

Tarazona 5: A Reassessment

Kenneth Kreitner

University of Memphis
kkreitnr@memphis.edu

Resumo

O manuscrito Tarazona 5 desempenhou, por diversos motivos, um papel apenas marginal na compreensão da música sacra espanhola do Renascimento. Tal circunstância justifica uma reavaliação criteriosa. A fonte compõe-se de três secções. Duas delas, atribuídas à mesma caligrafia e produzidas em papel parcialmente comum, têm sido tradicionalmente datadas entre 1517 e 1521, período em que Juan García de Basurto, autor de um *Requiem* incluído no conjunto, exercia funções na catedral de Tarazona. A análise do restante do repertório, contudo, sugere uma data posterior, muito provavelmente nas décadas de 1530 ou 1540. A terceira secção apresenta data ainda mais tardia, situando-se entre as décadas de 1550 e 1560. A partir dessas datas e de um inventário actualizado, o artigo passa a considerar: o propósito original e o carácter de cada uma das três secções; as informações que elas oferecem acerca de dois inventários do século XVI pertencentes à biblioteca da catedral de Tarazona; a possibilidade de manuscritos perdidos que integrariam o mesmo projecto; as atribuições a Peñalosa, das quais apenas uma revela plausibilidade; e, por fim, o significado de uma polifonia sacra cuja utilidade, no período de sua execução, superava a imponente que possa transmitir aos ouvintes contemporâneos.

Palavras-chave

Tarazona; Peñalosa; Basurto; *Requiem*; Motete.

Abstract

The manuscript Tarazona 5 has had, for a number of reasons, only a minor role in our understanding of Spanish church music in the Renaissance. It deserves a reassessment. The source consists of three sections. Two are in the same hand and share some paper; these have traditionally been dated to 1517–21, when Juan García de Basurto, who contributed a *Requiem*, was serving at Tarazona cathedral. A look at the rest of the music, however, suggests a later date, almost certainly the 1530s or 1540s. The third part is later still, from the 1550s or 1560s. With these datings and an updated inventory as a basis, the article goes on to consider the original purpose and character of the three sections; the light they shed on two sixteenth-century inventories of the Tarazona cathedral library; the possibility of lost manuscripts that were part of the same project; the source's attributions to Peñalosa, only one of which proves to be at all plausible; and the significance of sacred polyphony that was more useful then than it may be imposing today.

Keywords

Tarazona; Peñalosa; Basurto; *Requiem*; Motet.

MANUSCRIPT 5 AT THE ARCHIVO CAPITULAR OF THE CATHEDRAL of Tarazona, in rural Aragón, is one of several substantial sources of Spanish sacred music from the early sixteenth century, but it has never managed to take a strong place in the history of that music. The two most important studies—Eleanor Russell’s essay of 1979 on its most conspicuous work, the Basurto Requiem,¹ and a valuable codicological and repertorial investigation in Jane Hardie’s dissertation of 1983²—are both quite a few years old now, and since then, there has not been so much interest paid to it, though Pedro Calahorra edited some of its contents in a collection for Polifonía Aragonesa in 1995³ and it has featured sporadically in the literature on Francisco de Peñalosa, for whom it has a number of unique attributions.⁴ Otherwise it seems to have remained largely in the shadow of its famous neighbor Tarazona 2/3.⁵

It does, however, give us a good deal of unique music, much of which is of especial interest because it is of modest scale and, in many cases, anonymous, thus providing a rare glimpse of musical life below the elite level we normally concentrate on. It is well worth a closer look. And perhaps the most urgent question at this point its dating—its place, or places (for it is a composite source) in the chronology of Spanish sacred polyphony: does this music belong with the Peñalosa generation, or is it closer to Morales’s time? Along the way, we can take a look at a few of its more interesting contents.

My inventory appears below as Appendix 1,⁶ and a few elements may need a bit of explanation. Item numbers are my own, and I hope self-explanatory. Folio numbers are taken from a modern pencil foliation along the bottom of the rectos, which has some problems, but fewer such than any of the several alternatives; it is the system used by most modern commentators.⁷ Then I have tracked composer

¹ Eleanor RUSSELL, ‘The “Missa in agendis mortuorum” of Juan García de Basurto: Johannes Ockeghem, Antoine Brumel, and an Early Spanish Polyphonic Requiem Mass’, *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis*, 29 (1979), pp. 1-37.

² Jane Morlet HARDIE, ‘The Motets of Francisco de Peñalosa and their Manuscript Sources’ (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1983), I: 52-75.

³ Pedro CALAHORRA, ed., *Autores hispanos de los siglos XV-XVI de los MS. 2 y 5 de la catedral de Tarazona*, Polifonía Aragonesa 9 (Zaragoza, Institución ‘Fernando el Católico’, 1995).

⁴ See below for details.

⁵ Tarazona 2/3 is the largest and central source for Spanish sacred music of the era of Ferdinand and Isabel; its trajectory through music history is well accounted for by Eva T. ESTEVE ROLDÁN, ‘Manuscrito musical 2/3 de la Catedral de Tarazona: Estudio historiográfico’, *Nassarre*, 22 (2006), pp. 131-72. See also Tess KNIGHTON and Kenneth KREITNER, *The Music of Juan de Anchieta* (Abingdon, Routledge, 2019), pp. 157-8 and its notes, and a number of essays in *The Anatomy of Iberian Polyphony around 1500*, edited by Esperanza RODRÍGUEZ-GARCÍA and João Pedro d’ALVARENGA, Iberian Early Music Studies 5 (Kassel, Reichenberger, 2021), especially RODRÍGUEZ-GARCÍA’s own, ‘Tarazona 2/3, Francisco de Peñalosa, and a Dis-Attributed Credo: New Light on the Origins of the Manuscript’, pp. 190-226.

⁶ For additional details, see Emilio ROS-FÁBREGAS, ‘E-TZ 05’, *Books of Hispanic Polyphony*, edited by Emilio Ros-Fábregas, available at <<https://hispanicpolyphony.eu/source/13444>> (dated 10 October 2021, accessed 24 November 2023).

⁷ On these various foliations, see HARDIE, ‘Motets of Francisco de Peñalosa’ (see note 2), I: 53-54. The pencil foliation has pages 11 and 11bis; it goes continuously, omitting numbers for, and thereby tending to conceal, folios now missing; and it is difficult,

attributions in four separate places: on the page as the manuscript stands today, in a tabla at the beginning, and in two sixteenth-century inventories of the cathedral's music collection transcribed and published by Calahorra in 1992.⁸ The earlier of these is undated, but probably from the late 1550s; the later is dated 29 May 1570.⁹ As the table shows, it is hard to know how much authority to give their details: they do not always agree and they are sometimes demonstrably wrong, but at least they are there. And even more tantalizing, the old inventories give detailed (if unreliable) evidence of a great many musical manuscripts and prints now lost from the cathedral library.

Manuscript 5 has three distinct sections. Part I (ff. 1-24) is evidently later than the others; Parts II (ff. 25-66) and III (ff. 67-94) were originally separate but seem, for reasons we shall return to, to share an origin story. None of the sections contains a date, and their emphasis on liturgical music, with nothing obviously attachable to a particular occasion, plus the sparsity of secure composer attributions, leaves us without much to go on chronologically. Let us consider Part I first.

Part I

Part I may not be a coherent section at all: Hardie, owing to the condition of the manuscript, could do no more than to separate it into two gatherings, and suspected it to be a collection of fascicle manuscripts bound together afterward.¹⁰ All commentators seem to agree that it is somewhat later than the other two parts—but how much later?

There is one piece of concrete, though not quite airtight, evidence about its date: this section appears in Calahorra's Inventory 2, so that it was there, and already attached to Parts II and III, by May of 1570. Its absence from Inventory 1, on the other hand, suggests (but again does not quite prove) that it was not

sometimes impossible, to see in the recent photographs. I am grateful for the help of María Elena Cuenca in getting this straightened out. Ros-Fábregas, in 'E-TZ 05', *Books of Hispanic Polyphony* (see note 6), suggests that the manuscript itself might easily be formally refoiled, with f. 11bis becoming f. 12 and all folio numbers being 1 more after that. This has not happened yet, however, and thus his inventory and mine use the current, often invisible, foliation.

⁸ Pedro CALAHORRA, 'Los fondos musicales en el siglo XVI de la Catedral de Tarazona: I. Inventarios', *Nassarre*, 8 (1992), pp. 9-56: he calls it Fuente n.º 11, items 280-321. Hereafter I shall abbreviate this article 'Inventarios'. ROS-FÁBREGAS, '16/3 (1552-1561)', *Books of Hispanic Polyphony*, available at <<https://hispanicpolyphony.eu/node/16447>> (dated 8 May 2021, accessed 24 November 2023), has corrected a few small errors in, and provided facsimiles of, Inventory 1.

⁹ CALAHORRA, 'Inventarios' (see note 8). The original of the 1570 inventory (Calahorra's Inventory 2) does not survive; it is known only as copied (with its date) into his Inventory 3, itself dated 1591. On the date of Inventory 1: Emilio ROS-FÁBREGAS, 'Manuscripts of Polyphony from the Time of Isabel and Ferdinand', in *Companion to Music in the Age of the Catholic Monarchs*, edited by Tess Knighton (Leiden, Brill, 2017), pp. 404-68 at pp. 449-51, has traced its watermarks to the 1550s, and I would add that Calahorra's Fuente 1, described in Inventory 1 as 'un libro nuevo con unas cubiertas negras con seis missas. Auctor Clemens non papa', and as 'un libro impresso' in Inventory 2, must be a binder's volume, since the masses of Clemens were published only one at a time, beginning in 1556. Not until 1557 were there enough of these to make a volume of six, and note that it is called 'new'. I am grateful to Thomas Schmidt for his insights here.

¹⁰ HARDIE, 'Motets of Francisco de Peñalosa' (see note 2), I: 55-56, 59-60, 68. For an update on some details of the paper, with color photos of the watermarks, see ROS-FÁBREGAS, 'E-TZ 05' (see note 6).

at Tarazona, and perhaps not yet in existence, in the fifties.¹¹ Its contents give precious little stylistic sense of its age. Most are anonymous settings of liturgical and/or Biblical texts—snippets from the Mass and Office for the Dead (nos. 1, 2, and 17), psalm verses (no. 11 and the three verses copied together in no. 12), a hymn, an *Et incarnatus*, and so forth. Particularly curious is a set of three short motets labeled as petitions for rain (nos. 9, 13, and 16) and derived from Old Testament verses.¹² And most of its contents are of small scale and pretension: of the twenty items whose lengths can be reliably estimated—counting mass movements and psalm verses separately¹³—half are under thirty bars and all but three are under fifty.

Its most substantial composition, an anonymous *Missa sine nomine*, has five folios missing, leaving the Kyrie and Credo incomplete and the Gloria absent altogether.¹⁴ It does appear to have been a unified mass: all the movements are in F with a flat, and the Kyrie, Sanctus, and Agnus (the opening of the Credo is gone) all begin with a rising F-major scale that could be interpreted as a head-motive; curiously, it changes scribes between the Credo and Sanctus. But it too is anonymous and by any standard modest, with a Kyrie of 24 bars, a Credo of 85 (perhaps about 100 if it were complete), a Sanctus of 54, and a one-section Agnus of 16—all much smaller than, for a convenient comparison, the six Peñalosa-era masses, all from Tarazona 2/3, in the first volume of *Monumentos de la Música Española*, whose average measure-counts come to around 80, 250, 125, and 60 for their respective movements.¹⁵

The only other work to take up more than one opening is the motet *Marta ut audivit*, also anonymous, 113 bars long, which tells the story of the raising of Lazarus, condensed and adapted from John 11. It breaks its text into small bits—sometimes very small indeed—and gives them distinct and contrasting musical treatments, as shown in Table 1.

¹¹ It is perhaps worth noting here that the inner portion of Tarazona 2/3, the part that was for a long time Tarazona 3, is also missing from Inventory 1 (nos. 223-49 in his system) and present in Inventory 2, though the outer portion is there in both, and clearly they originated together. See also ROS-FÁBREGAS, 'Manuscripts of Polyphonic Music', pp. 449-51, and RODRÍGUEZ-GARCÍA, 'Tarazona 2/3', pp. 196-7 (see notes 9 and 5).

¹² No. 9 is taken from I Kings 18, no. 13 from I Kings 8, and no. 16 (see below) from Psalm 146. Nos. 9 and 13 have thus far eluded my powers of transcription.

¹³ But omitting numbers 5, 6, and 10, which are small fragments of something longer.

¹⁴ An old arabic foliation shows the remains of the Kyrie on a f. 2v and the Credo resuming on f. 8r; probably the Gloria took up old ff. 3v-6r and the Credo began on the lost f. 6v. Probably the Gloria was removed from the manuscript for some other purpose, leaving the end of the Kyrie and beginning of the Credo as victims.

¹⁵ Higinio ANGLÉS, ed., *La música en la Corte de los Reyes Católicos, I: Polifonía religiosa*, Monumentos de la Música Española 1 (Barcelona, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1941, 1960²). These are the *Missae sine nomine* of Anchieta, Escobar, and Alba; Peñalosa's *Missae Ave Maria peregrina* and *Nunca fue pena mayor*; and the composite Marian mass partly by Anchieta and partly by Escobar. Alba's mass is a 3, all others a 4. My statistics include two masses with no Benedictus and one with two Hosannas; two of the masses (Escobar's and *Ave Maria*) have two Agnus sections, which were counted and averaged separately.

Latin	English	Music
Marta ut audivit quia venit Jesus,	Martha, as soon as she heard that Jesus	Imitative pair, AB.
occurit illi dicens:	had come, went to meet him, saying:	
Domine,	Lord,	Homophony a 4, syncopated.
Si fuisses hic, frater meus non	if thou hadst been here, my brother had	Imitation a 4, BAST.
fuisset mortuus.	not died.	
Dixit illi Jesus:	Jesus saith to her:	Semi-homophony, ATB.
Resurget frater tuus.	Thy brother shall rise again.	Homophony a 4, syncopated.
Marta respondit:	Martha saith to him:	Non-imitative, ABT.
Scio quia resurget in novissimo	I know that he shall rise again at the last	Semi-homophony a 4, STBA.
die.	day.	
Jesus at illam dixit:	Jesus said to her:	Imitative pair, AB.
Ego sum	I am	S alone.
Resurrectio et vita.	the resurrection and the life.	Imitative pair, TS.
Credis hoc?	Believest thou this?	Homophony, STB.
Etiam, Domine.	Yea, Lord.	A alone.
Ubi posuistis eum?	Where have you laid him?	Homophony, STB, syncopated.
Veni, Domine, et videte.	Come, Lord, and see.	A alone, joined by TB in homoph.
Lacrimatus est Jesus, dicens:	Jesus wept, saying:	Semi-homophony a 4.
Lazare, Lazare, exi foras.	Lazarus, Lazarus, come forth.	Homophony a 4, syncopated.
Et continuo surrexit a	And then he rose from the tomb. ¹⁶	Imitation a 4, BAST.
monumento.		

Table 1. *Marta ut audivit*: Translation and Musical Treatment

The result (see its first page in Example 1) is quite a dramatic treatment of a text with a good deal of drama and dialogue of its own, much in the manner of other Gospel-related (and in some cases also miracle-related) motets of the Peñalosa era like Escobar's *Clamabat autem*, Peñalosa's *Transeunte Domino*, and the anonymous *Fatigatus Jesus*.¹⁷ I have no trouble seeing *Marta ut audivit* as coming from that earlier generation or being written in later imitation of it.

¹⁶ The translation is mine, borrowing freely from the Douay-Rheims Bible. The motet has not, to my knowledge, been published in a modern edition.

¹⁷ On *Clamabat autem* and *Fatigatus Jesus*, see especially Owen REES, *Polyphony in Portugal, c. 1530-c. 1620: Sources from the Monastery of Santa Cruz, Coimbra* (New York, Garland, 1995), pp. 52-77, with editions of both; Rees attributes *Fatigatus* to either Escobar himself or a clever imitator. The classic discussion of *Transeunte Domino* is HARDIE's in 'Motets of Francisco

The image displays a musical score for a vocal piece, likely a Mass, by Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina. The score is written for four parts: Soprano, Alto, Tenor, and Basso Continuo. The music is in G major (one sharp) and 4/4 time. The lyrics are in Latin, and the score includes a basso continuo line with figured bass notation (8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, ♯, ♭, etc.).

The lyrics are:

Mar - ta ut au-di - vit qui - a ve-nit Je - sus, o -
 Mar - ta ut au-di - vit qui - a ve-nit Je - sus, o - ccu-rit il -
 Do -
 ccu-rit il - li di - cens, o - ccu-rit il - li di - cens: Do -
 Do -
 li di - cens, o - ccu-rit il - li di - cens: Do -
 - mi - ne, si fu - i - sses hic, fra - ter me - us,
 - mi - ne, si fu - i - sses hic, fra - ter me - us, fra -
 - mi - ne, si fu - i - sses hic, fra - ter me - us, fra - ter me - us

Example 1. Anonymous, *Marta ut audivit*, bb. 1-28

de Peñalosa' (see note 2), I: 234-5; her edition, one of several available, is in the same dissertation, II: 443-53. All three motets, like *Marta ut audivit*, are essentially condensations and adaptations of texts, all with dialogue, from the Gospels.

This leaves us with the two attributions. One of these, written at the top of number 11, a setting of the psalm verse *Ad te levavi*, is to a Rubio who cannot currently be identified and whose surname is and was a common one. And the other, on number 15, an *Et incarnatus est*, is to Melchor Robledo, a composer with strong Aragonese connections and well represented in Aragonese sources. In fact, this *Et incarnatus* appears to have been one of his most popular and long-lived compositions: it is found, anonymously, in three Aragonese manuscripts from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.¹⁸

Unfortunately for our purposes, Robledo is solidly documented for only the last twenty years of his life: from 1566 to 1569 at Tarragona and from 1569 to his death in 1586 at Zaragoza, only about 100 km from Tarazona—which seems tempting, but 1569 is worryingly close to our *terminus ante quem* of 1570: more likely these pages were in Aragón before the composer's arrival in person.¹⁹

On the whole, then, it is hard to be precise about the original compilation—or compilations, if indeed it represents a series of fascicle manuscripts—of Part I, but the time between the inventories, say the late 1550s or 1560s, seems a reasonable estimate.

Parts II and III

Parts II and III of Tarazona 5 are, aside from a few later additions, in the same hand and they share some of the same paper,²⁰ suggesting that they originated together. They were, however, conceived separately: Part II has its own roman-numeral foliation from 1 to 39, and Part III has a smaller roman foliation that begins at 36. Clearly Part III is incomplete, and probably Part II as well. They appear as one volume in Calahorra's Inventory 1, showing that they were in existence and already together in the library by the late 1550s.

Incomplete as the one may be and the other definitely is, Parts II and III show signs that they were created for more or less specialized purposes. Part II, at least as we have it, consists mostly of Magnificats

¹⁸ It is published in Pedro CALAHORRA, ed., *Melchor Robledo (†1586): Opera polyphonica I: Misas—Pasiones—Motetes* (Zaragoza, Institución 'Fernando el Católico', 1986), pp. 178-80, notes pp. 31-2. According to Calahorra, the other sources are Alquezar I (17th-18th c.), Calatayud 2 and Calatayud [s.s.] (both 18th), and Daroca 1 (17th). On the special use of the *Et incarnatus* in Spanish and colonial churches of the sixteenth-century—it was usually the only part of the Credo done in polyphony during Advent and Lent—see for example Robert J. SNOW, ed., *A New-World Collection of Polyphony for Holy Week and the Salve Service*, Monuments of Renaissance Music 9 (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1996), p. 29.

¹⁹ Luis Antonio GONZÁLES MARÍN and Maria Carmen MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA, 'Robledo, Melchor', *Grove Music Online* (2001). Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.23605>; see also Pedro CALAHORRA MARTÍNEZ, 'El polifonista Melchor Robledo y su obra', *Anuario Musical*, 31-32 (1976-7), pp. 3-35. As the *Grove* article explains, a number of earlier references to musicians named Robledo, including at Zaragoza, are impossible to attach to Melchor for sure, and one to an earlier period in Tarragona has been impossible to verify.

²⁰ According to HARDIE, 'Motets of Francisco de Peñalosa' (see note 2), I: 54-67, her watermarks 1, 2, and 3 are exclusively in Part I; watermark 4 accounts for all of Part II and a few folios of III, and watermarks 5 and 6 are exclusively in Part III—which suggests that Part III was copied shortly after Part II, using some remaining paper stock. See also ROS-FÁBREGAS, 'E-TZ 05' (see note 6).

and music—a processional hymn,²¹ a setting of the Kyries tenebrarum,²² and a Lamentation—for Holy Week. Its final work, the motet *Beatus es et bene*, in honor of Saint Sebastian, is an outlier, and we shall come back to it. Its four Magnificats are all ascribed to known or presumed Spaniards: three to Pedro de Pastrana (†1563), an important composer who spent most of his career in Valencia, notably at the court of Fernando, Duke of Calabria,²³ and one to a Gómez, otherwise unidentified.²⁴ As we shall see, one of these is surely, and significantly, misattributed. They are followed by a Lamentation, now anonymous on the page, but given in both old inventories to a ‘Monton’, who elsewhere in the inventories must be Jean Mouton,²⁵ though Mouton has no secure Lamentations today.

The centerpiece of Part III is the Basurto Requiem, so called because it is attributed at its beginning to Juan García de Basurto (†1547). As Eleanor Russell has shown, however, it is not all by Basurto himself: there are two settings of *Sicut cervus*, one attributed on the page to Pastrana and the other in the inventories to Peñalosa though it is actually by Ockeghem; the communion, given to Josquin in Inventory 1, is actually from Brumel’s Requiem, first published in 1516. Moreover, the markedly simpler style of the Sanctus and Agnus led Russell, and I agree, to suspect that they were taken from elsewhere as well.²⁶ What we have, then, is a collage, somewhat in the tradition of Spanish composite masses as seen in

²¹ On *Gloria laus et honor*, see below.

²² The anonymous Kyrie ... *Qui expansis* is published in Dionisio PRECIADO, ed., *Francisco de Peñalosa (ca. 1470-1528): Opera Omnia vol. III: Himnos, Lamentaciones ‘et Alia’* (Madrid, Alpuerto, 1997), pp. 171-88 (notes pp. 53-9) in the belief, which I do not share, that the tabla to Tarazona 5 portrays *Gloria laus* and this series as ‘un grupo pasionario, cuyo autor es Peñalosa’ (p. 53). See also Kenneth KREITNER, *The Church Music of Fifteenth-Century Spain* (Woodbridge, Boydell, 2004), pp. 34-41, 88-91, and 129; Preciado’s notes; Jane Morlet HARDIE, ‘Kyries tenebrarum in Sixteenth-Century Spain’, *Nassarre*, 4 (1988) pp. 161-94; and João Pedro d’ALVARENGA, ‘Textual and Chant Traditions of the Kyries tenebrarum in Portugal, and Polyphony around 1500’, *Revista Portuguesa de Musicologia*, 6 (2019), pp. 91-112.

²³ Maricarmen GÓMEZ MUNTANÉ, ed., *Pedro de Pastrana (c. 1495-1563): Antología polifónica* (Valencia, Institut Valencià de Cultura, 2019); see also Bernadette NELSON, ‘The Court of Don Fernando de Aragón, Duke of Calabria in Valencia, c. 1526-c. 1550: Music, Letters and the Meeting of Cultures’, *Early Music*, 32 (2004), pp. 194-224, and more recently Francesc VILLANUEVA SERRANO, ‘Pastrana, Cárceres, Cepa’, *Revista de Musicología*, 44 (2021), pp. 491-530.

²⁴ GÓMEZ, in *Pastrana: Antología polifónica* (see note 21), p. 30, suggests Gonzalo Gómez de Portillo, master of the choirboys at Palencia cathedral, but the name is a common one.

²⁵ For two examples, CALAHORRA’s (‘Inventarios,’ see note 8) number 90, Mouton’s famous motet *Queramus cum pastoribus*, and number 465, a *Missa Dictem moi tonten*, i.e. *Dictes moy toutes*.

²⁶ RUSSELL, “‘Missa in agendis’” (see note 1), which includes (pp. 28-37) some transcriptions, has been further fleshed out in George Grayson WAGSTAFF, ‘Music for the Dead: Polyphonic Settings of the *Officium* and *Missa pro defunctis* by Spanish and Latin American Composers before 1630’ (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1995), especially pp. 229-50, and Cristina URCHUEGUA, *Mehrstimmige Messe im Goldenen Jahrhundert* (Tutzing, Schneider, 2003), pp. 167-8. Russell’s article is the source for most of the current understanding of Basurto’s career. On Ockeghem’s contribution, see also Jaap van BENTHEM, ed., *Johannes Ockeghem: Masses and Mass Sections, I, fasc. 4* (Amsterdam, Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 2005), pp. 13 and 32, notes pp. x-xii and xiv. On Brumel’s, see also Barton HUDSON, ed., *Antonii Brumel: Opera Omnia, v. IV, Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae 5* (n.p., American Institute of Musicology, 1970), pp. 78-79, notes p. xvi. The Brumel Requiem was first published by Antico in *Missarum diversorum authorum liber secundus* (RISM 1516¹).

Tarazona 2/3 and Barcelona 454;²⁷ and it is not hard to imagine a practical reason, say in the Spanish summer, why one might need to cobble a polyphonic Requiem together in a hurry and borrow movements where one can find them.²⁸

The Requiem is followed by three responsories from the Matins for the Dead, two of them quite long-lived and famous.²⁹ And these in turn are followed by half a dozen works, most of them short and given to Pastrana or Basurto, of a penitential and/or Passion-related nature; the most prominent of these is Anchieta's great Passion motet *Domine Jesu Christe qui hora*, from the 1490s, here misattributed to Peñalosa.³⁰

What the rest of this source was originally like, we do not know; since it starts on a folio 36, evidently much is missing. The Requiem is preceded (aside from some later additions) by two Kyries, both anonymous but given in the sixteenth-century inventories to Peñalosa and a mysterious Montes, and the penitential/Passion group is, or was, followed by similarly modest liturgical music: a pair of *Benedicamus Domino* settings (one anonymous, one by Pastrana, plus a later addition by Rivafrecha), a ferial mass attributed to Peñalosa and missing its last page, and an *Et incarnatus*, also given to Peñalosa but now lost.³¹

The prominence of Basurto in Part III is especially intriguing because Basurto himself served as *maestro de coro* in Tarazona cathedral from 1517 to 1521, moving to nearby Zaragoza briefly in 1521.³² It was this propinquity that led Jane Hardie to suggest that Part III, and by extension part II, were copied, or at least their contents assembled, locally during that period.³³ It is an attractive idea and, if correct, would place most of Tarazona 5 within the later lives of Peñalosa, Anchieta, and their contemporaries. I am inclined, however, to think these two sections have to be somewhat later, for two main reasons, one stylistic and one source-related.

²⁷ Kenneth KREITNER, 'Spain Discovers the Mass', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 139 (2014), pp. 261-302, at pp. 264-9.

²⁸ For a possibly comparable case involving a much more famous piece (and in winter), see Owen REES, *The Requiem of Tomás Luis de Victoria (1603)* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2019), pp. 56-9; further on the contexts for polyphonic Requiems around this time, see Tess KNIGHTON, 'Music for the Dead: An Early Sixteenth-Century Anonymous Requiem Mass', in *Pure Gold: Golden Age Sacred Music in the Iberian World: A Homage to Bruno Turner*, edited by Tess Knighton and Bernadette Nelson, DeMusica 15 (Kassel, Reichenberger, 2011), pp. 262-88, especially 280-8.

²⁹ On Anchieta's *Libera me* and Torre's *Ne recorderis*, see especially WAGSTAFF, 'Music for the Dead' (see note 26), ch. 4; and since then KREITNER, *Church Music* (see note 22), pp. 122-3 and 145-9, and KNIGHTON and KREITNER, *Music of Juan de Anchieta* (see note 5), pp. 72-4.

³⁰ *Domine Jesu Christe qui hora* is attributed in three other, normally trustworthy sources to Anchieta; see KNIGHTON and KREITNER, *Music of Juan de Anchieta* (see note 5), pp. 88-91 and 103 n. 26, where we speculate that the misattribution here may be due to confusion with Peñalosa's *Domine Jesu Christe qui neminem*. Most of the others in this group are published in Calahorra, *Autores hispanos*, and all the works by Pastrana are published in GÓMEZ, *Pastrana: Antología polifónica* (see note 21).

³¹ On Pastrana's *Benedicamus Domino*, see CALAHORRA, *Autores hispanos* (see note 3), and GÓMEZ, *Pastrana: Antología polifónica* (see note 21). On the Peñalosa attributions, see below.

³² RUSSELL, "'Missa in agendis'" (see note 1), pp. 1-3.

³³ HARDIE, 'Motets of Francisco de Peñalosa' (see note 2), I: 73-4.

23 rit, be - a - tus es et be - ne ti - bi e - rit e - gre - gi - e mar

be - a - tus es et be - ne ti - bi e - rit e - gre - gi - e mar - - -

rit, et be - - - ne ti - bi, et be - ne ti - bi e - - - rit e - gre - gi - e mar

8 tus es et be - ne ti - bi e - rit, e - - - rit, et be - ne ti - bi e - rit e - gre - gi - e, e -

be - ne ti - bi e - rit, et be - ne ti - bi e - rit, e - - - rit e - gre - gi - e

34 tir Se - ba - sti - a - ne qui - acumsanctis gau - de - - bis, gau -

tir Se - ba - sti - a - - - ne, Se - ba - sti - a - - - ne qui - a cum

- - - tir Se - ba - sti - a - - - ne qui - a cum san - - - ctis gau - - -

8 gre - gi - e mar - tir Se - ba - sti - a - ne qui - acumsan - ctis gau - - -

mar - tir Se - ba - sti - a - ne, Se - ba - sti - a - ne qui - a cum san - ctis gau -

Example 2. Yñiguez?, *Beatus es et bene*, bb. 1-44

My other reason concerns number 23 in my inventory, a Magnificat here attributed, along with two others, to Pedro de Pastrana. In four Italian sources, however, it is attributed to Jacquet of Mantua.³⁵ The earliest of these is Bologna R 142, probably from the 1530s or 1540s,³⁶ and it is followed by a Scotto

³⁵ Winfried KIRSCH, *Die Quellen der mehrstimmigen Magnificat- und Te Deum-Vertonungen bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Tutzing, Schneider, 1966), p. 340 (no. 838), and GÓMEZ, *Pastrana: Antología polifónica* (see note 21), pp. 30-1.

³⁶ Bonnie J. BLACKBURN, 'Josquin's Chansons: Ignored and Lost Sources', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 29 (1976), pp. 30-76, at p. 52.

print from 1554 and a Gardano print from 1562.³⁷ This on the face of it would seem to tip the balance in favor of Jacquet, but there is also a smoking gun—the Italian sources all have a 5-ex-4 canon in the tenor that is not indicated in Tarazona 5.³⁸ Surely this is the work of Jacquet, preserved here both corrupt and under the wrong name; no source for any of his Magnificats predates 1530, and I doubt very much that this piece does either. Now neither of these arguments constitutes ironclad proof in itself, and much awaits a thorough paper study; it remains possible that despite their uniformity of hands and continuity of foliations, Parts II and III were copied over a long period and/or reshuffled over the years.³⁹ But all things considered, I suggest a date for the completion of Parts II and III between 1530 and the early 1550s more than the late teens and early twenties.

The provenance of Parts II and III remains debatable. Russell, principally on biographical grounds, suggested that these portions of the manuscript originated in Palencia or with the imperial court;⁴⁰ Hardie, a few years later, overlaid liturgical considerations onto this, observing that the polyphony of both sections adheres to the Toledan reforms of Cisneros earlier in the century, which Tarazona cathedral had adopted, and suggested Tarazona as a likely place of copying.⁴¹ And more recently Bernadette Nelson has pointed out the strong connections between the contents of Tarazona 5 and the lost sources and the court of Fernando of Aragón, Duke of Calabria, Pastrana's principal employer, in Valencia, and suggested Pastrana himself as a conduit—an observation that becomes more intriguing now that we know one Magnificat given here to Pastrana is in fact by Jacquet, who, though he never worked in Valencia, did write a *Missa Ferdinandus dux Calabriae* in Ferdinand's honor around 1535.⁴²

But for now, it is the chronology and not the geography that is of the greatest interest. And the new chronology puts us in a position to consider some of its implications for understanding this manuscript and its music.

³⁷ The Scotto print is *I sacri et santi Salmi di David profeta...* (RISM 1554¹⁷); the Gardano is *Magnificat omnitonum cum quatuor vocibus Christophori Moralis hispani aliorumque excellentium virorum...* (RISM 1562¹). It is also in the eighteenth-century manuscript Loreto 46, which obviously has no bearing on our chronological question.

³⁸ Bologna R 142 and 1554¹⁷ have a verbal canon and signum; 1562¹ has a verbal canon and *resolutio*, but no signum; I have not seen Loreto 46. My thanks to Sarah Catanzaro for tracking some of these down for me at the University of Illinois.

³⁹ I am grateful to Emilio Ros-Fábregas for this cautionary suggestion.

⁴⁰ RUSSELL, “‘Missa in agendis’” (see note 1), pp. 12-6.

⁴¹ HARDIE, ‘Motets of Francisco de Peñalosa’ (see note 2), I: 69-75. RUSSELL (“‘Missa in agendis’”, see note 1, p. 15) noted the Cisneros connection with regard to the Requiem; Hardie extended it persuasively to other works in both sections. Grayson WAGSTAFF, in an email of June 3, 2020, observes that the Brumel communion does not correspond to the chant in use in Tarazona, casting doubt that the Requiem was copied or sung there.

⁴² NELSON, ‘Court of Don Fernando’ (see note 23), p. 197; George NUGENT, ‘Jacquet’s Tributes to the Neapolitan Aragonese’, *Journal of Musicology*, 6 (1988), pp. 198-203.

Peñalosa

Jane Hardie was the first to express a possible date for any portion of Tarazona 5 in terms of specific years, and her estimate of 1517-21 for Parts II and III, unchallenged so far as I know in the years since, has gradually and reasonably taken root as the standard.⁴³ This was in fact what drew me to this manuscript in the first place: it looked like an under-harvested source for Spanish church music copied during the lifetimes of Anchieta, Peñalosa, Escobar, et al. My suggested adjustment of those dates would throw these sections into the next generation of Spanish musicians, the one we tend to associate above all with Morales. That is a disappointment for my original plan, but if I am right that Parts II and III are from somewhere between the 'thirties and the mid-'fifties, this puts a new perspective on some old questions—perhaps most conspicuously, Tarazona 5's place in the canon of works by Peñalosa (†1528) himself.

Parts II and III and the old inventories thereof have a substantial number of attributions to Peñalosa, not a single one of them attested elsewhere. They may be conveniently expressed in a table:

Number	Title	Summary
19	<i>Gloria laus et honor</i>	Peñalosa on page, in tabla, in both inventories; unicum.
29	<i>Kyrie</i>	Peñalosa in both inventories only; unicum.
31e	<i>Sicut cervus</i> (a 2)	Peñalosa in both inventories, but by Ockeghem.
36	<i>Domine Jesu Christe qui hora</i>	Peñalosa on page, in tabla, in both inventories, but surely by Anchieta.
44	<i>Missa de feria</i>	Peñalosa in tabla, in both inventories, ambiguously on page; damaged; unicum.
45	<i>Et incarnatus est</i>	Peñalosa in both inventories only; lost.

Table 2. Peñalosa attributions

⁴³ For example, it is repeated without comment by Cristina URCHUEGUÍA in *Mehrstimmige Messe im Goldenen Jahrhundert* (see note 26), p. 83, and Cristina URCHUEGUÍA, *Mehrstimmige Messen in Quellen aus Spanien, Portugal und Lateinamerika: ca. 1490-1630: Drucke, Handschriften und verlorene Quellen*, RISM B xv (Munich, Henle, 2005), pp. 169-71.

To summarize further: Peñalosa's name appears, somewhere, on six of the items in the manuscript. One of these is certainly wrong, one all but certainly wrong, one now missing altogether.⁴⁴

Of the three remaining, *Gloria laus et honor* has the most convincing attribution: it is given to Peñalosa in large, contemporary letters on the page, and his name is in the tabla and both inventories.⁴⁵ *Gloria laus* is a processional hymn consisting of a refrain and a series of verses, sung in alternation by two different groups on either side of the closed church door just before the mass on Palm Sunday.⁴⁶ The tune in the *Passionarium toletanum* of 1516 is nearly identical to that in the *Liber*, though its rubric in the *Passionarium* specifies that it is to be sung by boys.⁴⁷

The setting in Tarazona 5 gives both the refrain, 'Gloria laus' etc., and the first verse, 'Israel es tu rex' etc., plus the words to the second verse. It is in four voices, both sections in mezzo-alto-tenor-bass clefs; the chant tune is lightly paraphrased, but with conspicuous breves, in the superius for 'Gloria laus' and the tenor for 'Israel es tu rex', so that the two sections have an audibly distinct sound, possibly meant to emphasize the importance of the *pueri* in the refrain. As the first page (Example 3) shows, it is denser than Peñalosa's usual run, but has the same kind of contrast of broad homophony (e.g. at the beginning), quick declamatory homophony (starting in b. 27), and imitative polyphony (starting in b. 17) that characterizes his sacred music. It does not ring forth to my ear as obviously by Peñalosa in the way that, for example, his unique motets in Toledo 21 do, but it is certainly a work of art, and its unusually (for Peñalosa) thick sound might be seen as a function of its dignified and dramatic occasion. It may indeed be his—but again, we have seen no true attribution to Peñalosa and two false ones already.

⁴⁴ I do not include no. 20, the *Kyries tenebrarum* setting given to Peñalosa by Preciado in the *Opera Omnia* but not by anyone in the sixteenth century; see note 22 above. It is at least possible that the lost *Et incarnatus est* was from one of his surviving masses; for a precedent, the *Et incarnatus* from Josquin's *Missa sine nomine* was copied by itself c. 1500 in Toledo in a manuscript now known as the Rosary Cantoral: see Lorenzo CANDELARIA, *The Rosary Cantoral: Ritual and Social Design in a Chantbook from Early Renaissance Toledo* (Rochester, University of Rochester Press, 2008), pp. 103-8. The classic exploration of the Peñalosa worklist remains Tess KNIGHTON, 'Francisco de Peñalosa: New Works Lost and Found', in *Encomium Musicae: Essays in Memory of Robert J. Snow*, edited by David Crawford and Grayson Wagstaff (Hillsdale, NY, Pendragon, 2002), pp. 231-52.

⁴⁵ It is published in PRECIADO, *Peñalosa: Opera Omnia III: Himnos* (see note 22), pp. 87-96 (notes pp. 28-30); see also James G. LAMAR, 'Peñalosa Dubia and Spuria' (M.M. thesis, University of Memphis, 2000), pp. 25-6, 58-63.

⁴⁶ *Liber usualis*, pp. 588-9; on the Hispanic practice, see SNOW, *New-World Collection* (see note 18), pp. 28-9. On the importance of refrains in processional hymns generally and *Gloria laus* in particular, see for example Ruth ELLIS MESSENGER, 'Medieval Processional Hymns before 1100', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 80 (1949), pp. 375-92; and Ruth ELLIS MESSENGER, 'Processional Hymnody in the Later Middle Ages', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 81 (1950), pp. 185-99.

⁴⁷ *Passionarium toletanum* (Alcalá de Henares, Arnaldo Guillén de Brocar, 1516). The book is unpaginated; *Gloria laus* is found on the fourth- and third-to-last printed pages, as downloaded at <<http://bdh.bne.es/bnearch/detalle/bdh0000057698>> (accessed 24 November 2023). The rubric: 'Dominica in ramis palmarum finita processione dicitur a pueris intra ianuam ecclesie hunc versum. Scilicet.'

Glo - ri - a, laus, et ho - nor, ti - bi

ti - bi sit, ti - bi sit, Rex Chri - ste Re - dem - ptor:

ptor: Cu - i, cu - i pu - e ri - le, pu - e ri - le, pu -

Example 3. Peñalosa?, *Gloria laus et honor*, bb. 1-36

The last piece in the manuscript—again, there was one more, now lost—is a Kyrie-Sanctus-Agnus ferial mass attributed to Peñalosa in the tabla and the old inventories, and on the page, at least after a fashion. At the top of f. 93v, above the superius of the Kyrie, is the word *Feriales* in the large ornate hand

used for other headings, plus the name Peñalosa in a smaller and apparently later cursive hand—one quite similar to that of the tabla, raising suspicion that the scribe of the tabla made this contribution, for good or ill, in both places. It is missing its last page, and with it the alto and bass of the Benedictus and Agnus. Example 4 below shows the Kyrie and the beginning of the Sanctus.

The musical score is presented in three systems, each with four staves (Soprano, Alto, Tenor, Bass). The lyrics are in Latin, and the notation includes various musical symbols such as clefs, notes, rests, and bar lines. The first system covers measures 1-10, the second system covers measures 11-21, and the third system covers measures 22-32. The lyrics for the first system are: Ky - ri - e e - - - lei - son. Chri - ste. The lyrics for the second system are: e - - - lei - son. Ky - ri - e e - - - . The lyrics for the third system are: lei - son. San - ctus, san - ctus san - ctus. The score includes several annotations: 'ms. D' above the first system, 'ms. damaged' above the third system, and '8' above the Alto and Tenor staves in the first and second systems.

Example 4. attr. Peñalosa, *Missa ferialis*, bb. 1-32

Ky - ri - e e - le - - - i - son. Ky - ri - e e - - le - - -

Ky - ri - e e - lei - son. Ky - ri - e e - - le - i -

Ky - ri - e e - - - lei - son. Ky - ri - e e - le - - -

Ky - ri - e e - - - lei - son. Ky - ri - e e - le - - -

13 i - son. Chri - ste e - le - i - - - - son. Ky - ri - e e - le -

son. Chri - ste e - le - i - - - - son. Ky - ri - e e - le -

i - son. Chri - ste e - - - le - - - i - son. Ky - ri - e e - le -

i - son. Chri - ste e - - - le - - - i - son. Ky - ri - e e - le -

25 - - - i - son. Ky - ri - e e - le - - - i - son.

i - son. Ky - ri - e e - le - - - i - son.

i - son. Ky - ri - e e - le - - - i - son.

- i - son. Ky - ri - e e - le - - - i - son.

Example 5. attr. Peñalosa, *Kyrie*, entire

María Elena Cuenca recently edited this work in her doctoral dissertation, and she has expressed toward the attribution a certain skepticism, which I share.⁴⁸ The piece puts its modest little *cantus firmus*—the same tunes, movement by movement, that are used in the anonymous ferial mass in the *Cancionero de la Colombina*⁴⁹—into the superius in breves and simply harmonizes them in the voices below, mostly also in breves, much more plain and stark even than the *Colombina* mass, which is probably from the 1490s. Peñalosa left his name on nothing remotely like this, and I do not think it belongs here.⁵⁰

And finally, the Kyrie at number 29 in my inventory (Example 5) is given to Peñalosa only in the sixteenth-century inventories. Like the *Missa de feria*, it is about as far from Peñalosa's sacred style as can be imagined, and again I think the attribution is no more than a mistaken scribal initiative.⁵¹

In sum: of the six works given to Peñalosa by Tarazona 5's scribe or its inventory-takers, one is lost and two are reliably attributed to others. Of the three that are uncontested, one is problematic and two are all but impossible to associate with this most playful, inventive, and dramatic of composers. But whether Tarazona 5 adds anything to his worklist or not, it is a testimony to his place in Spanish musicians' sense of their history: clearly, in the decades after his death in 1528, Peñalosa's name retained, indeed may have enhanced, its marquee value. To the musicians associated with Tarazona 5 in the sixteenth century, Peñalosa seems to have become a symbol of a respected, even if incompletely understood, recent past.

A Project?

A second thought: if Parts II and III of Tarazona 5 share their main scribe and some of their paper,⁵² then they must have been copied as part of a project of some sort. And if they were part of a project, whether there at Tarazona, or in Valencia, or wherever, were there any other products of this project in the Tarazona cathedral library? As it happens, we have a considerable amount of evidence on this question: the thirty or so musical sources inventoried there in the 1550s.

⁴⁸ María Elena CUENCA RODRÍGUEZ, 'Francisco de Peñalosa (ca. 1470-1528) y las misas en sus distintos contextos' (Ph.D. dissertation, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 2017), II: 403-6, commentary I: 358-60. See also LAMAR, 'Peñalosa Dubia and Spuria' (see note 45), pp. 15-6, 52-3.

⁴⁹ The standard edition is Miguel Querol GAVALDÁ, ed., *Cancionero Musical de la Colombina*, Monumentos de la Música Española 33 (Barcelona, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1971), pp. 55-7, nos. 45, 47, 46 (Querol did not treat it as a coherent mass). See also KREITNER, *Church Music* (see note 22), pp. 48-9, and KREITNER, 'Spain Discovers the Mass' (see note 27), pp. 269-72. On the Hispanic tradition of the ferial mass later, see also SNOW, *New-World Collection* (see note 18), 29-34.

⁵⁰ CUENCA, in 'Peñalosa y las misas' (see note 48), I: 359-60, suggests that it may have been meant as a sort of lead sheet (my term, not hers) over which trained singers might have improvised—an intriguing thought, but outside my brief here.

⁵¹ See LAMAR, 'Peñalosa Dubia and Spuria' (see note 45), pp. 14, 50-1.

⁵² See above, note 20.

This is a risky business at best, and the situation is not good: as we have seen, the inventories can be mystifying even when we still have the source they are recording, and we might reasonably expect their record of lost sources to be likewise unreliable.⁵³ But with due caution, a number of manuscripts in the list seem suggestively similar to Parts II and III. Table 3 shows my count of two sources that had substantial numbers of works by ‘our’ composers in them, both the major figures like Pastrana and Basurto and the minor ones like Montes, and like Parts II and III, each appears to have a kind of theme: Fuente 3 is dominated by motets and Fuente 4 features groups of hymns, Lamentations, and Marian music.⁵⁴

a. Composers in Fuente N.º 3 (items 3-54)

Composer(s)	Works
Pastrana	13
Basurto	8
Morales	6
Josquin, Vargas	3 each
Gombert, Laurus, Lupus, Mastre Joan, Verdelot	2 each
Bauldewyn, Cepa, Esquinas, Jacquet, Lheritier?, Peñalosa, Silva	1 each

b. Composers in Fuente N.º 4 (items 55-97)

Composer(s)	Works
Pastrana	15
Josquin, Morales	5
Monton	4
Montes	3
Basurto, Silva	2 each
Carceres, Févin, Jacquet, Laurus, Peñalosa, Ribafrecha, Richafort	1 each

Table 3. Two Other Manuscripts in This Project? Calahorra, ‘Inventarios’, *Nassarre* 8 (1992), pp. [15-9]

⁵³ They do somewhat better for Tarazona 2 and 3 (already apparently separate), though the earlier one misses all the hymns but one at the beginning, and omits the middle section, later Tarazona 3; see CALAHORRA, ‘Inventarios’ (see note 8), pp. [20-4] and ROS-FÁBREGAS, ‘Manuscripts of Polyphony’ (see note 9), p. 449 for details. Neither Russell nor Hardie, incidentally, had access to the sixteenth-century inventories, which were not published until 1992.

⁵⁴ The table omits two works in Fuente 3 by the Tarazona chapelmaster Juan Arnalte because they are omitted from Inventory 1 and thus likely later additions. One of the anonymous reviewers for this journal has suggested Fuente 14, which names many of the same composers, as another prospect.

Again we see a mixture of Spanish and foreign composers, and of the Josquin/Peñalosa generation and the Morales/Richafort generation, some of it from publications of the 1530s and 1540s.⁵⁵ And there may, of course, be more: the Tarazona inventories, however frustrating they can be, have by no means yielded up all their treasure.

Useful Music

Finally, a word in praise of useful music, which can have a long active life in sacred settings, as for example the persistence of the *Sevenfold Amen* in Protestant hymnals and churches long after the other works of Sir John Stainer had fallen out of fashion in the concert world.⁵⁶ The Renaissance is full of such music: witness Dufay's hymn cycle from the 1430s copied into Cappella Sistina 15 in the mid-1490s,⁵⁷ or, closer to home, the remarkable longevity of Urrede's *Pange lingua* in Iberian sources from the sixteenth to the early nineteenth century.⁵⁸ These are the survivors, in practice, of a great deal of music written not to be works of art so much as to fill a little gap in the liturgy or a particular ceremony, and persisting in the repertory as the need for them persists.

We have already seen one such long survivor, Robledo's *Et incarnatus* from Part I, copied elsewhere in Aragón as late as the eighteenth century.⁵⁹ But Tarazona 5 preserves many other, similar little bits of utilitarian music—psalm verses, settings of *Dic nobis Maria*, the *Et incarnatus*, the *Benedicamus Domino*, and so forth, even the little mass in Part I—that may seem out of place at a cathedral with, as

⁵⁵ For what it may be worth: among the likely identifiable works in CALAHORRA'S Fuente 3, Verdelot's *Levita Laurentius* was first published in RISM 1549¹⁵, Morales's *Sub tuum presidium* in 1539¹¹, and Lupus Hellinck's *Panis quem ego dabo* in 1532¹⁰; in Fuente 4, Silva's *Surrexit pastor* was first published in 1538³ and Richafort's *Quem dicunt homines* in 1532¹⁰.

⁵⁶ For example, Clarence DICKINSON and Calvin Weiss LAUFER, eds., *The Hymnal* (Philadelphia, Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1933), p. 502; I can report that it was sung with some enthusiasm in the First Presbyterian Church of Honesdale, Pennsylvania well into the 1970s and probably beyond.

⁵⁷ David FALLOWS, *Josquin* (Turnhout, Brepols, 2009), pp. 145-6; Alejandro Enrique PLANCHART, *Guillaume Du Fay: The Life and Works* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2018), II: 420-39. For source details and an inventory, see Richard SHERR, *Papal Music Manuscripts in the Late Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries*, Renaissance Manuscript Studies 5 (Neuhausen, American Institute of Musicology/Hänssler-Verlag, 1996), pp. 58-131. On the likely familiarity of these hymns in Spain c. 1500 see Bernadette NELSON, 'Manuscript Tarazona 2/3 and the Early Iberian Hymn: An International Perspective in the Post-Du Fay Age', in RODRÍGUEZ-GARCIA and ALVARENGA, *Anatomy of Iberian Polyphony* (see note 5), pp. 107-51.

⁵⁸ See Kenneth KREITNER, 'The Musical Warhorses of Juan de Urrede', *Fontes artis musicae*, 51 (2004), pp. 1-18; Kenneth KREITNER, 'The Repertory of the Spanish Cathedral Bands', *Early Music*, 37 (2009), pp. 267-86; Bernadette NELSON, 'Urrede's Legacy and Hymns for *Corpus Christi* in Portuguese Sources: Aspects of Musical Transmission and Influence', in *Musical Exchanges, 1100-1650: The Circulation of Early Music in Europe and Overseas in Iberian and Iberian-Related Sources*, edited by Manuel Pedro FERREIRA, Iberian Early Music Studies 2 (Kassel, Reichenberger, 2016), pp. 89-116; Manuel DEL SOL, 'El himno *Pange lingua* de Juan de Urrede, emblema del poder de las élites hispánicas en el Antiguo Régimen (siglos XVI-XVIII)', *Revista Historia y Genealogía*, 11 (2021), pp. 168-87; and Manuel DEL SOL, 'Beyond the Renaissance Musical Work: Johannes de Urrede's *Pange lingua* in the Early Modern Iberian World', in *Making Musical Works in Renaissance Spain*, edited by Soterraña AGUIRRE RINCÓN and John GRIFFITHS (Turnhout, Brepols, forthcoming).

⁵⁹ See above at note 18.

we know, a remarkably large and up-to-date polyphonic library, but that may actually have been a bigger part of its daily musical life than we imagine, even if they do not irresistibly draw the eye and soul today the way Peñalosa's music does. Indeed, in our time these modest little pieces may in fact have done more to repel our attention to this source. But the useful music is there, and it tells us something about its culture that, say, the *Missa Nunca fue pena mayor* cannot.

Example 6. Anonymous, *Psallite Deo nostro*, entire

There are also a few real charmers in there: let me present *Psallite Deo nostro* (Example 6), one of those anonymous petitions for rain in Part I, marked ‘Ad pluviam petendam’ on the verso and ‘Pro pluvia’ on the recto, and setting a verse and a half from Psalm 146, ‘Sing to our God upon the harp: who covereth the heaven with clouds, and prepareth rain for the earth’. It packs a surprising amount of music into its twenty-two bars, from the quick monotonic opening to evoke the spirit of the psalm, to the word-painting musical bloom on *cithara*, to the little modulation in bar 15, to the madrigalian ending—whoever wrote this had definitely heard Arcadelt’s *Il bianco e dolce cigno*.⁶⁰

At maybe a minute long, it would be awkward to program in the twenty-first century, but it’s not hard to love. Nor must we forget that there is some real human suffering behind it in dry country with a precarious agriculture.⁶¹

And there, perhaps, is the message to take away from Tarazona 5. It is not by any means a manuscript full of masterpieces—though *Marta ut audivit* and *Beatus es et bene* would I think be welcome additions to any serious choral concert—so much as a porthole into a musical world that is often hard for us to see, or to notice. The small-scale compositions, so many of them anonymous, in Parts I and III especially, offer a vivid and heartening image of the kind of music that got many churches, perhaps including as impressive an institution as Tarazona cathedral, through some less than luxurious times. It is the music of people who knew, as we sometimes forget today, how much good even a little bit of polyphony can do.

⁶⁰ Echoes of *Il bianco* can also be detected at the ends of *Domine rex* (no. 9) and of the Agnus and to a lesser extent the Sanctus of the mass (no. 3); whether this is a coincidence, connection, or cliché I shall not venture. The mass, incidentally, is another charmer as it survives, and it is a practical pity that it is so badly damaged. One of the anonymous reviewers for this journal also points out some affinities between *Psallite Deo nostro* and Verdelot’s madrigals, e.g. *Italia mia*.

⁶¹ On the importance of *pro pluvia* services and processions in early-modern Spain (though mostly somewhat later than Tarazona 5 and mostly in Catalonia and Valencia), see three essays in *Medieval and Early Modern Soundscapes*, edited by Ascensión Mazuela-Anguita (Woodbridge, Boydell, anticipated 2025): Francesc Orts-Ruiz, Chiara MAZZOLETTI and Lola PEÑA-FERNÁNDEZ, ‘The Organisation and Sonic Articulation of *pro pluvia* Processions in Early Modern Century Valencia and Barcelona’; Sergi GONZÁLEZ GONZÁLEZ and Helen HERBERT, ‘Mapping the Trajectories of *pro pluvia* Processions and Their Sonic Identities in Early Modern Barcelona and Tarragona’; and Pablo ACOSTA-GARCÍA, Antonio ARNIERI and Andrea GUTIÉRREZ ESPÍNOLA, ‘“Through penance, we weep for our sins”: Moving Emotions in the Rogative Procession’s Iberian Soundscape’.

Appendix 1

Inventory of Tarazona 5

All a 4 (or presumably originally so) unless specified.

— = no attribution

/// = item not there

No.	Folio	Title	On Page	Tabla	Inv. 1 1550s?	Inv. 2 1570 ⁶²	Remarks
1	1v	<i>In memoria aeterna</i>	—	—	///	—	Fragmentary: 1 folio missing, along with A and B voices.
2	2	[<i>Lux aeterna</i>] <i>luceat eis</i>	—	—	///	—	Fragmentary: 1 folio missing, along with S and T voices, which may have included monophonic intonations.
3	2v-10	<i>Missa sine nomine</i>	—	—	///	—	Fragmentary: 5 folios missing, along with some Kyrie, all Gloria, some Credo. Inv. 2 calls it ‘Una missa asta Sanctus,’ but it does have an Agnus.
4	10v-11	<i>Peccantem me quotidie</i>	—	///	///	///	
5	11v	(<i>Sanctus</i>)	—	///	///	///	Fragmentary: incomplete S-clef line. Mm. 1–15 ≈ S of no. 3 above.
6	11bis	<i>Confiteor</i>	—	///	///	///	Fragmentary: A & T lines, same as Confiteor of no. 3 above.
7	11bisv-12	<i>Dic nobis, Maria</i>	—	—	///	—	
8	12v-14	<i>Marta ut audivit</i>	—	—	///	—	
9	14v-16	<i>Domine rex, Deus Abraham</i>	—	—	///	—	Page: ‘Pro pluvia.’
10	16v	<i>Como nada Amen (?)</i>	—	///	///	///	Short fragment: a final cadence?
11	17	<i>Ad te levavi</i>	Rubio	—	///	Rubio ⁶³	

⁶² But copied in 1591; see above.

⁶³ Calahorra, ‘Los fondos musicales,’ item 286: ‘[a lápiz].’ The name Rubio, however, is in ink on the page.

No.	Folio	Title	On Page	Tabla	Inv. 1 1550s?	Inv. 2 1570 ⁶²	Remarks
12a	17v-18	<i>Cum invocarem</i>	—	—	///	—	Short fabordones treated as a group.
12b	17v-18	<i>In te Domine speravi</i>		///	///	///	
12c	18v-19	<i>Quoniam tu es Domine</i>		///	///	///	
13	19v-20	<i>Oravit Salomon</i>	—	—	///	—	Page: 'Pro pluvia petenda.'
14	20v-21	<i>Kyrie</i>	—	—	///	—	Tabla: 'Kiries feriados.'
15	21v-22	<i>Et incarnatus est</i>	Melchior Robledo	Melchior Robledo	///	Robledo	
16	22v-23	<i>Psallite Deo nostro</i>	—	—	///	—	Page: 'Ad pluviam petendam.'
17	23v-24	<i>Credo quod Redemptor meus</i>	—	///	///	///	
18	24v-25	<i>Te lucis ante terminum</i>	—	—	///	—	
<i>Begin Part II.</i>							
19	25v-27	<i>Gloria laus et honor</i>	Peñalosa	Peñalosa	Peñalosa	Peñalosa	Refrain and verse 1 (as in <i>LU</i> , 588-9) given separate music and openings; text to v.2 given below all four voices of v.1.
20	27v-31	<i>Kyrie ... qui expansis</i>	—	—	///	///	Kyrie eleison. Qui expansis in cruce ... Qui propheticè prompsisti ... Christus Dominus factus ...
21	31v-37	<i>Magnificat</i> (even, 8th)	Pastrana	Pastrana	Pastrana	Pastrana	Kirsch 957.
22	37v-45	<i>Magnificat</i> (odd, 1st)	Gomez	Gomez	Gomez	Gomez	Kirsch 817.
23	45v-51	<i>Magnificat</i> (even, 3rd)	Pastrana	Pastrana	Pastrana	Pastrana	Kirsch 838: 4 other sources attr. to Jacquet of Mantua.
24	51v-57	<i>Magnificat</i> (even, 6th)	Pastrana	Pastrana	Pastrana	Pastrana	Kirsch 956.
25	57v-61	<i>Aleph. Quomodo obtexit</i>	—	—	Monton	Monton	

No.	Folio	Title	On Page	Tabla	Inv. 1 1550s?	Inv. 2 1570 ⁶²	Remarks
26	61v-64	<i>Beatus es et bene (a 5)</i>	—	—	Pedro Yñiguez	Pedro Yñiguez	a 5, GGMAR.
<i>Begin Part III.</i>							
27	64v-65	<i>Ave maris stella</i>	Joannes Stiche	J.º Stich	///	Joan Estiche	Later hand. Anon. in Barcelona 1967.
28	65v-66	<i>Et incarnatus est</i>	Jonnes Estiche	eodem	///	Joan Estiche	Later hand.
29	66v-67	<i>Kyrie</i>	—	—	Peñalosa	Peñalosa	
30	67v-68	<i>Kyrie</i>	—	—	Montes	Montes	Page: 'In feriis.'
31a	68v-70	<i>In agendis mortuorum Requiem (introit)</i>	Basurto	Basurto	Basurto	Vasurto	<u>E. Russell</u> . ⁶⁴ By Basurto.
31b	70v-71	<i>Kyrie</i>	—	///	///	///	By Basurto.
31c	71v-73	<i>Requiem (gradual)</i>	—	///	///	///	By Basurto.
31d	73v-74	<i>Sicut cervus (a 3)</i>	Pastrana	—? ⁶⁵	Pastrana	Pastrana	By Pastrana.
31e	74v-75	<i>Sicut cervus (a 2)</i>	—	—?	Peñalosa	Peñalosa	By Ockeghem.
31f	75v-77	<i>Sanctus</i>	—	///	Logroño	///	Not by Basurto?
31g	77v-78	<i>Agnus</i>	—	///	///	///	Not by Basurto?
31h	78v-80	<i>Lux eterna</i>	—	—	Jusquin	///	By Brumel.
32	80v-82	<i>Libera me</i>	—	—	Ancheta	Jusquin	Attrib. Ancheta in Tar. 2/3. ⁶⁶
33	82v-83	<i>Ne recorderis</i>	—	—	Sanabria	Sanabria	Attr. Torre in Tar. 2/3 & Tol. 21.
34	83v-84	<i>Qui Lazarum</i>	—	—	Francisco Rey	Francisco Rei	
35	84v-85	<i>In te Domine speravi</i>	Pastrana	Pastrana	Pastrana	Pastrana	

⁶⁴ 'Missa in agendis,' TVNM 29 (1979).

⁶⁵ Tabla lists only one *Sicut cervus*.

⁶⁶ Attr. Torre in Toledo 21 mistakenly: see KNIGHTON and KREITNER, *Music of Juan de Anchieta*, 81 n. 28.

No.	Folio	Title	On Page	Tabla	Inv. 1 1550s?	Inv. 2 1570 ⁶²	Remarks
36	85v-87	<i>Domine Jesu Christe qui hora</i>	Peñalosa	Peñalosa	Peñalosa	Peñalosa	Surely by Anchieta; attr. to him in Seg, Tar 2/3, Sev 5-5-20.
37	87v-88	<i>Miserere mei Deus</i>	Pastrana	(damaged) ⁶⁷	Pastrana	Pastrana	a 5, SMTTB.
38	88v-89	<i>Tibi soli peccavi (a 5)</i>	Pastrana	missing?	Pastrana	Pastrana	
39	89v-90	<i>Pater dimitte illis</i>	Pastrana	missing?	Pastrana	Pastrana	
40	90v	<i>Dic nobis Maria</i>	Basurto	Vasurto	Basurto	Vasurto	
41	91	<i>Benedicamus Domino</i>	—	///	///	///	
42	91v-92	<i>Benedicamus Domino</i>	Pastrana	Pastrana	Pastrana	Pastrana	
43	92v-93	<i>Benedicamus Domino</i>	Ribafrecha	Rivafrecha	Ribaflech a	Ribafrecha	Later hand.
44a	93v-94	<i>Kyrie</i>	Peñalosa (?)	Peñalosa	Peñalosa	Peñalosa	Page: 'Feriales.'
44b	94v	<i>Sanctus</i>	—	—	—	—	Fragmentary: 1 folio lost.
44c	94v	<i>Agnus Dei</i>	—	—	—	—	Fragmentary: 1 folio lost.
45	—	<i>Et incarnatus est</i>	///	—	Peñalosa	Peñalosa	Folio(s) lost.

Kenneth Kreitner is Benjamin W. Rawlins Professor of Musicology, Emeritus, at the University of Memphis, where he also directed the Collegium Musicum. His book *The Church Music of Fifteenth-Century Spain* (Boydell, 2004) won the Robert M. Stevenson Award from the American Musicological Society, and he has written extensively on Spanish church music around 1500, Renaissance instrumental music and performance practice, and American amateur bands. Since retirement, he has returned to his hometown of Honesdale, Pennsylvania. ORCID  <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5842-3418>.

Recebido em | Received 02/02/2023

Aceite em | Accepted 12/02/2025

⁶⁷ Tabla page is damaged at the bottom; title for no. 37 is partially visible; 38 and 39 were probably there at one time.