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Resumo

Nos finais do século XV e nas primeiras décadas do século XVI as oportunidades para o intercâmbio musical entre Portugal e os vizinhos reinos de Espanha eram múltiplas e variadas. Como sucedia com os músicos, também os repertórios de música polifônica cruzavam a fronteira. O entendimento comum é que os manuscritos faziam uma viagem de sentido único, de Espanha para Portugal, e que as fontes portuguesas contêm versões muito afastadas dos exemplares espanhóis, resultado de transmissões únicas e tardias. Os estudos de caso que neste artigo se oferecem mostram um panorama diferente e mais complexo: que em alguns casos, a música chegou precocemente; que as versões nos manuscritos portugueses estão por vezes mais próximas dos seus arquétipos do que aquelas que sobrevivem nos manuscritos espanhóis; e que os padrões de transmissão do repertório não eram diferentes daqueles que se encontram em quaisquer outros lugares da Europa. Adicionalmente, propõe-se uma nova datação para o corpo original do manuscrito P-Ln CIC 60.
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Abstract

In the late fifteenth century and the early decades of the sixteenth century, opportunities for musical exchange between Portugal and the Spanish kingdoms were multifarious. As with musicians, repertoires of polyphonic music also travelled across the border. Our common understanding is that manuscripts made a one-way route from Spain to Portugal, and that Portuguese sources contain versions far removed from the Spanish exemplars, resulting from unique and often late transmissions. The case studies offered in this article show a different and more complex picture: that in some cases music arrived quite early; that versions in Portuguese sources are sometimes closer to their archetypes than those in most of the surviving Spanish manuscripts; and that the patterns of transmission were not different from those found elsewhere in Europe. Additionally, a new dating for the original layer of manuscript P-Ln CIC 60 is proposed.
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In the late fifteenth century and the early decades of the sixteenth century, opportunities for musical and, more broadly, cultural exchanges between Portugal and Spain were multifarious. Several Spanish musicians, such as, for instance, the three Baena brothers, Gonzalo, Francisco and Diego, made their careers in the Portuguese court, and a number of Portuguese musicians, such as João de Coimbra and Pedro do Porto, worked in Castilian and Aragonese courtly and ecclesiastical institutions. Repertories of polyphonic music also travelled across the border. Leaving aside the many anonymous pieces in Portuguese sources that may, or may not, be of local composition, our common understanding is that manuscripts made a one-way route from Spain to Portugal, and that Portuguese sources contain versions far removed from the Spanish exemplars, often resulting from late transmissions. However, as this article will show, in some cases music seem to have arrived quite early, and versions in Portuguese sources are closer to their archetypes than those in the surviving Spanish manuscripts. Portuguese versions of a given piece—which tend to adopt distinguishing details of notation and specific equipollent readings possibly as the result of different scribal habits, their sources often functioning as a closed family grouping—thus correspond, through their exemplars, to a given version in one branch of the Spanish tradition, even if that version does not exist anymore.

As in all processes of transmission, it is not infrequent in early Iberian polyphonic repertories, both sacred and secular, that the scribe or editor of a manuscript intentionally introduces changes, mostly unnecessary, into the text of a musical work, in order to adapt it to specific performing conditions, to adjust the musical syntax to a changing aesthetic paradigm and taste, or simply to...
ameliorate it. The extant versions of the motet *Precor te, Domine* by Francisco de Peñalosa (c.1470-1528) and of the villancico *Passame por dios barquero* attributed to Pedro de Escobar (documented in 1507-14) illustrate the main categories of those deliberate changes: in the first case, we will examine omission and truncation—the latter almost always involving some compositional work in order to give the piece a new ending; in the second case, amendment and reworking will be considered. Moreover, the tradition of a number of pieces is imperfectly studied, mostly because of mistakes in the collation of the sources. This is due to the fact that the access to the relevant manuscripts has been, and frequently still is, difficult, particularly in Spanish ecclesiastical institutions. The motet *Memorare piissima*, variously attributed to Peñalosa and Escobar, but undoubtedly by the latter composer, is a case in point that needs reconsideration. This article will clarify its transmission history. It will additionally offer a new dating for the original layer of manuscript *P-Ln CIC 60*.

**Precor te, Domine**

The text of *Precor te, Domine* is a prayer, its middle part describing the agony of Christ during crucifixion in a pictorial way, gradually reaching unconsciousness and death. It is found in different versions with variants in a number of books of hours from the fifteenth and early sixteenth century. The most common incipit of this prayer is ‘Precor te, piissime Domine Jesu Christe’, although there are versions beginning with ‘Precor te, amantissime Domine Jesu Christe’ (as in the last part of the text in most versions), and at least one starting with ‘Deprecor te, piissime Domine Jesu Christe’. In some sources, the rubric preceding the prayer gives its authorship to ‘Papa Benedictus ordinis cisterciensis’—that is, to Benedict XII, the third Avignon pope (1280-1342; papacy 1334-42). The granting of indulgences to those who said this prayer, either at Mass after the Elevation or in front of the crucifix, depending on the sources, is also usually mentioned in the rubrics, as is often the case with other prayers used in devotional motets. The precise text as set by Peñalosa has not been

---


5 This is the case with, for instance, the well-known Juan de Urrede’s *canción Nunca fue pena mayor* in the *Cancionero de Palacio* and two other non-Iberian sources, where the repetition of the *mudanza* section is cut by six semibreves plus the unmeasured final note (that is, three whole bars) and provided with a shorter, newly-composed cadence on A instead of G for the second ending.

6 Which is not the case with Rees, *Polyphony in Portugal* (see note 2), pp. 413-29, when he does not rely on previous scholarship.

7 Other such cases are the motets *O bone Jesu, illumina oculos meos* and *Domine Jesu Christe, qui diei hora ultima*, both bearing conflicting attributions. These are dealt with in João Pedro d’Alvarenga, ‘Juan de Anchieta and the Iberian Motet around 1500’, *Acta Musicologica* (forthcoming).
found in the sources consulted. However, among them, two fifteenth-century French books of hours of the use of Paris and two Italian books of hours, one dated 1488 and the other one from before 1510, present readings quite close to the text in the motet with almost no significant variation. An edition of this text is given in Appendix I.

The motet *Precor te, Domine* survives in three Spanish and two Portuguese manuscript sources and has three different versions (see Table 1). These different versions have been studied more recently by Kenneth Kreitner. The three Spanish sources—Barcelona 454 (*E-Bhc* M. 454), Toledo 21 (*E-Tc Cód. B. 21*), and Tarazona 2/3 (*E-TZ Ms. 2/3*)—have only the first two of the three *partes* copied anonymously in Coimbra 32 (*P-Cug MM 32*). The omission of the last *pars* results in what Kreitner names as the ‘medium version’ of the motet. It ends rather indecisively on a C sonority instead of the expected A-mi sonority (since the piece is in transposed Mi tonality). In Coimbra 12 (*P-Cug MM 12*), near the end of the original first *pars*, both text and music are reworked and a newly composed ‘Amen’ finishes the piece, ending it properly on A. Kreitner calls this truncated version the ‘short version’ of the motet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSS in approximate chronological order</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>E-Bhc</em> M. 454, sections B+C, ff. 66v-67v</td>
<td><em>Peñalosa</em></td>
<td>1520-5</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>E-TZ</em> Ms. 2/3, ff. 261v-262r</td>
<td>p.losa</td>
<td>before 1528?</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P-Cug</em> MM 12, ff. 34v-35r</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>c.1540-50</td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P-Cug</em> MM 32, ff. 32v-34r</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>c.1540-55</td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>E-Tc Cód. B. 21</em>, ff. 87v-90r</td>
<td><em>Peña[losa]</em></td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Sources for the motet *Precor te, Domine*

---

8 These are: *F-Pn* Lat. 1175 (book of hours, use of Paris, fifteenth century); *F-Pn* Lat. 1183 (book of hours, use of Paris, 1475-1500); *L-Vnm* Lat. III, 69 (book of hours, Italy, 1488); and *P-Lcg M.A. 149* plus Zagreb, Strossmayerova Galerija, S.G. 339-352 (main codex plus detached folios; book of hours, Ferrara, c.1506-7, known as ‘Offiziolo di Alfonso I d’Este’); see Giacomo Baroffio, *Corpus Italicum Precum*, in *Iter Liturgicum Italicum* <http://www.hymnos.sardenga.it/iter/iterliturgicum.htm> (accessed 22 September 2017). Hardie, ‘The Motets of Francisco de Peñalosa’ (see note 3), p. 303, gives the reference of two fifteenth-century sources of probable Spanish origin ‘in addition to the sources cited by Lerquiuss and Sinclair’, which she does not specify. The text provided in Hardie (p. 301)—which, she says without any further details, was taken from ‘the manuscript sources’ (p. 302)—is a longer and more remote version than the one used in the ‘long version’ of the motet; on the different versions of the motet, see the next paragraph.


10 This is indeed the most popular version of *Precor te, Domine*, since it was published in *Francisco de Peñalosa: Motets for Four & Five Voices*, edited by Martyn Imrie, Mapa Mundi, Series A (Lochs, Vanderbeek & Imrie, 1990), vol. 72, pp. 55-8.
The editor of the ‘short version’ in Coimbra 12 must have had access to the full, ‘long version’ as copied in Coimbra 32 because, in rearranging the text, he makes use of a line taken from the third pars of the motet. Neither the text nor the music common to Coimbra 12 and 32 (that is, the first 91 breves) have differences, this including details of spelling and notation such as ligatures. Given that both manuscripts were in all likelihood compiled during the same period—as Owen Rees has convincingly shown—and that the copy of Precor te, Domine in Coimbra 12 seems not to belong to the original layer of this manuscript, it is reasonably safe to assume that the editor of the ‘short version’ worked directly from the ‘long version’ in Coimbra 32. Moreover, in Coimbra 32, the last word in line 6, ‘dolore’, is erased and substituted with ‘gestu’—which, interestingly, is the only recorded alternative to ‘gustu’ in the original prayer at that place in the sources consulted; the scribe of Coimbra 12 already wrote ‘gestu’ originally.

The Spanish sources have some significant differences from the Coimbra sources. Barcelona 454, Toledo 21, and Tarazona 2/3 share an extra line of text, which is not included in the Coimbra manuscripts: ‘cum transverberato corpore’ (‘with severed body’, line 9), between ‘cum transfixo corde’ (‘with pierced heart’), and ‘cum sanguineis vulneribus’ (‘with bloody wounds’). At this point, the Spanish sources make more sense, not only because that line of text is part of the original prayer, but also because in the Coimbra versions the absence of that line of text leads to the repetition of ‘cum transfixo corde’, thus breaking the consistent pattern of giving a new line of text to each of the successive duos (and indeed to each of the successive phrases throughout the whole piece). If not for other reasons, this textual variant links the Spanish sources together and separates them from the Portuguese sources.

The Spanish sources also have differences between them, mainly in wording and use of coloration. Moreover, Toledo 21 has unique readings for bars 72-3, 83 (altus; introduced by hyparchetype ε; see the sketch stemma on Figure 1), and 79-80 (altus; clearly arising from a copying error that a different scribe later erased and emended by conjecture). It however has a common reading with Tarazona 2/3 for bar 74 (tenor), which is separative as regards the Portuguese sources and must thus have been introduced higher in the stemma; both sources also share a different, though equivalent, mensural sign. Barcelona 454 explicitly presents the piece in two partes and has unique readings for bars 56, 74-5 (tenor) and 79-80 (altus), all corrupt; it obviously

---

11 On P-Cug MM 12 and MM 32, see Rees, Polyphony in Portugal (see note 2), pp. 185-94 and 215-27 respectively.
12 The piece, written by a scribe different from any of the eight scribes who copied the original layer of Coimbra 12, appears at the end of a gathering firstly filled with the last part of the composite mass that includes Anchieta’s Credo, and after two added pieces, both textless: the Alleluia Primus ad Sion by Escobar in a four-voice version, and an eighth-tone Alleluia by Heliodoro de Paiva (d. 1552). The copy of Precor te is the only one in the whole manuscript using Italic script for the text. This allows dating it to the 1560s.
13 See Appendix I.
belongs to a different branch, also derived from hyparchetype γ (see Figure 1), because it has the prevalent readings on bars 72-3 and 83 in the altus and the same mensural sign as in the Portuguese sources. Even if divided into two branches, all the existing sources in the Spanish tradition for this piece stem from the now lost exemplar that first omitted the third pars of the motet, thus producing its ‘medium version’. Therefore, the hypothetical sketch stemma for Precor te, Domine would be the one on Figure 1. Kreitner’s conviction that the ‘long version’ in Coimbra 32 is ‘most likely’ the ‘original Precor te’ is then probably right, except for the fact that ‘the original’ (or, more precisely, the version closest to the archetype) would have included text line 9—that is, it would have been hyparchetype β. The fact that no version of the motet directly deriving from this hyparchetype exists is an obvious indication that a significant number of intermediate sources were lost. This, and the descent from a hyparchetype probably lateral to β surely account for a few suspicious readings in the last pars of the ‘long version’ as copied in Coimbra 32.15

**Figure 1.** The hypothetical sketch stemma for Precor te, Domine

**Passame por dios barquero**

As seen, the extant versions of Precor te, Domine illustrate omission and a particularly elaborate case of truncation. Two other categories of deliberate change to the text of a musical work are amendment and reworking. They frequently combine, as in one of the extant versions of Passame

14 See Kreitner, ‘Peñalosa, “Precor te”, and Us’ (see note 9), p. 299.

15 For instance, bars 141-2 and 176-7 in the tenor part are clearly corrupt readings. Indeed, Owen Rees casts doubt on the authorship of the ‘long version’ in Coimbra 32 because of what he considers ‘the incompetent counterpoint’ in the final pars of the motet; see his ‘Two of a Kind: Motet Pairs and Identity Crises in the Iberian Repertory’, unpublished paper read at the 45th Medieval and Renaissance Music Conference, Prague, 6 July 2017.
This villancico exists in three sources: the Cancionero de Palacio (E-Mp Ms. II-1335) in its second layer, f. ccxxxij/190r, where it is attributed to ‘Escobar’ by a different, later hand; the Cancionero de Elvas (P-Em Ms. 11793), ff. 95v-96r; and the small manuscript Lisbon 60 (P-Ln CIC 60), ff. 39v-40r. The piece has no authorship attribution in the Portuguese sources.

The layer of the Cancionero de Palacio where Passame por dios barquero appears is dated by Romeu Figueras to between 1507 and 1510. The Cancionero de Elvas is dated to the third quarter of the sixteenth century, probably around 1570. This dating, established by Gil Miranda, has been commonly accepted for palaeographic and codicological reasons—the use of an elegant italic script for the texts and the latest recorded date for the sole watermark type being 1571—and also because it includes the first tercet of an elegy written in around 1555 by Dom Manuel de Portugal (c.1525-1606) and, in its second part, one glosa and four cantigas by Pêro de Andrade Caminha (c.1520-1589) appearing in other manuscript sources from the third quarter of the sixteenth century. The original layer of Lisbon 60 is dated by Owen Rees to c.1530-50. However, a later dating for this manuscript in around 1570 seems more plausible, on the basis of palaeographic and codicological evidence (see Appendix II).

Turning back to Passame por dios barquero, we will firstly consider its text (see Table 2). Besides some trivial differences in spelling, the Portuguese sources also have differences in wording (Elvas, text lines 2, 3 and 7; Lisbon 60, text lines 2 and 7); text line 10 is the same as text line 3 in all three versions. These latter differences should be valued as significant variants. For instance: ‘de aquesa’ is a synonym of ‘de esa’ but not of ‘de aquella’; ‘dolor’ and ‘amor’, although they can be semantically equivalent—as it is often the case in most sixteenth-century and later poetry—are strictly not synonyms.

---

16 La música en la corte de los Reyes Católicos, IV-1: Cancionero Musical de Palacio (Siglos XV-XVI), introduction and research by José Romeu Figueras, Monumentos de la Música Española XIV-1 (Barcelona, CSIC - Instituto Español de Musicología, 1965), vol. 3(A), p. 22; see also Emilio Ros-Fabregas, ‘Manuscripts of Polyphony from the Time of Isabel and Ferdinand’, in Companion to Music in the Age of the Catholic Monarchs (see note 1), pp. 404-68, at pp. 415-28.


18 This elegy, Aquella voluntad que se ha rendido, appears complete in the Cancionero de Luiz Franco Corrêa, P-Ln Cod. 4413, compiled between 1557 and 1589.


Passame por dios barquero
daquella parte del rio,
duelete del amor mio.

Que si puemes dilacion
en venir a socorrerme,
no podras despues valerme,
segun crece mi passion.

No quieras mi perdicion,
pues en tu bondad confio,
duelete del amor mio.

* ‘pones’ in the T and B parts.

The note, that is, the first tercet, in the version of Lisbon 60, also appears in Coplas de vnos tres pastores Martin & Miguel & Antô çô otras de Alegre fuy & outras de pasesme por dios barquero [Burgos, Friedrich Biel, 1515-9]. The glosses in this print, attributed by some authors to Rodrigo de Reinosa (c.1450-c.1530), are however different.

Table 2. The text of Passame por dios barquero in its three extant sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clefs</th>
<th>Palacio</th>
<th>Elvas</th>
<th>Lisbon 60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c1 c4 F3</td>
<td>c1 c4 F3</td>
<td>c1 c4 F4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>partial (T B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S c3 T B @3</td>
<td>@3</td>
<td>c3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 T 21-2</td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 S 5</td>
<td>d-Br</td>
<td>d-Br</td>
<td>Br Sb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 5</td>
<td>d-Br</td>
<td>d-Br</td>
<td>f d-Sb g a b M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 5</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d d-Sb e M f Sb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 B 72-3</td>
<td>B c d e M</td>
<td>B c d e M</td>
<td>B Br</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 83-3</td>
<td>g Br</td>
<td>g Sb</td>
<td>g e Sb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 91-2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 B 107</td>
<td>d Sb</td>
<td>d c M</td>
<td>d Sb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 B 14</td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 S 163</td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 163</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 167</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S T B –/17</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>– = bar 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 S T 18/19</td>
<td>d-Br</td>
<td>d-Br</td>
<td>Br Sb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 18/19</td>
<td>c’ d-Sb b a g M</td>
<td>c’ d-Sb b a g M</td>
<td>d Br Sb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 B 21/22</td>
<td>f Sb g Br</td>
<td>f Sb g Br</td>
<td>f a g c M g Sb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 S T B 22/23</td>
<td>Br Sb</td>
<td>Br Sb</td>
<td>d-Br</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Points of variation in the extant sources of Passame por dios barquero

21 The following abbreviations are used in this table: B = bassus (or contra); Br = breve; d- = dotted (e.g. d-Br = dotted breve); M = minima; r = rest (e.g. Br-r = breve rest); S = superius (or tiple); Sb = semibreve; T = tenor. Reference to the note figures follows their order within the given bar not including rests. Reference to pitches uses the Helmholtz notation system (middle c = c’).
Looking at the music (see Appendix III), the Lisbon version seems to be far removed from the version in the Cancionero de Palacio while the Elvas version seems to be closer to it. The extent of variation in the readings in Lisbon 60 allows us to consider this version as a reworking, although not of the type of unrelated or remotely related versions resulting from the use of common melodies. The primary aim of the editor of the Lisbon version of Passame por dios barquero seems to have been to modernize and correct musical syntax by transforming octave-leap cadences into regular perfect ones and avoiding the parallel fifths between the outer voices in the penultimate bar. The insertion of one whole bar into the first half of the mudanza section, however, harms the balancing of triple and duple rhythms, with consequences in text underlay and prosody.

If compared to the version in Palacio, Elvas has only two different readings (nos. 4 and 5 on Table 3). However, one of these variant readings (no. 5) is unique to Elvas and so it separates this version from the versions in Palacio and in Lisbon, as these latter sources agree at this point. The reading unique to Elvas can of course be counted as a mechanical change by assimilation of the next musical figure, but the different reading in the third line of text (‘amor’ for ‘dolor’) is also separative. Consequently, we have to assume that the Lisbon version was worked out from a hyparchetype closer to Palacio than Elvas. The sketch stemma for Passame por dios barquero would thus be the one in Figure 2.

![Figure 2. The hypothetical sketch stemma for Passame por dios barquero](image)

---

22 As is the case with, for instance Secaronne los pesares, also in Palacio, ff. 119v-120r, attributed to Escobar and, in another version, anonymous in Elvas, ff. 41v-42r; in a different setting in Lisbon 60, ff. 37v-38r; and with only one voice-part in the so-called Cancionero de Paris, F-Peb Ms. Masson 56, ff. 22v-23r. On this latter manuscript, see Nuno de Mendonça RAIMUNDO, ‘O cancioneiro musical de Paris: Uma nova perspectiva sobre o manuscrito F-Peb Masson 56’, 2 vols. (Master’s thesis, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 2017), which includes a critical edition of its full contents.

23 Obviously, this does not contradicts Rees’s conclusion that the version in Lisbon 60 is the furthest from the one in the Cancionero de Palacio; see his ‘Manuscript Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional, CIC 60’ (see note 20), pp. 74-5, n. 46.
Although in vernacular repertory, as Owen Rees wrote elsewhere, ‘readings of both music and text seem often to have been less stable’ than in Latin polyphony, the case of Passame por dios barquero makes it clear that an apparently similar version to the earliest known copy of a given piece can after all be farther removed from the archetype than the exemplar for a reworking of that same piece.

Memorare piissima

The tradition of the motet Memorare piissima, which also includes an instance of reworking, is inaccurately described in the relevant existing literature. This work survives in five Spanish and two Portuguese manuscript sources and has conflicting attributions to Peñalosa and Escobar (see Table 4). Except for Jane Hardie (who considers it doubtful in her 1983 dissertation) and Dionisio Preciado (who only uses and discusses three of the seven surviving sources in his edition of Peñalosa’s opera omnia), the authorship of Escobar for this piece is generally acknowledged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSS in approximate chronological order</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Sco Ms. 5-5-20, ff. 15v-17r</td>
<td>Escobar</td>
<td>1510s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Bbc M. 454, sections C+D, ff. 162v-163r</td>
<td>Penalosa</td>
<td>1525-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Tz Ms. 2/3, ff. 282v-283r</td>
<td>escobar</td>
<td>before 1528?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Cug MM 12, ff. 201v-203r</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>c.1540-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Cug MM 32, ff. 25v-26r</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>c.1540-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Tc Cód. B. 21, ff. 78v-82r</td>
<td>Peñalosa</td>
<td>1549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Sc Ms. 1, ff. 31v-33r</td>
<td>Petrus escobar</td>
<td>1550-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Sources for the motet Memorare piissima

24 REES, ‘Manuscript Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional, CIC 60’ (see note 20), p. 78.
26 The most popular edition of this work is Pedro de Escobar: Memorare piissima, edited by Martyn Imrie, Mapa Mundí, Series A, 224 (Lochs, Vanderbeek & Imrie, 2004). Although this edition states that its source is manuscript E-Sc Ms. 1, it is in fact an eclectic edition, incorporating the reading of manuscripts P-Cug MM 12, MM 32 and E-Tc Cód. B. 21 for bars 68-70. An edition from E-TZ Ms. 2/3 is in Autores hispanos de los siglos XV-XVI de los ms. 2 y 5 de la catedral de Tarazona, edited by Pedro Calahorra, Polifonía Aragonesa, IX (Zaragoza, Institución Fernando el Católico, 1995), pp. 97-105. Bar numbers hereafter refer to Imrie’s edition.
27 The copy in E-Sco Ms. 5-5-20 is incomplete because of the lack of f. 16.
The text of *Memorare piissima* is composed in the form of a prayer to the Virgin, meditating on her fifth and sixth sorrows (the crucifixion and the deposition of Christ)—a favourite of late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Castilian devotees, and particularly Queen Isabel.\(^{28}\) Although Hardie states that this text appears in books of hours along with *Precor te*,\(^{29}\) it was found nowhere within the sources consulted.\(^{30}\) Except for a number of differences in spelling (e.g. ‘obprobria’/‘opprobria’; ‘amicicia’/‘amicitia’; ‘substulit’/‘sustulit’), the extant sources show no variant readings in the text.

Taking into consideration two significant points of variation in the music—one involving the altus and tenor in the three-voice segment setting the words ‘non dimittas cogitare’ (‘do not let go from thy thoughts’) on bars 68-70, and the other one involving the altus on bars 84-5—, Jane Hardie identifies four successive versions of this motet, which she discusses mostly in a phylogenetic way (that is, grouping the texts in the extant sources according to their similarities and separating them by considering their differences as changes in a chronological sequence). This produces an apparently convincing case regarding the filiation of the different versions of the piece. The whole argument is, however, based on a puzzling misreading of manuscript Coimbra 32.\(^{31}\) To sum up, Hardie says that, on bars 68-70, the copy in Coimbra 32 introduces a new tenor while retaining the original altus part (corresponding to her version III of the motet). This results in an awkward clash of an unprepared second between the two voice parts, but the defect would be corrected in Coimbra 12 by the writing of a new altus part (corresponding to her version IV of the motet). The new altus and tenor parts as in Coimbra 12 also appear in Toledo 21.\(^{32}\) Actually, the readings in Coimbra 12 and 32 are exactly the same at this point (see Figures 3 and 4, where bars 68-70 are marked in the altus and tenor parts). Therefore, no version III of the motet exists.


\(^{29}\) Hardie, ‘The Motets of Francisco de Peñalosa’ (see note 3), pp. 160 and 162.

\(^{30}\) These are those referred to in Baroffio, *Corpus Italicum Precum* (see note 8). Also, no such incipit is recorded in the general index of Victor Lerouquis, *Les livres d’heures manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1927). In addition, to my knowledge, no other composer set this text to music.

\(^{31}\) Which can only be explained by the hypothesis that Hardie did not have had access to the originals and had worked from unmarked copies that present each opening in two separate images.

\(^{32}\) Hardie, ‘The Motets of Francisco de Peñalosa’ (see note 3), pp. 137-43; the example on p. 139, however, assigns version III to Coimbra 12, and version IV to Coimbra 32. See also Rees, *Polyphony in Portugal* (see note 2), p. 421, who relies on Hardie, and Ros-Fabregas, ‘The Manuscript Barcelona’ (see note 3), vol. 1, pp. 318-21, who did not collate the readings in Coimbra 32, and was thus unable accurately to describe the tradition of this piece.
Figure 3. *Memorare piüssima*, altus part, (a) *P-Cug* MM 12, f. 202r, detail, (b) *P-Cug* MM 32, f. 26r, detail

Figure 4. *Memorare piüssima*, tenor part, (a) *P-Cug* MM 12, f. 201v, detail, (b) *P-Cug* MM 32, f. 25v, detail
Yet, given the established chronology of the manuscripts, we could still hypothesize that the new altus and tenor parts on bars 68-70 had been devised in Portugal and that this supposedly ‘Portuguese version’ had went back to Spain, originating the copy in Toledo 21. This would have been the obvious conclusion, had Hardie been right about the readings in Coimbra 32. However, in view of all types of variation (including differences of rhythm; differences of rhythm and pitch; and differences in notation, particularly the distribution of ligatures), it is clear that the Spanish and Portuguese sources form separate family groupings, the latter evidently deriving from the first.

Given the unique reading in Seville 5-5-20 (E-Sco Ms. 5-5-20) of the altus on bars 84-5 (Hardie’s version I of the motet), and the additional fact that Barcelona 454 and Seville 1 (E-Sc Ms. 1) each have one error of pitch not shared with any other source, the hypothetical sketch stemma for Memorare piissima would be that in Figure 5. Each of the hyparchetypes α and δ undoubtedly represent a group of similar, though not necessarily identical, sources, now lost. Except for the significant variant on bars 68-70 introduced by hyparchetype δ and differences in the distribution of ligatures, readings along the main branch of the stemma are uniform. Seville 5-5-20 (which cannot be fully assessed because its copy of the motet is incomplete), besides the aforementioned unique reading, and Coimbra 12 each have one variant of rhythm; Barcelona 454 bears three variants of rhythm; and Coimbra 32 shows five such variants. Therefore, no copy descends directly from another.

Figure 5. The hypothetical sketch stemma for Memorare piissima

---

* Variant on bb. 84-5 (= Hardie’s version II); possibly no authorship attribution
** Variant on bb. 68-70 (= Hardie’s version IV)

33 This is the usual picture with the Coimbra sources, including the sacred repertory in the original layer of P-Ln CIC 60, most probably also copied from Coimbra-related exemplars in around 1570 (see Appendix II).
Since both versions II and IV of *Memorare piissima* obviously coexisted, it is impossible to determine from the available evidence when and where the latter version originated and, thus, when it was transmitted to Portugal. The differences between the copies in Coimbra 12 and 32 corroborate Owen Rees’s assumption that the scribes in Santa Cruz ‘were probably drawing in many cases upon different exemplars’.  

However, it is extremely difficult to ascertain if these different exemplars originated in Portugal from one single Spanish source (either a choirbook or a fascicle-manuscript), or if they corresponded to multiple transmissions, although, in the case of *Memorare piissima*, a few concordances in details of notation linking the Coimbra copies against the Spanish support the first hypothesis. As is often the case with what Owen Rees has conveniently called the ‘Spanish Court repertory’, Tarazona 2/3—here along with Seville 1 and Toledo 21, and aside from the significant variant on bars 68–70—has the closer reading to those in the Coimbra sources. The same also happens with Tarazona 2/3 and Coimbra 32 as regards *Precor te, Domine* in the 126 breves common to both sources.  

If Seville is indeed the origin of the exemplars that were used in the compilation of Tarazona 2/3, then the main channel of this repertory transmission to Portugal, or at least to Coimbra, must have passed through, or originated in, Seville. Version IV of *Memorare piissima* could thus be a version by the composer himself instead of being the result of a scribe’s emendation.

The examples presented above are surely enough to show that Portuguese sources have to be properly and carefully assessed, particularly regarding late fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Spanish, or probably Spanish, repertories. Since these Portuguese sources form a lateral, though stenotomically close, tradition, with limited opportunities for generating multiple exemplars and so reasonably protected from contamination (while not, as seen, from emendation), it is entirely

34 Rees, Polyphony in Portugal (see note 2), p. 82.
35 See Rees, Polyphony in Portugal (see note 2), p. 427.
36 On E-TZ Ms. 2/3, see the Books of Hispanic Polyphony database at <https://hispanicpolyphony.eu/source/13442> (accessed 19 October 2017), and also Ros-Fàbregas, ‘Manuscripts of Polyphony’ (see note 16), pp. 446-51. Ros-Fàbregas’s hypothesis is that Tarazona 2/3 was copied from older manuscripts in Tarazona in the middle or the second half of the sixteenth century. This is not, however, at odds with the possibility that most of its contents had its origin in Seville; see Juan Ruiz Jiménez, *La Librería de Canto de Órgano: Creación y pervivencia del repertorio del Renacimiento en la actividad musical de la Catedral de Sevilla* (Seville, Junta de Andalucía - Consejería de Cultura, 2007), pp. 37-8; and Juan Ruiz Jiménez, ‘“Sounds of the Hollow Mountain”: Musical Tradition and Innovation in Seville Cathedral in the Early Renaissance’, *Early Music History*, 29 (2010), pp. 189-239, at pp. 226-36. Quite recently, Esperanza Rodríguez-García has shown that Ros-Fàbregas claiming is hardly tenable, and that the manuscript was most probably copied in the decade before Peñalosa’s death in 1528; see Esperanza Rodríguez-García, ‘Did Francisco de Peñalosa compose the Credo of the mass Rex virginitum?’, unpublished paper read at the ENIM 2018 - 8th Conference on Musical Research, Porto, Portugal, 9 November 2018.
37 The transmission via Seville is also one of the hypotheses put forward by Tess Knighton for the works by Escobar included in Gonçalo de Baena, *Arte nouamente inuentada pera aprender a tâger* (Lisbon, German Galhard, 1540); see her ‘Gonçalo de Baena’s Arte para tanger (Lisboa, 1540): Local and International Repertories’, in Musical Exchanges, 1100-1650: Iberian Connections, edited by Manuel Pedro Ferreira (Kassel, Reichenberger, 2016), pp. 209-39, at p. 221. This has however to be tested by studying the variants found in all sources for the relevant works, particularly the motet *Clamabat autem*. 
possible that even late sources provide missing links to the main tradition or contain versions stemming from early transmissions, and therefore not remote from the lost originals. The example of Precor te clearly shows that the earliest or geographically closer sources, or those bearing the name of the composer—that is, the presumed ‘authoritative’ sources—are not always those that prove to be the closest to the archetype, especially if transmission giving rise to the lateral, or ‘peripheral’, tradition is fairly early, as it appears to be the case. Finally, the examples in this article, even if consisting of single pieces, also suggest that the corpus of extant Iberian manuscripts is clearly separated into family groupings, revealing processes and patterns of transmission similar to those found everywhere in the rest of Europe.\footnote{This is in agreement with Ros-Fábregas’s conclusion in his ‘The Manuscript Barcelona’ (see note 3), vol. 1, p. 332, that ‘contrary to Hardie’s contention [in her PhD dissertation], even for the transmission of the narrow circle of Peñalosa’s works there is no unified Iberian manuscript tradition’.}
Appendix I

An edition of the text of Precor te, Domine

Precor te, Domine Jesu Christe,
propter illam inaestimabilem caritatem
quando tu, rex caelestis, pendebas in cruce,
cum deifica caritate;

cum maestissima anima,
cum tristissimo dolore,
cum turbatis sensibus,
cum transfixo corde,
cum transverberato corpore;
cum sanguineis vulneribus,
cum expansis manibus,
cum extensis venis,
cum clamoroso ore,
cum rauca voce,
cum pallida facie,
cum mortali colore,
cum lacrimosis oculis,
cum gemebundo gutturo,
cum sitibundis desideriis,
cum amaro gustu felis,
cum inclinato capite,
cum divisione corporis et anime,
cum origine viventis fontis,
et in ea caritate,

precor te, amantissime Domine Jesu Christe,
qua tum amorosum cor tuum exstringebatur,

ut sis mihi placabilis super multitudinem peccatorum meorum,
bonum et sanctum finem,
nec non gloriosam beatamque resurrectionem,

propter misericordiam tuam mihi tribuere digneris.

Amen.

Main source:
P-Cug MM 32

Additional non-musical sources:
F-Pn Lat. 1175 (book of hours, use of Paris, 15th century), ff. 131r-132r;
F-Pn Lat. 1183 (book of hours, use of Paris, 1475-1500), ff. 151v-153r;
I-Vnm Lat. III, 69 (book of hours, Italy, 1488), apud BAROFFIO, Corpus Italicum Precum (see note 8);
P-Lcg M.A. 149 (book of hours, Ferrara, c.1506-7, known as ‘Offiziolo di Alfonso I d’Este’), cit. in BAROFFIO, Corpus Italicum Precum (see note 8).

Original spellings were not retained, even when they offer clear clues to Portuguese pronunciation of the Latin (as in ‘inextimabilem’, and ‘ressureitionem’ or ‘resureitionem’, and the irregular use of /ç/ [tz] in words like ‘façie’, ‘cruçe’, and ‘voçe’).

An English version by Leofranc Holford-Strevens is found in KREITNER, ‘Peñalosa, “Precor te”, and Us’ (see note 9), pp. 295-6.

E-Bbc M. 545, E-Te Cód. B. 21, and E-TZ Ms. 2/3 end with line 24.

1 ‘Precor te piissime’ > F-Pn Lat. 1175, F-Pn Lat. 1183, I-Vnm Lat. III, 69, P-Leg M.A. 149
2 ‘per’ > P-Leg M.A. 149
3 ‘eximiam’ > P-Leg M.A. 149; word omitted > F-Pn Lat. 1175, F-Pn Lat. 1183, I-Vnm Lat. III, 69
4 ‘qua tu’ > E-TZ Ms. 2/3, F-Pn Lat. 1175, F-Pn Lat. 1183, I-Vnm Lat. III, 69, P-Leg M.A. 149; ‘quam tu’ > E-Te Cód. B. 21; ‘quam cum’ > E-Bbc M. 454
5 ‘dum pendebas’ > F-Pn Lat. 1183
6 ‘claritate’ > F-Pn Lat. 1183
7 ‘mitissima anima’ > E-Te Cód. B. 21, E-TZ Ms. 2/3 (S and T parts), F-Pn Lat. 1175, F-Pn Lat. 1183; ‘amantissima anima’ > E-Bbc M. 454 (A and T parts); ‘anima santissima’ > E-Bbc M. 454 (B part)
8 ‘mitissimo’ > E-Bbc M. 454
9 ‘gustu’ > F-Pn Lat. 1175, I-Vnm Lat. III, 69, P-Leg M.A. 149; ‘gestu’ > F-Pn Lat. 1183, P-Cug MM 12; ‘gestu’ over erasure (original: ‘dolore’) > P-Cug MM 32
10 ‘conturbatis’ > I-Vnm Lat. III, 69, P-Cug MM 32 (S part; surely an error: P-Cug MM 12 has ‘cum turbatis’)

11 line 9 omitted in P-Cug MM 32 and P-Cug MM 12; ‘et transverterato corpore’ > E-Te Cód. B. 21
12 ‘nervis’ > I-Vnm Lat. III, 69
13 ‘corpor’ > F-Pn Lat. 1183
14 ‘amaroso’ > E-Bbc M. 454
15 ‘aceti et felis’ > P-Leg M.A. 149
16 ‘fontis viventis’ > F-Pn Lat. 1175, P-Cug MM 32 (S part); ‘viventis fons mea’ > E-Bbc M. 454; line 23: ‘cum emanatione sanguinis et aquae’ > I-Vnm Lat. III, 69
17 ‘in ea’ > F-Pn Lat. 1175, F-Pn Lat. 1183, P-Leg M.A. 149; ‘in eadem’ > I-Vnm Lat. III, 69; ‘et in’ > E-Te Cód. B. 21; ‘in’ > E-Bbc M. 454
18 ‘carne’ > F-Pn Lat. 1183
19 ‘deprecor te’ > I-Vnm Lat. III, 69
20 ‘qua amorosum cor tuum func’ > P-Leg M.A. 149; ‘qua tuum amorosum cor’ > F-Pn Lat. 1175, F-Pn Lat. 1183, I-Vnm Lat. III, 69
21 ‘astringebatur’ > I-Vnm Lat. III, 69, P-Leg M.A. 149; ‘stringebatur’ > F-Pn Lat. 1175; ‘constringebatur’ > F-Pn Lat. 1183
22 ‘nobis’ > I-Vnm Lat. III, 69
23 ‘nostrorum’ > I-Vnm Lat. III, 69
24 ‘et bonum’ > I-Vnm Lat. III, 69
25 ‘beatam et gloriosam’ > P-Leg M.A. 149; ‘gloriosam laetamque’ > I-Vnm Lat. III, 69
26 ‘inter ineffabilem’ > P-Leg M.A. 149
27 ‘tuan misericordiam’ > F-Pn Lat. 1183, I-Vnm Lat. III, 69, P-Cug MM 32 (A and B parts); ‘tuan magnam misericordiam’ > F-Pn Lat. 1175
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Appendix II

The date of manuscript P-Ln CIC 60

The following palaeographic and codicological evidence allow us to date the original layer of manuscript P-Ln CIC 60 to around 1570.

1) Roman round script (or Humanistic script) is used throughout the original layer of Lisbon 60. This type of script seems to have been consistently used in Portuguese music manuscripts not before the early or mid-1570s. The first known dated manuscript using Roman round script is P-Cug MM 3, copied in the most part probably by Francisco de Santa Maria in 1575. P-Cug MM 31, a fragmentary choirbook possibly copied in around that same year by the same scribe, also uses Roman round script. However, P-Cug MM 25, whose estimated date of copying is around 1575 or later, still uses semi-Roman script. The same applies to P-Cug MM 56, a passionarium datable to the 1570s.

Semi-Roman script has the general appearance of Humanistic script, but retains some characteristics of Gothic script such as the round /r/ after /o/, /p/ and /h/, and the preference for the upright /d/. Semi-Roman script appears along with late Gothic and more informal types of script, such as Italic cursive, in earlier manuscripts not intended for use at the lectern such as P-Cug MM 32.

The only presumably early choirbook using Roman round script in some parts is P-Cug MM 7. However, this is an extremely complex volume, made up of different fascicles from at least two originally distinct manuscripts, of which the terminus ante quem is not firmly established.

2) Similar, though not identical, watermarks to those in Lisbon 60 are dated 1557 (the watermark type described as ‘hand and star’), 1553 and 1570 (the ‘armillary sphere and star’ type) in the
These are also the two principal types of watermark in *P-Cug* MM 242, a manuscript in open-score format dated by Owen Rees to c.1565-c.1570. However, it should be stressed that, unless we find an exact match in a dated paper, the evidence of similitude in watermarks lacks precision and can only be used as a clue, even if often a valuable one.

3) The binding, which is certainly the original—since the whole volume was obviously made up before copying began and there are no signs of it having been rebound—is certainly datable to the third quarter, possibly the later half, of the 16th century, but not earlier than around 1560.

As Owen Rees rightly proposed, the original layer of Lisbon 60 was most probably copied by a Portuguese scribe, as a private anthology, from Coimbra-related sources, in the same orbit as the manuscripts from the Augustinian monastery of Santa Cruz. It was then possibly located in a Cistercian monastery early in its history, given the fact that the series of chants and texts added on ff. 55v-60r under the general heading ‘Ordo ad inumandum fratrem mortuum’ is taken from the Cistercian ritual. By the mid 1830s, the manuscript was in private hands and, if the person named on f. 1r, Joaquim Pessoa da Silva Arnaut, is accurately identified, it was probably in the vicinity of Coimbra. It should be noted that this Joaquim had a brother, António, who was abbot of the parish church of Santa Eulália in Arouca, thus providing a link to a Cistercian monastery. Contrary to Rees’s hypothesis of the origin of this manuscript in the monastery of São Vicente de Fora, it was apparently never in Lisbon until Manuel Ivo Cruz acquired it, a few years before he sold his private collection to the National Library of Portugal in 1971.

---


47. On this manuscript, see Rees, *Polyphony in Portugal* (see note 2), pp. 8, and 325-64. See also Filipe Mesquita de Oliveira, ‘A gênesis do teto para instrumentos de tecla no testemunho dos manuscritos *P-Cug* MM 48 e MM 242’ (PhD dissertation, Universidade de Évora, 2011), chapter 2.

48. See Maria Margarida Faria Ribeiro da Cunha de Castro Seixas, ‘A encadernação manuelina, a consagração de uma arte: Estudo das suas características e evolução, em bibliotecas públicas portuguesas’ (PhD dissertation, Universidad de Salamanca, 2011), pp. 284 and 474, where two early exemplars of similar bindings (classed as ‘Renaissance-type’) over prints dated 1554 and 1561, respectively, are presented; the binding over the copy of the print referred to in note 50 below is also of the same type.

49. Rees, ‘Manuscript Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional, CIC 60’ (see note 20), pp. 57-64.


52. To which I contributed by pointing out circumstantial evidence; see Rees, ‘Manuscript Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional, CIC 60’ (see note 20), pp. 62-3, and n. 28.
Appendix III
An edition of the three extant versions of *Passame por dios barquero*
ON THE TRANSMISSION OF IBERIAN POLYPHONIC MUSIC IN THE EARLY DECADES OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY
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