

2009

What Can the Organ Partitura to Tomás Luis de Victoria's Missae, Magnificat, motecta, psalmi et alia quam plurima of 1600 Tell Us about Performance Practice?

Noel O'Regan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.claremont.edu/ppr>



Part of the [Music Practice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

O'Regan, Noel (2009) "What Can the Organ Partitura to Tomás Luis de Victoria's Missae, Magnificat, motecta, psalmi et alia quam plurima of 1600 Tell Us about Performance Practice?," *Performance Practice Review*: Vol. 14: No. 1, Article 5. DOI: 10.5642/perfpr.200914.01.05
Available at: <https://scholarship.claremont.edu/ppr/vol14/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Current Journals at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Performance Practice Review by an authorized editor of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

What Can the Organ *Partitura* to Tomás Luis de Victoria's *Missae, Magnificat, motecta, psalmi et alia quam plurima* of 1600 Tell Us about Performance Practice?¹

Noel O'Regan

Copyright © 2009 Claremont Graduate University

Tomás Luis de Victoria's *Missae, Magnificat, motecta, psalmi et alia quam plurima*, 3, 4, 8, 9, 12vv of 1600 was a landmark publication, bringing together in a single print all of his polychoral music, much of it already published in Venice and Rome. It introduced Victoria's version of the Roman polychoral idiom to the Iberian peninsula, where it was to have great influence, spreading from there into the new world.² It was clearly intended as a major publication project and was dedicated to the new Spanish King Philip III whose aunt, the dowager Empress Maria of Austria, Victoria was serving; it also provided the Madrid royal printer Ioannes Flandrus with the opportunity to show his skill in printing music for multiple parts.³ Most significantly it included, for the first time with a vocal print, an organ *partitura* in four-voice open score. This, for the most part, reproduces the music of the first choir only (even in triple-choir pieces), with rests when that choir is not singing. On first glance it appears to follow the vocal lines of Choir I exactly but, on closer examination, there are considerable modifications that throw some light on its function and have implications for contemporary performance practice in Madrid and in Rome.⁴

¹ I would like to dedicate this paper to Prof. Robert Stevenson in admiration of his lifetime's outstanding work on Hispanic music.

² Noel O'Regan, "From Rome to Madrid: the polychoral music of Tomás Luis de Victoria," *Atti del Convegno internazionale: La tradizione poliorale in italia, nella penisola Iberica e nel Nuovo Mondo*, 27-29 Ottobre 2006 (Venezia: Fondazione Levi, in press).

³ Robert Stevenson, "Tomás Luis de Victoria: unique Spanish genius," *Inter-American Music Review* 12 (1991), 1-100; idem., "Tomás Luis de Victoria," *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie (London: Macmillan, 2001).

⁴ The copy of the *partitura* in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, has been consulted, as have the part-books in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence and in the library of Valladolid Cathedral. I am grateful to Clara Mateo Sabadell for consulting the Valladolid part-books on my behalf.

Victoria himself was conscious that having the *partitura* printed was something new. In a letter sent to Jaén Cathedral Chapter in February 1601, accompanying a copy of the print, he said:

“I have had this book of Masses, Magnificats, Psalms, Salves and other things printed for two and three choirs together with this particular book for the organ, the like of which, glory to God Our Lord, has not previously been issued in Spain or Italy. This is produced for organists in the case where there are not four voices present or just one who sings with the organ – similarly the [triple-choir] Mass and Magnificat [can be sung] with voices, organ and instrumentalists.”⁵

This tells us that Victoria envisaged his *partitura*, not as providing a fully-realised organ part to accompany Choir I, which is how it has sometimes been regarded, particularly by some groups recording this repertoire,⁶ but either to substitute for Choir I entirely or to accompany a soloist singing just one of its parts. His reference to singing with the organ could refer in particular to his nine-voice *Missa pro Victoria* where Choir I has five vocal parts, including two soprano lines, the upper of which is not included in the organ *partitura*. This top line could have been sung, with the organ playing the other four Choir I parts, and all the second choir parts being sung by voices. It is significant that, even where the texture of Choir I thins out and the first soprano part of this Mass could have been included in the *partitura*, it is not.

There are four sections in two of the double-choir Masses in this print, which are set for five voices only. Two are in the *Missa Alma Redemptoris Mater*: the *Christe eleison* and the *Benedictus*, where the four voices from Choir II are joined by the tenor from Choir I. Victoria includes both sections in his *partitura*, despite their being sung mainly by Choir II, and leaves out the Tenor I part, presumably intending it to be sung, with the organ supplying the other four parts where there were not enough singers available. The same two movements of the *Missa Ave Regina* are also set for five voices: in this case it is the alto from Choir I that is added to Choir II. The *partitura* leaves out this Altus I part in the *Benedictus*, but, in the *Christe eleison*, it excludes the Altus II part instead. Again Victoria must have intended both to be sung. His suggestion to have just one singer from Choir I, with the other parts played on the organ, presumably can apply to the bulk of the print's contents as well. As for two of the three triple-choir items – the *Missa Laetatus sum* and the *Magnificat Sexti toni* – Victoria seems to be suggesting in his letter that the organ could play the Choir I parts, with voices and instruments each performing the parts of one

⁵ *Yo he hecho ymprimir esos libros de misas magnificats Salmos salves y otras cossas a dos y a tres choros para con el organo de questo libro particular que a gloria de dios nostro señor no a salido en españa ni en ytalia libro particular. Como esto para los organistas porque con el donde no hubiere aparejo de quatro voces una sola que cante con el organo ara coro de por ssi – tambien la misa y magnifica para voces organo y ministriles.* The letter was first published in Samuel Rubio, “Dos interesantes cartas autógrafas de T. L. de Victoria,” *Revista di Musicología* 4 (1981), 333-341 and subsequently republished in Stevenson, “Tomás Luis de Victoria: unique Spanish genius,” 30.

⁶ For example, in the recording *Tomás Luis de Victoria, Volume 1: Devotion to our Lady* by The Sixteen, directed by Harry Christophers, Collins 15012/Coro COR16035.

of the other choirs. The separation in his wording implies that voices take one choir and instruments the other. He does not include the third triple-choir setting in the publication – the psalm *Laetatus sum* on which the Mass is based – but there are no significant disparities in this setting that would suggest treating it differently.

What Victoria is essentially doing here is providing for church choirs that did not have eight or twelve singers available, but that might still wish to sing (and buy) his music. We know from the preface to Viadana's *Cento Concerti Ecclesiastici* of 1602, for instance, that this sort of situation was common around 1600, with choirs taking certain parts from compositions to suit the available singers, often without sufficient awareness that leaving out some parts might make musical nonsense of the result; this was Viadana's stated reason for providing these small-scale concertato motets.⁷ In 1599, Asprilio Pacelli had done something similar, writing in the introduction to his *Chorici Psalmi et Motecta* (Rome: Nicolò Muti) that, although he was having his music printed in four vocal part-books (without a *Bassus ad organum* in his case), the music would sound just as well, or even better, if one of the vocal parts – the altus – were left out and the organ used to fill up the harmony.⁸

The organ was being increasingly used both for accompaniment and to substitute for voices at this period, especially in devotional contexts and in oratories such as those of confraternities. In the same introduction, Pacelli stated that his four-voice alternatim psalms and motets were “composed more as *concerti* with organ, such as is nowadays the custom in Rome for spiritual delight, so that they can entertain piously, than as ordinary church music.”⁹ Gabriele Fattorini in the preface to his *I Sacri Concerti a due voci* of 1600 said the same thing: “Although [...] it cannot be denied that music with many instruments gives great pleasure on days of high solemnity, and, indeed is then most fitting, experience teaches over and over again that with one, or at the most two, voices, which now and then nicely and skilfully sing with an organ, the weary souls of sinners can be refreshed and the pious minds of listeners charmed and captivated by divine love.”¹⁰ In fact, both Pacelli and Fattorini included extra *ripieno* parts for a second choir

⁷ See the translation of Viadana's preface in Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History* 3, The Baroque Era (London and Boston: Faber, 1952, 1981), 60-63.

⁸ Noel O'Regan, “Asprilio Pacelli, Ludovico da Viadana and the Origins of the Roman *Concerto Ecclesiastico*,” *Journal of Seventeenth-Century Music*, 6 (2000), <http://www.sscm-jscm.org/v6/no1/oregan.html>.

⁹ *Mi sono risoluto dunque per sodisfattion di molti dar alla stampa il presente Libro di Salmi et Mottetti fatti più per concerti con organo, quali hoggidi si usano in Roma, diletto spirituale, per potersi trattenere piamente, che per musica ordinaria di cappella.* See O'Regan, “Asprilio Pacelli.”

¹⁰ *Quamquam [...] harmonicis, et graves multifariis symphoniis concentus in magnis sollenibus maximopere oblectare, ac optime convenire, inficias iri minime possit: una tamen, aut altera summum voce cum organo aliquando perite, et suaviter divinas laudes canente, tum defessos cantorum spiritus recreari, tum pias auditorum mentes mulceri, supernoque amore captari, identidem perdocet experientia.* Gabriele Fattorini, *I sacri concerti a*

in order to increase the flexibility of their publications, essentially turning it into polychoral music.¹¹ Victoria was working in the convent of the *Descalzas Reales* in Madrid where both music of high solemnity and for devotional contexts would have been called for; similarly, in Rome, where he worked for a number of confraternities as well as for the *Collegio Germanico*, his music could have been heard in a variety of large- and small-scale contexts.¹²

Flexibility was the key, especially in adapting published music. Pacelli's preface reminds us that, just because it was standard and convenient for sacred music to be printed in part-book format with all parts texted, this was not necessarily the only way of performing it. There are, for instance, examples of Victoria's sacred music arranged for lute with one or two solo voices singing the upper part(s).¹³ Victoria was taking a risk in publishing so much music for eight and twelve voices in his 1600 print with just eight short three- and four-voice works added as an appendix. Hitherto he had always added his polychoral music to prints that mainly contained music for fewer voices. People might well have been put off buying the 1600 print if they thought they had to have eight or twelve singers to perform it, and so he is providing an alternative for churches that had fewer singers, but at least employed an organist.¹⁴ Rather than expect that organist to use a *Bassus ad organum* part to improvise from, he provides a *partitura*

due voci, Murray C. Bradshaw (Neuhausen-Stuttgart: AIM, Hänssler-Verlag, 1986). This translation is by Murray Bradshaw.

¹¹ Pacelli included an extra part-book in a 1601 reprint containing Choir 2 parts for optional double-choir settings of the doxologies to his psalms and Magnificats. He further promised in his preface to issue a second volume, which would contain *risposti*, presumably settings for Choir 2 of the alternate verses to the *alternatim* psalms. See O'Regan, "Asprilio Pacelli."

¹² Noel O'Regan, "Tomás Luis de Victoria's Roman churches revisited," *Early Music*, 28 (2000), 403-418.

¹³ For example, there are eight pieces by Victoria arranged for lute in the manuscript Tenbury 340 from c. 1615 now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, one of a series of manuscripts associated with the recusant English Catholic Edward Paston. The vocal part-books do not survive, but the Cantus parts are not included in the lute tablature, implying that they were intended to be sung. See James L. Mitchell, *An Examination of Manuscript Tenbury 340 and a Critical Edition of Six Works from its Repertory* (Unpublished M.Mus dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1998).

¹⁴ This may have been one of the reasons why the chapter of Avila Cathedral decided that this print was not appropriate for their church and authorised its return to Victoria with some polite words. They felt this particularly about the *Missa pro Victoria*. See Samuel Rubio, "La misa *Pro victoria* de Tomás Luis de Victoria," *Ritmo* 52 (1982), [not paginated]. Quoted in Eugene Casjen Cramer, *Tomás Luis de Victoria: A Guide to Research* (Garland Publishing, New York and London, 1998), 164.

with four of the voice parts included. Victoria was nothing if not a good marketer of his publications.¹⁵

Looking more closely at Victoria's organ score we find that, for about half of the twenty-four pieces, the organ reproduces the vocal parts of Choir I exactly. However, for thirteen of these works it does not just follow Choir I, but makes various changes and additions that fall into a number of categories. The most common change is to substitute the Bassus II part for Bassus I, in order to avoid the fifth – or more rarely the third - of the harmony when it falls in Bassus I.¹⁶ There are also places where the Bassus I part has dropped out, leaving Tenor I with the fifth of the harmony; in these cases the Bassus II part is again added to complete the harmony.¹⁷ Other changes involve adding one or more voices from Choir II, where there are only one or two parts singing in Choir I, in order to fill up the harmony.¹⁸ There is one place where the organ adopts the Cantus II part rather than Cantus I, where the former is higher in pitch than the latter.¹⁹ Another type of change is to simplify the bass part—and occasionally one or more of the others—by eliminating ornamental figures such as scalic runs, keeping the organ part on a held breve.²⁰

What is most significant about these changes (apart from the last) is that almost all occur in those pieces that Victoria had first published in or before 1581, i.e. in his earliest essays in the polychoral idiom. The pieces with the most changes are those first published in 1572 (*Ave Maria*) and 1576 (*Nisi Dominus*, *Regina Coeli*, *Salve Regina*, *Super flumina Babylonis*). There are fewer changes in those from 1581 (*Alma Redemptoris Mater*, *Ave Regina*, *Dixit Dominus*, *Laudate Dominum*, *Laudate Pueri*) and virtually none in any of the pieces published subsequently in 1583 (*Laetatus sum*, *Litaniae Beatae Maria Virginis*), 1585 (*Lauda Sion*), 1592 (*Missa Salve Regina*) and those newly composed for the 1600 print (see Table 1 below). There is an easy explanation for this: in his early polychoral pieces Victoria did not write for split choirs singing at a distance from each other and so did not necessarily make his two choirs harmonically independent of each other. Groupings of voices could be taken across both choirs and one of the bass parts (usually Bassus I) could have the fifth of the harmony. As long as the

¹⁵ There are various examples of Victoria, as in the case of Jaén Cathedral, sending copies of his prints to princes and institutions and asking for money in return. See Stevenson, *op. cit.*, 28-29.

¹⁶ E.g. in the final nine bars of *Nisi Dominus*.

¹⁷ E.g. in bars 34-35 of *Alma Redemptoris mater*.

¹⁸ E.g. in bars 10, 27-29 of *Ave Regina*.

¹⁹ Bars 63-66 of *Dixit Dominus*.

²⁰ E.g. in the last eight bars of *Salve Regina*. Some of these changes have also been described in Daniele V. Filippi, *Tomás Luis de Victoria* (Palermo: L'Epos, 2008), 92.

two choirs were adjacent to each other this was not a problem but, by the early 1580s in Rome, choirs were being physically separated, and composers began to write for harmonically independent choirs, avoiding the fifth in either bass part and keeping the two choirs distinct rather than mixing voices across them.²¹ Clef combinations were rationalized, with the same combinations—and voice-types—in both choirs. This made it easier to have both bass parts doubling the root of the harmony, at the same pitch or an octave apart. The third above the root was used occasionally in triple-choir music but not commonly. After 1581 Victoria and his Roman contemporaries generally used contrary motion between the bass parts, or rests when writing for three choirs, to avoid parallel octaves.

Evidence for the change in approach in Rome comes from a number of rewritings of double-choir pieces found in a series of related Roman manuscripts from the early 1580s. Music by Giovanni Animuccia, Orlando di Lasso, Luca Marenzio, and Giovanni P. da Palestrina was altered, to allow performance by spatially-separated choirs, by rewriting bass parts to eliminate fifths and tidying up overlaps between voices across the choirs into a cleaner takeover from one choir to the next.²² It clearly became important for Rome-based composers to adapt this new idiom and, while there is no evidence for the rewriting of Victoria's earlier pieces to make them singable by real *cori spezzati*, he too adapted the new procedures after 1581. In that context, it is odd that, in republishing his early pieces in 1600, Victoria chose not to rewrite the vocal parts, but he did adapt the organ *partitura* so that it reflects the split-choir ideal. Victoria did revise his work in other contexts, and one might well have expected him to do so here, particularly as he was producing an organ *partitura* with revisions.²³ The fact that he did not implies that, when all parts were sung by voices, he still assumed that in these early pieces the two choirs would be adjacent to each other. Otherwise listeners who were positioned closer to Choir I would hear second inversion harmony, which by then, in Rome at least, was not acceptable. That this was also the case in Madrid is shown by the fact that in all of the pieces first published in 1600 (and presumably composed after Victoria returned to Madrid in about 1587) there are no instances of second inversion harmony in one of the choirs, even in pieces for three choirs where its avoidance is more challenging for the composer.

The provision of the revised versions in the organ *partitura*, on the other hand, suggests that when the organ was used to substitute for (or perhaps accompany) Choir I, then such separation was expected. It was common, at least in Rome, for the singers in Choir I to serve as

²¹ Noel O'Regan, "Sacred Polychoral Music in Rome 1575-1620," (Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford, 1988). Idem., "The Performance of Roman Sacred Polychoral Music in the late 16th and early 17th Centuries: Evidence from Archival Sources," *Performance Practice Review*, 8 (1995), 107-146.

²² Noel O'Regan, "The Early Polychoral Music of Orlando di Lasso: New Light from Roman Sources," *Acta Musicologica*, 56 (1984), 234-251.

²³ It is particularly odd that, in *Super flumina Babylonis*, Victoria returned to the original version of 1576 rather than incorporate the revisions of 1585, which had been in line with more recent Roman practice.

soloists and be positioned at the main organ with the *maestro di cappella* while other *ripieni* choirs sang from platforms some distance away, often with their own conductor and portative organ. An interesting consequence of Victoria's rewriting of the organ part is that it introduces parallel octaves between the organ part and the bass of Choir II, something he otherwise studiously avoids. Even here he does try to avoid them by using contrary motion, but cannot do so all the time. Other composers of the period were not fussy about parallels between bass and other lines: Ludovico da Viadana in the preface to his *Salmi a quattro chori* of 1612 makes no apology for doubling up bass and other lines: "Because they stand apart from one another the listener cannot distinguish whether they are singing in octaves or in unison [...] For if one wishes to follow the rules strictly in the *ripieni*, one must introduce whole rests and half rests, dotted notes and syncopations; as a result the music becomes distorted, clumsy, and unyielding, and the singing reckless and less attractive." He finishes by saying: "But when all is said and done I have done things in my own way."²⁴

Another important area in which Victoria's organ *partitura* gives information is the practice of transposition. The organ parts for two of the Masses have the rubric "Ad quartam inferiorem" at the beginning of the Kyrie: the *Missa Alma Redemptoris Mater* and the *Missa Salve Regina*. Both use the *chiavette* or high-clef combination and both have a B \flat in the key signature. They are not the only pieces in the collection to use the *chiavette* but the others, which include the antiphons *Alma Redemptoris Mater* and *Salve Regina* on which the two Masses are based, as well as *Dic nobis Maria (Victimae paschali)*, *Dixit Dominus*, and the *Magnificat primi toni*, do not have the same rubric on the organ *partitura*. This can probably be explained by the fact that the two Masses are the first two pieces in the *partitura* to use the *chiavette*; they are the first and third items respectively in the publication, separated by the *Missa Ave Regina* that is in standard clefs or *chiavi naturali*. The two Masses in *chiavette* each end on one of the only two final notes used in this publication, the *Missa Alma Redemptoris* on F and the *Missa Salve Regina* on G. There are no pieces here notated in *chiavette* and with no flat in the key signature, which generally led to transposition down a fifth. So it is reasonable to assume that Victoria, or his printer, having included the transposition rubric on the first two relevant items in the publication, did not see the need to keep reminding the organist to transpose. Of course, one could argue that the omission of the rubric on the antiphons and other pieces in *chiavette* meant that Victoria did not intend them to be transposed, but only the two Mass settings. Let us therefore examine the clefs and ranges used by Victoria in this print in some more detail.

²⁴ Ludovico Grossi da Viadana, *Salmi a quattro chori*, ed. Gerhard Wielakker (Madison: A-R Editions, 1998), 2-3.

**TABLE 1. CLEF COMBINATIONS,²⁵ KEY SIGNATURES AND FINALS OF
PIECES IN VICTORIA'S *MISSAE, MAGNIFICAT, MOTECTA, PSALMI ET ALIA
QUAM PLURIMA OF 1600.***

(Dates of original publication are given in brackets. The pieces are grouped according to clef combination, key signature and final, and are in alphabetical order within each grouping.)

Standard clefs, F final:

Ave Regina (1581)	2 x C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\flat	F
Ecce nunc (1600)	2 x C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\flat	F
Missa Ave Regina (1600)	2 x C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\flat	F
Missa pro Victoria (1600)	C ₁ C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄ C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\flat	F

Standard clefs, F final, Choir I *a voci pari*

Laudate Pueri (1581)	C ₁ C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\flat	F
Nisi Dominus (1576)	C ₁ C ₁ C ₃ F ₃ C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\flat	F
Regina Coeli (1576)	C ₁ C ₁ C ₃ F ₃ C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\flat	F
Super flumina (1576)	C ₁ C ₁ C ₃ F ₃ C ₂ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\flat	F

Triple-choir pieces, F final: Standard clefs for Choirs I & III, Choir II *a voci pari*

Laetatus sum (1583)	2 x C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄ C ₁ C ₁ C ₃ F ₃	\flat	F
Magnificat sexti toni (1600)	2 x C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄ C ₁ C ₁ C ₃ F ₃	\flat	F
Missa Laetatus sum (1600)	2 x C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄ C ₁ C ₁ C ₃ F ₃	\flat	F

Standard clefs, G final

Litaniae BVM (1583)	2 x C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\natural	G
Lauda Sion (1585)	2 x C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\natural	G
Ave Maria (1572)	2 x C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\flat	G

²⁵

In describing clefs, the usual system is employed where the letters C, F, and G describe the type of clef and the subscript number is the line on which it is placed, counting from the bottom of the staff upwards.

Laudate Dominum (1581)	2 x C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\flat	G
Veni Sancte Spiritus (1600)	2 x C ₁ C ₃ C ₄ F ₄	\flat	G

Chiavette, F final

Alma Redemptoris (1581)	2 x G ₂ C ₂ C ₃ F ₃	\flat	F
Missa Alma Redemptoris (1600)	2 x G ₂ C ₂ C ₃ F ₃	\flat	F

Chiavette, G final, Choir I a voci pari

Magnificat primi toni (1600)	G ₂ G ₂ C ₂ C ₃ G ₂ C ₂ C ₃ F ₃	\flat	G
Dic nobis Maria (1600) (Victimae paschali)	G ₂ G ₂ C ₁ C ₃ G ₂ C ₂ C ₃ C ₄	\flat	G

Chiavette, G final (some variation in Choir I or Choir II)

Dixit Dominus (1581)	G ₂ C ₂ C ₃ C ₄ G ₂ C ₂ C ₃ F ₃	\flat	G
O Ildephonse (1600)	G ₂ G ₂ C ₂ C ₄ G ₂ C ₂ C ₃ F ₃	\flat	G
Salve Regina (1576)	G ₂ G ₂ C ₂ C ₄ C ₁ C ₂ C ₃ F ₃	\flat	G
Missa Salve Regina (1592)	G ₂ G ₂ C ₂ C ₄ G ₂ C ₂ C ₃ F ₃	\flat	G

Table 1 gives details of clefs, key signatures, and finals for each of the twenty-four polychoral pieces in the 1600 print. At first glance the range of clef combinations seems considerable – there are thirteen different combinations – but they can be rationalized into seven groups as in the table. Taking into account the use of *voci pari* combinations, where one choir has two sopranos, alto, tenor and no bass, and seeing the triple-choir pieces as an extension of the double-choir standard clef ones, the number of different combination can be further reduced to four: standard and *chiavette* combinations with either F or G as final. Using the signifiers that make up the tonal-type method of analysis, in which only the soprano clef, key signature, and final are delineated, we have five tonal types: C₁ \flat F, G₂ \flat F, C₁ \natural G, C₁ \flat G and G₂ \flat G. Of the twenty-four pieces only seven use the *chiavette*; F and G finals are almost evenly balanced, with thirteen of the former and eleven of the latter.

The use of *voci pari* combinations in one of the choirs, something of which Victoria was fond, does not affect the overall clef combination, which can be established from the clefs of the outer soprano and bass parts. Similarly the variations in clef (and hence in voice type) within

Choir I in *Dixit Dominus*, *O Ildefonse*, and the *Missa Salve Regina* do not affect the intended overall clef combination. Interchanging C₄ and F₃ clefs for the bass in *chiavette* was common practice, and the use of C₂ rather than C₃ for the third part down simply indicates an alto rather than a tenor range. There are two pieces where Victoria unusually uses the C₁ clef within the *chiavette*, *Salve Regina*, and *Dic nobis, Maria*; in both cases this is to cover a mezzo-soprano range and does not alter the overall function of the clef code. His analogous use of the C₂ clef for the top part of Choir II in the standard-clefed *Super flumina Babylonis* also indicates a mezzo-soprano voice and again does not affect the clef code.

It is important to note here the unreliability of the Pedrell complete edition of Victoria's works in regard to the clefs of two of the works in *chiavette*: the *Salve Regina* and the *Missa Alma Redemptoris Mater*.²⁶ The first two editions of the *Salve Regina*, in 1576 and 1581, started with the normal *chiavette* clefs, but for the fourth verse "Eia ergo," and subsequent verses, the Bassus II part changed from F₃ to F₄, in order to accommodate some low Gs without using ledger lines. The 1576 print did the same thing in the case of the final *Agnus Dei* sections of the *Missa Simile est Regnum* and the *Missa Beatae Mariae*. This does not affect the transposition code since that would have been indicated to the singers by the clefs at the start of these works. In 1600, Victoria or his publisher used the F₃ clef for Bassus II throughout. Pedrell used F₄ for Bassus II but did not indicate by a prefatory clef the original use of F₃ at the start of the piece, or its use throughout in 1600. For the *Missa Alma Redemptoris Mater*, Pedrell also used F₄ for Bassus II without a prefatory indication that the original 1600 print used F₃. In the 1600 print, Victoria/Flandrus was happy to use ledger lines below the Bassus II staff to accommodate low notes. These normally come at the ends of sections, and they might be compared to the low strings of the theorbo, then becoming popular as an accompanying instrument. Downward transposition does bring these notes even lower but, since this is the case in the two Masses for which Victoria provides the instruction to transpose, it cannot have posed a problem. In Madrid, we know that from at least 1601 onwards, the singers in the *Descalzas Reales* were supported by a *bajon* (bassoon) that would have ensured that these low notes would have been heard.²⁷ In answer to the question posed above then, it would seem logical to apply the transposition instructions to all of the pieces using *chiavette* in the 1600 print.

Victoria's publication seems to have been the earliest to include a rubric indicating downward transposition of a fourth on an organ part.²⁸ This was to become relatively common

²⁶ *Thomae Ludovici Victoria Abulensis Opera omnia*, ed. Felipe Pedrell (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1902-13). Pedrell is also unreliable in the case of the original clefs of *Dic nobis, Maria (Victimae Paschali)*, where he does not indicate that the original clef of the Altus II part was C₂ rather than C₁.

²⁷ Stevenson, "Tomás Luis de Victoria: Unique Spanish Genius," 23.

²⁸ Lute intabulations transposed down a fourth or fifth appear earlier, for example the large collection published by Jacob Paix in Lauingen in 1583. See Ala Botti Caselli, "Musiche di Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina nelle partiture e nelle intavolature organistiche tra Cinque e Seicento," *Bolletino della Deputazione di Storia Patria per L'Umbria*,

practice in the early seventeenth century, and theorists such as Adriano Banchieri in 1601 wrote of transposing pieces in *chiavette* down by a fourth when there was a flat in the key signature and by a fifth when there was none.²⁹ The increasing use of organ for accompaniment or substitution from the 1590s meant that transposition needed to be codified more clearly. It must also have applied to unaccompanied pieces in *chiavette*, but there was not the same need to coordinate voices and organ in that case. Andrew Parrott has summarized the evidence, though he overlooked this Victoria print, saying that the earliest example was to be found in Viadana's *Cento Concerti* of 1602.³⁰ Victoria's primacy was not helped by the fact that, in the Pedrell edition, the rubric was omitted from the *Missa Alma Redemptoris*, though he did print it for the *Missa Salve Regina*.

Victoria's 1600 organ score was a novelty that did not catch on, at least as a means of providing organ parts for sacred music. Publishing books for organ was certainly in the air around 1600. In 1599, the Venetian printer Giacomo Vincenti published an anthology of double-choir music by mainly Rome-based composers "con le parte dei bassi per poter sonarli nell'organo."³¹ This was a *basso seguente*, conflating the two vocal bass parts without any figures or accidentals. The composers included five of Victoria's Roman contemporaries: Felice Anerio, Ruggiero Giovanelli, Luca Marenzio, Giovanni M. Nanino, and Giovanni P. da Palestrina. Fattorini's *I Sacri Concerti a due voci* of 1600 was published in Venice by Ricciardo Amadino with a "basso generale per maggior commodità degli'organisti."³² The organ part of *Laetamini in Domino* is notated a fourth lower than the rest. Murray Bradshaw mistook this for an error but, since the piece is the only one in the collection to use the *chiavette* and has a flat in the key signature, the print is clearly providing the necessary transposition ready-made for the

105 (2008), 217-251). Simone Verovio's *Diletto spirituale* published in Rome in 1586 has redactions for both organ tablature (on two staves) and lute as well as three/four vocal parts. All those with vocal parts in *chiavette* are transposed down a fourth or fifth. The same applies, with some exceptions to Verovio's later publications. See Patrizio Barbieri, "«Chiavette» and Modal Transposition in Italian Practice (c. 1500-1837)," *Recercare*, 3 (1991), 5-79.

²⁹ Adriano Banchieri, *Cartella, overo Regole utilissime à quelli che desiderano imparare il canto figurato* (Venice, 1601). The lute parts in the publications mentioned in the previous footnote are transposed in accordance with Banchieri's writings. See also Patrizio Barbieri, "Chiavette," *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie (London: Macmillan, 2001).

³⁰ Andrew Parrott, "Transposition in Monteverdi's Vespers of 1610. An 'Aberration' Defended," *Early Music*, 12 (1984), 490-516.

³¹ The pieces by Rome-based composers had been published in 1592 in Rome by Francesco Coattino, but without an organ part; they had been collected and edited by Giovanni Luca Conforti.

³² Fattorini, *op. cit.*

organist.³³ In the same year, Nicolò Muti in Rome published Emilio de'Cavalieri's *Rappresentatione di Anima, et di Corpo*, which, for the first time, added figures and accidentals to an organ bass.³⁴ In 1601, Muti published the first volume of the Roman singer Giovanni Luca Conforti's *Salmi passaggiati...con il basso sotto per sonare, et cantare con organo, con altri stromenti* with an organ bass,³⁵ and in 1602, Lodovico da Viadana's influential *Cento Concerti Ecclesiastici*, published by Vincenti in Venice, also included a figured organ bass.³⁶

The *basso seguente* or *basso continuo* was easier to print and easier for the organist to work from. Lodovico da Viadana confirms this in the preface to his *Cento Concerti Ecclesiastici*:

“No tablature has been made for these concertos, not in order to escape the trouble, but to make them easier for the organist to play, since, as a matter of fact, not every one would play from a tablature at sight, and the majority would play from the *partitura* as being less trouble; I hope that the organists will be able to make the said tablature at their own convenience which, to tell the truth, is much better.”³⁷

Viadana uses both the words “intavolatura” (translated here as “tablature”) and “partitura.” Since the latter is what he provides, it must mean the basso continuo, with the former indicating either an open score or a version in keyboard tablature. While praising the former he recognises that the latter is becoming the preferred medium for organists. Victoria's score would indeed have been difficult to play from at sight: the parts are not lined up against each other, and so the organist would have had to read the four parts individually, a skill which, of course, organists did possess prior to the introduction of keyboard tablature.³⁸ It is printed in three consecutive staves,

³³ Ibid., xix.

³⁴ Warren Kirkendale, *Emilio de'Cavalieri "Gentilhuomo Romano." His Life and Letters, His Role as Superintendent of all the Arts at the Medici Court, and His Musical Compositions* (Florence: Olschki, 2001), Chapter 9.

³⁵ See the edition by Murray C. Bradshaw (Neuhausen-Stuttgart: American Institute of Musicology, Hänssler-Verlag, 1985).

³⁶ Lodovico da Viadana, *Cento Concerti Ecclesiastici*, ed. Claudio Gallico (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1964).

³⁷ *Che non si è fatta la intavolatura à questi concerti, per fuggir la fatica, ma per rendere più facile il suonargli à gli'organisti, stando che non tutti suonerebbero all'improvviso la intavolatura, e la maggior parte suonaranno la partitura, per essere più spedita: però potranno gl'organisti à sua posta farsi detta intavolatura, che a dirne il vero parla molto meglio.* Lodovico Viadana, *Cento Concerti*, 122. The English translation is taken from Strunk, *Source Readings*, 62.

³⁸ There are earlier examples of open-score *partiture*: In 1577 Angelo Gardano issued two publications, *Musica di diversi autori* and *Tutti i madrigali di Cipriano di Rore a quattro voci* in four-stave open score, but these were intended as much for private study as for keyboard performance. Keyboard *partiture* also appeared in some

continuing from left to right across the two pages of each opening. There are bar lines, which do help, generally placed after every eight minims, but often after six, ten or more, in the manner of contemporary lute tablature.

The big difference between Victoria's *partitura* and these other *bassi sequenti* is, of course, that Victoria mostly only intabulated the music of Choir I. We have seen his explanation for this in the letter to Jaén. Does this rule out the use of organ to accompany both choirs, deriving a *basso seguente* from the two bass parts or using two organs, one with each choir? Presumably not, since this was also such a common practice at the time, certainly in Rome, where each choir often had its own small organ to accompany it.³⁹ The two sets of part-books with double- and triple-choir music copied for Duke Giovanni Angelo Altaemps in Rome, while not containing any works by Victoria, both have single organ books to accompany polychoral music by Palestrina, Felice Anerio, and others of his Roman contemporaries.⁴⁰ If the organ is to be used as an accompanying instrument for Victoria's large-scale music it would seem more sensible to use it for both choirs, rather than just the one. We can be similarly flexible in using instruments to substitute for, or to accompany, some of the vocal parts.

The fact that Victoria chose not to go down the route of the *basso seguente* but sought to reproduce only the vocal parts of Choir I, and those not exclusively, means that his score provides us with some useful information about performance practice, as well as about transposition. Taken together with the composer's letter to the chapter of Jaén Cathedral, it reminds us that we needn't take sets of printed part-books published around 1600 at face value, but should rather be prepared to adapt and experiment, especially in substituting voices with organ. As Asprilio Pacelli, who had followed Victoria as *moderator musicae* at the Collegio Germanico in Rome, said at the end of the preface to his 1599 *Chorici Psalmi*: "All of this can be left to the judgement of the experienced and perceptive *maestro di cappella*, or the capable and sensible organist; with their knowledge and understanding, further advice and examples are unnecessary."⁴¹ While we still know little about performance practice in 1600 Madrid, viewing Victoria's publication of that year in the context of contemporary Italian developments can give us a broader view of the composer's intentions. His polychoral music can be equally apt for

theoretical works in the late sixteenth century, for example in Juan Bermudo, *El Libro llamado Declaración de instrumentos musicales* (Osuna: Juan de Leon, 1555).

³⁹ See Noel O'Regan, "The performance."

⁴⁰ See Luciano Luciani, "Le composizioni di Ruggero Giovannelli contenute nei due codici manoscritti ex Biblioteca Althaempsiana, detti «Collectio major» e «collectio minor»,» *Ruggero Giovannelli «musica eccellentissimo e forse il primo del suo tempo»*. *Atti del Congegno Internazionale di Studi (Palestrina e Velletri, 12-14 giugno 1992)*, eds. Carmela Bongiovanni and Giancarlo Rostirolla (Palestrina: Fondazione Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, 1998), 281-318.

⁴¹ *Il che tutto si lascia in arbitrio del dotto svegliato mastro di capella, dal valente, et giuditioso organista: alla cui dottrina, valore: non fa di mestieri usare simili essemplificationi, et avvertimenti*. See O'Regan, "Asprilio Pacelli."

making a big show on days of high solemnity and for captivating pious souls in more intimate contexts, as envisaged by Gabriele Fattorini.