

Marcela García*
 RODRIGO DE CEBALLOS'S
MAGNIFICAT CYCLE ON THE
EIGHT TONES: A DESCRIPTION
 AND COMPARISON WITH SIMILAR
 CYCLES BY CRISTOBAL DE MORALES
 AND FRANCISCO GUERRERO

Abstract

Until recently the music of Rodrigo de Ceballos (ca. 1525/30–1581) had been largely ignored by musicologists under the assumption that most of it was lost or preserved in deteriorated manuscripts. Research by the musicologist Robert Snow proved this assumption wrong and placed the composer among important figures of Spanish music during the sixteenth century. Ceballos's style is influenced by the music of two major Spanish composers of the sixteenth century, Cristóbal de Morales (1500–1553) and Francisco Guerrero (1528–1599).

Morales, Guerrero, and Ceballos wrote polyphonic settings of the odd-verses of the Magnificat text on the eight tones, to be sung alternatim with the even-numbered verses at Vespers. Ceballos's *Magnificat Cycle* was sung for several centuries at the cathedral in Bogotá, Colombia, and the manuscripts extant there constitute the only surviving source for the setting.

The settings by the three composers present similarities in the number of voices, number of measures per verse, number of points of imitation, tone transposition, use of *cantus firmus*, use of a rhythmic motive, cadences, and use the *finalis* from the monophonic intonation. After a description of general bibliographical data and interactions among the three composers, this study examines the main characteristics of the Magnificat setting of the odd verses of the text on the eight tones by Ceballos and its similarities and differences with comparable cycles by Morales and Guerrero. This description

* **Marcela García**, Professor, Music History and Theory, Music Department, University of Texas Pan American, United States of America.

establishes specific musical influences among them and determines stylistic traits of the music of the most important Spanish composers of the mid-sixteenth century.

Keywords: Magnificat, Rodrigo de Ceballos, Cristóbal de Morales, Francisco Guerrero.

Resumen

Durante varios años musicólogos e investigadores asumieron que la música de Rodrigo de Ceballos (c.a. 1525/30–1581) estaba completamente perdida o preservada en manuscritos en mal estado. Investigaciones hechas por el musicólogo Robert Snow demostraron que esta premisa no es cierta y que este compositor merece un sitio entre las figuras más importantes de la música española del siglo dieciséis. La música de Cristóbal de Morales (1500–1553) y Francisco Guerrero (1528–1599), dos compositores españoles notables del siglo dieciséis, ejerció una influencia importante en la música de Ceballos. Morales, Guerrero, y Ceballos escribieron arreglos polifónicos de los versos impares del texto del Magnificat en los ocho tonos, para ser cantados alternatim con los versos pares durante la celebración del servicio de vésperas. Los Magnificats de Ceballos fueron interpretados en la catedral de Bogotá, Colombia por varios siglos y los manuscritos usados en esa catedral son en este momento las únicas copias completas que existen del ciclo.

Es interesante observar que los ciclos de Magnificats de los tres compositores son bastante similares. Estas similitudes incluyen número de compases por verso, número de puntos de imitación, transposición de tonos, uso del *cantus firmus*, uso de un motivo rítmico, tipo de cadencias, y uso de la nota *finalis* de la entonación monofónica. Después de una corta presentación bibliográfica de los tres compositores, el presente estudio examina las características principales del ciclo de Magnificats en los ocho tonos de Ceballos y sus similitudes y diferencias con los ciclos de Guerrero y Morales. A través de esta investigación se establecen influencias musicales específicas entre los tres compositores y se determinan factores generales de estilo de la música de los compositores españoles más importantes de mediados del siglo dieciséis.

Palabras clave: Magnificat, Rodrigo de Ceballos, Cristóbal de Morales, Francisco Guerrero.

The music of Rodrigo de Ceballos had been largely ignored by musicologists under the assumption that most of it was lost or preserved in deteriorated manuscripts. Research by the musicologist

Robert Snow proved this assumption wrong and placed the composer among important figures of Spanish music during the sixteenth century. Cristóbal de Morales, Francisco Guerrero, and Tomas Luis de Victoria, the most prominent Spanish composers of the century, were widely published and their music was popular both in Europe and in the Americas. However, Ceballos was never published during his lifetime or after, until Snow started publishing his complete works in 1995. Possible reasons for the lack of publication of his works during his life time might have been that Ceballos did not travel outside of Spain as the other composers did, or because publications were expensive and many times put the composers under financial hardship. Whatever the reason might have been, it could not have been the quality of the music. Ceballos's polyphony is flowing and beautiful, dissonances are carefully controlled, and melodies are curved and graceful. In general, his technical skills and expressiveness easily equal those of Morales, Guerrero, and Victoria.

During the Spanish colonization of the Americas, the practice of singing religious polyphony was implemented in newly constructed cathedrals and churches. Books and manuscripts of polyphonic music were brought from Europe for this purpose. Several manuscript collections, which include the music of Ceballos in different archives throughout the Americas, reflect the popularity of Ceballos and other European composers in the colonies. Ceballos's preserved compositions number about eighty including motets, masses, psalms, Magnificat settings, and other liturgical and secular works. Like many of his contemporaries, Ceballos composed an eight-tone polyphonic setting of the odd-numbered verses of the Magnificat text, to be sung alternatim with the even-numbered verses at Vespers. According to Stevenson, this collection of Magnificats is one of the most important musical treasures of South America.¹ Ceballos's *Magnificat Cycle* was sung for several centuries at the cathedral in Bogotá, Colombia, and the manuscripts used there constitute the only extant source for the setting. Ceballos's musical style reflects that of his contemporaries, such as Cristóbal de Morales and Francisco Guerrero. Guerrero was Ceballos's personal friend, and according to Snow, he could have been the person who recommended Ceballos for an appointment as a copyist at the Cathedral in Seville in 1553.²

With all of Ceballos's works transcribed and available to researchers and performers at the present time, a close study of Ceballos's compositions is necessary for a better understanding of sixteenth-century music in Spain and the Americas. The forthcoming discussion will focus on describing the style and technical generalities of Ceballos's Magnificat Cycle on the Eight Tones. Some of the aspects that will be discussed include imitations, cadences, use of *cantus firmus*, length of verses, and use of mode. Following this discussion a comparison of Ceballos's cycle with similar cycles by his most notable countrymen, Morales and Guerrero, will place the cycle in a broader context.

General Characteristics of Ceballos's Magnificat Cycle

Ceballos's *Magnificat Cycle on the Eight Tones* is written in the polyphonic style of mid-sixteenth century Europe, and many features found in the cycle are easily traced to the style of Cristóbal de Morales, the most influential Spanish composer at the time. The cycle sets the odd-numbered verses of the Magnificat text polyphonically, except for the first verse, which is divided into the initial monophonic intonation of the word "Magnificat," followed by a polyphonic response. The texture of the whole cycle is highly imitative and the monophonic intonation appears as *cantus firmus* in most verses. Features such as number of voices, types of cadences, length of verses, number of points of imitation, use of unifying motives, and the way the *cantus firmus* is set in different verses are very consistent throughout the cycle and provide many musical features that unify it.

Verses 1, 3, 7, 9, and 11 in all tones are set in four parts: *triple* (Spanish equivalent to soprano), *altus*, *tenor*, and *bassus*; verse 5 in all tones has no bass part (i.e. *bassus tacet*) yielding a three-voice setting. Only Tones 1 and 2 are transposed (a fourth above), with *B-flat* appearing in the key signature; the rest of the tones are at the original pitch. *B-flat* also appears in the key signature for the fifth and sixth tones. The following tables will be referred to in the forthcoming discussion of the general characteristics of each tone.

Table 1
Number of Measures and Points of Imitation in Rodrigo de Ceballos's *Magnificat Cycle on the Eight Tones*

VERSE	1		3		5		7		9		11		Total # of measures per tone
TONE	P.I.	#ms	P.I.	#ms	P.I.	#ms	P.I.	#ms	P.I.	#ms	P.I.	#ms	
1	1	6	3	25	3	31	2	14	2	26	2	14	116
2	1	8	3	29	3	35	2	24	3	25	2	20	141
3	1	12	3	29	3	30	2	21	2	25	2	21	138
4	1	12	3	30	3	35	2	22	2	21	2	22	142
5	1	12	3	27	3	26	2	20	2	22	2	18	125
6	1	15	3	30	3	28	2	17	3	32	2	18	140
7	1	10	3	34	3	27	2	21	3	27	2	21	140
8	1	10	3	24	3	33	2	19	3	25	2	14	125
Average		11		29		31		20		25		19	133

Key:

P.I. = Number of points of imitation or sections for each verse.

#ms = Number of measures per verse.

General Characteristics of Verse

Verse 1 has an introductory character, it is the shortest of all, the imitations are straightforward, and only one imitative section is presented. The length of the first verse averages eleven measures: verse 1 of Tone 1 is the shortest with six measures, and verse 1 of Tone 6 is the longest with fifteen measures. Material derived from the monophonic intonation is used in most settings of verse 1 except in Tone 8. Due to the fact that verse 1 sets only the second half of the verse polyphonically, the *cantus firmus* does not appear complete, but only the final portion is used. The *tiple* is the voice that most consistently carries the presentations of the *cantus firmus* in this verse throughout the cycle, but it also appears in other voices. Only in Tones 1 and 3 is the *cantus firmus* set to long rhythmic values. In the other tones it is more varied rhythmically, particularly in Tones 6 and 7.

Verse 1 in all tones starts with the rhythm of a whole note followed by two half notes. This rhythm also serves as the opening motive for verse 3 in all tones, and for verse 9 in all tones except 2 and 4. This rhythmic motive is the strongest unifying musical characteristic

of the cycle. However, after the first one or two presentations of the unifying motive, the rhythm often appears varied as three half notes preceded by a half rest.

Table 2
Use of *cantus firmus* in Rodrigo de Ceballos's *Magnificat Cycle on the Eight Tones*

VERSE	1	3	5	7	9	11
TO NE						
1	Tiple, termination	NO	Tiple, termination	Altus, complete	Tiple, termination	Tenor, complete
2	Tiple, termination	Tenor and tiple, <i>initio</i> and termination	Tiple and altus, termination	Tiple, termination	Tiple, complete	Altus, complete
3	Tiple, tenor and bassus, termination	Bassus, tenor, altus	Tiple, termination	Tiple, complete	Altus and tenor, termination	Altus, complete
4	Bassus and tiple, termination	Tiple, termination	Tiple and altus, termination	Bassus, complete	Altus, complete	Tiple, complete
5	Tiple and tenor, termination	Tiple and tenor <i>initio</i> , termination	Tiple, <i>initio</i> and termination	Tiple, complete	Tiple, altus, and tenor, termination	Tenor, complete
6	Tiple, altus, bassus, termination	Tenor, termination	Tiple, termination	Tiple complete, tenor presents the CF of Tone 5	Tenor and bassus, termination	Tenor, complete
7	All, termination	Tenor, termination	Tiple, altus, tenor, termination	Tenor, complete	Tenor and bassus, termination	Tiple, complete
8	NO	Altus, tenor, bassus, termination	Tiple and tenor	Bassus, complete	All, <i>initio</i>	Tiple, complete

Key:

The content of each cell indicates the voice in which the *cantus firmus* appears, followed by and indication of which section of the cantus is being used (*initio*, *mediant*, or *termination*). Grey areas denote use of the complete *cantus firmus* set in one voice in long rhythmic values. Note specially Tone 6, verse 7, while the *tiple* presents the *cantus firmus* of the corresponding tone, the tenor presents the *cantus firmus* of Tone 5.

General Characteristics of Verse 3

After the introductory character of verse 1, the setting of verse 3 strikes the listener as more complex and lengthy. Verse 3 is in fact the second most lengthy verse of all, exceeded only by verse 5. The

length of verse 3 in all tones averages twenty-eight measures, with Tone 7 the longest at thirty-four measures, and Tone 8 the shortest at twenty-four measures.

The text of verse 3 is usually divided in three imitative sections. In Tone 5 the first portion of the text "Quia respexit humilitatem ancillae suae" is subdivided into two sections set to different motives. In Tones 2, 6, and 8 the second section of this verse, with the text "ecce enim ex hoc beatam me dicent," could be subdivided in two sections, for better understanding of the imitations. However, the first part of this phrase on the words "ecce enim," is neither long enough or marked with a sufficiently conclusive cadence to make it a separate section.

The unifying rhythm of the cycle serves as opening motive for verse 3 in all tones, further underlying the cyclic character of the setting. Different portions of the *cantus firmus* are used in the setting of verse 3 in most tones, except for Tone 1. Only in Tone 2 does the *cantus firmus* appear at the beginning, set to long rhythmic values. In Tones 3, 5, and 8 the *cantus firmus* is paraphrased in the opening imitation in various voices, and in Tones 4, 6, and 7 the final portion of the chant appears towards the end of the verse. The *cantus firmus* is never set complete in a single voice in verse 3.

Table 3
Text of the Magnificat

1. Magnificat Anima mea Dominum.
2. Et exsultavit spiritus meus in Deo salutari meo.
3. Quia respexit humilitatem ancillae suae: ecce enim ex hoc beatam me dicent omnes generationes.
4. Quia fecit mihi magna qui potens est: et sanctum nomen ejus.
5. Et misericordia ejus a progenie in progenies timentibus eum.
6. Fecit potentiam in brachio suo: dispersit superbos mente cordis sui.
7. Deposuit potentes de sede, et exaltavit humiles.
8. Esurientes implevit bonis: et divites dimisit inanes.
9. Suscepit Israel puerum suum, recordatus misericordiae suae.
10. Sicut locutus est ad patres nostros, Abraham et semini ejus in saecula.
11. Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto.
12. Sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

General Characteristics of Verse 5

The three-voice texture of verse 5 marks a departure from the rest of the verses, not only in the scoring but also in style. Verse 5 is the longest of all verses (on average thirty-one measures), imitations are usually further apart, and the motives used for imitations are longer.

The text of verse 5 is consistently divided into three imitative sections, the first on the words "Et misericordia ejus," the second on the words "a progenie in progenies," and the third on the words "timentibus eum." Verse 5 in all tones also shows motivic consistency. The unifying motive of verses 1, 3, and 9 does not appear in this verse, but two types of rhythmic motives are used for the opening of verse 5 in all tones. One motive consists of a dotted whole note followed by a half note, and is used in Tones 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7. The other motive consists of one whole note, one half note, and one whole note, and is used in verses 3, 5, and 8.

The final portion of the *cantus firmus* is used in all settings of verse 5, mostly in the *tiple*, and always towards the end of the verse. In addition, in Tone 5 the first notes of the *cantus firmus* appear at the beginning of the *tiple*, set to long values, and the termination appears again in the *tiple* towards the end of the verse.

General Characteristics of Verse 7

In comparison to previous verses, the character of verse 7 suggests a moment of relaxation and contemplation. The verse is shorter than verses 3 and 5, it always starts with long rhythmic values, and the *cantus firmus* is presented complete and restricted to one voice.

Verse 7 is among the short verses of the cycle together with verses 1 and 11. The verse averages twenty measures, with the setting of Tone 1 the shortest at fourteen measures and Tone 2 the longest at twenty-four.

The unifying rhythmic motive of the cycle is not used in this verse, but instead the rhythmic value of two whole notes invariably opens the verse in all tones. In general, the rhythmic values of the first measures are longer and the texture more homophonic

than in previous verses. Tones 1 and 6 continue that texture through the end of the verse. Verse 7 in all tones, except for Tone 2, include a complete presentation of the *cantus firmus*. The slower rhythm is typical also of verse 11 also, and in both verses 7 and 11 it is related to the presentation of the complete *cantus firmus* in long values in one voice.

With the slow rhythmic values and the clear texture, Ceballos emphasizes the meaning of the text and underlines the use of the *cantus firmus* acknowledging the sacredness of the monophonic intonation. The *tiple*, and not the tenor, is the favorite voice for the complete presentation of the *cantus firmus* in this verse. An exception with no precedent comes in the setting of verse 7 of Tone 6 with a simultaneous presentation of two different *cantus firmi*. While the *tiple* presents the complete *cantus firmus* of Tone 6, the tenor presents the corresponding *cantus firmus* of Tone 5 in the first 7 measures. This combination of *cantus firmi* is not repeated in any other place in the cycle.

It is noteworthy that the complete *cantus firmus* presentations in verse 7 on Tones 1, 4, and 8 are on a different pitch than the polyphonic setting. This is carried out in two different ways. The setting of Tone 1 is transposed but the presentation of the *cantus firmus* is at the original pitch. On the other hand the settings of Tones 4 and 8 are not transposed, but the *cantus firmus* is.

The text of verse 7 is always divided in two sections, the first with the words "Deposuit potentes de sede," and the second on the words "et exaltavit humiles." For verses 3, 6, 7, and 8 the first section is almost homophonic, and imitations start to occur only in the second portion of the text.

General Characteristics of Verse 9

Verse 9 returns to the complexity in length and texture of verses 3 and 5, serving in most cases as a climactic point for the setting, except in Tones 2 and 4. In those tones verse 9 includes a presentation of the complete *cantus firmus* set in long values in one voice. In these two settings verse 9 is similar in character to the settings of verse 7, with the slow rhythmic values and homophonic texture that accompany the presentations of the complete *cantus firmus*. Verse 7 in Tone 2 does

not present the complete *cantus firmus* as it does in the rest of the tones. Therefore it could be assumed that in Tone 2 Ceballos delayed the complete presentation of the *cantus firmus* to verse 9. However, Tone 4, verse 7 did include a presentation of the complete *cantus firmus*, and in this tone the reflective character of verse 7 extends until the end of the tone through verses 9 and 11. The presentation of the complete *cantus firmus* in Tone 4 is particularly interesting because it is transposed a fifth lower. Verse 9 in Tones 1, 3, 5, 6, and 7 presents the final portion of the *cantus firmus* in different voices towards the end of the verse. In Tone 8 this verse paraphrases the initio of the *cantus firmus* in all voices in the first imitation.

Verse 9 averages twenty-five measures, Tone 4 being the shortest at twenty-one measures, and Tone 6 the longest at thirty-four measures. This makes verse 9 the third longest verse after verses 5 and 3. The rhythmic motive presented previously in verses 1 and 3 returns in and serves as the opening motive for most of its settings of verse 9, except for Tones 2 and 4 which set the complete *cantus firmus* and therefore utilize long rhythmic values.

The division of the text of verse 9 in imitative sections are inconsistent; sometimes the text is divided in three sections and sometimes in two. The verses divided in two sections often present subdivisions subdivision of the imitations, and these sections occur in different parts of the text. The most common division is one section on the words "Suscepit Israel puerum suum," a second section on the word "recordatus," and a third section on the words "misericordiae suae."

General Characteristics of Verse 11

In verse 11 a type of conclusive climax is achieved: the *cantus firmus* is invariably set complete in one voice, rhythmic values are slower, the texture is more homophonic, and the verse is rather short. The homophony provides a particularly clear setting of the text and brings each tone to a conclusion.

The favorite voices for the presentations of the complete *cantus firmus* in this verse are the *tiple* and the tenor. Similar to the character of verse 7, the *cantus firmus* is presented in long rhythmic values and the rest of the voices accompany it in a homophonic manner. In fact,

verse 11 is in general more homophonic than verse 7. No particular motive is assigned to the first portion of the text, and only in some cases a motive is assigned to the second portion of the text. The text is always divided into two sections, the first on the words "Gloria Patri, et Filio," and the second on "et Spiritui Sancto."

The complete presentations of the *cantus firmus* in Tones 2 and 3 of this verse are notable because the *cantus firmus* is at a different pitch than the polyphonic setting. In Tone 2 the setting is transposed a fourth higher while the *cantus firmus* is at the original pitch, while in Tone 3 the setting is in the original pitch and the *cantus firmus* is transposed a fifth higher.

Monophonic Intonation

The monophonic intonation formulas copied in the manuscripts differ from the standard formulas in the *Liber Usualis* (See Table 4). Ceballos uses the standard formulas in his polyphony, and these have therefore been provided for the monophonic intonations in the transcriptions. The differences between the intonations given in the manuscript and the standard formulas suggest that the monophonic intonations must have been transmitted orally. Only the incipit for the intonation of the words "Magnificat" is provided in the manuscripts, and therefore the comparison applies only to the first notes of the *cantus firmus*.

For Tones 3 and 5 the formulas in the manuscript are almost identical to the standard ones, except for an added slur in Tone 5. The intonations given in the manuscript for Tones 2 and 8 are missing a note and the corresponding ligature, which would change the distribution of syllables for performance. The formula for Tone 4 has an additional G sharp. Formulas for Tones 1, 6, and 7 have additional notes at the beginning of the intonation in the manuscript. Tone 1 introduces the formula with a C instead of the B-flat of the standard tone. Tone 7 introduces the formula with a G, adding a leap of a fourth to the beginning of the intonation. Tone 6 adds an F and a G to the beginning of the formula, creating additional neighbor tones to the intonation.

The changes in the intonation formulas in the manuscripts may follow from variations introduced during performance of the cycle in the Cathedral, and could offer evidence of a new set of formulas for cycles composed or performed in the Americas.

Table 4
Comparison of the Different Versions of the Monophonic Intonation

	TONE 1	TONE 2
Intonation		
<i>Liber Usualis</i>		
Polyphony		
	TONE 3	TONE 4
Intonation		
<i>Liber Usualis</i>		
Polyphony		
	TONE 5	TONE 6
Intonation		
<i>Liber Usualis</i>		
Polyphony		
	TONE 7	TONE 8
Intonation		
<i>Liber Usualis</i>		
Polyphony		

Cadences

Two types of cadences have been considered in the analysis of the cycle. The cadences that close each verse are referred to as final cadences, and the cadences that separate points of imitation or main sections are referred to as middle cadences. Cadences that occur within a point of imitation do not divide major sections and are considered secondary or intermediate. Even though close examination of these cadences would be undoubtedly interesting, the discussion has concentrated on broader characteristics (final and middle cadences).

All final cadences for each verse rest on the final note of the monophonic formula. Most middle cadences rest on the recitation note of the monophonic intonation, except for Tones 6 and 7, in which the reciting note is used only once as the final note for middle cadences.

Final cadences

Final cadences are constructed with the typical sonority of the mid-late Renaissance: the harmonic interval of a major sixth resolving to an octave in the inner voices, accompanied by a melodic movement of five to one in the bassus line. We will refer to this cadence as M6–8, 5–1 for short. This type of cadence is used for most final cadences, with the following exceptions. In verse 5 in all tones, the three-voice texture omits the 5–1 movement of the bassus, and the final octave is approached from the major sixth in the tenor (in this case the bass line) and the altus or *tiple*. The M6–8, 5–1 cadence is also avoided as final cadence in Tones 4 and 5 for a different reason. In both Tones 4 and 5 the note above the final note is a semitone higher. In Tone 4 the final note of the tone is *E*, and in Tone 5 the final note is *A* (with an added *B-flat* in the key signature). In these cases the movement of the bassus progresses from the fourth degree to the final note, to avoid the diminished fifth that would be formed by a 5–1 progression in the bass. Therefore most cadences in Tones 4 and 5 approach the final note with a 4–1 movement in the bass, except for the fifth verses, which use a M6–8 progression. Ceballos also uses a 4–1 progression in the bassus in verse 9 in Tones 2, 4, and 8.

Somewhat puzzling is the final cadence for Tone 4, verse 9, which progresses from the sixth and seventh melodic degrees to the final note E in the bassus, without a descent to the final note in the inner voices. This is the only final cadence of a verse that is not clearly conclusive in the usual way.

Middle cadences

Many middle cadences also use the M6–8, 5–1 progression. However, it is common to find the final note in the bassus delayed by a rest, appearing immediately after as the first note of the following imitation. In those cases a parenthesis has been placed around the 1, i.e. M6–8, 5–(1).

Some middle cadences use the deceptive sonority, usually preserving the M6–8 in inner voices, and introducing a note a third below the final note in the bassus. These deceptive cadences can be found in Tone 3, verse 5, measures 55 and 63, in Tone 6, verse 5, measure 60, and in Tone 8, verse 9, measure 102.

In one middle cadence we find the interval of a major sixth inverted into a minor third, resolving to a unison. This inversion can be found in Tone 6, verse 7, measure 84. In Tone 7, verse 3, measure 29, *ficta* cannot be applied to the major third to make it a minor third, and therefore the melodic progression to the final note goes from a major third to a unison.

It is common in middle cadences to find the 5–1 progression in the bassus without the M6–8 in the inner voices, or the opposite, the M6–8 progression formed with the bass voice, without the 5–1 progression. The cadence in Tone 8, verse 9, measure 102, is unique: it progresses from the seventh to the first degree in the bassus, without any other approach to the final note in the inner voices.

Influences Among the Ceballos, Morales, and Guerrero

The most significant influences in the music of Rodrigo de Ceballos (ca. 1525/30–1581) come from the two main figures in Spanish music of the sixteenth century, Cristóbal de Morales (1500–1553) and Francisco Guerrero (1528–1599).³ The connection between Morales

and Guerrero is self-evident. Morales, the oldest of the three and the best known outside of Spain, was Guerrero's teacher during 1545 in Seville. On the other hand, there is no direct evidence of a meeting between Morales and Ceballos. However, both composers worked in adjacent areas, and due to the popularity and numerous editions of Morales's music, it is highly possible that Ceballos would have been familiar with Morales's compositions.

Conversely, Ceballos and Guerrero were contemporaries and knew each other at least since 1553, when Ceballos was appointed as copyist of books of masses for the Seville Cathedral where Guerrero worked. The two composers helped judge candidates for the maestro de capilla post in Cordoba in 1567. Considering that both composers worked in the same area, that they met each other on several occasions, and that they were both prominent composers of Spanish music during the century, undoubtedly they were familiar with each other's compositions. Yet, Guerrero's compositions are more "modern"⁴ than Ceballos's, and his style anticipates eighteenth-century harmonic usage. This difference in the style of the two composers is easily explainable taking into account the fact that Guerrero outlived Ceballos by eighteen years, and towards the end of the sixteenth century Guerrero and other composers were writing in a transitional style. Ceballos's works were never published during his lifetime or after; in fact the first publication of any of his music is the *Obras Completas de Rodrigo de Ceballos*⁵ begun by Snow in 1995. On the other hand, Guerrero often published his compositions during his lifetime, and he was recognized as an important composer of Spanish music.

Ceballos's Life

Ceballos was born in Aracena in the province of Huelva (70 miles northwest of Seville) sometime between 1525 and 1530. His whereabouts until 1553 are unknown but, like many other musicians of the time, he probably received musical training as a choirboy in cathedrals near his hometown. Snow suggests that the commission given to Ceballos to copy music books for the Cathedral in Seville in 1553 must have been by recommendation of Guerrero.⁶ The next year Guerrero published music in Seville, Venice, Paris, and Louvain, and it is likely that Ceballos became acquainted with these compositions.

In February of 1554 Guerrero was selected as *Maestro de capilla* in Málaga, to replace Morales after his death. Guerrero declined the post after a few days, and a second competition was held in June. In this competition Ceballos was selected as second choice for the post, and Juan de Cepa was appointed *Maestro de capilla*. In 1556 Ceballos was hired as tiple singer in the cathedral in Córdoba, and later he was appointed to share the post of *Maestro de capilla* with the elder Alonso the Vieras in the same church. In the same year, Ceballos went back to Seville to be ordained as a priest, and at this time he must have meet Guerrero again, who worked in the Seville Cathedral all of his life. Ceballos took over the *Maestro de capilla* duties in the Córdoba Cathedral after Vieras's retirement in 1557. This was the first of two major positions that Ceballos held during his lifetime. In 1561, after five years in Cordoba, Ceballos resigned his post and became *Maestro de capilla* at the royal chapel of Granada. He held this post until his death in 1581.

Travels to Italy

Of the three composers, Guerrero is the one who stayed in one place longer than the others. He worked at the cathedral in Seville for the fifty-seven years between 1542 and his death in 1599. During this time the chapter at Seville gave him leave to travel to Italy twice, in 1581 and 1588. He was planning to go back in 1599 and was awarded a third leave, however, he never made the trip and died of the plague that same year. Morales, in contrast, was the only one of the three who spent a long period of time in Italy, living there for eleven years between 1534 and 1545 when he worked for the papal chapel and traveled throughout Italy. Yet, apart from the long stay in Rome, Morales, unlike Guerrero and Ceballos, did not settle for longer than two or three years in any one place. Before Rome he spent three years in Avila and two in Plasencia, and after his return from Rome he spent three years in Toledo, three years in Andalucía, and two years in Málaga. At the time of his death he had once again applied for the post of *Maestro de capilla* in Toledo. Ceballos did not travel to Italy, but certainly had the opportunity to get acquainted with Italian polyphony, not only indirectly through the music of Morales and Guerrero, but through other publications that were widely circulated at the time.

Composers Output

Of the three composers, Guerrero has the largest output. This is hardly surprising bearing in mind the fact that he lived for seventy-one years, quite a considerable life span at the time, compared to the fifty some years that both Ceballos and Morales lived. Nonetheless, the three composers wrote mainly in the same genres, including masses, Magnificats, motets, psalms and liturgical works, and a small amount of secular works. The following table (Table 5) compares the output of the three composers.

Table 5
Compositions by Morales, Guerrero, and Ceballos Organized by Genres

	Morales	Guerrero	Ceballos
Masses	24	19	3
Magnificats	16 (both even and odd-numbered verses on each of the eight tones)	16 (both even and odd-numbered verses on each of the eight tones)	8 (only the odd-numbered verses)
Motets	88	181	40
Other liturgical works	3	3	31
Secular and instrumental	6	17	7
Totals	121	220	89

Settings of the Magnificat by the Three Composers

The case of the Magnificats is an interesting one. Both Morales and Guerrero composed two complete sets of the odd and even-numbered verses on the eight tones. Morales's Magnificats were the most popular of his works, and were reprinted more than any other set of Magnificats before 1600.⁷ Morales wrote his Magnificats while working for the papal chapel. It was the custom in the papal chapel to sing all verses in polyphony rather than alternating polyphonic verses with *plainchant*, as was usual elsewhere in Europe. Morales wrote his sixteen Magnificats for those occasions, and he published five of them in this manner with Scotto in Venice in 1542 and with Rener in Wittenberg in 1543. He later separated the odd and even-

numbered verses and published them independently. Guerrero also arranged polyphonically both the even and the odd-numbered verses, but he did not intend them to be performed consecutively. Considering the relationships and similarities among the works of the three composers, it is very possible that Ceballos composed a set of the even-numbered verses as well, but only the odd-numbered verses have survived.

Comparison of Ceballos's and Morales's Magnificat Settings

The influence of Morales and Guerrero on the Ceballos Magnificats becomes evident when looking at the music in detail.⁸ Taking into account that Morales wrote his music before Guerrero and Ceballos, it is useful to look first at those musical features in the Morales settings that might have influenced Ceballos.

In general, Morales's settings of the odd-numbered verses of the eight tones are longer than those of Ceballos. The tones in Morales's setting average are 155 measures, while in Ceballos's the average are 133 (compare Tables 2 and 3). The Morales setting on Tone 5 is particularly long, with a total of 186 measures. It exceeds the longest setting of any tone in Ceballos's cycle by more than forty measures. Nonetheless, the average lengths of the respective verses in all of the tones are similar for the two composers, with verses 3 and 5 being longest. The extended length of verse 3 is due to the fact that the text is the longest of the odd-numbered verses, while the length of verse 5 is related to the texture. Both Ceballos and Morales chose to set verse 5 for three voices (except for Morales's Tone 2, verse 5 which maintains the four-voice texture). This thinner texture lends itself to more widely spaced imitations and longer motives, which contribute to the length of the verse. The only other two instances in which the number of voices varies in Morales's setting are Tone 1, verse 7, and Tone 2, verse 9, both set for three voices. The latter verse is particularly interesting in that Palestrina later added two *si placet* voices in the high register, yielding a five-voice setting.

The number of points of imitation used by the two composers is very similar in all verses except in verse 5. In both cycles verse 1 includes one imitation, verse 3 is divided into three imitations, and verses 7, 9, and 11 into two, with a few exceptions. The main

differences occur in verse 5, which Ceballos divides consistently into three sections and Morales almost always into two, despite the fact that the Morales settings of this verse are longer. Morales setting in general is less sectional and has fewer cadences within the points of imitation. The following table shows the number of measures and points of imitation in the Morales Magnificats. Gray areas indicate verses and tones that are particularly short or long.

Table 6
Number of Measures and Points of Imitation in Morales's Setting of the Odd-Numbered Verses of the Magnificat

VERSE	1		3		5		7		9		11		Total
TONE	#ms	# pts	#ms	# pts	#ms	# pts	#ms	# pts	#ms	# pts	#ms	# pts	
1	8	1	30	3	28	2	26	2	31	3	25	2	148
2	8	1	35	3	30	2	23	2	27	2	27	2	150
3	13	1	30	3	34	2	27	2	28	2	21	2	153
4	8	1	33	3	34	3	26	2	27	2	23	2	151
5	20	1	42	3	36	3	31	2	33	2	24	2	186
6	13	1	25	3	33	2	15	2	25	2	24	2	135
7	18	1	32	3	31	2	31	2	34	2	24	2	170
8	12	1	30	3	31	2	24	2	26	2	21	2	144
Average # of ms.	13		32		32		25		29		24		155

Key:

pts = number of points of imitation per verse.

ms = number of measures per verse.

Grey areas denote longer and shorter verses.

Mode Transposition and Cadences

With regard to transposition of the Magnificat tones and cadences, the Ceballos and Morales Magnificats are almost identical. Morales used the transposed version of Tones 1 and 2 just as Ceballos did, and he added the *B-flat* to the key signature in Tone 6 but not in Tone 5 (Ceballos added the *B-flat* in both Tones 5 and 6). Both composers use the finalis of the corresponding monophonic intonation as *finalis* for the polyphonic setting of each verse, and the

recitation note of the intonation as *final* note for middle cadences (or cadences that separate the different points of imitation). The only composer before Morales who used the final note of the monophonic intonation as final note for the polyphonic setting was Constanzo Festa. After Morales the practice spread, and all later composers did the same.⁹

For Morales the M6–8, 5–1 (the harmonic interval of a major sixth followed by an octave in the inner voices and accompanied by a 5 to 1, melodic degrees, movement in the bass) is the favorite cadence. This cadence is used consistently except in Tone 4 where the approach to the final note is usually with a 4–1 progression in the bass or with the M6–8 progression in the inner voices without the 5–1 movement in the bass (the 4–1 progression in the bass is common when the note above the final is only a semitone higher. In this situation a M6–8 progression accompanied by a 5–1 movement in the bass would create a tritone between the bass and the second melodic degree, and this was not a common sonority at the time). Morales also avoids the M6–8, 5–1 cadence in Tone 5 with *A* as the finalis. Even though the *B-flat* does not appear in the key signature the rule “one note above *la* is always sung *Fa*” would have been observed as *ficta*, causing many *B*'s to be changed to *B-flat*, so that the same tritone sonority is being avoided.

Finalis and *Cantus Firmus*

In all tones both Morales and Ceballos consistently use the reciting note as the final note for middle cadences, except for Tone 7. Both composers avoid *E*, the final note of the mediatio of the chant, as final note for the middle cadences in Tone 7, and use *A*, the final note of the intonation instead. The following table (Table 7) shows the final notes for cadences in the Magnificat settings of both Guerrero and Morales, which correspond to the reciting and final notes of the intonations, except for Tones 6 and 7.

Both Morales and Ceballos include the monophonic intonation as melodic material in the polyphonic verses in three ways: (1) the intonation appears complete in one voice from beginning to end; (2) portions of the intonation appear in different voices (particularly the termination of the verse that descends stepwise towards the final

Table 7
Final Notes for Middle and Final Cadences of the Magnificat Setting of the
Odd-Numbered Verses of the Text by Morales and Ceballos

TONE	Final note for middle cadences	Final note for final cadences in each verse
1	<i>D</i>	<i>G</i>
2	<i>B-flat</i>	<i>G</i>
3	<i>C</i>	<i>A</i>
4	<i>A</i>	<i>E</i>
5	<i>C</i>	<i>A</i>
6	<i>F</i>	<i>F</i>
7	<i>A</i> (the final note for the <i>mediatio</i> of the chant is <i>E</i>)	<i>A</i>
8	<i>C</i>	<i>G</i>

note); and (3) the first notes of the intonation are paraphrased in all the voices at the beginning of the polyphonic setting and serve as a motive for imitation. In the previous chapter we discussed how consistent Ceballos is in his use of a *cantus firmus* in the same verses in different tones. Morales used the *cantus firmus* in almost all the verses, but he did not set it as consistently as Ceballos.

The complete *cantus firmus* appears in Morales setting in verse 5 of Tone 2, verse 7 of Tones 1, 2, 6, and 7, verse 9 of Tones 2, 3, and 6, and verse 11 of Tones 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7. Ceballos also liked to set the complete *cantus firmus* in verses 7 and 11, the only exception being in Tone 2, verse 11. Two instances of Morales's complete settings of the *cantus firmus* are noteworthy. In Tone 2, verse 5, after a complete statement of the *cantus firmus* in the tiple, that voice joins the others in free counterpoint. In Tone 1, verse 7, all voices paraphrase the first notes of the *cantus firmus* in imitation at the beginning, and later the tenor presents the complete version. Ceballos did not use either of these techniques. When he sets the complete intonation in one voice, the voice does not have any other material from the beginning to the end of the verse. Almost without exception when a voice completes the presentation of the *cantus firmus* and the verse continues, the final section is repeated in the same voice.

Notable in the settings by both composers are those verses where the complete *cantus firmus* appears in one voice at a different pitch level from that of the polyphonic setting. These instances occur in Morales in Tone 7, verse 7; Tone 3, verse 9; and Tones 4 and 6, verse 11. In Ceballos they are found in Tones 1, 4, and 8, verse 7; Tone 4, verse 9; and Tones 2 and 3, verse 11. For both composers the technique of paraphrasing some notes of the intonation in several voices is by far the least favored. The following table shows the use of the monophonic intonation as *cantus firmus* in Morales's setting.

Table 8
Use of the Monophonic Intonation as *cantus firmus* in Morales Setting

VERSE	1	3	5	7	9	11
TONE						
1	Tiple termination	Tiple and altus paraphrased	Tiple and altus termination	All voices paraphrased later tenor complete	NO	NO
2	Altus and tiple termination	All voices paraphrased plus termination	Tiple complete and then free counterpoint	Altus complete	Tenor complete	Tiple complete
3	Tiple and bass termination	Tenor <i>initio</i>	NO	Tenor, <i>initio</i> transposed	Altus complete and transposed	Tiple <i>initio</i>
4	Tiple termination	All voices paraphrased	All voices paraphrased	All voices paraphrased	Bass <i>initio</i>	Altus complete and transposed
5	Tenor termination	NO	Tiple <i>initio</i>	All voices paraphrased and later bass termination	Tenor <i>initio</i>	Tiple complete
6	Tiple termination	NO	Tiple termination	Tiple complete	Tenor complete	Bassus complete and transposed
7	Tiple termination	Tenor termination	NO	Bassus complete and transposed	NO	Tenor complete
8	Tiple termination	Tiple <i>initio</i>	NO	NO	termination	Tenor <i>initio</i>

When setting the complete *cantus firmus* in one voice, Morales sometimes uses the type of homophonic texture in long values used by Ceballos in similar verses. This is particularly true when the complete *cantus firmus* is set in verse 11. That verse thus serves as a climactic conclusion in the settings of both composers.

In regard to the appearance of a unifying motive, Morales sets the same motive used by Ceballos, a whole note followed by two half notes, in verse 1 in all tones. The rhythm is derived from the accentuation of the word "Anima" and it is natural to start the polyphonic response in verse 1 with it. However, as explained in the previous chapter, Ceballos continued to use the motive as a unifying device consistently in verses 3 and 9. This is not the case in Morales's setting. He uses the rhythm in the first verse, but thereafter the rhythm appears only randomly at the beginning of several verses.

Comparison of Ceballos's and Guerrero's Magnificat Settings

When comparing Ceballos's setting to Guerrero's, more differences emerge than in the comparison with the Morales setting. Guerrero sets verse 5 for three voices, as Morales and Ceballos did, and the rest of the verses are set to four voices, with a few exceptions. However, when Guerrero uses fewer than four voices, he also introduces different combinations of high and low voices. In both Morales and Ceballos the bassus is tacet in verse 5 in all tones, resulting in a voice combination of *triple*, *altus*, and *tenor*. Guerrero does the same in verse 5 in Tones 1 through 6, but in Tones 7 and 8 the *tenor* is omitted, yielding a voice combination of *triple*, *altus*, and *bassus*. Guerrero uses this same combination in Tone 1, verse 7. In Tone 3, verse 9, the *triple* is tacet, and in Tone 6, verse 11 the three voices are two *triples* and *altus*, without *tenor* or *bassus*. The setting of Tone 6, verse 9 deserves special attention; a two-voice texture in the lower register, *altus* and *bassus*, displays beautiful melismas in short values and imitations similar to Orlando di Lasso's motets for two voices.¹⁰ Verse 11 in Tones 1 and 4 uses a four-voice texture in the high register with two *triples*, *alto*, and *tenor*. Consequently, Guerrero's setting presents a variety in the combination of voices that cannot be found in Ceballos's or Morales's settings.

In length of verses Guerrero's setting resembles Morales's more than Ceballos's. The average number of measures per tone in Guerrero are 158, slightly longer than Morales's 155, and of course much longer than Ceballos's 133. In the average length of each verse Guerrero differs from both Morales and Ceballos. In Guerrero's settings verse 11 is the longest, 33 measures on average, whereas in Morales and Guerrero verses 3 and 5 are the longest. Furthermore, in Guerrero's setting the length of individual verses is less uniform than in the settings of the other composers. Compare for example in Guerrero's setting the length of verse 7 in Tone 3, which is 38 measures, with the length of the same verse in Tone 7, which is only 15 measures, or less than half the length. These differences in length of verses together with the differences in voice combinations explained above, indicate that Guerrero might not have considered his settings of the odd-numbered verses of the text as a cycle, since after all no more than one tone would be sung on any given occasion. In this respect, Ceballos's use of several additional musical features to make his setting a cycle might have been unusual.

Regarding the number of imitative sections into which each verse is divided, Guerrero again stands apart from the other two composers. Guerrero's setting appears less sectional; internal cadences are sometimes so unclear or weak that the verse seems to be one long imitative section. Verse 1, of course, is a single imitative section in the settings of all three composers. Consider, for example, Guerrero's Tone 5, verse 5. Ceballos divided verse 5 consistently into three sections and Morales in two or three. In Guerrero's version, after seventeen measures on the words "Et misericordia ejus a progenie in progenies" without a resting point, a weak deceptive cadence introduces the second part of the text. In Tone 7, verse 7, the case is similar. The second point of imitation starts two measures before the first portion of the text "Deposuit potentes de sede" is completely presented, and only a weak deceptive cadence divides the two sections. Deceptive cadences are also found in Ceballos's setting, but his divisions in sections are clear and well defined. Furthermore, he frequently subdivides a line of text into two imitations, creating a much more sectional setting. The following table shows the length of verses and number of points of imitation in Guerrero's setting, gray areas denoting verses or tones that are unusually long.

Table 9
Number of Measures per Verse and Tone, and Number of Points of Imitation into Which the Text is Divided in Guerrero's Setting

VERSE	1		3		5		7		9		11		Total ms.
TONE	#ms	# pts	#ms	# pts	#ms	# pts	#ms	# pts	#ms	# pts	#ms	# pts	
1	7	1	32	3	31	3	31	2	38	3	40	3	179
2	9	1	38	3	34	2	23	2	23	2	30	2	157
3	16	1	37	2	37	2	34	2	26	2	29	2	179
4	9	1	24	3	32	3	19	2	31	3	39	2	154
5	13	1	30	2	30	2*	23	2	23	2	36	2	155
6	10	1	27	2	32	2	26	2	30	2	27	2	152
7	12	1	28	3	31	3*	15	2*	25	2	30	2	141
8	12	1	32	2	30	3	17	2	21	2	31	2	143
Average # of ms.	11		31		32.1		23.5		27.1		32.8		158

Key:

#ms = number of measures per verse.

pts = number of points of imitation per verse.

Grey areas denote longer and shorter verses.

Guerrero uses the same transpositions of tones and added accidentals as Ceballos. Tones 1 and 2 are transposed a fourth higher with the corresponding *B-flat* in the key signature, and Tones 5 and 6 have an added *B-flat* in the key signature, even though they are not transposed.

Concerning final notes for middle and final cadences, Guerrero is less consistent than Morales and Ceballos. In Guerrero's settings all final cadences of each verse rest on the *finalis* of the corresponding intonation, except for Tone 5, verse 7, where the cadence rests on *D* instead of the expected *E*. In Tones 2, 5, and 7 the use of the reciting note as a final note for the middle cadences is not consistent. Guerrero's setting of Tone 2 rests more times on *G*, the final of the intonation, than on *B-flat*, the reciting note. Both Morales's and Ceballos's settings rest consistently on *B-flat* in the middle cadences in this tone. Guerrero's setting of Tone 5 uses the reciting note *C* to rest on middle cadences only twice. Again, Morales and Ceballos both used *C* in middle cadences more consistently in this tone. In verse 7 the three composers avoided *E* as the final note in middle

cadences, and used *A* instead. Curiously enough, in Tone 6, where both Morales and Ceballos used *F* as a middle cadence resting note, Guerrero uses *A* and applies a 4–1 progression in the bass. The following table shows the final note used for most middle cadences and for all final cadences in Guerrero’s setting.

Table 10
Final Notes for Middle and Final Cadences for the Magnificat Setting of the Odd-Numbered Verses of the Text by Guerrero

TONE	Final note for middle cadences	Final note for final cadences in each verse
1	<i>D</i>	<i>G</i>
2	<i>G</i> (reciting note <i>B</i>)	<i>G</i>
3	<i>C</i>	<i>A</i>
4	<i>A</i>	<i>E</i>
5	<i>F</i> and <i>C</i> (reciting note <i>C</i>)	<i>A</i>
6	<i>A</i> (reciting tone <i>F</i>)	<i>F</i>
7	<i>A</i> (Final note for the <i>mediatio</i> <i>E</i>)	<i>A</i>
8	<i>C</i>	<i>G</i>

Guerrero’s favorite type of cadence is also the M6–8, 5–1 progression. He uses the 4–1 progression in the bass in Tones 4, 5, and in the middle cadences of Tone 6, all these cadences having in common the second melodic degree above the final being a semitone apart.

Guerrero uses the same three techniques employed by Morales and Ceballos when including the monophonic intonation in the polyphonic setting: complete in one voice, paraphrased in imitation, or sections in different voices. However, Guerrero uses the *cantus firmus* less than both Morales and Ceballos. He includes the complete *cantus firmus* in one voice only in six verses, compared to seventeen verses in Ceballos’s settings and eleven verses in Morales’s settings. Guerrero’s preferred verses in which to set the complete *cantus firmus* in one voice are 7, 9, and 11, resembling both Ceballos and

Morales. Nonetheless, like Morales and unlike Ceballos, he does not set the complete *cantus firmus* in these verses consistently. In three of the seven instances in which Guerrero sets the complete *cantus firmus* in one voice, he uses a homophonic texture in long note values as Ceballos and Morales did. Those instances occur in Tone 2, verse 9, Tone 4, verse 7, and Tone 7, verse 7. Curiously enough, Guerrero sets the complete *cantus firmus* in one voice in verse 11 only once, in Tone 2. Guerrero's settings thus lack the climactic ending achieved by Ceballos and Morales. Guerrero transposes the *cantus firmus* less than Morales and Ceballos did. Only twice does this occur, in Tone 4, verse 7, and in Tone 8, verse 7. The following table (Table 11) shows the use of the monophonic intonation as *cantus firmus* in Guerrero's setting. Noticeable is the setting of verse 11 in Tone 2. As in Morales's Tone 1, verse 7, the *cantus firmus* is first paraphrased in all voices in imitation and then the complete version appears in the *triple*. Again, this is a technique that Ceballos did not use.

Guerrero uses the rhythmic motive of a whole note followed by two half notes in approximately half the verses. The motive initiates verse 1 in all tones except for Tones 2 and 8; verse 3 in Tones 1, 3, 4, and 7; verse 7 in Tones 2, 3, 6, and 7; verse 7 in Tone 2; and verse 9 in Tones 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8. Applied in this manner, the motive can be understood as a unifying device in the setting, although used inconsistently in contrast to the systematic way in which Ceballos used it.

Conclusions of the Comparison of the Three Settings

We have compared the similarities and differences among the settings of the odd-numbered verses of the Magnificat text by Ceballos, Morales, and Guerrero. It is clear that Morales's settings influenced both Ceballos and Guerrero, and that the three settings are similar, yet not without individual traits. Similarities among the three settings include both the application of the rules of sixteenth-century common practice, plus features specific to the setting of the Magnificat. Similarities derived from common practice style include the use of a polyphonic texture, the division of sections into points of imitation, the preferred use of the M6-8, 5-1 cadence, and in general the controlled use of dissonances and the flowing curves of the melodies.

Table 11
Use of the Monophonic Intonation as *cantus firmus* in Guerrero's Setting

VERSE	1	3	5	7	9	11
TONE						
1	Bassus, tiple and tenor termination	bassus and tenor termination	Tiple termination	NO	No	Altus termination
2	Tiple termination	Tiple <i>initio</i> and termination	Tiple termination	NO	Tenor complete	All voices paraphrased and tiple complete
3	Tenor termination	All paraphrased and tiple termination	Tiple termination	Tiple and tenor <i>initio</i> and termination	All voices paraphrased	All voices paraphrased
4	NO	Tiple termination	Tiple termination	Altus complete and transposed	Tenor complete	Tiple termination
5	Tiple termination	Tiple <i>initio</i> and termination	NO	Tiple and altus <i>initio</i> and termination	Tenor complete	NO
6	Tiple termination	NO	Tiple termination	NO	NO	Bassus termination
7	Tiple termination	NO	NO	Tenor complete	Tiple termination	Tiple termination
8	NO	Tenor termination	All voices paraphrased	Altus complete transposed	NO	NO

Similarities particular to the settings of the Magnificat of the three composers indicate a more direct influence of Morales on Ceballos's and Guerrero's settings. These similarities include the number of voices used for each verse, the transposition of certain tones, the use of the monophonic intonation as *cantus firmus* for the polyphonic settings, the use of a unifying rhythmic motive, and the correspondence of the polyphonic settings to the harmonic framework implied by the Magnificat tones. Regarding the latter,

we mentioned that Morales was one of the first composers to use the final note of the monophonic Magnificat tones as the final note for the polyphonic settings. Composers after Morales followed this practice, including both Ceballos and Guerrero.

The individual traits of the composers in each setting are also of considerable interest. Guerrero's setting stands apart and displays a greater number of differences from both Ceballos's and Morales's settings, than they do with each other. These differences include a variety in voice combinations, fewer sectional divisions, weaker middle cadences, the use of different notes for middle cadences (instead of reciting notes), less use of *cantus firmus*, and different proportions in the average length of individual verses.

The most interesting feature of Ceballos's setting is that it shows enough unifying characteristics between tones to consider it a cycle. The consistency in the use of various rhythmic motives, the settings of the complete *cantus firmus*, the climactic character of verses 7 and 11, the combination of polyphonic and homophonic textures, the proportions of the average length of verses, and the number of voices and voice combinations, distinguish Ceballos's setting as a unique cyclic composition. Ceballos's style is flowing and clear, and his technical skills and expressiveness easily equal those of Morales and Guerrero.

NOTES

¹ Robert M. Stevenson, "The Bogotá Music Archive." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 15 (1962) 298.

² Robert J. Snow, *The Extant Music of Rodrigo de Ceballos and its Sources*. (Detroit: Detroit Studies in Music Bibliography, 1980) 19.

³ Biographical data for the three composers has been taken from: Snow, "Rodrigo de Ceballos." *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. (Ed. Stanley Sadie. 2nd ed. 20 vols. London: Macmillan, 2001); Snow, *The Extant Music of Rodrigo de Ceballos*; Stevenson, "Francisco Guerrero." *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*; Stevenson, "Cristóbal de Morales." *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*; Stevenson, *Spanish Cathedral Music in the Golden Age*. (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1961); Stevenson, "Francisco Guerrero (1528–1599). Seville Sixteenth-Century Cynosure."

Interamerican Music Review 13.1 (1992): 21–98; Stevenson, "Cristóbal de Morales (1500–1553). Light of Spain in Music." *Interamerican Music Review* 13.2 (1992): 1–105.

⁴ Stevenson, "Francisco Guerrero."

⁵ Rodrigo de Ceballos, *Obras completas de Rodrigo de Ceballos*. (Ed. Robert J. Snow. Granada, Spain: Centro de Documentacion Musical de Andalucía. 1995–2004).

⁶ Snow, *The Extant Music of Rodrigo de Ceballos*.

⁷ Stevenson, *Spanish Cathedral Music*.

⁸ Cristóbal de Morales, *XVI Magnificat, Venecia: Opera Omnia vol. 4, 1545*. In *Monumentos de la Música Española*, vol. 17. Ed. Higinio Anglès. (Roma: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1956); Francisco Guerrero, *Magnificat per omnes tonos, Venecia: Opera Omnia vol. 10*. In *Monumentos de la Música Española*, vol. 56. Ed. José M Llorens and Karl H. Müller-Lancé. (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1999).

⁹ Stevenson, *Spanish Cathedral Music* 84.

¹⁰ Orlando di Lasso, *The Complete Motets, vol. 10*. Ed. Peter Bergquist. (Madison, Wisconsin: A-R Editions, 1995).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apel, Willi. *The Notation of Polyphonic Music 900–1600*. 5th ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953.

Berger, Karol. *Musica Ficta: Theories of Accidental Inflections in Vocal Polyphony from Marchetto Da Pavoda to Gioseffo Zarlino*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Bergquist, Peter. "Mode and polyphony around 1500: Theory and practice." *The Music Forum* 1 (1967): 99–161.

Ceballos, Rodrigo de. *Obras completas de Rodrigo de Ceballos*. Ed. Robert J. Snow. Granada, Spain: Centro de Documentacion Musical de Andalucía. 1995–2004.

Crook, David W. *Orlando di Lasso's Imitation Magnificats for Counter-Reformation Munich*. Princeton: Princeton U, 1994.

Erb, James. "Aspects of Form in Orlando di Lasso's Magnificat Settings." *Orlando di Lasso Studies*. Ed. Peter Bergquist. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Freis, Wolfgang. "Cristobal de Morales and the Spanish tradition." *Revista de Musicología* 16 (1993): 2750–2769.

Garcia, Marcela. "Music In Colonial Santa Fe de Bogotá, Colombia: The Music Archive in the Cathedral and the Local Composer Jose Cascante." Dis. University of Oregon, 1994.

- "Music from the Old World Preserved in the New World: A Transcription with Analysis of Rodrigo de Ceballos's Magnificat Cycle on the Eight Tones, as Found in Bogotá, Colombia." Dis. University of Oregon, 2002.
- Guerrero, Francisco. *Opera Omnia. Monumentos de la Musica Española* 56. Eds. V. Garcia, M Querol Gavaldá, and others. Roma: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1955.
- Harden, Bettie Jean. "Musica Ficta." *New Harvard Dictionary of Music*. Ed. Don Michael Randel. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Lasso, Orlando di. *The Complete Motets*. Vol. 10. Ed. Peter Bergquist. Madison, Wisconsin: A-R Editions, 1995.
- Morales, Cristóbal de. *Opera Omnia. Monumentos de la Musica Española* 17. Ed. Hinginio Angés. Roma: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1952.
- Perdomo Escobar, José Ignacio. *Historia de la Música en Colombia*. Bogotá, D.C.,: Editorial A B C, 1963.
- *El Archivo Musical de la Catedral de Bogotá*. Bogotá, D.C.,: Publicaciones del Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1976.
- Reif, Jo-Ann. "Music and Grammar: Imitation and Analogy in Morales and the Spanish Humanists." *Early Music History 6: Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Restrepo Posada, José. "Los Libros Corales de la Catedral." *Boletín Cultural y Bibliográfico de la Biblioteca Luis Angel Arango* 10 (1962): 1257-1261.
- Smith, James Arthur. *The 16 Magnificats of Cristobal de Morales: Elements of Style and Performance Practice*. Austin: University of Texas, 1976.
- Snow, Robert J. *The Extant Music of Rodrigo de Ceballos and its Sources*. Detroit: Detroit Studies in Music Bibliography, 1980.
- "Rodrigo de Ceballos." *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. Ed. Stanley Sadie. 2nd ed. 20 vols. London: Macmillan, 2001.
- Stevenson, Robert M. "Colonial Music in Colombia." *The Americas* 19 (1962): 121-136.
- "Cristóbal de Morales." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 6 (1953): 3-42.
- *Latin American Colonial Music Anthology*. Washington, D.C.: General Secretariat, Organization of American States, 1975.
- *Renaissance and Baroque Musical Sources in the Americas*. Washington, D.C.: General Secretariat, Organization of American States, 1970.
- *Spanish Cathedral Music in the Golden Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.
- *Spanish Music in the Age of Columbus*. Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960.
- "The Bogotá Music Archive." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 15 (1962): 292-315.
- "The First New World Composers: Fresh Data from Peninsular Archives." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 23 (1970): 95-106.

- “Francisco Guerrero.” *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. Ed. Stanley Sadie. 2nd ed. 20 vols. London: Macmillan, 2001.
- “Cristóbal de Morales.” *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. Ed. Stanley Sadie. 2nd ed. 20 vols. London: Macmillan, 2001.
- “Francisco Guerrero (1528–1599). Seville Sixteenth-Century Cynosure.” *Interamerican Music Review* 13.1 (1992): 21–98.
- “Cristóbal de Morales (1500–1553). Light of Spain in Music.” *Interamerican Music Review* 13.2 (1992): 1–105.

Submitted 28 September 2005

Accepted 14 October 2005