The Splendor of Mexican Matins: Sonority & Structure in Jerusalem’s Matins for the Virgin of Guadalupe
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At a time when Bach, Handel, Purcell, and Alessandro Scarlatti were writing their choral masterpieces in Europe, another corpus of magnificent choral music was being composed in the Spanish viceroyalties of Peru and Mexico, in genres now largely misunderstood and ignored. Most notably, the Matins service was the most ambitious and prestigious category of composition in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the Spanish New World. Any aspiring composer who wanted to establish himself as a worthy artist delved into this genre. In Naples or Venice the road to achieving superstardom would have been opera; in Mexico City, Puebla, and Oaxaca, however, it was Matins.

Structurally, a Matins service has a collection of prefatory items, analogous to a prologue, followed by three nocturns (roughly equivalent in scale to the three acts of a play or opera). The three nocturns are themselves divided into items that occur in threes: three antiphons (melodic snippets) that frame three monophonic Psalms, three lessons (a Scripture reading or homily divided into three sections), three blessings, and—most importantly in Baroque settings—three responsories for voices and orchestra. In short, the whole service is a collage of “threes.” The one notable rupture occurs in the third nocturn where the last responsory (what would have been responsory 9) is replaced by a grand setting of the *Te Deum or Hymn of Thanksgiving* (see appendix 1).

Many composers composed Matins settings where vernacular-texted *villancicos* in a popular style were substituted for the more formal elevated style of the Latin responsories. Mexican cathedrals are chockfull of impressive Matins compositions that contain a complete set of the required responsories or *villancicos*. (See appendix 2 for a list of some of the more important settings.) Many of these works rival in scale and sophistication the operas and oratorios of their European contemporaries.

Although several Matins cycles are associated with Christmas and saints’ days, no figure garners more attention than does the Virgin of Guadalupe. Her image adorns nearly every Mexican church and cathedral, and music venerating her was composed by the great Mexican composers of the Baroque and Classic eras. (See appendix 3.) A perusal of the list reveals such masters as Antonio de Salazar, Manuel de Sumaya, Ignacio de Jerusalem, Matheo Tollis de la Rocca, Antonio de Juanas, Francisco Delgado, Manuel Arenzana, and even Giacome Rust—the same Jacob Rust who later became the chapel master at Salzburg, where a young lad, Wolfgang Mozart, composed and performed under his supervision.

One recently discovered masterpiece dedicated to her is Ignacio de Jerusalem’s splendid *Matins for the Virgin of Guadalupe*, performed in the Mexico City cathedral in 1764. This concerted work is well-crafted, sumptuous, and ambitious, containing the expected invitatatory, hymn, and eight elegant responsories for vocal soloists or choir. See appendix 4 for a list of citations, concordances, and borrowings related to this work.

At first glance the manuscript appears to be missing pages and movements, since Legajo C.c.9 breaks off before the Matins’s completion, but if one perseveres and muddles past all of the music for Jerusalem’s *Matins for the Conception* in Legajo C.c.10 one will find most of the
missing pieces; the “missing” parts are merely misfiled. Much of the appropriate chant material can be gleaned from Choirbooks 5-2-8 and 6-1-3. Choirbook 5-2-8 contains the requisite Psalm texts for the feasts of the Virgin; these vary slightly from those found in the Vulgate. Choirbook 6-1-3 contains the chant for Psalm 94, which would have been interpolated into the concerted “Invitatory for the Virgin of Guadalupe,” as well as the required antiphons. This chant book, titled Commun[e] Virginum ad Mutut[inum] (Common of the Virgin at Matins), contains iconographic depictions of the Virgin of Guadalupe, suggesting that it was a source of music in her honor.

No specific Te Deum is attached to Jerusalem’s Matins for the Virgin of Guadalupe. Given the enormous scale and grandeur of this Matins service, Jerusalem’s repetitive and almost miniscule Te Deum for small orchestra and four-voice choir found in Legajo C.c.2, No. 4., is unlikely to have been chosen to conclude one of his crowning works. A more appropriate conclusion would have been his Te Deum from Legajo C.c.1; it is polychoral, richly orchestrated, and evokes grandiose theatricality and splendor—as does the rest of his Matins for the Virgin of Guadalupe. This larger Te Deum is unquestionably the one commissioned by the chapel master Antonio de Juanas, which was described in the 1793 inventory of the Mexico City cathedral archive as having parts that were “badly worn”—a testament to its frequent use in the cathedral. Apparently, this stunning Te Deum was one of the Billboard Top-Ten hits of Colonial Mexico.

Jerusalem’s orchestral versos intended as substitutions for Psalm verses constitute some of the earliest American orchestral music of substance. These small “symphonies” could be interpolated into the monophonic singing of the Psalms; when combined, then, one hears a gorgeous and novel interplay between plain chant and symphonic sonorities. Jerusalem’s versos are found in concordant sources in both the Puebla and Mexico City cathedrals. In the various manuscripts the movements are gathered together into sets (juegos) that are kept intact—no movements are added, nor are any deleted—but the order in which the movements are presented seems to have been alterable. No two versions agree as to which verso is first or second or third. Apparently these juegos de versos were much like place-settings of silverware one can buy in a department store. Once a pattern is selected, it really doesn’t matter in what order one finds the fork, knife, and spoon when one opens the box. The order is irrelevant as long as the contents consist of the expected components.

Overall, Jerusalem’s style moves from the frenetic and inexorable activity of the Baroque into the stylistic traits of the Classical period. The texture is generally homophonic and top-dominated, with one graceful melody at a time (as opposed to the tangled web of chattering counterpoint we find in Baroque polyphony). “Sign” figures with appoggiaturas abound. Rhythms are often spunky, with “Scotch snaps” consisting of a sixteenth note followed by a dotted eighth. The harmonic rhythm is slow, often with the repeated bass notes associated with a “drumming bass.” The orchestra includes more treble instruments than bass. The surface rhythms are ever changing, moving from long to short values, from even eighth notes to dotted rhythms, from half notes to running sixteenths, and from duplets to triplets—even within the same phrase. Cadences are clearly defined, frequent, and hierarchical; recurring rests and pauses reinforce the underlying structure of the text and music. Jerusalem’s articulations are meticulous, graceful, and mercurial—all reflecting the Classical aesthetic.

Jerusalem’s Matins for Our Lady of Guadalupe is a glorious gem in the choral literature; it is chockfull of varied styles, differing emotions, and multifarious moods. The main corpus of the
composition features the full choir with orchestral accompaniment, and the styles run the gamut. The hymn “Quem terra pontus sidera” wafts along in a lilting 6/8 meter and conjures up images of pastoral tranquility. The first responsory, “Vidi speciosam sicut columbam,” is an energetic and intense choral number in G-minor, Jerusalem’s favorite key for intensely emotional and heartfelt feelings. The chord progressions march forward in inexorable activity, resembling Bach’s harmonic language and the irrepressible activity of the Baroque. Later Jerusalem explores the grace of an aristocratic minuet in “Signum magnum apparuit in coelo” with its interplay of contrasting rhythms that remind one more of Mozart and the Classic than of Bach and the Baroque. Some entire movements feature a solo voice with orchestral accompaniment much like an operatic aria. Jerusalem provides tender introspection in the alto’s “Quae est ista quae progreditur,” bold self-confidence in the bass’s “Quae est ista quae ascendit,” florid virtuosity in the soprano’s “Tibi cherubin,” heart-stopping fireworks in the soprano’s “Te ergo quaesumus,” and melodious yet flamboyant drama in the tenor’s “Beatam me dicent omnes generationes.” One of the piece’s strongest sections is the concluding Te Deum that juxtaposes two choirs in intertwining dialogue while the clarion trumpets and strings create a thrilling background texture of quasi-military excitement.

Several of Jerusalem’s responsories in his Matins for Our Lady of Guadalupe have a theatrical flare, which is not surprising given that he was the music director at the Coliseo, Mexico City’s version of Broadway. We hear occasional passages that feature the violins in florid figurations and catchy motives; here again we see Jerusalem’s personal touch. He was a virtuoso violinist, and he enjoyed being in the spotlight. One could assume that Jerusalem conducted the work’s premiere, not from the organ bench as Sumaya would have done, but as the orchestra’s concertmaster and principal violinist.

Significantly, if one interpolates Jerusalem’s versos into the Psalms at the beginning of the nocturns, a sense of growth and building excitement results. We first hear voices alone (singing in plainchant) with brief orchestral excursions without any singing (the versos). At a nocturn’s midpoint—immediately after the absolution, blessing, and Lord’s Prayer—we suddenly encounter the resplendent sound of the choir and orchestra intertwined in full-sounding sonorities. Here again, the responsories build in magnificence as we approach the nocturn’s end. The first responsory of each nocturn is full and rich, but the “middle” responsories are for a soloist or duet (see again appendix 1). To conclude the nocturn, Jerusalem is careful to return to sonorities full of rich depth and thrilling activity—in much the same way that Mozart is careful to end the act of an opera with a flurry of notes and a full cast on stage belting out their lines in frenzied excitement. Jerusalem achieves a similar effect: the third and sixth responsories and the ultimate Te Deum are all full-bodied, and make the most of his choral and orchestral resources.

Historically, Mexico has effortlessly combined the ancient with the modern. One sees it through a stroll in Mexico City, with sixteenth-century edifices framed on either side by towering skyscrapers of steel and glass. In Mexican culture the past maintains a kind of contemporary presence not enjoyed in many cultures. We see this juxtaposition of old and new in Jerusalem’s method of composition; he is careful to preserve the medieval structure of the responsory, even while recasting it in the garb of modern Classicism. The medieval responsory began with a large-scale antiphon called the respond, sung by the massed choir; one of its defining attributes
was its division into two or even three subunits (often abbreviated Ra, Rb, and—if needed—Rc). After the respond the cantor sang the versicle, V, a single line of text, often from a Psalm, and then the choir returned to sing the second portion of the respond, the portion from Rb on. An asterisk in the chant indicated the critical juncture where Rb began and thus functioned in much the same way that a sign marks the spot for a del segno repeat in modern notation.

Jerusalem ingeniously replicated these medieval features while simultaneously offering those of a recitative and da capo aria that one would expect in Baroque and early Classical vocal music. His sleight of hand is ingenious: he shapes the first part of the Respond (Ra) as a prefatory recitative: just as an operatic recitative will prepare a choral number or aria but never return, so the portion Ra of the respond prepares the rest of the responsory but never comes back. At the juncture (Rb) of the responsory Jerusalem begins the A section of a da capo aria or choral number, with its attendant catchy tune, steady meter, and richer orchestration. The versicle is transformed into the B section of the aria (with an excursion to a different key, a different melodic theme, or a thinner density and texture), and, as expected, we soon find ourselves back at the beginning of the aria (section Rb). In the medieval tradition the versicle was most often realized by a soloist; in his Classical realization of the responsory, Jerusalem likewise reduced the texture at the versicle (and also the doxology) so that a single voice was featured in this middle B section, even if the main responsory as a whole was choral.9

**Structure of a responsory**

R = the Respond

Ra = the 1st part of the Respond

Rb = 2nd part of Respond

Usually done by the choir

V = the Versicle (a single line, usually from a Psalm)

Usually done by a soloist

Dx = the Doxology (Glory be to the Father & to the Son . . . )

Rab V Rb

Or

Rab V Rb Dx Rb

Can be a da capo aria = Recitative: Ra Aria: Rb - V - Rb

The borradores (autograph sketches) for the *Matins for Our Lady of Guadalupe* have been preserved. These, which include some discarded sections, provide a glimpse of Jerusalem’s compositional methods and aesthetic judgements. We do not habitually find a composer’s borradores in cathedral archives since those particular papers were considered the personal property of the composer himself—unlike the performance parts for the individual musicians, and the skimpy conducting score called the guión, which were owned by the employing
institution. In Jerusalem’s case, however, the Mexico City cathedral archive ended up with his borradores; after Ignacio’s death they went to his son Pedro, and subsequently ended up with Pedro’s widow, who sold the borradores to the Mexico City cathedral for a handsome sum.¹⁰

Several fascinating conclusions can be drawn from careful scrutiny of the borradores. For example, it is evident that Jerusalem first drafted the string and vocal lines, and then later added the oboe and horn lines. The wind and brass parts were sometimes jotted down on empty staves at the bottom of the page, and in some instances they were even written out on a sheet separate from the sketched score, and then appended to the back of the borrador—almost as an afterthought. We also find movements excised from the finished product, such as the soprano aria “Motete 1º del II Nocturno a solo con Violines y bajo a Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe (1764)” (Legajo C.c.10, No. 3). It has the editorial decision “no sirve”—“it doesn’t work”—scrawled on the cover. The sketched score in Legajo C.c.2, No. 5, contains a “Cavatina del Sor. Guglielmi” that was explicitly intended for substitution in Jerusalem’s Te Deum.¹¹ The borrador for Jerusalem’s magnificent Te Deum shows that he initially drafted the work for three choirs plus orchestra; he apparently had a change of mind later, however, for when the performance parts were copied he distributed the music between two—not three—antiphonal choirs.

One striking feature of Jerusalem’s Matins for the Virgin of Guadalupe as a whole is its thematic unity. A memorable motive or melodic gesture from one place often reappears—much like a familiar character in a drama—unexpectedly on a later occasion. For instance, a lush contrapuntal web of interlocking triads at the word “aquarum” in Responsory 1 (Vidi speciosam) recurs in Responsory 3 (Quae est ista) at the words “laudaverunt eam.” (See examples 1 and 2.)

Significantly, these thematic cross-references occur in the same nocturn; the sequence occurs near the beginning of the concerted section of Nocturn 1, and then reappears in its closing moments, making a sort of musical frame that encloses the larger architectural structure.

Jerusalem repeatedly uses other melodic motives, for instance, a distinctive descending scale pattern in dotted rhythms, and a prominent melodic arrival on the flat-⁷th degree of the scale. The descending dotted-rhythm pattern characterizes the melodic contour of Responsory 2 (for bass voice); it resurfaces in Responsories (for alto voice) 4 (in the section for solo soprano) and 7 (for a soprano soloist and then choir). The unifying aspect of this descending motive is strengthened by the fact that it occurs primarily in the passages for solo voice. Thus Jerusalem provides a sort of musical spotlight, with the motivic building blocks highlighted whenever there is a shift to a solo vocal texture. Like the descending dotted rhythmic motive, the flat-⁷th also crops up with recurring frequency. For example, Responsory 2 has an instrumental ritornello that features a prominent lowered seventh scale-degree followed by a cadence on the tonic; in precisely the same way, the orchestral ritornello to the main “Allegro” section of Responsory 4 lands squarely on the lowered seventh degree, and then concludes on the tonic. Responsory 5 also makes prominent use of the flat seventh degree. Jerusalem never falls into unthinking redundancy, but he does weave together memorable events in such a way that this large-scale work has a certain unified and interconnected style and sound that are all its own. (See examples 3 and 4.)

In another example (5), the entire shape and mood of Responsory 4’s main “Allegro” section in triple meter strongly resembles Responsory 7’s introductory “Andante” in triple meter. Once
again, they are both crafted from the genetic material already discussed—primarily the
descending dotted rhythm and the flat 7th degree—but other rhythmic and melodic similarities
are equally striking. Although the two are not identical twins, they nevertheless are
unmistakable siblings.

In an earlier article regarding Jerusalem’s Mass settings I demonstrated his proclivity for giving
each massive work its own unifying motives, a sort of genetic code of musical cells that
permeate the various movements and give the larger structure a sense of cohesion. The
thematic unity of the Matins for the Virgin of Guadalupe is a remarkable achievement given that
the work was not composed all at one time, but that many of the responsories were borrowed
from earlier compositions and recycled in subsequent Matins services (the borrowings and
concordances are indicated in appendix 4).

What we have is a case much like Handel’s and Bach’s; for them a good piece was not limited to
a single context but could be used again. What seems clear is that Jerusalem, in spite of his
borrowings, was concerned with thematic unity. How he succeeded in creating cohesion merits
consideration. I propose that once he had decided which items he would excerpt from previous
works and reuse he composed new pieces that would recapitulate aspects of the older
“borrowed” works, with each motive coming back in a cyclic fashion like the motivic cells in a
Beethoven symphony. If that theory is correct, it would seem most likely that Jerusalem wrote
Responsories 4, 6, and 7 after he had already decided to incorporate Responsories 1, 2, 3, and 5.
I would argue that Responsoy 4 is the last to have been composed, given its abundance of
thematic links to the other movements.

In conclusion let me say that the music histories that we find on the shelves of conservatories
and libraries across the globe delve into the European Baroque and praise its sophistication and
contribution to Western culture. But what of eighteenth-century Mexico? Why has Mexico been
ignored by nearly all Western scholars (with the notable exception of pioneers such as Tom
Stanford, Jesús Estrada, Robert Stevenson, Lincoln Spiess, Juan Pedro Gaffney, and Aurelio
Tello)? One explanation for this omission is that musicologists have not known what to look for
when digging. When they looked to Mexico for oratorios and cantatas and came up empty-
headed, they erroneously assumed that Mexico produced no large-scale choral works worthy of
mention. How foolish. They went searching for diamonds, and in so doing overlooked the
emeralds and rubies. The very essence of the Mexican spirit (Mexicanidad) in the eighteenth
century rests in its overlooked gemstones, the Maitines. They are ambitious, glorious, and well-
crafted, and can help inform us as to what it meant to be “Mexican” in a past age.

Most of us have seen paintings and banners of the Virgin of Guadalupe; they hang in nearly
every Latino church in Mexico and the American Southwest. These visual icons serve to remind
us of the noble spirit of Mexico, the mystery and value of her many peoples, and the profound
contribution they have made in the history of the Americas—including these United States. But
the Virgin of Guadalupe’s legacy is aural as well as visual; it is time that we consider the
magnificent cathedral music of Mexico as worthy of a place in our text books, our libraries, our
classrooms, and—most importantly—in our hearts. This music can touch us—if we let it.

ENDNOTES


3. Of great help in locating works in the Mexico City and Puebla cathedrals is E. Thomas Sanford’s *Catálogo de las acervos musicales de las catedrales metropolitanas de México y Puebla de la biblioteca Nacional de Antropología et Historia e otras colecciones menores* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología et Historia, 2002). Sanford’s work largely supplants the summary of works at Mexico City and Puebla made by Robert Stevenson in his still essential *Renaissance and Baroque Musical Sources in the Americas* (Washington: General Secretariat, Organization of American States, 1970) = RBMSA. Neither Stevenson nor Sanford had access to manuscripts that were in the possession of Jesús Estrada in the middle of the twentieth century; after the death of Padre Estrada his family saw to it that the priceless manuscripts were returned to the Mexico City cathedral. The citations for the Estrada collection were copied by me in the summer of 2004. The works from Oaxaca are catalogued by Aurelio Tello in *Archivo musical de la catedral de Oaxaca: Catalogo*, Serie catalogos 1 (Mexico City: CENDIDIM, 1990). My citations for Durango Cathedral are from Francisco Atúñez’s *La capilla de música de la catedral de Durango, México: Siglos XVII y XVIII* (Durango: Francisco Atúñez, 1970).
4. A complete performing edition of the work is available through Russell Editions, 541 Lilac Drive, Los Osos, CA 93402. A fabulous recording of most of the *Matins for Our Lady of Guadalupe* by the San Francisco-based choir Chanticleer, under the direction of Joseph Jennings, is available on compact disk (Teldec 3984-21829-2).


6. See Mexico City Cathedral, Legajo C.c.12 / AM0613 & AM0614, and Puebla Cathedral, Legajo 43.


8. For a thorough explanation of responsory forms see Hoppin, *Medieval Music* (note 1), 105-10.

9. The more extended structure, Rab-V-Rb-Dx-Rb, occurs in responsories 3 and 6, which, ending nocturns, include the doxology.


11. With the appearance of Pietro Alessandro Guglielmi in this manuscript we once again see Jerusalem with first-hand knowledge of composers in Mozart’s musical environment. Guglielmi was one of the most admired composers in Vienna, and one of Mozart’s competitors.

12. See “Hidden Structures and Sonorous Symmetries” (note 7).

**APPENDIX 1**
Order of 18th-Century Matins in Mexico

preparation

Processional (optional)

Domine labia mea (intoned)

Invitatory (concerted—interspersed with chanted Psalm 94)

Hymn (concerted, often a “Pastoral” in 6/8 time)

**NOCTURN 1**

Antiphon 1 & Psalm (plainchant) *

Antiphon 2 & Psalm (plainchant) *

Antiphon 3 & Psalm (plainchant) *

Versicle, Lord’s Prayer & Absolution (intoned)

Benediction 1 & Lesson 1 (intoned)

Responsory 1 (concerted, with choir)

Benediction 2 & Lesson 2 (intoned, continuation of previous Lesson)

Responsory 2 (often a solo or duet with orchestra)

Benediction 3 & Lesson 3 (intoned, continuation of previous Lesson)

Responsory 3 (concerted with choir, with virtuosity for soloist)

**NOCTURN 2**

Antiphon 4 & Psalm (plainchant) *

Antiphon 5 & Psalm (plainchant) *

Antiphon 6 & Psalm (plainchant) *

Versicle, Lord’s Prayer & Absolution (intoned)

Benediction 4 & Lesson 4 (intoned)

Responsory 4 (concerted, with choir)

Benediction 5 & Lesson 5 (intoned, continuation of previous Lesson)

Responsory 5 (often a solo or duet with orchestra)
Benediction 6 & Lesson 6 (intoned, continuation of previous Lesson)

Responsory 6 (concerted with choir, with virtuosity for soloist)

**NOCTURN 3**

Antiphon 7 & Psalm (plainchant) *

Antiphon 8 & Psalm (plainchant) *

Antiphon 9 & Psalm (plainchant) *

Versicle, Lord’s Prayer & Absolution (intoned)

Benediction 7 & Lesson 7 (intoned)

Responsory 7 (concerted, with choir)

Benediction 8 & Lesson 8 (intoned, continuation of previous Lesson)

Responsory 8 (often a solo or duet with orchestra)

Benediction 9 & Lesson 9 (intoned, continuation of previous Lesson)

*Te Deum* (a “numbers” arrangement with each section of text having its own music as a separate movement: choral sections, duets, solos, etc.)

- During any Psalm short symphonies (called *versos*) may be inserted. The sonorities then shift back and forth between plainchant and instrumental interludes.

**APPENDIX 2**

Several Major Matins Cycles in the Mexico City & Puebla Cathedrals

**Juan Gutiérrez de Padilla**

Villancico Cycle for Corpus Christi, 1628. Puebla, Legajo 1, N° 1.

Villancico Cycle for Christmas, 1651. (SA/SATB), Puebla, Legajo 1, N° 2.

Villancico Cycle for Christmas, 1652. (SATB/SATB), Puebla Legajo 1, N° 3.

Villancico Cycle for Christmas, 1653. (SATB/SATB), Puebla, Legajo 2, N° 1.

Villancico Cycle for Christmas, 1655. (SAATB), Puebla, Legajo 2, N° 2.

Villancico Cycle for Christmas, 1659. (SAATTBB), Puebla, Legajo 2, N° 3.

Villancico Cycle for 8 voices. (SATB/SATB), Puebla, Legajo 3, N° 1.

Villancico Cycle for Christmas, 1656. (SATB/SATB), Puebla, Legajo 3, N° 2.
Villancico Cycle for Christmas, 1657. (SATB/SATB), Puebla, Legajo 3, Nº 3.

[Antonio de] Salazar
Responso Cycle for Assumption or Christmas, 1715, Mex. City, Rollo IV.

[Diego Joseph de] Salazar
Responso Cycle for Holy Trinity, 1732, Mexico City, Legajo XII, letra S.
Responso Cycle for Christmas, 1730s, Mexico City, Legajo XII, letra S.
Responso Cycle for San Ildefonso, 1730s, Mexico City, Legajo XII, letra S.

Nicolás Ximenes de Cisneros

Joseph de Lazo Valero
Responso Cycle for St. John the Baptiste, 1758, Puebla, Leg. 16, Nº 1-8.

M. Tollis de la Rocca
Responso Cycle for Christmas, 1758, Mexico City, Legajo C.b.22.

Ignacio de Jerusalem
Responso Cycle for Christmas, Mexico City (cited in 1793 Inventory)
Responso Cycle for the Assumption, Mexico City, Legajo C.c.6
Responso Cycle for the San Pedro, Mexico City (cited in 1793 Inventory)
Responso Cycle for the Conception, Mexico City, (1768) Legajo C.c.10 & C.c.11
Responso Cycle for San José, Mexico City (cited in 1793 Inventory)
Responso Cycle for San José, Mexico City (cited in 1793 Inventory)
Responso Cycle for Our Lady of the Pillar, Mexico City (cited in 1793 Inventory)
Responso Cycle for Our Lady of Guadalupe, 1764, Mexico City, Legajo C.c.9
Responso Cycle for the Virgin of the Pillar, Mexico City, Legajo D.b.31
Responso Cycle for San Ildefonso, Mexico City (cited in 1793 Inventory)
Responso Cycle for Saint Philip Neri, Mexico City (cited in 1793 Inventory)
Antonio de Juanas

Responsory Cycle for Christmas (1792-1798), Mexico City, Legajos B.a.1 & B.a.2.
Responsory Cycle for the Assumption (1799), Mexico City, Legajos B.a.4, B.a.5, & B.a.6.
Responsory Cycle for San Ildefonso (1799), Mexico City, Legajo B.a.7.
Responsory Cycle for San Pedro (1797), Mexico City, Legajos C.a.28, C.a.29, & C.a.30.
Responsory Cycle for Our Lady of the Pillar (1797), Mexico City, Legajos C.a.31 & C.a.32.
Responsory Cycle for Our Lady of Guadalupe (1799), Mexico City, Legajos C.a.33 & C.a.34.
Responsory Cycle for the Immaculate Conception (1796), Mexico City, Legajos E.a.6 & E.a.7.
Responsory Cycle for the Birth of the Virgin (1797), Mexico City, Legajo E.a.8.
Responsory Cycle for San José (1800), Mexico City, Legajo E.a.9.
Responsory Cycle for Corpus Christi (1806), Mexico City, Legajo E.a.13.
Responsory Cycle for Corpus Christi (1808), Mexico City, Legajo B.a.10.

Francisco Delgado

Responsory Cycle for Our Lady of Guadalupe, Mexico City, Legajo C.c.23.
Responsory Cycle for San Felipe, Mexico City, Legajo C.c.25.
Responsory Cycle for Saint Philip Neri, Mexico City, Legajo C.c.27.

Martín Francisco de Cruzelaeguí

Responsory Cycle for the Most Precious Blood of Our Lord, Jesus Christ, Puebla Cathedral, Legajos 71 & 72. Mexico City Cathedral, Leg. D.d.16 / AM1229 & AM1230.
Responsory Cycle for San José, Puebla Cathedral, Legajo 81.

Manuel Arenzana

Responsory Cycle for Saint Peter, Puebla Cathedral, Legajo 101.
Responsory Cycle for Our Lady of Guadalupe (1795), Legajo 102.

APPENDIX 3

Works dedicated to Our Lady of Guadalupe.

All citations apply to the Mexico City cathedral unless noted otherwise.
Anonymous [Francisco Delgado?]


Arenzana, Manuel

“Responsorios de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe compuestas a grande orquesta.” Puebla Cathedral, Legajo 102.

Delgado, Francisco

“Las Vísperas de María de Guadalupe.” Leg. C.c.22.


“Hymno de Maytines a cuatro y ocho con toda Horquesta y organo obligado Para la festividad de Maria S[u] S[antiss]ima de Guadalupe.” Opera 33. Leg. C.c.24, No. 3.

Jerusalem, Ignacio de

“Maitines para la Aparición de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe” (excerpts from 1756, a complete service in 1764, and a revised version yet again in 1765).

Juanas, Antonio de

“Maytines de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe.” 1799. Leg. C.a.33 & C.a.34.

Mora, José

“Responso[rio] dedicado a Ntra Sra de Guadalupe.” No. 41 in Francisco Atúnez’s Catálogo of Durango Cathedral.

Ortiz de Zárate, Vicente

“Ave Maria a Ntra Sra de Guadalupe.” 1750. No. 48 in Francisco Atúnez’s Catálogo of Durango Cathedral.

Paniagua, Cenobio

“Quae est ista. 2º Respº de la aparicion. a 4” (Citation from Stevenson, RBMSA, 160). In Mexico City Cathedral.

Rust, Giacome [Jacob]

“Beatam me dicent omnes,” Responsory 8 from Ignacio de Jerusalem’s complete 1764 Matins (Leg. C.c.9, No. 2 & Leg. C.c.10, No. 2), actually by Rust. This same piece appears as Responsory 5 in Jerusalem’s “Maytines de la Asunción de Nuestra Señora” (Leg. C.c.6).
Salazar, Antonio de

“A coger las flores. Villancico a 4 de la Virgen de Guadalupe, por Mro [Antonio de] Salazar.”
Puebla Cathedral, Legajo 19, No. 8.
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“Mirenla decender,” [for Guadalupe]. Mexico City Cathedral, Fondo Estrada, Legajo 83)32.
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“Que est ista quae ascendit. Responsorio Segundo de los Maitines de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe . . . solo con violines y baxo. Compuesto por Matheo de la Rocca. Maestro &c. 1776.” Leg. C.b.20, No.3.
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APPENDIX

Jerusalem’s Matins for Our Lady of Guadalupe, 1764: Citations, Borrowings, & Concordances

The “Invitatorio y Himno à 4, con VVs. Trompas i Baxo a N[uestra] S[eñora] de Guadalupe,” (1764) is found in Leg. C.c.9, No. 1 (AM0605), followed by the “Ocho Responsorios para los Maytines de la Aparicion de Ntra Sra de Guadalupe, à 4, con violines, óboés, trompas, órganos, y bajo,” Leg. C.c.9, No. 2 (AM0606). The instrumental parts and some of the choral parts are contained in Leg. C.c.10, No. 2. There is an additional responsory for soprano, violins, and continuo, “Motete del 2º Nocturno . . . a solo con violines y baxo. A Nª Sª de Guadalupe,” that was written out by Jerusalem in 1764 and then discarded. It contains the comment, “No sirve” (It doesn’t work). This aborted movement is scored for soprano, two violins, and accompaniment (Leg. C.c.10, No. 3).

Invitatory: “Sancta Maria Dei genitrix virgo” (Holy Mary, virgin mother of God)

This is drawn from Jerusalem’s Matins for the Assumption, Legajo C.c.6. There is a concordant version in Puebla Cathedral (Legajo 68, No. 3). The title page for the Invitatory and hymn for the Matins for Our Lady of Guadalupe (C.c.9) notes at the bottom of the page that this material is also applicable to the Matins for Our Lady of the Pillar (“e para el Pilar”).

Hymn: “Quem terra pontus sidera” (Whom earth, sea, and stars)

This was drawn from Jerusalem’s earlier work, Matins for the Assumption (Legajo C.c.6). The borrador for the Matins for Our Lady of Guadalupe even states that one can find the borrador for the hymn in the Matins for the Assumption: “El Borrador del Hymno está en con [sic] el Ynvitº de los Maitines de la Asunción de N. S. (The sketch for the hymn [is located] with the Invitatory for the Matins for the Assumption of Our Lady). He revised this hymn later in Matins for the Conception in 1768 (Legajo C.c.10 / AM0607). A reduced version of the hymn is found in the Puebla cathedral (Legajo 68, No. 7), but it contains only the music for the odd-numbered verses.

Responsory 1: “Vidi speciosam” (I saw her, fair as a dove)

This responsonry is the oldest of the set, dating from Jerusalem’s compositions for Matins for Our Lady of Guadalupe in 1756 (Legajo E.b.2, No. 2 / AM0514). He later reused it in the Matins for the Conception (Legajo C.c.10). A concordant version in the Puebla cathedral (Legajo 68, No. 3) clarifies that this responsonry was utilized as Responsory 1 for: the Matins for the Virgin of Guadalupe; the Matins for the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin; the Matins for the Octave of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin; and even the Matins for Santo Domingo (but with a new text “Euge, serve bone”).

Responsory 2: “Quae est ista quae ascendit” (Who is this that arises as Aurora rises up?)
According to the score this responsory is derived from an aria: “Este Responsorio es de el Mt~ro Jerusalem sacado de una Area que Comienza propicia estrella; vease entre los borradores sueltos” (This Responsory by Maestro Jerusalem [is] taken from the aria that begins ‘Propitia estrella’ [Fortunate Star]).

**Responsory 3: “Quae est ista quae processit sicut sol” (Who is she who comes forth like the sun)**

The title page of the borrador indicates that this is derived from the first nocturn of Jerusalem’s Matins for Our Lady of the Pillar. A concordant version, Legajo E.b.2, No. 3 (AM0515), dated 1760, clearly states that it was used as the processional for the Matins for the Apparition: “para la procesión de la Aparición.”

**Responsory 4: “Signum magnum apparuit in caelo” (A great sign appeared in heaven)**

This responsory contains many motivic references to the other responsories; most likely it was one of the last to be composed. Jerusalem seems to be drawing upon his “borrowed works” for motivic material, and the responsory serves to tie together the entire cycle.

**Responsory 5: “Quae est ista quae progreditur” (Who is she who goes forth)**

The end of this responsory’s borrador indicates that it was drawn from Jerusalem’s villancico “Todos pueden alegar” (All are able to claim), and further states that the music can be found among the loose sheets: “Este Responsorio es del Mt~ro Jerusalem; sacado de una Area que comienza Todos pueden alegar &c. Vease entre los Voradores sueltos.”

**Responsory 6: “Elegi et sanctificavi locum istum” (I have chosen and sanctified this place)**

The following year Jerusalem used this responsory again in his Matins for Our Lady of Guadalupe of 1765; that it is in the same place in Nocturn 2 is clear from its title page: “Motete 3º del 2º Nocturno para los Maitines de Nª Sª de Guadalupe. Composizion a 4 con ripienos, trompa[s] i bajo, comp[ues]to por Dn. Ignazio Jerusalem, Mº de Cap[i]l[a]na Yglesia de Mexico. año de 1765,” Legajo E.b.1 (AM0511 & AM0515).

**Responsory 7: “Felix namque” (Happy are you indeed)**

This appears to be freshly composed for The Matins for the Virgin of Guadalupe; it is not in any other service in the Mexico cathedral, but it has motivic material from the older “borrowed” responsories, implying it was a later work. A concordant version of this responsory is found in Puebla cathedral (Legajo 68, No. 5) as the fifth responsory in Matins for the Immaculate Conception; there is another concordant version in the Guadalajara cathedral.

**Responsory 8: “Beatam me dicent omnes” (All generations shall call me blessed)**

This work is actually by Giácome (or Jacob) Rust. The borrador bears the ascription: “Responsorio Octavo de N.S. de Guadalupe, a Solo con violines, viola, oboeses, trompas &c. Del Sigr. Giácome Rust.” Jerusalem used this same piece by Rust—with attribution—as Responsory 5 for his Matins for the Assumption (Legajo C.c.7).
Professor Craig Russell of California Polytechnic State University is steeped in the music of Spain and the Hispano-American world. He has published over seventy articles on eighteenth-century Hispanic studies, Mexican cathedral music, the California missions, and American popular culture. Early in 2009 Oxford University Press is releasing his most recent book, From Serra to Sancho: Music and Pageantry in the California Missions. He has contributed twenty-six articles to the newest edition of The New Grove Dictionary and collaborated with Chanticleer on four compact disks, two of which received Gramophone award nominations (Mexican Baroque and Our American Journey). On their most recent recording, The Mission Road, Dr. Russell accompanies Chanticleer on his baroque guitar. His compositions are released on Naxos and have been widely performed in Europe, Australia, and the USA—including concerts dedicated to his compositions in Carnegie Hall, the Kennedy Center, the Sydney Opera House, and Disney Hall in Los Angeles.