God that they would dedicate their miraculous child to the service of the Temple. The feast celebrates the day when, at the age of three, Mary entered the Temple without reluctance, accepting a life of virginity and service to God. For the Catholic Church, this act established Mary’s virginity at the time of her betrothal to Joseph. The approbations of the antiphon directly connect the images of the Temple in James’s story to Mary’s role in the Incarnation and the approbation of God.

*Beata Dei Genitrix Maria,*

*Virgo perpetua, templum Domini,*

*sacrarium Spiritus Sancti: sola sine exemplo placuisti Domino nostro Jesu Christo, alleluia.*

Blessed Mary, Mother of God, perpetual Virgin, temple of the Lord, sanctuary of the Holy Spirit, who alone, without example, pleased our Lord, Jesus Christ, alleluia.

Esquivel’s frequent selection of texts that extol Mary through her connection to Christ suggests a deference to the Dominican ideals espoused by his benefactor, Pedro Poncé de Léon. The Dominican Order is characterized by its fervent devotion to Christ’s suffering as a man. All other devotions are influenced by this central focus. Although the order believed that it owed its foundation to the intercession of Mary, their devotions

---

50. . . *que todo lo que dize la letra, que con el canto se puede contra hazer, se contrahaga en la composición.* Juan Bermudo, *Declaración de instrumentos musicales* (Osuna: Juan de León, 1555), f. 125.
to her focus primarily on her obedience and her own devotion to Christ. This is exemplified by the order’s founder, St. Dominic, who was attracted to Mary’s sense of duty and how the preachers of the order could learn from her example. Although Esquivel was a secular clergyman, his frequent adoption of texts that underscore the Dominican devotional approach reveals the strong influence of his patron. A line from the dedication of the 1613 print is informative:

... the special gentleness of your spirit and your mildness so drew me to you that I chose you thereafter to be my patron in all things.

Assuming that Esquivel was not simply playing the sycophant, he revealed the significant influence that the bishop had over his own spiritual life, and certainly over that of the diocese of Ciudad Rodrigo, during the first decade of the seventeenth century.

Esquivel’s setting of Beata Dei genitrix is one of only two known Spanish settings of the text. Francisco Guerrero’s six-voice setting was popular enough that Victoria included it in his own 1585 Motecta Festorum Totius Anni, assigning it to the feast of Mary’s Nativity. While Esquivel’s version differs in mode, voice distribution, and length, it does contain noticeable echoes of the Guerrero setting. An informed listener would have recognized Esquivel’s subtle nods to Guerrero’s motet in the homorhythmic moment at “Templum Domini,” the syncopated entrance of “placuisti Domino,” and the descending “Alleluia” figure. Both composers also provide an ascending stepwise setting to the word “sola” that references the solmization syllables sol and la. Esquivel even provides a cautionary accidental to the B4 in the altus to preserve the relationship (see Ex. 4.6).

---


52 Esquivel frequently uses cautionary accidentals to prevent singers from lowering pitches by means of musica ficta. For a discussion of this practice in Renaissance music, see Don Harrán, “New Evidence for Musica Ficta: The Cautionary Sign,” Journal of the American Musicological Society 29/1 (Spring 1976), 77–98.
Ex. 4.6: Esquivel, Beata Dei Genitrix Maria, mm. 27–32.

Ave Maria Domini mei mater à 5

No one religious topic generated more controversy among sixteenth-century Catholic clergy than the debate over Mary’s conception. The Immaculatist stance was that Mary, like Jesus, was born without the stain of original sin, thus ensuring her worthiness as a vessel of God Incarnate. To those who supported the doctrine, most notably the Franciscans and Jesuits, Mary’s purity was not enough. They felt that Mary had to have been divinely conceived, thus avoiding any contact with original sin. This view was most elegantly elaborated by Francisco Suárez. He claimed that since Mary was selected to be the mother of Jesus at the time of creation—before original sin was known—she would naturally be exempt from that stain.

---


argument the Dominicans saw no foundation for the Immaculatist claim in scripture or patristic writings. Instead, they felt that St. Thomas Aquinas was correct when he wrote that Mary had been conceived naturally and then purified in the womb.\textsuperscript{55} To be sure, the Dominicans and other opponents to the Immaculate Conception doctrine celebrated other Marian feasts that lacked secure scriptural foundation, but they balked at giving Mary an uncomfortably similar status to Jesus. The debate became so heated during the sixteenth century that members of the clergy had to be restrained from charging each other with heresy over the matter.\textsuperscript{56}

The polemic over the Immaculate Conception was so intense that the Council of Trent avoided ruling on the question in order to preserve Church unity for more pressing matters.\textsuperscript{57} The Church eventually compromised by allowing both opinions, but with a prohibition on the use of overtly Immaculatist texts in the liturgy. Nonetheless, the Dominican Pope Pius V successfully expunged any references to Mary’s Immaculate Conception in the reformed breviary and missal. Instead, the Office and Propers texts for the feast of Mary’s Conception express only the dignity and glory of the event rather than any direct reference to its divine nature.\textsuperscript{58}

Throughout the sixteenth century, Spanish clergymen were the most ardent supporters of the Immaculatist cause. Following the failure to advance the doctrine at the Council of Trent, the center of popular support for the doctrine shifted to Seville. The city leaders, cathedral chapel, and confraternities were particularly active in staging public events and supporting Immaculatist art, music, and literature.\textsuperscript{59} Even after Pius V

\textsuperscript{55} Stratton, 3.

\textsuperscript{56} Borgerding, 170-71.

\textsuperscript{57} Borgerding, 169, 171.

\textsuperscript{58} Borgerding, 171.

\textsuperscript{59} For a discussion on the effects of the controversy on Spanish visual arts, see Stratton. The best examination of the effects on Spanish sacred music is Borgerding, 160-213. Esquivel’s Conception motet is mentioned only in passing in Borgerding’s
published a bull in 1570 forbidding the proclamation of the Immaculate Conception in the vulgar tongue, Sevillians continued publicly to support the “pious opinion,” even raising the solemnity of the celebration to the level of the city’s most important annual feasts such as Corpus Christi. This outward demonstration of support for the cause also had effects beyond the city. As Seville was often the model for other cathedrals in Castille and Andalusia, the unabashed support for the Immaculatist doctrine created an atmosphere that allowed other cities to test the determination of papal enforcement in the matter.

In selecting motet texts for the feast of the Conception, immaculate or otherwise, composers faced some limitations. As was the case for the feasts of Expectation, Snows, Assumption, Nativity, and Presentation, there is no direct reference to Mary’s Conception in the Bible. The story of her birth, like that of her presentation to the Temple, has its roots in the Infancy Gospel of James. Even in this narrative, the Conception is not explicitly described as immaculate. Anna is simply afforded the same late-life pregnancy that was given to Abraham’s wife Sarah. Spanish composers wishing to express the pious opinion necessarily turned to the allegorical imagery that was developed by pro-Immaculatist theologians and visual artists. The primary allegory centered around symbols of purity borrowed from the Canticum canticorum, a text associated with Mary since the Middle Ages. Mary’s divine and pure Conception was described as a closed garden, a lily among the thorns, and the rose of Sharon. Further images from the Old work, since he did not have access to the complete versions of the work, located in the archives of the cathedrals of Coria and Burgo de Osma.

60 Borgerding, 208.

61 Borgerding, 176.

62 The allegory of the Song of Songs was interpreted by Christian theologians during the Middle Ages as a dialogue between Christ and the Church (the Beloved), but as early as the twelfth century Mary had become the surrogate for the Church. See E. Ann Matter, The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), 151–77.
Testament included the gate of heaven, the exalted cedar, and the olive. No phrase, however, was more evocative of the Spanish Immaculatist view than “Tota pulchra es” (CC 4:7). Its frequent use in painting, devotional poetry, and music led to its adoption as a motto for the Immaculatist cause. Thus, when Guerrero, a Sevillian maestro, highlighted the phrase in his motets Quasi cedrus (1555), Dulcissima Maria (1555), and Tota pulchra es (1570), its meaning was clear to his listeners.

Composers who chose to create more orthodox works could use the direct references from the Conception Office or the more generalized devotional texts from the Common of the Virgin or the Little Office. The most popular non-Immaculatist text in Spain was Conceptio tua Dei genitrix, the Magnificat antiphon for Vespers II. This very generalized text, set by Juan Ylario (fl. early 16th century), Morales, Guerrero, Juan Ginés Pérez de la Parra (1548–1600), and Juan Pujol places the focus on Mary’s connection to Christ. While this text would seem to fit Esquivel’s preference for Christological Marian texts, he uncharacteristically chose to adapt a pre-Tridentine source by extracting text from the seventh, eighth, and fourteenth versicles of the pre-Tridentine Assumption sequence Area virga primæ matris Eveae:

Ave Maria Domini mei mater, alma caelica, plena gratia, tu benedicta in secula orbis Regina, tu es pulchra Dei sponsa, Domina in caelo, et in terra.

Hail Mary, Mother of my Lord, soul of heaven, full of grace, you are blessed unto the ages, Queen of creation. You are the beautiful bride of God, Lady, in heaven and on earth.

Esquivel’s situation at Ciudad Rodrigo may have influenced his choice. One of Seville’s most prominent Dominicans, Pedro Ponce de León, became bishop of the Ciudad Rodrigo diocese in 1605. Esquivel, who was working during the height of the

---

63 Borgerding, 179.

64 Borgerding, 180-89.

65 Missale Abulense (Salamanca: Juan de Portas, 1500–01), unfoliated. Area virga prime matris Eveae appears in as a prosa for the feast of the Assumption. Thanks to Grayson Wagstaff for providing this citation.
Immaculate Conception polemic, likely understood the Dominican opposition to the doctrine; he clearly states his admiration for the bishop’s choice of orders in the 1613 print’s dedication. If Esquivel’s high regard for the bishop was more than mere flattery, he would certainly have had the Dominican view in mind as he chose a motet text for the feast of Mary’s Conception. The text he chose, however, offers some evidence that his own view of the matter may have actually been in conflict with the prevailing Dominican opinion.

On the surface, *Ave Maria Domini mei mater* is a simple litany of Mary’s virtues, couched in the form of a gloss on the Angel Gabriel’s salutation with devotional phrases that proclaim Mary as a queen in Heaven and on Earth. The phrase “tu es pulchra Dei sponsa,” however, stands out because of its allusion to the favorite Immaculatist phrase, “tota pulchra es.” While the word “pulchra” is not Immaculatist in its own right, its appearance in the context of a Conception motet during a time of great sensitivity to the issue would have been read as a clear reference to the controversial doctrine. This phrase alone would not necessarily cast Esquivel as a supporter of the Immaculatist cause, but when taken together with the musical setting’s allusions to a more famous motet by Guerrero, Esquivel’s view on the matter becomes clearer.

Esquivel’s admiration for Guerrero’s five-voice motet *Ave Virgo sanctissima* is evidenced by his inclusion of a parody Mass on the motet in his 1608 *Liber primus*. Esquivel was not alone in his reverence for Guerrero’s motet, which was based on a Spanish antiphon text for the Nativity of John the Baptist. It was widely known and appreciated to the degree that it became the source of five parody Masses in addition to

---


Esquivel’s setting. The popularity of Guerrero’s motet in Spain stemmed from the work’s attractive musical setting and its use of several popular Immaculatist symbols, such as the precious pearl, the beautiful lily, and the rose.

The influence of Ave virgo sanctissima is evident at every level of construction in Esquivel’s Conception motet. Both works are set for five voices and both have as their structural foundation a canon at the unison in the uppermost voices. Formally, both motets are based on devotional texts that take the form of short litanies. Guerrero, the Sevillian, offers a clearly Immaculatist statement that invokes the symbols of purity that had become associated with the doctrine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ave virgo sanctissima</th>
<th>Hail, most holy Virgin,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dei mater piissima</td>
<td>Most holy Mother of God,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maris stella clarissima</td>
<td>Brightest star of the sea:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve semper gloria</td>
<td>Hail ever glorious,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarita pretiosa</td>
<td>Precious pearl,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicut lilium formosa</td>
<td>As beautiful as a lily,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitens olens velut rosa.</td>
<td>Shining, smelling like a rose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Esquivel constructed his text in a similar manner with a salutation to the Virgin, followed by a list of her qualities (see p. 157).

While the Marian attributes that Esquivel presents are not so controversial, he alludes to the most Immaculatist of all terminology by including the phrase, “tu es pulchra Dei sponsa.” While Guerrero might have provided an elaborate setting for this special statement, Esquivel does not alter his succession of stretto points of imitation. Rather, he makes his statement in a more subtle manner by excerpting a portion of the opening canonic melody of Guerrero’s motet (Ex. 4.7a). By referring to the most

---

68 In addition to Esquivel’s composition, parody Masses on Ave Virgo sanctissima include examples by Philip II’s Flemish assistant maestro de capilla Géry de Ghersem (c. 1573-1630), the Aragonese composer Pedro Rimonte (c. 1565–1627), and Portuguese composers Estêvão Lopes Morago (c. 1575-after 1630), Manoel de Tavares (fl. 1630), and Juan del Vado y Gómez (c. 1625-1691); Borgerding, 197f.

69 The outward similarities of the Esquivel and Guerrero motets are also noted in Walkley, 232–36.
recognizable portion of the Guerrero setting, Esquivel leaves no doubt as to the intertextual connection that should be made by the listener.

Ex. 4.7a: Francisco Guerrero, *Ave Virgo sanctissima*, cantus I, mm. 1–6.

Ex. 4.7b: Juan de Esquivel, *Ave Maria Domini mei*, mm. 23–28. Quotation of Guerrero indicated in dotted brackets.

By linking his most Immaculatist phrase to a popular Immaculatist motet, Esquivel offers an insight into his own feelings on the Conception debate. Whether he was seeking to avoid the disapproval of his employer or problems with the work’s publication, his use of intertextual and structural connections with Guerrero’s work was a clever way to create an Immaculatist motet while avoiding the type of overt statements prohibited by Rome.
One reference to a Guerrero motet is not sufficient evidence to brand Esquivel an active supporter of the Immaculate Conception. His established reverence for Guerrero’s works may have been the only motive for the connections found in the Conception motet. Perhaps the best evidence for Esquivel’s Immaculatist leanings exists in the only known image of the composer. The woodcut title page at the head of the 1608 Missarum liber primus shows Esquivel in prayer before an image of the Virgin and Child (see Chapter 1, Fig. 1.1). The inscription Sancta et immaculata virginitas offers evidence that his devotion to the Virgin and her Immaculate Conception was fervent enough that he felt the confidence to proclaim it on the first page of a publication that was underwritten by a Dominican bishop. Esquivel did not include a motet on the text in the print, but he certainly knew the fine setting by Morales, as well as Guerrero’s parody Mass on the same work. Whether Esquivel felt free to express his Immaculatist views during his daily duties cannot be determined, but the musical and iconographical evidence indicate that he felt some impulse to reveal his feelings in creative ways.

**Virgo Dei Genitrix à 4**

The feast of Mary’s Expectation was a particularly Spanish celebration. It occurred one week before Christmas and celebrated the Church’s anticipation, through Mary, of the birth of Jesus. In his Discursos, Juan de Acevedo drew a parallel between the Expectation and Palm Sunday by noting that each commences a week-long anticipation of the appearance of Jesus as a living man. The feast traces its origins to a 656 C. E. decision by the Tenth Council of Toledo that translated the feast of the Annunciation from 25 March to 18 December, in order to comply with an ancient Church

---

70 Morales’s four-voice motet was widely available in print (1541, 1546) and also survives in several Spanish manuscripts (ToleBC 17, MadM 6829, TarazC 8, VallaP s.s., SevBC 1, SaraP 34, GranCR 5). It was also intabulated for vihuela in Miguel de Fuenllana, *Libro de musica para vihuela, intitulado Orphenica lyra* (Valladolid: n.p., 1554). Guerrero’s five-voice imitation Mass was published in his Missarum liber primus (Paris: Nicolai du Chemin, 1566).

71 Acevedo, f. 378.
law prohibiting the celebration of feasts during Lent. When Alfonso VI (1040-1109) conquered Toledo in 1085, he replaced the Mozarabic with the Roman Rite and, in time, restored the Annunciation to its original date. The December celebration, however, remained and came to be called Santa María de la O for the seven “O” antiphons that are sung after the conclusion of Vespers I and II. In 1573 Leo XIII approved the feast for Toledo, and the celebration gradually spread to the rest of Spain. By the first quarter of the seventeenth century, the Expectation was celebrated in much of the kingdom and had come to be considered a particularly Spanish feast.

For his Expectation motet, Esquivel chose the Gradual from the Mass for Conception.

\[
\begin{align*}
\textit{Virgo Dei Genitrix} & \quad \text{Virgin Mother of God:} \\
\textit{quam totus non capit orbis,} & \quad \text{He whom the whole of creation cannot} \\
\textit{in tua se clausit viscera,} & \quad \text{contain, closed himself within your womb,} \\
\textit{factus homo.} & \quad \text{and became Man.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

72 The O antiphons, named after the common four-note setting of the introductory “O,” are the Magnificat antiphons in the ferial Office for the seven days before the Vigil of Christmas. Each addresses Jesus by one of his scripturally ascribed names and concludes with a petition for the coming of Christ. They include: \textit{O sapientia, O adonai, O radix Jesse, O clauis David, O Oriens, O Rex genitum, O Emmanuel Rex}. In addition, \textit{O virgo virginum quomodo fiet} is the Magnificat antiphon for Second Vespers on the Feast of the Expectation.

73 It was approved as a double-major, without an octave, which would have always fallen on Christmas.


75 A 1620 \textit{Breviarium romanum} from Madrid lists the Expectation under an appendix titled \textit{Proprium Sanctorum Hispanorum}.

76 The only other contemporary Spanish settings of \textit{Virgo Dei Genitrix} are an anonymous setting in the late fifteenth-century Barcelona Biblioteca Central MS. 454 (BarcBC 454), and a setting by Rodrigo de Ceballos, with copies in SevBC 1 and ToleBC 7.
The composer’s choice presents a succinct devotion that, true to his general approach, praises Mary through her relation to Jesus, an approach all the more appropriate for a feast so close to Christmas. Esquivel rarely looked outside the Office for Marian texts, but in this case the Office antiphons for the Expectation did not offer the same clarity of devotion as this Gradual text, which presents a vivid image of the pregnant Virgin and the “expected” event. To underscore this, Esquivel paid special attention to the final phrase, *viscera, factus homo*. The phrase repetitions—five times in most voices—constitute half the total length of the motet, presenting a clear signal of the text’s importance. The repeated phrase proclaims the miracle for which the Church is eagerly waiting, and Esquivel reinforces this reading with the musical imagery of a descending figure that outlines a perfect fifth or fourth, with occasional extensions to the octave (see Ex. 4.8a).

Ex. 4.8a: Esquivel, *Virgo Dei Genitrix*, mm. 26–32.

This type of imagery was typical for Renaissance composers who wished to create a musical picture of God descending from heaven to become incarnate. One other notable madrigalism appears in the altus part in mm. 12–13 of the transcription. Esquivel sets the tenor and altus in imitation at the unison to the text “non capit,” resulting in a short but attractive passage of parallel thirds. The move requires the altus to leap out of its modal octave for six semi-minims before returning by an upward octave leap, suggesting that
the musical line cannot be “contained” by the modal octave (D4–D5), just as Mary cannot be contained by all of creation.

Ex. 4.8b: Esquivel, *Virgo Dei Genitrix*, mm. 11–15.

Conservative musical imagery is not the main point of interest in the polyphonic setting of *Virgo Dei Genitrix*. Rather, the overall musical setting reveals the experimental nature of Esquivel’s compositional style.\(^{77}\) Disjunct writing in the inner voices, unorthodox voice leading, and non-cadential accidentals are characteristic of his most experimental works.\(^{78}\) In addition to the altus’s excursion outside the modal octave in mm. 12–13, the same singer is required to navigate consecutive skips of a fourth in mm. 28 and 41. Moreover, Esquivel’s use of B-flat in the altus/bassus parts serves to

---

\(^{77}\) Esquivel certainly had few Spanish models for inspiration. The only other Spanish settings of *Virgo Dei Genitrix* are an anonymous setting in BarcBC 454, which was not available for comparison, and a setting by Rodrigo de Ceballos found in both SevBC 1 and ToleBC 7.

\(^{78}\) Esquivel’s unorthodox part-writing must have caused some consternation with later musicians. Pages 111–13 of the Hispanic Society of America’s copy of the 1608 motet book has many pasted paper corrections that appear to be attempts to reconcile some of the non-traditional sounds created by this setting. The Coria Cathedral copy was also consulted for this study, but the possibility that there are serious errors in the print is suggested by the faulty clef position in the bassus part on the third line of p. 111.
complicate an already modally ambiguous work. The entire first half of the motet proceeds in mode 8, disturbed only by the B-flats in mm. 10, 11, 15, and 18. By forcing B-natural on the altus part through the use of cautionary accidentals (see Ex. 4.9), Esquivel reinforces the modal focus of G for the close of the first half of the motet. The second half of the motet, which consists of the *viscera, factus homo* repetitions, is more ambiguous. The first major cadence (m. 35) falls on A, the eventual final of the second half, but the B-flats in mm. 38–40 continue to cloud the music’s direction. The cadential structure at the end of the motet, however, suggests that mode 10 is the final destination. If Esquivel’s intention was to create a sense of “expectation” by means of modal instability, he was certainly successful.

Ex. 4.9: Juan de Esquivel, *Virgo Dei Genitrix*, mm. 20–25.

*Susciptiens Simeon à 5*

The feast of Mary’s Purification celebrates the successful completion of her isolation following the birth of Jesus and her ritual purification at the Temple. The relation of this event is found only in Luke 2: 21-40.\(^79\) Mosaic Law mandated that a

---

\(^79\) Luke’s Nativity account proceeds directly from the birth of Jesus to the Presentation, omitting any reference to Matthew’s account of the flight to Egypt or the Slaughter of the Innocents.
woman was forbidden from touching anything consecrated to God for seven days after the birth of a male child. She was furthermore required to remain in isolation for another thirty-three days, after which she was to bring the child to the Temple along with a year-old lamb and a pigeon or turtle dove. If the woman was poor, another pigeon could be substituted for the lamb—and according to Luke, Mary and Joseph did exactly that. The animals were then to be sacrificed as burnt offerings to God, thus releasing the woman from her impurity.

The feast also celebrates the presentation of Jesus to the Temple. Since Jesus was the couple’s first-born son, Mary and Joseph were required to consecrate him to God at the time of Mary’s Purification. Once this was done, the father was expected to “ransom” the child back by paying the attending priest five shekels. While in the Temple, Mary and Joseph encountered Simeon, a righteous old man to whom God had promised a glimpse of the Messiah. Simeon took the child into his arms and proclaimed,

Sovereign Lord, as you have promised, you may now dismiss your servant in peace. For my eyes have seen your salvation, which you have prepared in the sight of all people, a light for revelation to the Gentiles and for glory to your people Israel.\(^{80}\)

This text was adopted by the Church as the Canticle of Simeon, or the *Nunc dimittis*.

The text of Esquivel’s Purification motet avoids any mention of Mary and focuses on the Presentation mystery of Simeon’s canticle.

*Suscipiens Simeon, puerum in manibus,  
exclamavit dicens: *Nunc dimittis  
Domine servum tuum in pace.*

Simeon, receiving the Child into his hands, said, in a loud voice, “Now you may dismiss your servant in peace, O Lord.”

This text also appears in the Purification Office liturgy as the verse following Matins lesson 6 of nocturne 2. The text is unique among Esquivel’s Marian motets in that it makes no mention of the Virgin at all. He might have taken the opportunity to extol Mary’s obedience to God’s law and her purity, which were devotional points in his other

\(^{80}\) Luke 2: 29-32.
Marian motets, but in choosing to focus on the Presentation he offers some insight into contemporary Spanish devotion.

Esquivel’s contemporary Luis de Acevedo treats the Purification as a three-in-one feast that celebrates Mary’s Purification, Jesus’s Presentation, and the beginning of the Christian faith in the person of Simeon. He deals with the Purification in the first four *discursos* but then devotes significant space to a discussion of the mysteries of Simeon’s recognition at the Presentation. To Acevedo, Simeon is the representative of all humanity, who recognizes the Child from the bright light that emanated around Him. The witness of Simeon, then, is the moment that begins humankind’s new faith. By setting Simeon’s words, Esquivel offers his, or his institution’s, primary focus for the feast. It is not the Purification of Mary, nor even the Presentation of Jesus to the Temple, but rather the first time that Jesus is recognized as the Messiah.

Esquivel’s setting of *Suscipiens Simeon* is a free paraphrase of the canticle tone. The ascending figure that marks Esquivel’s first point of imitation in the superius and altus I recalls the opening of the canticle tone, although adjusting the tone’s characteristic minor third between the second and third pitches to a whole tone. To connect the motet and the chant further, the composer follows a full break between the introductory clause and the text of the canticle with a section of composed *falsobordone* on the text “Nunc dimittis” (see Ex. 4.10a).
Ex. 4.10a: Juan de Esquivel, *Susci piens Simeon*, mm. 19–31.
Esquivel’s *falsobordone* may have been a common Spanish harmonization or he may have purposely emulated the opening of the polyphonic verse of Victoria’s *Nunc dimittis* setting (Ex. 4.10b).

![Ex. 4.10b: Tomás Luis de Victoria, Nunc dimittis, mm. 1–5.](image)

Esquivel does not cite the entire first verse of the canticle, choosing an abbreviated statement:

**Canticle of Simeon, Verse 1**

*Nunc dimittis servum tuum, Domine,*<br>
*secundum verbum tuum in pace.*

**Esquivel**

*Nunc dimittis Domine servum tuum in pace.*

He does, however, retain the tone’s characteristic contours in the polyphonic lines on the appropriate words, although ordered differently (see Ex. 4.10b).

**Ecce ancilla Domini à 5**

Esquivel returned to the theme of Mary’s obedience for his Annunciation motet, *Ecce ancilla Domini*. The motet text comes from the fifth antiphon of Vespers I of the Annunciation, which itself derives from Luke 1:38 as Mary’s response to the angel at the Annunciation: *Ecce ancilla Domini fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum et discessit ab illa angelus.*<sup>82</sup> Although Esquivel was inclined to take up popular motet texts, in this case he

---

<sup>82</sup> The antiphon is also the fifth antiphon of Lauds for the Annunciation and appears as the fifth antiphon for First Vespers of Expectation.
eschewed the antiphon *Missus est Gabriel*, which had been made popular through polyphonic settings by Josquin, Mouton, and Morales. Instead, he chose to draw the listener’s attention to Mary’s own words of obedience and humility, words that were promoted by theologians as the necessary human acceptance of salvation. Luis de Acevedo, who placed the Annunciation as the first of his *discursos* on Marian feasts, agrees with the Church Fathers that it was necessary for a woman to offer obedience to God, in order to cancel the first human woman’s disobedience that led to original sin:

> . . . dixo San Epiphanio en el lugar alegado que es dezir que si la primera Eua nos puso de lodo, la segunda nos saco del, y si la primera Eua nos fue causa de tantas penas y duelos, la segunda lo fue de muchos bienes, si la primera Eua fue causa de la muerte por que ella abrio la puerta para que entrase en el mundo, la segunda Eua que es Maria, fue causa de la vida que nos la dio, y por ella entro Dios en el mundo, si por la primera vino la enfermedad, por la segunda nos vino la salud y remedio, para que como muger Eua, fue el principio de nuestra perdicion otra fuesse el principio de

---

83 Josquin’s four-voice setting of *Missus est Gabriel* appears in a number of early sixteenth-century manuscripts (including Toledo Cathedral ToleBC 17), as well as Petrucci’s *Motteti C* (Venice: Ottaviano Petrucci, 1504).

84 Mouton’s five-voice setting survives in a number of early sixteenth-century manuscripts as well as the prints *Liber selectarum cantionum quas vulgo Mutetas* (Augsburg: Grimm & Wyrsung, 1520), and *Secunda pars magni operis musici* (Nuremberg: Berg & Neuber, 1559).

85 Morales’s setting appears in *Missæ cum quatuor vocibus* (Venice: Girolamo Scotto, 1542) and the manuscripts ToleBC 17 and Bibliotek der Hansestadt Lübeck (LübBH 203). The only other Spanish example is a setting by Infantas that survives in Nuremberg Landeskirchliches Archiv MS. 222 (NurLA 222) and *Sacræ cantiones, cum quinque, sex et pluribus vocibus, de festis præcipuis totius anni, a præstantissimis Italiæ musicis nuperrime concinnatae. Quarum quædam antæ Venetiis separatim editæ sunt ... studio & opera Friderici Lindneri* (Nuremberg: Catherine Gerlach, 1585).
Ecce ancilla Domini is the shortest of all of Esquivel’s Marian motets and the only one that revolves around a plainchant cantus firmus. The antiphon chant, which appears in the altus, most closely matches the Saragossa antiphoner until m. 18 of the motet transcription, where a cadential F-sharp appears. The polyphonic structure is based on three points of imitation that are derived from intervals found in the source chant. Some musical imagery appears at the beginning of the work in the lower voices in order to emphasize the lowliness of the ancilla or “maidservant.” In spite of the brevity of the motet, Esquivel treats the phrase “secundum verbum tuum” with repetition, further emphasizing the theme of obedience to God’s word.

Sub tuum præsidium à 5 and Surge Propera amica mea à 3

Esquivel assigned two motets for use in conjunction with the votive Marian services on Saturdays. This devotion has its roots in the legend that Jesus appeared to Mary on the Saturday before the Resurrection in reward for her steadfast faith. The liturgy of the Mass and Office dates to the time of the First Crusade. Esquivel’s motet

---

86 Acevedo, 4.


89 See Chapter 2.
Sub tuum præsidium, from the 1608 motet book, is based on the oldest known Marian antiphon.\textsuperscript{90}

\begin{quote}
Sub tuum præsidium confugimus sancta
Dei genitrix, nostras deprecationes ne
despicias in necessitatibus, sed a
periculis cunctis libera nos semper
Virgo gloriosa et benedicta.
\end{quote}

We turn to you for protection, Holy Mother of God. Do not despise our prayers in our time of need, but save us from every danger, ever glorious and blessed Virgin.

The popularity of the text as a motet or antiphon setting inspired compositions by Heinrich Isaac (c. 1450/55–1517),\textsuperscript{91} Antoine Brumel (c. 1460–c. 1513),\textsuperscript{92} Jean Lhéritier (c. 1480–after 1551),\textsuperscript{93} Costanzo Festa (c. 1485/90–1545),\textsuperscript{94} John Taverner (c. 1490–1545),\textsuperscript{95} Adrian Willaert (c. 1490–1562),\textsuperscript{96} Nicholas Gombert (c. 1495–c. 1560),\textsuperscript{97} Thomas Crequillon (c. 1505/15–1557),\textsuperscript{98} Jacobus Clemens non Papa (c. 1510/15–c. 1555),\textsuperscript{99} Pierre Certon (d. 1572),\textsuperscript{100} the Portuguese Pedro de Escobar,\textsuperscript{101} and Esquivel’s

\textsuperscript{90} The oldest extant copy of the prayer Sub tuum præsidium was discovered on an early third-century Coptic papyrus. The text, however, reflects the prayer’s origins in the times of Roman persecution of Greek Christians in Egypt. Buono, “Sub tuum (We Fly to Your Patronage),” 458–60.

\textsuperscript{91} In organ tablature in SGallS 530.

\textsuperscript{92} Motetti e canzone libro primo (Rome: Andrea Antico, 1521) and mss. CambriP 1760, LonRC 1070, and FlorBN II.I.232.

\textsuperscript{93} Mss. BolC Q 20, RomeV 35-40/II, RomeM 23-4, VatS 19, VatG XII.4, PiacD (5), and StuttL 36.

\textsuperscript{94} Mss. VerBC 760 and RomeM 23-4.

\textsuperscript{95} Mss. CambriU Peter 471-4 (Henrician part books).

\textsuperscript{96} Ms. ModE C.313.

\textsuperscript{97} Ms. UlmS 237.

\textsuperscript{98} Mss. LeuvU 163, CheleM E 1, and in print in Sacrarum cantionum 5 voci (Antwerp: Tilman Susato, 1546).

\textsuperscript{99} Ms. RegB B223-33.
fellow Spaniards Infantas, and Santos de Aliseda (d. 1580). The lack of any example by Morales, Guerrero, or Victoria is certainly surprising, considering the authority and popularity of this Marian prayer.

Ironically, the brief text of *Sub tuum* served as the foundation for Esquivel’s longest Marian motet. In place of his trademark conciseness, the composer repeats virtually every phrase of the text. Why he assigned such an elaborate composition to the Saturday devotion is not entirely clear, but he also composed a polyphonic Mass for the occasion, suggesting that there were times when the devotion was celebrated in a particularly festive manner. The scope of the work would have been appropriate for the celebration at Esquivel’s first post in Oviedo. The chapter ceremonial requires that the Mass at the Saturday devotion be celebrated in the manner of a semi-double feast. Moreover, the style of the motet suggests that it is an early work by the composer.

Musically *Sub tuum præsidium* offers a few moments of musical imagery, such as the opening point of imitation that rises to the text “We fly to your protection.”

---

100 Ms. PadBC D27. Print versions exists in *Mottetti del frutto 4 voci* (Venice: Antonio Gardano, 1539, 1549 and Girolamo Scotto, 1549, 1562).

101 Ms. TarazC 2.

102 *Don Fernando de las Infantas, patritii cordubensis Sacrarum varii styli Cantionum tituli Spriitus Sancti, Liber II cum quinque vocibus* (Venice, Scotto, 1578).

103 Ms. ToleBC 7.

104 Morales did compose a motet with the same title, but after opening the work with “Sub tuum præsidium confugimus,” he turns toward an original text that solicits Christ’s aid, refuge, and forgiveness. *Quartus liber cum quatuor vocibus. Motetti del fiore* (Lyons: Jacques Moderne, c. 1539).

105 Esquivel’s *Missa De Beata Virgine in Sabbato à 4*, a plainchant Mass, was printed in his 1613 sacred music collection [ff. 450-65]. Studies of this work have provided analyses that focus on Esquivel’s paraphrase of the plainchants, but none provides any real historical context for polyphonic settings of the Saturday devotional Mass, nor reports whether any other examples exist. See Robert Snow, *The 1613 Print of Juan Esquivel Barahona*, 29; and Bruner, 70–80.

cross relation in mm. 29 and 34 and tritone movement between the voices in mm. 28 and 32 of the transcription on the text “deprecationes” also underline the theological dissonance of sin (see Ex. 4.11).

Ex. 4.11: Juan de Esquivel, *Sub tuum præsidium*, mm. 28–34.

The rather uninspired points of imitation also point to a composer who is still learning. Assuming that terseness, non-cadential dissonance, and parallel perfect intervals found in some of Esquivel’s compositions are traits of his later style, *Sub tuum præsidium* should probably be regarded as an earlier work. The devotional nature of the text, rather than one that is closely related to a particular feast, may well have been an attractive option for a young composer.

*Surge propera amica mea* is one of only two motets that Esquivel included in his 1613 print. Its association with the Saturday Marian devotion is made clear from its placement alongside the *Missa de Beatae Mariae in Sabbato* and the rubric at the head of the motet that reads *MOTETUM: Beatae Mariae cantandum in organo*. Unusual characteristics abound in this work. It is Esquivel’s only known three-voice motet. The
scoring of two superius parts with a bassus offers a tantalizing Baroque polarization of voices, but the imitative texture and mostly conjunct bass movement belie any real influence of the emerging North Italian continuo motet (see Ex. 4.11). Nonetheless, the scoring is unique in Esquivel’s motet writing and unusual for a Renaissance composer.

Ex. 4.12: Juan de Esquivel, *Surge propera amica mea*, mm. 1–7.

*Surge propera* is also the only Marian text that Esquivel derived completely from the *Canticum canticorum* (Song of Songs 2:13-14):


(Beloved) Arise, my love, my fair one, and come with me. (Lover) My dove in the clefts of the rock, in the hiding places of the mountainside. Show me your face, Let your voice sound in my ears; for your voice is sweet, and your face is lovely.

Song of Songs 2 was fertile ground for Renaissance composers. It is rich in imagery and long received a Marian exegesis. In particular, the imagery had been connected to the feast of the Visitation by the Augustinian theologians Honorius Augustodunensis (fl. 1106-1135) and Rupert of Deutz (c. 1075-1129). Mary (the Lover), as the representative

---

107 Esquivel employed an early sixteenth-century Vulgate version of the Song of Songs text for his motet that retained the word “propera” in verse 14. Later editions reveal a gradual removal of the word. G. Brian Cardell, Rare Books Librarian, Catholic University of America, e-mail message to author, 5 January 2005.
of the Church, is exhorted by Christ (the Beloved) to rise and go visit Elizabeth, an act that will usher in the new age (spring). Most settings of text from this chapter, such as the examples by Guerrero, Vivanco, and Lassus, begin in the middle of verse 10 (“Surge propera, amica mea, formosa mea et veni”), emphasizing the Visitation reading. Esquivel, however, bypasses the springtime imagery and focuses the listener’s attention towards the image of the hiding dove, which had been interpreted as representing Mary’s humility, and the bird’s sweet voice, which was tied to the Magnificat.  

Conclusions

The close connection between Esquivel’s Marian motet texts and the feasts to which they are assigned in the 1608 and 1613 collections strongly supports the conclusion that Esquivel composed the motets with those feasts in mind, rather than assigning feasts only for publication. For those motets that do not make use of specific Office texts from their assigned feasts, such as *Sancta Maria succure miseris* and *Virgo Dei genitrix*, there are external or exegetical factors that help to establish the festal connection. In the case of *Ave Maria Domini mei mater*, a strong intertextuality with a motet by Guerrero dispels any doubt that it was composed for use during the feast of Mary’s Conception.

Esquivel’s selection of texts also demonstrates a preference for those biblical and liturgical passages that emphasize Mary’s obedience to God’s law. Any glory due her is derived principally from her connection to Christ, an approach that surely resonated with the Tridentine attempt to place Christ at the center of Salvation and to keep Mary’s role limited to what scripture and authoritative teachings could support. With the exception of his Conception motet, Esquivel’s conservative choices would have found approval in the eyes of his Dominican bishop. The Conception motet, however, does offer evidence that Esquivel shared the prevailing Spanish opinion regarding the Immaculate Conception.

---

108 Thanks to Jane Dahlenburg for sharing her work on the Marian readings of the Song of Songs.
Taken as a whole, Esquivel’s motets reveal a composer who was enthusiastic about liturgical reform or at least supportive of it. His Mariology is not constructed on popular Spanish tradition but is solidly grounded in the writings of Tridentine Spanish theologians such as Juan de Acevedo and Francisco Suárez.
CONCLUSIONS

Juan de Esquivel was one of the most prolific composers of the generation that followed Francisco Guerrero. His 1613 print alone was one of the largest volumes of sacred music produced by a Spanish composer during the Renaissance and one of the last monuments of sacred vocal polyphony in Spain. Archival research has revealed that Esquivel was a much more prominent composer in Spain than previous scholarship has recognized. Both the Salamanca and the Burgos chapters contacted him about positions in those prestigious cathedrals, and his music was owned by cathedral chapters from Andalucia to Aragon. That he remained in Ciudad Rodrigo after 1600 is testament to Sanchez Cabañas’s claim that Esquivel held that position out of love for his home city.

Esquivel’s knowledge of the music of contemporary and older Spanish composers is evident in his numerous references to the works of others and in his chant and text treatments. His individual style suggests that he was also seeking to move beyond the limits of tradition and Renaissance modal theory. Esquivel had a clear understanding of his place in the line of Spanish tradition, and he self-consciously manipulated traditional practices and late Renaissance musical style to create an individual and somewhat mannered style of music. The results of this study suggest that further exploration of Esquivel’s style in the context of seventeenth-century Portuguese polyphony is warranted.

As a Spaniard, Esquivel lived in a culture that viewed the Virgin Mary as a special advocate for the Spanish people. The enthusiastic popular devotion to Mary is most clearly demonstrated by the Spanish support for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Documentary and musical evidence suggests that Esquivel was an advocate for the doctrine, although his principal patron was a Dominican bishop, whose order openly disagreed with the Immaculate Conception doctrine.

The purpose of this study was to examine Esquivel’s compositions on Marian
texts in the context of Spanish polyphonic and devotional traditions. Marian texts were chosen in order to examine Esquivel’s music in the context of a large body of Spanish work. That Esquivel created music within traditional frameworks should not make him unremarkable. Rather, he stands as the final figure in a century-long development of those traditional practices, while offering an individual voice that is as personal as that of Morales or Guerrero.

Institutional Marian devotion in post-Tridentine Europe was focused on a cycle of eight feast days in her honor, the Saturday devotion and the Little Office. Spanish churches celebrated the additional feast of the Expectation. While the Magnificat may be considered a Marian text, its place in every Vespers service turns Mary’s greeting into a more universal statement of faith. The most devotional texts of the Marian Office were the four major antiphons sung at Compline.

In setting the four principal Marian antiphons, Spanish polyphonic practice, with allowances for those composers who spent most of their careers abroad, was remarkably uniform. The pre-Tridentine Spanish practice of singing only Salve Regina at Compline resulted in a large number of Salve settings and noticeably fewer settings of the other three antiphons. Moreover, the Salve service remained an important devotional service into the seventeenth century. Esquivel and his fellow Spaniards tended to compose the Salve Regina in alternatim settings that provided polyphony for the even-numbered verses around a cantus firmus that was particular to Spain. Esquivel honored the prevailing practice but also followed the early seventeenth-century trend towards experimentation with chromaticism.

Because of the reliance on the Salve Regina antiphon, Spaniards had little need to compose polyphonic settings of the other three Marian antiphons. Of the three, Regina caeli received the most treatments, and Alma Redemptoris mater received the fewest. Esquivel’s complete cycle of Marian antiphons was only one of three such cycles composed by Spaniards before 1630, suggesting that the impetus for his cycle was the need in Spanish churches for more settings of the other three antiphons.

Likewise, Esquivel created a cycle of Vespers hymns for duplex feasts that included Ave maris stella, the hymn sung at all the principal Marian feasts. As in the
case of the antiphons, Esquivel followed Spanish practice and set the hymn for *alternatim* practice. His two polyphonic strophes represent a transition from sixteenth-century settings, which provide polyphony for up to four strophes, to the seventeenth-century practice of composing only one strophe, which would be adapted as needed.

The motet was the most versatile of polyphonic genres during the Renaissance. Composers and institutions were free to select texts that addressed specific points of Marian devotion. The motets were then used in a variety of situations. As an insertion into the Mass, the motet was able to present a particular point of Marian devotion within the liturgy of the Mass. Motets were often sung in place of the Benedictus, as evidenced by the shortened Sanctus settings of Esquivel and other early seventeenth-century Spanish composers. The widespread use of motets during Mass prompted post-Tridentine composers to provide festal designations for their motets and to choose texts that were closely linked with specific liturgies. Esquivel’s cycle of motets for Marian feasts stands as the most complete cycle published in Spain. Documentary evidence also reveals that Marian motets were sung during outdoor religious processions on feasts such as Assumption, Conception, and Mary’s Nativity, and for the weekly Salve service.

A close reading of Esquivel’s Marian motets reveals that he was keenly aware of contemporary Spanish Mariology. The *Marial* of Esquivel’s contemporary Juan de Acevedo offers substantive parallels to Esquivel’s musical treatment of the Marian motet texts. The composer looked mostly to the Marian Office for motet texts. In the Tridentine spirit he preferred scriptural texts that emphasized Mary’s obedience and role as the model Christian over the devotional texts that characterized the motets of the previous generation.

Esquivel’s compositions on Marian texts offer a view into a time of great change in the Spanish Church. In the midst of reform, tradition remained a strong force. His ability to extend Spanish tradition while providing music for the reformed liturgy and the new attitudes towards liturgical fidelity is remarkable. He could not have known that he would be among the final composers of Renaissance polyphony in Spain. Rather, his music suggests that he was conscious of his musical inheritance. His chromatic style suggests that he was aware of modern compositional aesthetics, but other aspects of his
style, such as chant paraphrase, link him to a much older style.
APPENDIX A

CONTENTS OF JUAN DE ESQUIVEL’S PUBLICATIONS

Missarum Ioannis Esquivelis in alma ecclesia Civitatensi portionarii, et cantorum praefecti, liber primus superiorum permissu, Salmanticae, ex officina typographica Arti Taberniel Antverpiani, anno a Christo nato M.DC.VIII. (Salamanca: Arthur Taberniel, 1608)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Voice no.</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asperges me</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>antiphon motet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave, Virgo Sanctissima</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>parody Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Batalla</td>
<td>6vv</td>
<td>parody Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa hexachordum</td>
<td>8vv</td>
<td>cantus firmus Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ductus est Jesus</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>parody Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Glorioso confessor Domini</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>parody Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa pro defunctis</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>plainsong Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In paradisum</td>
<td>6vv</td>
<td>antiphon motet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motecta festorum et dominicarum cum communi sanctorum, IV, V, VI, et VIII vocibus concinnanda. (Salamanca: Arthur Taberniel, 1608)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Voice no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria</td>
<td>In Dominicis</td>
<td>7vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salva nos Domine</td>
<td>In Dominicis</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peccavi super numerum</td>
<td>In Dominicis</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrexit Dominus</td>
<td>In Die Ressurrectionibus</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filiæ Hierusalem</td>
<td>S. Marci.</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanto tempore vobiscum</td>
<td>SS. Philippi</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O crux benedicta</td>
<td>S. Crucis</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petite, et accipietis</td>
<td>Rogationibus</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendo ad Patrem meum</td>
<td>Ascensione Domini</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repleti sunt omnes</td>
<td>Penteconstes</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duo Seraphim clamabant</td>
<td>SS. Trinitatis</td>
<td>6vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego sum panis</td>
<td>Corporis Christi</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendit Angelus Domini</td>
<td>Nativitate S. Ioann. Baptis.</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu es Pastor</td>
<td>Apost. Petri et Pauli</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedicta tu in mulieribus</td>
<td>Visitationis BMV</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Text</td>
<td>Latin Translation</td>
<td>Volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudemus Deum</td>
<td>S. Mariae Magdalenae</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Beata Iacobe</td>
<td>Sancti Iacobi</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In illo tempore</td>
<td>S. Mariae ad Nives</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et ecce vox</td>
<td>Transfigurationis Domini</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatus Laurentius</td>
<td>S. Laurentii</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaltata est</td>
<td>Assumptionis BMV</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Maria</td>
<td>Nativitate BMV</td>
<td>8vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic est Michael Archangelus</td>
<td>S. Michael Archangelus</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciscus pauper et humilis</td>
<td>S. Franciscus</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve sancte pater</td>
<td>S. Francisci Confessoris</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O quam glorioum es regnum</td>
<td>Omnium Sanctorum</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O beatam pontificem</td>
<td>S. Martini Episcopi Confess.</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Dei genetrix</td>
<td>Presentationis BMV</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve crux pretiosa</td>
<td>S. Andreae</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria Domini mei mater</td>
<td>Conceptionis BMV</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgo Dei genetrix</td>
<td>Expectationis BMV</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quia vidisti Thoma credisti</td>
<td>S. Thomae Apost.</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria in excelsis Deo</td>
<td>Nativitate Domini</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbum caro factum est</td>
<td>Circumcisione Domini</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tria sunt munera</td>
<td>Epiphania Domini</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O fortissimi</td>
<td>SS. MM. Fabiani et Sebastiani</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Ildephonse</td>
<td>S. Ildephonsi</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancte Paule Apostole</td>
<td>Conversione . Pauli Apostoli</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucipiens Simeon</td>
<td>Purificatio BM</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancti Angeli custodes nostri</td>
<td>Angeli Custodis</td>
<td>6vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce ancilla Domini</td>
<td>Annuntiationis BMV</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ihant apostoli</td>
<td>Commune Apostolorum</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabunt iusti</td>
<td>Tempore Paschali</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui vult venire post me</td>
<td>Unius Martyris</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istorum est enim regnum</td>
<td>Plurimorum Martyrum</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnes Sancti</td>
<td>Plurimorum Martyrum</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce sacerdos magnus</td>
<td>Commune Confessoris Pontificis</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacerdos et Pontifex</td>
<td>Commune Confessoris Pontificis</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In medio ecclesiæ</td>
<td>Commune Doctorum</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similabo eum</td>
<td>Com. Confessoris Non Pontificum</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media nocte clamor</td>
<td>Commune Virginum</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallax gratia</td>
<td>Pro Nec Virgine Nec Martyre</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domus mea</td>
<td>Commune de Dicationis Ecclesiae</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub tuum praesidium</td>
<td>Beata Mariae in Sabbatio</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In illa die stillabunt</td>
<td>Dominica Prima Adventus</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veni Domine et noli tardare</td>
<td>Dominica Secunda Adventus</td>
<td>5vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vox clamantis in deserto</td>
<td>Dominica Tertia Adventus</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canite tuba in Sion</td>
<td>Dominica Quarta Adventus</td>
<td>4vv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Simile est regnum
Cum turba plurima convenirent
Ecce ascendimus Hierosolymam
Emendemus in melius
Ductus est Iesus
Assumpsit Iesus Petrum
Erat Iesus ejiciens demonium
De quinque panibus
In illo tempore
O vos omnes
Christus factus est pro nobis
Pater misericordiae
Delicta iuventutis meae
In paradisum

_{Ioannis, Esquivel, Civitatensis, et eiusdem sanctæ ecclesiæ portionarii, psalmorum, hymnorum, magnificarum et b. Mariæ quatuor antiphonarum de tempore, necnon et missarum tomus secundus._} (Salamanca: Francisco de Cea Tesa, 1613)

**Psalms (all 4vv)**

*Dixit Dominus Primi toni*
Beatus vir
Laudate Dominum omnes gentes
*Dixit Dominus Sexti toni*
Lætatus sum
Lauda Hierusalem Dominum
Credidi
In exitu
Nunc dimitis [Canticle for Compline]

**Hymns (all 4vv)**

**Feast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Adventu Domini</td>
<td>Conditor alme siderum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Nativitate Domini</td>
<td>Christe Redemptor omnium, Ex Patre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctorum Innocentium</td>
<td>Salvete flores Martyrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Epiphania Domini</td>
<td>Hostis Herodes impie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angeli Custodis</td>
<td>Custodes hominum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominicæ in Passione</td>
<td>Vexilla Regis prodeunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominicæ in Albus</td>
<td>Ad cœnam Agni providi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In festis S. Crucis</td>
<td>Vexilla Regis prodeunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Michaelis</td>
<td>Tibi Christe splendor Patris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Ascensione Domini</td>
<td>Jesu nostra redemptio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Text</td>
<td>Latin Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In festo Pentecostis</td>
<td>Veni Creator Spiritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In festo sanctissimæ Trinitatis</td>
<td>O lux beata Trinitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In festo Corpus Christi</td>
<td>Pange lingua gloriosi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Nativitate S. Ioannis Baptistæ</td>
<td>Ut quæant laxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In festo Apostolorum Petri, et Pauli</td>
<td>Aurea luce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Mariæ Magdalæ</td>
<td>Pater superni luminis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Iacobi Apostoli</td>
<td>Defensor alme Hispaniæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petri ad Vincula</td>
<td>Petrus beatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfigurationis Domini</td>
<td>Quicumque Christum quæritis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In festis Virginis Mariæ</td>
<td>Ave maris stella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnium Sanctorum</td>
<td>Christe Redemptor omnium, Conserva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversionis . Pauli</td>
<td>Doctor egregie Paule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commune Apostolorum</td>
<td>Exsultet cælum laudibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commune Apostolorum tempore Paschali</td>
<td>Tristes erant Apostoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unius Martyrum</td>
<td>Sanctorum meritis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confessorum Pontificum</td>
<td>Iste confessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin</td>
<td>Jesu corona virginum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro nec Virgine nec Martyre</td>
<td>Fortem virili pectore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicationis Ecclesiæ</td>
<td>Urbs beata Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Completorum</td>
<td>Te lucis ante terminum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Magnificats**

*First Vespers*

- **Primi toni** 5vv
- **Secundi toni** 4vv
- **Tertii toni** 4vv
- **Quarti toni** 4vv
- **Quinti toni** 6vv
- **Sexti toni** 4vv
- **Octavi toni** 4vv

*Second Vespers*

- **Primi toni** 4vv
- **Secundi toni** 4vv
- **Tertii toni** 4vv
- **Quarti toni** 4vv
- **Quinti toni** 4vv
- **Sexti toni** 4vv
- **Octavi toni** 4vv
- **Benedicamus Domino** 4vv
Four Marian Antiphons
Alma Redemptoris mater   4vv
Ave Regina Cœlorum    5vv
Regina Cœli     4vv
Salve Regina     4vv

Miscellaneous
Te Deum laudamus     4vv
Benedictus     4vv
Vidi aquam     4vv
Asperges     4vv
Motetum commune ad omnium festa  4vv

MISSARUM TOMUS SECUNDUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Title</th>
<th>Voice no.</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tu est Petrus</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>parody Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarti toni</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>cantus firmus Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Mariae in Sabbato</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>plainsong Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surge propera</td>
<td>3vv</td>
<td>motet for BMS Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoc est præceptum meum</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>parody Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi Cedrus</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>parody Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortus Conclusus</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>parody Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deo Gratias</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items for the Dead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Voice no.</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responde mihi</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>Matins lesson 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa pro defunctis</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachrymosa [Dies iræ]</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne recorderis</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>Matins Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiescant in pace</td>
<td>4vv</td>
<td>Dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amen</td>
<td>5vv</td>
<td>Dismissal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

ARCHIVAL REFERENCES TO ORIGINAL SOURCES OF WORKS
BY JUAN DE ESQUIVEL

Extant Copies of Print Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1608 Motets</td>
<td>Badajoz</td>
<td>Badajoz Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608 Motets</td>
<td>Burgo de Osma</td>
<td>Burgo de Osma Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608 Motets</td>
<td>Coria</td>
<td>Coria Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608 Motets</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Hispanic Society of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608 Masses</td>
<td>Badajoz</td>
<td>Badajoz Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613 Print</td>
<td>Coria</td>
<td>Coria Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613 Print</td>
<td>Ronda</td>
<td>Santa María de la Encarnación Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Records of Purchased Printbooks (not extant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year purchased or obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1608 Motets</td>
<td>Burgos</td>
<td>1609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608 Masses</td>
<td>Burgos</td>
<td>1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613 Masses</td>
<td>Burgos</td>
<td>1613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608 Motets</td>
<td>Calahorra</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608 Masses</td>
<td>Calahorra</td>
<td>1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613 Print</td>
<td>Calahorra</td>
<td>1613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613 Print</td>
<td>Oviedo</td>
<td>1615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608/1613 Masses</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>1618 inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608 Masses, 1608 Motets,</td>
<td>Zamora</td>
<td>1627 inventory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extant MS sources

Mexico City Cathedral, Valdés Codex (17th century), ff. 27v-36
Missa Ductus est Jesus

Oviedo Cathedral Libro de atril no. 3 (18th century)
motet: O vos omnes
Oviedo Cathedral *Libro de atril no. 4* (18th century)

Advent motets from 1608 *Motecta festorum*

- *In illa die*  
- *Veni Domine á 5*  
- *Veni Domine á 4*  
- *Simile est regnum*  
- *Cum turba plurima*  

Vila Viçosa, Portugal (copied in Lisbon), MS *Officium majoris hebdomadæ* (1735), ff. 18v-19

Motet: *O vos omnes*

Plasencia Cathedral MS 1 (1776), ff. 1v-9, 11v-39, 41v-128v.

Motets from 1608 *Motecta festorum*

- *Peccavi super numerum*  
- *Surrexit Dominus*  
- *Filiae Hierusalem*  
- *Tanto tempore vobiscum*  
- *Petite, et accipietis*  
- *Repleti sunt omnes*  
- *Ascendo ad Patrem meum*  
- *Ego sum panis*  
- *Descendit Angelus Domini*  
- *Tu es Pastor*  
- *Benedicta tu in mulieribus*  
- *Laudemus Deum*  
- *O Beata Iacobe*  
- *In illo tempore*  
- *Et ecce vox*  
- *Beatus Laurentius*  
- *Exaltata est*  
- *Hic est Michael Archangelus*  
- *Franciscus pauper et humilis*  
- *Salve sancte pater*  
- *O quanquam gloriosum est regnum*  
- *O beatum pontificem*  
- *Beata Dei Genitrix*  
- *Salve crux pretiosa*  
- *Ave Maria Domini mei mater*  
- *Virgo Dei genetrix*  
- *Quia vidistis Thoma credisti*  

- *O Ildephonse*  
- *Sancte Paule Apostole*  
- *Sucipiens Simeon*  
- *Ecce ancilla Domini*  
- *Ibant apostoli*  
- *Stabunt iusti*  
- *Qui vult venire post me*  
- *Omnes sancti quanta passi sunt*  
- *Ecce sacerdos magnus*  
- *In medio ecclesiae*  
- *Similabo eum*  
- *Media nocte clamor*  
- *Falax gratia*  
- *Domus mea*  
- *Sub tuum præsidium*  
- *Et incarnatus & Et vitam from Credo*  
- *in Adventu et Quadragesima*  
- *In illa die stillabunt*  
- *Veni Domine et noli tardare*  
- *Vox clamantis in deserto*  
- *Canite tuba in Sion*  
- *Simile est regnum*  
- *Cum turba plurima convenirent*  
- *Ecce ascendimus Hierosolymam*  
- *Emendemus in melius*  
- *Ductus est Jesus*  
- *Assumpsit Iesus Petrum*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Phrase</th>
<th>Latin Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gloria in excelsis Deo</td>
<td>Erat Iesus ejiciens demonium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbum caro factum est</td>
<td>De quinque panibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tria sunt munera</td>
<td>In illo tempore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milites Christi [O fortissimi]</td>
<td>O vos omnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pater misericordiae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unidentified Mass Credo by Esquivel, perhaps *Missa Ductus est Jesus* (1613)
MODERN EDITIONS OF MUSIC BY JUAN DE ESQUIVEL


Vol. 1: Veni Domine, Gloria in excelsis, Emendemus in melius, O vos omnes, and Ego sum panis vivus from 1608 motet collection.

Vol. 2: Exaltata sum and O quam gloriosum from 1608 motet collection.


Gloria in excelsis Deo from the 1608 motet collection. Reprint of Rubio, Antología polifónica sacra, vol 1.


Veni Domine, Vox clamantis in deserto, Ego sum panis vivis, Sancta Maria, and from 1608 motet collection. Ed. Bruno Turner.

Missa pro defunctis and In paradisum from 1608 Missarum liber primus. Ed. Clive Walkley.


O vos omnes and O quam gloriosum from 1608 motet collection


*Repleti sunt omnes* from 1608 motet collection


*Tria sunt munera* from 1608 motet collection.


*Duo seraphim* from the 1608 motet collection


*Veni Domine* from the 1608 motet collection.

Editions in Academic Works


*Missa pro defunctis* and *In paradisum* from 1608 Missarum liber primus

*Responde mihi, Missa pro defunctis, Ne recorderis, Requiescant in pace/Amen* from 1613 print.

Vol. 2: Missa Ave Virgo Sanctissima, Missa Batalla, Missa Ut Re Mi Fa Sol, Missa Ductus est Jesus, Missa Glorioso confessor Domini, Missa pro defunctis from the 1608 Missarum liber primus and O crux benedicta, Ascendo ad Patrem, Ego sum panis, Tu est pastor ovium, O quam gloriosum, Ave Maria [Domine mei mater], Gloria in excelsis Deo, Tria sunt munera, Ecce ancilla Domini, Istorum est enim, Omnes Sancti, Sub tuum præsidium, Canite tuba in Sion, Emendemus in melius, O vos omnes, Christus factus est, Delicta juventutis, and In paradisum from the 1608 motet book.
APPENDIX D

TRANSCRIPTIONS

This appendix includes transcriptions of three representative works that are not available in scholarly or commercial editions. Note values have been reduced by half in the transcriptions. Brackets have been included to indicated ligated notes, and coloration is indicated by broken brackets. Musica ficta has been applied conservatively and is indicated with a flat, natural, or sharp symbol above the note. Text that appeared in Roman type in the print also appears in Roman type in the editions. Text is provided in italics where indications for textual repetiton occur (ij.) in the print. The orthography has been standardized to modern liturgical norms.
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CRITICAL NOTES

1. Ave Maria. Canon for 7 voices (SSAATTB). See Chapter 4, pp. 131–34, for a complete discussion of this work.

Source: Motecta festorum (1608)

Text: Opening phrase of antiphon Ave Maria.

Clefs: C1 C4 F4

Sup. 1: Past trimming of the source has removed the indication for the canonic interval to generate the Sup. 2 voice. Top corner of print missing. Final pitch may be missing.

Sup. 1: Pitches may have been placed in wrong locations for C1 clef.

Source: *Psalmorum, Hymnorum, Magnificarum . . . Missarum tomus secundus* (1613)

Text: Marian antiphon for Vespers I of Holy Trinity to None of Saturday before Advent I.

Clefs: G3 C2 C3 C4, G3 G3 C2 C3 (verse 4), G3 G3 C2 C3 C4 (verse 7a–b). Clef system suggests transposition of perfect fourth lower.


Source: *Psalmorum, Hymnorum, Magnificarum . . . Missarum tomus secundus* (1613)

Clefs: C1 C3 C4 F4

Chant verses follow *Antiphonale Romanum* (1912).

Polyphony for strophe 6 adapted from strophe 2.
Ave Maria
Canon for 7 Voices

Superius I

Superius II *

Altus I

Altus II

Tenor I

Tenor II

Bassus

Ave Maria, Ave Maria.

Tenor primus in secunda supra Bassum

Altus secundus in secunda

Tenor secundus in subdiatesaron

Ave Maria, Ave Maria.
Salve Regina

Salve, Regina, mater misericordiae:

Vi - - - - - ta,
Vi - - - - - ta,
Vi - - - - - ta,
Vi - - - - - ta,
Vi - - - - - ta,
Vi - - - - - ta,
Vi - - - - - ta,

Vi - - - - - ta,

Vi - - - - - ta,

Vi - - - - - ta,

Vi - - - - - ta,

Vi - - - - - ta,
ce - ce, do, dulce - ce - ce, do et spes nos-tra, sal - ta, dulce - do, et spes nos-tra, sal - ve, et spes nos-tra, sal - ve, et spes nos-tra, sal - ve, et spes nos-tra,
salve, et spes nostra, salve,

salve, et spes nostra, salve,

salve, et spes nostra, salve,
Ad te clama - mus, ex - su - les, fi - li - i He - væ.

Superius 1

Superius 2

Altus

Tenor

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad

Ad te sus - pi - ra - mus, ad
men - tes, et flen - tes, ge - men - tes, et flen -
et flen - tes, et flen - tes, ge - men - tes, et flen -
flen - - - - - tes, ge - men - tes, et flen -

---
tes in hac la-cri-ma-rum val -
tes in hac la-cri-
tes in hac la-cri-ma-rum val -
tes in hac la-cri-ma-rum val -
b. $\text{in hac lacrimarum vale,}$

marum val. $\text{in lacrimarum vale,}$

hac lacrimarum vale, in hac lacrimarum

val. $\text{in lacrimarum vale,}$

marum vale, $\text{in lacrimarum vale,}$

val. $\text{in lacrimarum vale,}$

val. $\text{in lacrimarum vale,}$
Eia ergo, Advocta nostra, illos misericordes oculos ad nos converte.

V

be - ne - dic - tum fruc - tum ven - tris tu - i,

ne - dic - tum fruc - tum ven - tris tu - i,

be - ne - dic - tum fruc - tum ven - tris tu - i,

dic - tum fruc - tum ven - tris tu - i, fruc - tum

dic - tum fruc - tum ven - tris tu - i, fruc - tum

fruc - tum ven - tris tu - i, fruc - tum ven - tris tu - i.

fruc - tum ven - tris tu - i, fruc - tum ven - tris tu - i,

fruc - tum ven - tris tu - i, fruc - tum ven - tris tu - i,
V?

no - bis post____ hoc ex - si - li - um o - sten - de.
vir-go Ma-ri-a, o dul-cis vir-go Ma-ri-a, vir-go Ma-

vir-go Ma-ri-a, o dul-cis vir-go Ma-ri-a, vir-go Ma-

vir-go Ma-ri-a, o dul-cis vir-go Ma-ri-a, vir-go Ma-

vir-go Ma-ri-a, vir-go Ma-

vir-go Ma-ri-a, vir-go Ma-

vir-go Ma-ri-a, a, vir-go Ma-

a, Ma-

go Ma-

a, vir-go Ma-
Ave maris stella

In Festis Virginis Mariae

1. Ave maris stella, Dei mater alma,

Atque semper virgo, Felix caeli porta.

Superius

Altus

Tenor

Bassus

Suemens ilud Ave, Suemens ilud Ave,

Suemens ilud Ave, Suemens ilud Ave,
lud, Ave, Su-mens il-lud Ave, Ga-bri-e-lis mens il-lud Ave, Su-mens il-lud Ave, Ga-bri-e-

ve, Su-mens il-lud Ave, Ga-bri-e-

Su-mens il-lud Ave,
The image contains musical notation with lyrics. The lyrics are partially obscured, but it appears to be a setting of a religious or sacred text, possibly a chant or hymn. The visible part of the lyrics includes phrases such as "Fundamentum in pace, Funda nos in pace," indicating a theme of seeking refuge or protection. The musical notation suggests a harmonic structure typical of polyphonic settings from the Renaissance era. The notation includes various musical symbols and intervals, typical of this style of composition.
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Muntans E - vae no - - - - men.

3.

Solve vincula reis,

Profer lumen caecis,

Malas nostra pel-ле,

Bona cuncta posce.
Superius I

Monstra te esse matrem, Monstra te esse

Superius II

Monstra te esse matrem, Monstra te esse

Altus

Monstra te esse matrem, Monstra te esse

Tenor

Monstra te esse matrem, Monstra te esse
Su - mat per - te pre - ces, Su -

Su - mat per te pre - ces, Su - mat per te

Su - mat per te pre - ces, Su - mat per te

Su - mat per te pre - ces, Su - mat per te

Qui pro no - bis na -
5. Virgo singularis, Inter omnes mitis,
Nos culpis solutos, Mi tes fac et castos.

6. Vi tam praestabas puram, Vi tam praestabas puram, Vi tam praestabas puram, Vi tam praestabas puram, Vi tam praestabas puram, Vi tam praestabas puram, Vi tam praestabas puram, Vi tam praestabas puram.
pater noster, tu - tum, I - ter pa - ra tu - tum, Ut vi - den - tes Ie - sum, Ut vi - den - tes Ie - sum,

pater noster, I - ter pa - ra tu - tum, Ut vi - den - tes Ie - sum, Ut vi - den - tes Ie - sum,
Sit laus Deo Patri, Summo Christo decus, Spiritu Sancto, Tri-bus honor unus. Amen.
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