

Further Remarks on Manuscript *P-Cug* MM 3 and its Collection of Masses

João Pedro d'Alvarenga

CESEM
Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas
Universidade NOVA de Lisboa
jpalvarenga@fesh.unl.pt

Resumo

Este artigo revisita o manuscrito *P-Cug* MM 3 e propõe novas hipóteses sobre a sua produção e estrutura original. É dada particular atenção à coleção de seis missas que nele se contém, para cinco das quais se identificam os modelos. O uso recorrente de tipos de apresentação que envolvem entradas em três notas diferentes reafirma a autoria de Francisco de Santa Maria para a totalidade do repertório e a autoria do conteúdo reforça a natureza autógrafa do manuscrito.

Palavras-chave

Estudo de fontes; Atribuição de autoria; Tipos de apresentação; Missa de imitação na década de 1570; Santa Cruz de Coimbra.

Abstract

This article revisits manuscript *P-Cug* MM 3 and proposes new hypotheses concerning its production and original structure. Particular focus is placed on the collection of six Masses it contains, identifying the models for five of them. The recurring use of presentation types featuring stacked entries supports the attribution of the entire repertory to Francisco de Santa Maria, and the content authorship further reinforces the autographic nature of the manuscript.

Keywords

Source studies; Authorship attribution; Presentation types; Imitation Mass in the 1570s; Santa Cruz in Coimbra.

MANUSCRIPT *P-CUG* MM 3, HENCEFORTH COIMBRA MM 3, is a large choirbook containing six Masses, three settings of the Lamentations, three Marian antiphons, and one hymn setting. The bulk of the manuscript was the work of a single scribe, who not only ruled the staves and entered the music and text but also most likely added the decorative initials.

Three of these initials (on ff. 31r, 58v, and 62v) incorporate the date '1575', showing that the individual sections where they are located were copied in, or around, that year.¹

When Owen Rees first examined Coimbra MM 3 for his 1991 Ph.D. dissertation, which resulted in the seminal *Polyphony in Portugal* published four years later, in 1995,² he put forward a number of hypotheses concerning the copying of the manuscript and the authorship of its contents based on codicological evidence and the examination of recurring contrapuntal devices. In brief, Rees suggested that the manuscript originally consisted of three distinct units, which were arranged differently before being re-bound sometime between 1937 and 1941. Based on circumstantial evidence, he proposed that the main scribe and decorator may have been the composer Francisco de Santa Maria.³ He also argued that other Masses in the manuscript, besides *Missa O beata Maria*, which bears the composer's name, could be attributed to him, particularly the sixth Mass, which he considers 'possible to attribute [...] to Francisco de Santa Maria with some confidence'.⁴ Elsewhere, I suggested that, in addition to the Masses, the three settings of the Lamentations could also be the

A preliminary version of this text was presented at the *XI Encontro de Investigação em Música – ENIM 2022* as part of the panel 'Dos ofícios de compor e cantar na segunda metade do século XVI', held at the University of Aveiro on 10-12 November 2022. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers of this article for their insightful comments, which brought important details to my attention that I had previously overlooked. Research for this study was financed by national funds through the FCT – Foundation for Science and Technology, PI, under the project PTDC/ART-PER/0902/2020, <<https://doi.org/10.54499/PTDC/ART-PER/0902/2020>>.

¹ The initial on f. 31r bears the inscription 'IN 1575'. *P-Cug* MM 3 is reproduced, briefly described, and fully indexed on the *Portuguese Early Music Database*, at <<https://pemdatabse.eu/source/47991>> (accessed 17 October 2024). Images of higher quality are also available on *Alma mater*, at <<https://am.uc.pt/bib-geral/item/45477>> and, alternatively, at <https://digitalis-dsp.uc.pt/bg6/UCBG-MM-3/UCBG-MM-3_item1/P62.html> (both accessed 17 October 2024).

² Owen REES, *Polyphony in Portugal c.1530-c.1620: Sources from the Monastery of Santa Cruz, Coimbra*, Outstanding Dissertations in Music from British Universities (New York - London, Garland, 1995).

³ Francisco de Santa Maria was a Spaniard, born in Ciudad Rodrigo on an unknown date, but probably in the mid 1530s. He was the natural son of Pedro Moro and Isabel Sánchez and his lay name was Francisco Moro (or Mouro, in Portuguese, as it appears in *P-Cug* MM 34, f. 37v). He is documented in the Cathedral of Ciudad Rodrigo in 1553 as a choirboy (or, most likely, a young singer, given his presumed age at the time) with permission to study Arts, when Diego Buxel (d. after 1572), presumably his teacher, was the chapel master there. Shortly afterwards he moved to Portugal, where he served as chapel master, first to the Bishop of Guarda, João de Portugal (1556-85), and then, for a brief period of time, to the Bishop of Coimbra, João Soares (1545-72). Being already a priest, he took the habit in the Monastery of Santa Cruz in Coimbra on 17 March 1562, professing one year later, on 19 March 1563, to become an Augustinian Canon Regular. He was the chapel master in Santa Cruz for more than thirty years, until shortly before his death, on 13 February 1597. On this composer, even if incomplete or outdated, see Ernesto Gonçalves de PINHO, *Santa Cruz de Coimbra, centro de actividade musical nos séculos XVI e XVII* (Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1981), pp. 170-3, and Pedro MIRANDA, 'D. Francisco de Santa Maria, Cantor Mor de Santa Cruz de Coimbra' (Master's thesis, Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, 2001). The evidence supporting the holographic nature of the manuscript is drawn from a passage in the composer's obituary, which reads as follows: '[...] o tempo que lhe ficava gastava em compor suas obras de musica, as quais são sem conto, elle as compunha escreuia, e apontava de letra, e letras de debuxo, e ponto muito perfeito, como se ue em muitos liuros que compôs, e escreueo de magnificas, outro de missas, outro de motetes, os quais são infinitos muitos de todas as festas e de todos os sanctos, lamentações de todos os dias a uozes muito suaues, saudosas, e deuotas [...]' (the time he had left, he spent composing his works of music, which are countless; he composed them, wrote them out, and entered the text, the pen-drawn initials, and very perfect music notation, as can be seen in many books he composed and wrote out, one of Magnificats, another of Masses, another of motets, which are infinite, many for all the Feasts and all the Saints, Lamentations for all [three] days, in very soft, nostalgic, and devout voices); *P-Lant* Cónegos Regulares de Santo Agostinho, Mosteiro de Santa Cruz de Coimbra, maço 3 de livros, n.º 8, *apud* Pedro de AZEVEDO, 'Rol dos Cónegos Regrantes de Santo Agostinho, por D. Gabriel de S. Maria', *Boletim da Segunda Classe da Academia das Ciências de Lisboa*, 11 (1918), pp. 105-77, at p. 147, also quoted in REES, *Polyphony in Portugal*, p. 153.

⁴ See REES, *Polyphony in Portugal* (see note 2), pp. 149-53; quotation from pp. 152-3.

work of Francisco de Santa Maria.⁵ Rees thought this very unlikely, but the same stylistic criteria he himself employed—namely ‘the unusually liberal use of cambiata figures’; the simultaneous use of passing notes, or of a passing note and a cambiata that ‘may create prominent parallel fifths [...] or fourths’; ‘the sounding of a suspended note [...] against its note of resolution’; and ‘other characteristics’⁶—suggest otherwise.

The Masses in Coimbra MM 3 and their models

I had long been convinced that most, if not all, of the Masses in Coimbra MM 3 were imitation Masses, although none of their models had been identified. One of the clearest pieces of evidence to form this conviction, besides the original heading of Missa *O beata Maria*, was the finding of a concordance of the first Mass of Coimbra MM 3 in Coimbra MM 70 (*P-Cug* MM 70)—a cantus part-book from an original set of presumably five copied in the 1570s—where it appears with the title ‘tu es petrus’.⁷

Recently, the models for five of the six Masses were identified by Nuno Raimundo and me, while we, along with Pedro Sousa Silva, edited and analysed them for the *Lost&Found* project.⁸ Table 1 presents the model for each Mass and its corresponding sources.

1	Maistre Gosse, <i>Tu es Petrus</i> 2p. <i>Quodcumque ligaveris</i>	RISM 1532/11, 1539/12, 1540/6, 1545/4, 1564/6, <i>D-LEu</i> Thomaskirche 51 (1), (2), ff. 101v-102v, <i>I-TVcap</i> 7, ff. 50v-51r
2	Cristóbal de Morales, <i>Miserere nostri Deus</i> 2p. <i>Innova signa</i>	RISM 1543/5, 1546/9, <i>P-Cug</i> MM 48, ff. 85v-86v (1st <i>pars</i>) + 94r-94v (2nd <i>pars</i>)

⁵ João Pedro d’ALVARENGA, ‘Polifonia portuguesa sacra tardo-quincentista: estudo de fontes e edição crítica do *Livro de São Vicente*, manuscrito P-LfFSVL 1P/H-6’, 2 vols. (Doctoral dissertation, Universidade de Évora, 2005), vol. 1, pp. 50-3. Regarding the authorship of the Lamentations, besides consideration of their technique and style, there is also some circumstantial evidence that points to Francisco de Santa Maria. For instance, a marginal note in the *Livro do recebimento dos noviços* informing about the composer’s death says: ‘d(om) fr(ancis)co castelhano obijt foi mestre da Capella do Bispo da guarda E da see de Coimbra E compos muitas cousas q(ue) se canta(m) en santa Cruz, como são as Lame(n)tações das endoe(n)ças etc’ (Dom Francisco, Castilian, died; he was chapel master to the Bishop of Guarda and in Coimbra Cathedral, and composed many things that are sung in Santa Cruz, such as the Lamentations of Maundy Thursday, etc); *P-Lant* Cónegos Regulares de Santo Agostinho, Mosteiro de Santa Cruz de Coimbra, liv. 90, f. 9r.

⁶ REES, *Polyphony in Portugal* (see note 2), pp. 152-3. Among the ‘other characteristics’ I included the presentation type at the opening of the ‘Cogitavit Dominus’ section of the second Lamentation, which will be discussed later in this article; see ALVARENGA, ‘Polifonia portuguesa sacra’ (see note 5), vol. 1, pp. 51-2.

⁷ *P-Cug* MM 70 is reproduced, briefly described, and fully indexed on the *Portuguese Early Music Database*, at <<https://pemdatabase.eu/source/64481>> (accessed 17 October 2024). The superius part of the Mass is on ff. 72r-77v. Other concordances between Coimbra MM 3 and MM 70 include the three Lamentations, whose superius (superius 1 in the case of the third Lamentation) is on ff. 1r-4r in the latter part-book.

⁸ The process of identifying the models involved searching for motets whose text incipits matched the titles of the Masses *O beata Maria* and *Tu es Petrus*. After identifying the models for these two Masses, we proceeded to verify the content of printed motet collections that might have been available in Santa Cruz, based on information about the exemplars used by the scribes of surviving manuscripts produced there between the 1540s and 1560s. The *Lost&Found* project was run in CESEM – Centre for the Study of the Sociology and Aesthetics of Music at Lisbon Nova University between 1 March 2021 and 31 May 2024. Editions of the six Masses can be found on the *Lost&Found project*, at <<https://lostandfound.fcsh.unl.pt/works>> (accessed 17 October 2024).

3	Pedro Guerrero, <i>O beata Maria</i> 2p. <i>Accipe quod offerimus</i>	<i>E-SI</i> Ms. 21, ff. 98v-99r (1st pars only), <i>E-TZ</i> Ms. 8, ff. 34v-38r, <i>E-Vp</i> s.s., ff. 56v-58r, <i>E-Zac</i> Ms. 34 (tenor only), <i>GCA-Gc</i> Ms. 3, ff. 11v-12r + 56v-57r, <i>MEX-Pc</i> Ms. 1, ff. 102-103v
4	Lupus Hellinck, <i>In te Domine speravi</i> 2p. <i>Quoniam fortitudo mea</i>	RISM 1532/9, 1535/1, 1537/1, 1539/6, 1553/2, 1553/33, 1559/1, 1571/16, 1574/13, 1592/6, plus 25 MS sources
5	No model found	
6	Jacobus Clemens non Papa, <i>Venit vox de caelo</i> 2p. <i>Respondens miles</i>	RISM 1554/1, 1554/13, 1554/16, 1559/1, 1559/5, 1575/17, plus 22 MS sources

Table 1. The models of the Masses and their sources⁹

It is not difficult to explain how the motets by Gosse, Morales, Hellinck, and Clemens made their way to Coimbra. The first three are included in printed anthologies issued by Gardane in 1539 (RISM 1539/6, 1539/12) and Scotto in 1543 (RISM 1543/5), which, as Rees has convincingly shown, were used as exemplars by the scribes of Coimbra MM 7, MM 32, and MM 48 (*P-Cug* MM 7, MM 32, and MM 48).¹⁰ The source for Clemens's *Venit vox de caelo* could have been Scotto's *Motetti del Laberinto, A Cinque Voci Libro quarto* (RISM 1554/16), as other editions by the same printer, besides RISM 1543/5, were demonstrably used by the compilers of Coimbra MM 48 and MM 242 (*P-Cug* MM 242).¹¹

Pedro Guerrero's motet *O beata Maria* survives in four Spanish and two Central-American manuscript sources.¹² It must have had a significant dissemination. It even reached Italy, where its composer moved to in the late 1550s, as it is used as model for a Mass by Ippolito Baccusi printed in Venice in 1588, as part of his *Primo libro delle messe a quattro voci* (RISM B27).¹³

As shown in Table 1, the only Mass for which no model has been found is the fifth in the manuscript. In this Mass, the *soggetto* of the first Kyrie has a distinctive melodic contour including an ascending leap of a minor sixth. It recurs at the opening of all other movements and, as far as can be determined, in the 'Benedictus' section of the Sanctus as well, although the relevant pages are severely corroded by the iron gall ink. The only other *soggetto* that is repeated is the one of the second Kyrie, which also briefly appears in the Gloria and the Sanctus and, in a *sesquialtera* version, in the

⁹ For a nearly comprehensive list of the manuscript sources of Hellinck's *In te Domine speravi* and Clemens's *Venit vox de caelo*, see *The Motet Database Catalogue*, at <<https://www.uflib.ufl.edu/motet>> (accessed 17 October 2024).

¹⁰ See REES, *Polyphony in Portugal* (see note 2), pp. 87-97; and Owen REES, 'Printed Music, Portuguese Musicians, Roman Patronage: Two Case Studies', in *Early Music Printing and Publishing in the Iberian World*, edited by Iain Fenlon and Tess Knighton, De Musica, 11 (Kassel, Reichenberger, 2006), pp. 275-98, at pp. 278-83. As Table 1 indicates, Morales's *Miserere nostri Deus* is copied in Coimbra MM 48.

¹¹ See REES, *Polyphony in Portugal* (see note 2), p. 91.

¹² In addition, an intabulation is included in Estebán DAZA, *Libro de mvsica en cifras para vihuela, intitulado el Parnasso* ([Valladolid], Diego Fernández de Córdoba, 1576), book 2, ff. 45v-49r.

¹³ The most recent scholarly work on the Italian composer, Alessandra IGNESTI, 'Ippolito Baccusi and the Musical Culture of North-Eastern Italy' (Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University, 2021), does not identify the model for Baccusi's *Missa O beata Maria*; see its p. 84, Table 2.

‘Hosanna’ section of the latter movement. As can be seen in Table 2, showing the formal variety of the six Mass settings, this is the shortest Mass in the collection. It is also the one that uses homophonic textures the most, particularly in the Gloria and Credo. Its characteristics suggest that it is a freely composed Mass, that is, a Mass that uses no pre-existing source material. Accordingly, it is titled [*sine nomine*].

	Kyrie	Et in terra pax (Gloria)
[<i>Tu es Petrus</i>]	Kyrie I – Christe I* – Christe II – Kyrie II (117)	Domine Deus* – Qui tollis (146)
[<i>Miserere nostri Deus</i>]	Kyrie I – Christe – Kyrie II (86)	Qui tollis (124)
<i>O beata Maria</i>	Kyrie I – Christe – Kyrie II (76)	Domine Deus* – Qui tollis (160)
[<i>In te Domine speravi</i>]	Kyrie I – Christe – Kyrie II (67)	Domine Deus* – Qui tollis (114)
[<i>sine nomine</i>]	Kyrie I – Christe – Kyrie II (51)	Qui tollis (91)
[<i>Venit vox de caelo</i>]	Kyrie I – Christe – Kyrie II (92)	Qui tollis (148)

	Patrem omnipotentem (Credo)	Sanctus	Agnus Dei
[<i>Tu es Petrus</i>]	Crucifixus – Et iterum* – Et in Spiritum (195)	Pleni sunt* - Hosanna – Benedictus* (127)	(36)
[<i>Miserere nostri Deus</i>]	Crucifixus* – Et iterum (202)	Pleni sunt* – Hosanna (106) [no Benedictus]	(49)
<i>O beata Maria</i>	Et incarnatus – Et resurrexit* – Et in Spiritum (197)	Hosanna – Benedictus* (121)	(28)
[<i>In te Domine speravi</i>]	Et incarnatus – Crucifixus* – Et in Spiritum – Et vitam (182)	(34) [only 1st section copied into <i>P-Cug</i> MM 3]	(39)
[<i>sine nomine</i>]	Et incarnatus – Crucifixus (158)	Hosanna (66) – Benedictus* [almost all illegible]	(28)
[<i>Venit vox de caelo</i>]	Et incarnatus – Crucifixus* – Et in Spiritum (275)	Benedictus* – Hosanna (133)	(45)

Asterisks mark sections with reduced scoring.

Table 2. Divisions of each movement (and its total duration in breves) in the six Mass settings

Table 3 shows the relationship between the Masses and their models in terms of tonal types, scoring, and overall ranges. Among the collection, Missa [*In the Domine speravi*] is the only one that preserves both the number of voices and the tonal type of its model. Missa [*Tu es Petrus*] and Missa *O beata Maria* change the tonal type of the model in a way that the final of the latter turns to be the cofinal of the former. Changes in tonal type relative to the model—not transpositions—are not uncommon in sixteenth-century Portuguese imitation Masses. They also occur, for instance, in the Missa [*Philomena*] surviving in manuscript Coimbra MM 9 (*P-Cug* MM 9) under the name of ‘Verdeloth’ and in the anonymous Missa *Quem dicunt homines* copied in Lisbon L.C. 57 (*P-Ln* L.C.

57), both on motets by Jean Richafort.¹⁴ Missa [*Miserere nostri Deus*] transposes the model a fourth higher to *cantus mollis*, keeping E tonality with A-mi final. Missa [*In te Domine speravi*] keeps C tonality as in the motet by Lupus Hellinck on which it is based. The Mass is, however, set in four voices, while its model is for five voices. Scoring reduction is, again, not an uncommon practice. Coincidentally, Hellinck's own Missa *In te Domine speravi* is also set in four voices.

		Motet		Mass	
1	<i>Tu es Petrus</i>	♯ – g2c2c3c4 – G	19	♯ – g2c1c2c3 – C (G)	15
2	<i>Miserere nostri Deus</i>	♯ – c1c3c4f3 – E	19	♭ – g2c2c3c4 – A (D)	19
3	<i>O beata Maria</i>	♯ – g2c2c3c4 – C	19	♯ – c1c3c3c4 – G (C)	16
4	<i>In te Domine speravi</i>	♯ – g2g2c3c3f3 – C	18	♯ – g2c2c3c4 – C	19
5	[<i>sine nomine</i>]			♯ – c1c2c3c4 – E (A)	16
6	<i>Venit vox de caelo</i>	♭ – g2c2c2c3f3 – F	19	♭ – g2c2c2c3f3 – F	20

Table 3. Tonal types and overall ranges of the motets and their derivative Masses, including Missa [*sine nomine*]

The two Masses that change the tonal type of their models—Missa [*Tu es Petrus*] and Missa *O beata Maria*—along with Missa [*sine nomine*], use non-standard, clustered clef combinations. Missa [*Tu es Petrus*] employs g2c1c2c3 clefs, resulting in a correspondingly narrow overall range of fifteen notes. Both Missa *O beata Maria* and Missa [*sine nomine*] have overall ranges of sixteen notes. Apparently, clustered clef combinations and narrow overall ranges were common in Santa Cruz at the time.¹⁵ The other three Masses use standard *chiavette* combinations, with either c4 or f3 clefs for

¹⁴ On *P-Cug* MM 9, see REES, *Polyphony in Portugal* (see note 2), pp. 173-83, and the *Portuguese Early Music Database*, at <<https://pemdatabase.eu/source/47826>> (accessed 17 October 2024). For *P-Ln* L.C. 57, see especially ALVARENGA, 'Polifonia portuguesa sacra' (see note 5), vol. 1, pp. 124-35 and 177-79, and the reproduction on *Biblioteca Nacional Digital*, at <<https://purl.pt/30777>> (accessed 17 October 2024). Missa [*Philomena*] in *P-Cug* MM 9 is an intriguing case, as it only uses motifs from the second *pars* of Richafort's motet. Although it is listed among the works of Philippe Verdelot in H. Colin SLIM and Stefano LA VIA, 'Verdelot [Deslougues], Philippe', *Grove Music Online*, 2001, updated 2014, <<https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.29190>>, and also in Alice TACAILLE, 'Philomena praevia de Jean Richafort: la complexité du modèle au défi de l'analyse', in *Théorie et analyse musicales 1450-1650*, edited by Anne-Emmanuelle Ceulemans and Bonnie J. Blackburn (Louvain-la-Neuve, Département d'histoire de l'art et d'archéologie – Collège Érasme, 2001), pp. 195-228, at p. 197, its attribution to the French composer must be considered doubtful because of its highly unusual modelling process, until it receives a critical examination, which has never been attempted. Richafort's *Philomena praevia* is copied in Coimbra MM 48, f. 45r-v, attributed to 'Claudin'; his *Quem dicunt homines* is found in the same manuscript, ff. 46v-48r.

¹⁵ The overall average range in the early works of Pedro de Cristo (most likely a student of Francisco de Santa Maria in Santa Cruz) copied in Coimbra MM 33 (*P-Cug* MM 33) is sixteen notes; see Owen REES, ed., *Music by Pedro de Cristo (c.1550-1618): An Edition of the Motets from Coimbra. Biblioteca Geral da Universidade, MM 33* (Amsterdam, Harwood Academic Publishers, 1998), pp. viii-ix. *P-Cug* MM 33 is a holograph of the composer dating from the 1580s for the most part. It is reproduced, briefly described, and fully indexed on the *Portuguese Early Music Database*, at <<https://pemdatabase.eu/source/56917>> (accessed 17 October 2024). High-quality images are also available on *Alma mater*, at <<https://am.uc.pt/bib-geral/item/46249>> (accessed 17 October 2024). On this manuscript, see Owen REES, 'Newly Identified Holograph Manuscripts from Late-Renaissance Portugal', *Early Music*, 22/2 (1994), pp. 261-6 and 269-77, and REES, *Polyphony in Portugal*, pp. 229-36. On the non-standard types of clustered clef combinations in the forty-three motets copied in the Coimbra MM 231 incomplete set of part-books (*P-Cug* MM 231, MM 231A, and MM

the lowest voice and wider ranges of nineteen to twenty notes. As discussed below, in the original usage units that make up Coimbra MM 3, the order of the Masses appears to proceed from narrower to relatively wider overall ranges (see Table 3; the overall ranges of the three settings of the Lamentations are as follows: sixteen, eighteen, and eighteen notes, respectively).

The copying process and original structure of Coimbra MM 3

Regarding the original structure of Coimbra MM 3, Rees has noted that ‘the pieces numbered 1-2 and 6-9 in the inventory [of the manuscript in his *Polyphony in Portugal*, p. 150] once stood together as a single unit containing three Masses [*Tu es Petrus*, *Miserere nostri Deus*, and *Venit vox de caeli*] and three Lamentation settings, since not only are the folios on which they occur numbered continuously in the original foliation, but all these folios are of the same type of paper’. He has also noted that ‘another type of paper occurs at the folios occupied by nos. 3-4 and 10-13 in the inventory [that is, Masses *O beata Maria* and *In te Domine speravi*, and the four pieces copied by a second scribe on the eight folios originally left blank], which therefore may also have stood together, while Mass no. 5 [*sine nomine*] is copied on a third kind of paper’.¹⁶

In addition to Rees’s remarks, I would like to highlight the following details. The manuscript contains two distinct original foliations. The first, to which Rees refers, is located in the top right corner of the recto pages, with sequences running from folios 2 to 23 and 24 to 49, the latter corresponding to folios 52-77 in the modern foliation. A second original foliation, marked in smaller numbers, appears in the bottom right corner of the recto pages. This can be seen on folios 35, 37, 39-40, 42 (1, 3, 5-6, 8), 44-51 (1-8), and 82-83 (5-6).¹⁷ Moreover, two folios are missing from the current volume. The first, which would have been folio no. 1 in the original foliation, contained the superius and tenor parts of the first Kyrie and first Christe from Missa [*Tu es Petrus*] on the verso page, while the recto page was likely blank. It was probably already lost before the modern re-binding, as the original foliation now begins with no. 2. The second missing folio was located between folios 51 and 52 in the modern foliation. It contained the altus and bassus parts of the Agnus Dei from Missa [*sine nomine*] on the recto, while the verso page was almost certainly blank. This folio may have been lost either before or during the re-binding process, as the modern foliation was added to the already re-bound volume. Most importantly, the page layout is not consistent throughout the manuscript. The

231B), most of which are attributable to Francisco de Santa Maria, see João Pedro d’ALVARENGA, ‘Fragmentary Motets in Coimbra Sources from the 1570s’, in *Fragmenta Musicae: Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by João Pedro d’Alvarenga, Manuel Pedro Ferreira, and Alberto Medina de Seïça, Épitome musical (Turnhout, Brepols, 2025), forthcoming. The *P-Cug* MM 231 set of part-books, dated to the 1570s, is reproduced, briefly described and fully indexed on the *Portuguese Early Music Database*, at <<https://pemdatabase.eu/source/97592>> (accessed 17 October 2024); see also REES, *Polyphony in Portugal* (see note 2), pp. 311-23.

¹⁶ REES, *Polyphony in Portugal* (see note 2), p. 151.

¹⁷ I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer who pointed out the significance of this second original foliation.

sections copied by the main scribe feature 12 staves per page, ruled with a 23 mm-wide rastrum, except for ff. 13-14 and 20-23, which have 11 staves ruled with a 28 mm-wide rastrum. The folios copied by the second scribe, except for the recto of folio 78 (which has no staves ruled), contain 10 staves per page, ruled with a 31 mm-wide rastrum and bounded by vertical lines in ink on each side of the writing area.¹⁸ Consideration of the page layout alongside the material characteristics of the paper (that is, watermark, the number of laid lines over a specified span, and the average spacing between chain lines) defines five different paper types, labelled 1a (the 11-stave paper), 1b, 2a, 2b, and 3, to correspond with Rees's paper types.¹⁹ Taking all this into account, Table 4 presents the current structure of Coimbra MM 3.

						lacks f. 1
1	2-12			1b	A	Missa [<i>Tu es Petrus</i>] (Kyrie incomplete)
	12v					blank page
	13			1a		blank page
2	13v-14v					Missa [<i>Miserere nostri Deus</i>]
	15-19v			1b		
	20-23			1a		
	23v					blank page
			24	2a		blank page
3			24v-34		A	Missa <i>O beata Maria</i> (1575)
			34v			blank page
		1 (=35)	35			blank page
4		3 (=37)	35v-43			Missa [<i>In te Domine speravi</i>] Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus
		5 (=39)				
		6 (=40)				
		8 (=42)	41v-42			blank opening (Hosanna and Benedictus should have been copied here)
			42v-43			Agnus Dei
			43v			blank page
		1 (=44)	44	3		blank page
5		2 (=45)	44v-48		A	Missa [<i>sine nomine</i>] Kyrie, Gloria, Credo
		3 (=46)				
		4 (=47)				
		5 (=48)				

¹⁸ Similar vertical lines were later added to ff. 35v-39r in the modern foliation.

¹⁹ On the paper types, see REES, *Polyphony in Portugal* (see note 2), pp. 368-9 and 384-5. The watermark in paper type 3 most likely resembles Briquet no. 969, which belongs to a group of similar watermarks found in papers dating from between 1569 and 1582. The faintness of the image on the paper in Coimbra MM 3 suggests that the moulds used to make it were already old. This does not suggest a late date for the paper, as moulds were often repaired as closely as possible to the original design.

		6 (=49)	48v-49			blank opening
		7 (=50)	49v-51v			Sanctus, Agnus Dei (incomplete)
		8 (=51)				lacks 1 folio
	24		52	1b		blank page
6	24v-40		52v-68		A	Missa [<i>Venit vox de caelo</i>] <i>a5</i> (1575)
	40v-41		68v-69			blank opening
7	41v-44		69v-72			<i>Incipit Lamentatio</i>
8	44v-46		72v-74			<i>De Lamentatione. Heth.</i> <i>Cogitavit</i>
9	46v-49		74v-77			<i>De Lamentatione. Heth.</i> <i>Misericordiae a5</i>
	49v		77v			blank page
			78	2b		blank page, no ruling
10			78v-80		B	<i>Ave regina caelorum</i>
11		5 ^a (=82)	80v-82			<i>Regina caeli laetare</i>
12		6 ^a (=83)	82v-84			<i>Regina caeli laetare</i>
13			84v-85			<i>Procul recedant (Te lucis)</i>
			85v			blank page

The columns on the left display the following information: the piece number from Rees's inventory of *P-Cug* MM 3; the original ink foliation in the top right corner of the pages; the original ink foliation in the bottom right corner (with correspondence to modern foliation); the modern pencil foliation; the paper type; and the copyist.

Table 4. The current structure of Coimbra MM 3

When looking at Table 4, two facts stand out. First, Missa [*In te Domine speravi*] was never copied in its entirety. The opening where the 'Hosanna' and 'Benedictus' sections of the Sanctus should have been (ff. 48v-49r) has remained blank. This suggests that this Mass was the last piece to be entered into Coimbra MM 3 by the main scribe. Second, the part containing Missa [*Miserere nostri Deus*] has two different paper types. This suggests either the use of leftover paper from a previous copying project or a miscalculation of the amount of ruled paper needed to complete the manuscript. In the first case, it could be hypothesised that this Mass was the first piece, or one of the first pieces, to be entered into Coimbra MM 3 by the main scribe. In the second case, it would have been the last. However, this second hypothesis is incompatible with the suggestion I previously made regarding Missa [*In te Domine speravi*], which seems to be the most likely. Moreover, there is additional palaeographical evidence supporting the first hypothesis. Missa [*Miserere nostri Deus*] is the only work that employs minuscule Roman numerals, 'ij', for the text repetition sign, up to the 'Crucifixus' section of the Credo, where the Arabic numeral '2' starts to be used in the bassus part.

The original gathering structure of the manuscript was probably obliterated before the modern re-binding took place. This is suggested by the presence of sets of paper strips along the gutter between folios 6-7, 11-12, 16-17, 21-22, 26-27, 31-32, 36-37, 41-42, 46-47, 51-52, and 80-81, which

result from the guard binding method used to assemble groups of loose folios.²⁰ Nevertheless, it remains possible to reconstruct that structure with some degree of certainty. The sequences 1-8 defined by the second original foliation likely correspond to three original quaternions. Thus, the folios used by the second scribe (ff. 78-85) formed one regular quaternion. Missa [*sine nomine*] was copied into a regular quaternion (ff. 44-51) to which a single folio was added at the end of the gathering, f. [51bis], which is now missing. It is important to note that the next folio, f. 52, is on a different type of paper and, as such, could not have formed a regular bifolio with f. [51bis]. One possibility is that folio [51bis] initially formed a bifolio with folio [1] of the original foliation. This would suggest that Missa [*sine nomine*] was copied before Missa [*Tu es Petrus*]. If this were the case, it would be plausible that the compiler of Coimbra MM 3 decided, at some point, to give the Masses a different order. He may have separated the bifolio into two single folios, which were subsequently lost, possibly because they were simply glued and not sewn to the adjacent bifolios.

Missa *O beata Maria* was similarly copied into a quaternion plus one single folio, probably located at the end of the gathering (ff. 24-34 in the modern foliation). Missa [*Venit vox de caelo*] and the three settings of the Lamentations could feasibly fit into two quaternions and one quinternion, although smaller quires and irregular gatherings were also possible. Missa [*Tu es Petrus*] would fit into one sexternion, or, if folios [51bis] and [1] were originally a bifolio, one quinternion plus one single folio. In this latter case, folio 12, instead of being a single folio, could also have been part of a bifolio with folio 15, forming a binion with folios 13-14 (which are on a different type of paper). Then, folios 16-19 would form another binion, and folios 20-23 (on the same type of paper as ff. 13-14), yet another. This would imply that Missa [*Miserere nostri Deus*] was copied after Missa [*Tu es Petrus*], though no evidence supports this assumption.

Therefore, there are four possible configurations for the original gathering structure of the section containing Missa [*Tu es Petrus*] and Missa [*Miserere nostri Deus*]. The first possibility is that both Masses were copied in separate gatherings without sharing any bifolios, represented by the collation formula $[A]^{12} [B]^2 [C]^{4+1} [D]^4$. The second possibility is that the two Masses shared one bifolio, as shown by the formula $[A]^{1+10} [B]^4 [C]^4 [D]^4$. The third suggests that Missa [*Tu es Petrus*] originally shared one bifolio with Missa [*sine nomine*]: $[A]^{2(-1)} [B]^{10+1} [C]^2, [D]^{4+1} [E]^4$. Finally, the fourth possibility combines the previous two, with Missa [*Tu es Petrus*] sharing one bifolio with Missa [*sine nomine*] and another with Missa [*Miserere nostri Deus*]: $[A]^{2(-1)} [B]^{10} [C]^4 [D]^4 [E]^4$. However, the third possibility appears the most plausible, as it accounts for the use of a unique paper type in Missa [*sine nomine*] and mixed paper types in Missa [*Miserere nostri Deus*], while also providing the simplest explanation for the loosing of folio [1] in the original foliation and folio [51bis]. Accordingly,

²⁰ I thank the same anonymous reviewer mentioned in n. 17 for bringing this specific binding technique to my attention.

the order of copying might have been: 1) Missa [*Miserere nostri Deus*], 2) Missa [*sine nomine*], and 3) Missa [*Tu es Petrus*], with the following collation formula: (ff. 13-23) [A]², [B]⁴⁺¹ [C]⁴ (ff. 44-51bis] in the modern foliation plus f. [1] in the original foliation) [D]⁸ [E]² (ff. 2-12) [F]¹⁰⁺¹.

The above considerations suggest the hypothesis of five production units—‘groups of quires that formed a material unity at the time of production’—each copied in one go and marked by both palaeographic and codicological caesuras.²¹ In the case of Coimbra MM 3, the most obvious codicological caesuras are interruptions in the sequences of quires, indicated by the presence of single folios at the end of regular quires (quaternions, identified by the sequences of the second original foliation, and possible quinternions), combined with the use of different types of paper. The palaeographic caesuras include changes in layout and scribe (as in the final gathering of the current volume),²² systems of abbreviation, such as the text repetition sign, and differences in decoration, although determining exactly when the decoration was added during the copying process remains a matter of conjecture.

Regarding decoration, the section that draws the most visual attention is the one containing Missa *O beata Maria* and Missa [*In te Domine speravi*]. This is due to the boxed initials filled with red, unique to this section of the manuscript. The opening Kyrie of the first Mass and the Sanctus of the second feature two-stave-high initials, while the Christe—not the Kyrie—and Gloria of the second Mass display one-stave-high initials in the altus and bassus parts, with the Christe’s initials painted over the original grotesque initials. A similar hierarchy appears in the section containing Missa [*Tu es Petrus*] and Missa [*Miserere nostri Deus*]. The remaining page of the first Mass’s opening presents three-stave-high grotesque initials in the first Kyrie, whereas the second Mass uses one-stave-high initials of a similar type. This suggests that larger initials serve as markers for the beginning of a production unit. However, the first Kyrie of Missa [*Venit vox de caelo*] and the exordium of the first Lamentation both feature two-stave-high grotesque initials, even though no other indications suggest that these pieces—and the two other settings of the Lamentations—were copied at different times. Missa [*sine nomine*], displays nearly two-stave-high grotesque initials in the opening Kyrie, though their positioning is awkward due to the unsuitable indentation of the staves.

That said, the production units might have been as follows:

1. Missa [*Miserere nostri Deus*] (no. 2), ff. 13-23, paper types 1a and 1b, collation [A]² [B]⁴⁺¹ [C]⁴;

²¹ Erik KWAKKEL, ‘Towards a Terminology for the Analysis of Composite Manuscripts’, *Gazette du livre médiéval*, 41 (2002), pp. 12-9, at pp. 13-4.

²² With regard to page layout, I am not considering indentation in the folios ruled by the main scribe, as the patterns appear random and largely unsuitable for the content, indicating poor planning in the copying process. For instance, in the quaternion where Missa [*In te Domine speravi*] is copied, ff. 35r-40r and 41v-42v in the modern foliation have the first and seventh staves indented; f. 40v has the first, second, third, seventh, eighth, and ninth staves indented; and f. 41r has the first, second, seventh, and eighth staves indented.

2. Missa [*sine nomine*] and Missa [*Tu es Petrus*] (nos. 5 and 1), ff. 44-[51bis]+[1]-12, paper types 3 and 1b, hypothetical collation [D]⁸ [E]² [F]¹⁰⁺¹ (quire [E] subsequently disrupted);
3. Missa [*Venit vox de caelo*] and the set of three Lamentations (nos. 6 and 7-9), ff. 52-77, dated '1575' on two initials, paper type 1b, hypothetical collation [G]⁸ [H]⁸ [J]¹⁰ or, judging from the following unit, [G]⁸ [H]⁸⁺¹ [J]⁸⁺¹;
4. Missa *O beata Maria* and Missa [*In te Domine speravi*] (nos. 3-4), ff. 24-43, dated '1575' on one initial, paper type 2a, collation [K]⁸⁺¹ [L]⁸⁺¹;
5. The Marian antiphons and the hymn setting (nos. 10-13) entered by a second scribe, ff. 78-85, paper type 2b, collation [M]⁸.

Following the separation of Missa [*sine nomine*] and Missa [*Tu es Petrus*], possibly during the copying of the second production unit, it is probable that at least two usage units were formed, which almost certainly resulted in two distinct volumes. The first usage unit received its ink foliation, while the second remained unfinished by the main scribe.²³ The criteria for ordering the Masses may have been based on cleffing and corresponding overall ranges, which resulted in Missa [*Miserere nostri Deus*] being after Missa [*Tu es Petrus*]. This arrangement allowed the three Masses in the first usage unit to progress from higher to lower clefs and, correspondingly, from narrower to wider overall ranges. The second usage unit may have been intended to follow a similar arrangement, progressing from narrower to wider overall ranges. Therefore, a short Mass in high clefs, intended to parallel Missa [*Tu es Petrus*], might have been planned but was never copied.²⁴ Table 5 presents the usage units, with the second unit organised hypothetically. Following the intervention of the second scribe, it is possible that the pieces he copied stood at the start of the corresponding usage unit, as he left the first page of the production unit blank and unruled.²⁵ It is most likely that both usage units were bound together at an unknown later date, possibly with the second unit placed at the front. As previously noted, the current structure of Coimbra MM 3 results from a re-binding that took place sometime between 1937 and 1941, after the volume disintegrated. According to the General Library of Coimbra

²³ Additional evidence that the two usage units were once separate volumes is provided by concordances. Among the pieces copied by the main scribe, only those from the originally numbered sections of Coimbra MM 3 (i.e., from the first usage unit) have concordances. Missa [*Tu es Petrus*] and the three settings of the Lamentations also appear in Coimbra MM 70; see n. 7 above.

²⁴ The hypothesis that the folios left blank by the main scribe were intended for copying another Mass had already been suggested by Rees; see his *Polyphony in Portugal*, p. 151.

²⁵ One should note that the four pieces copied by this second scribe all appear in Coimbra MM 44 (*P-Cug* MM 44), which is composed of different units copied during the 1580s, with the three Marian antiphons one after the other in the same order. Evidence, however, suggests that at least the hymn setting, *Procul recedant somnia*, was copied into Coimbra MM 3 and Coimbra MM 44 from different exemplars. On *P-Cug* MM 44, see REES, *Polyphony in Portugal*, pp. 259-70, and the *Portuguese Early Music Database*, at <<https://pemdatabase.eu/source/64344>> (accessed 17 October 2024). The Marian antiphons are found on ff. 92v-98r (nos. 52-54 in Rees's inventory of this manuscript, *Polyphony in Portugal*, p. 262); they are barely legible owing to ink corrosion. The hymn setting is texted to verse 1, *Te lucis ante terminum*, in *P-Cug* MM 44, ff. 78v-79r (no. 42 in Rees's inventory, *Polyphony in Portugal*, p. 261; the setting of verse 2 on ff. 79v-80r, under the same inventory number, is in fact a different piece, as shown by the clef combinations used).

University, the manuscript will soon undergo restoration, a process that will undoubtedly impact the re-structuring of its content and may help clarify our understanding of its original structure.

First usage unit

1	[1v]-13	Missa [<i>Tu es Petrus</i>]	♯ – g2c1c2c3 – C (G)	15
2	13v-23	Missa [<i>Miserere nostri Deus</i>]	♭ – g2c2c3c4 – A (D)	19
6	24v-40	Missa [<i>Venit vox de caelo</i>]	♭ – g2c2c2c3f3 – F	20
7	41v-44	Incipit Lamentatio	♭ – c1c2c3c4 – A	16
8	44v-46	De Lamentatione. Heth. Cogitavit	♯ – c1c3c3f3 – E	18
9	46v-49	De Lamentatione. Heth. Misericordiae	♭ – g2c1c1c3c4 – C	18

Second usage unit

10-13		Marian antiphons and hymn setting [never-copied Mass]	[? – g2c1c2c3 – ?]	[15]
5		Missa [<i>sine nomine</i>]	♯ – c1c2c3c4 – E (A)	16
3		Missa <i>O beata Maria</i>	♯ – c1c3c3c4 – G (C)	16
4		Missa [<i>In te Domine speravi</i>]	♯ – g2c2c3c4 – C	19

The columns on the left give the following information: the piece number from Rees's inventory of *P-Cug* MM 3 and the original ink foliation in the top right corner of the pages. The rightmost column gives the overall range of the corresponding piece.

Table 5. Original usage units

Authorship and recurring presentation types in the main layer of Coimbra MM 3

Among the many compositional devices and modelling procedures recurring in the Masses (some of them addressed by me elsewhere, specifically concerning Missa *O beata Maria*²⁶), there are two that strongly suggest the same composer's fingerprint. The first is the building up of openings with entries on three different notes a fourth or a fifth apart. The second is the simultaneous presentation of two different *soggetti*, or two different versions of the same *soggetto*, one of which in cantus firmus fashion.

Openings with entries on three different notes a fourth or a fifth apart result in episodic modal ambiguity, even if one entry comes in on one of the previously heard notes. In mid-sixteenth-century canonic repertory, presentation types in stacked entries, particularly periodic entries, are often found in the middle or at the end of a piece, but rarely at the beginning.²⁷ Although likely composed in the late 1520s, Gosse's motet *Tu es Petrus* is one of those rare examples. It starts with a pair of imitative duos in adjacent voices, with the onset of the following voice at the fourth below the onset of the

²⁶ João Pedro d'ALVARENGA, 'On Imitation and Style in Mid to Late 16th-Century Portuguese Masses: The *Missa O beata Maria* by Francisco de Santa Maria and its Model', a paper read at the *50th Medieval and Renaissance Music Conference*, Uppsala University, Sweden, 4-7 July 2022.

²⁷ See Peter SCHUBERT, 'Hidden Forms in Palestrina's *First Book of Four-Voice Motets*', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 60/3 (2007), pp. 483-556, at pp. 499-500 and n. 28.

accommodate entries on the two structural notes of the mode without changing the counterpoint (i.e., the vertical intervals generated by the interlocking of the *soggetto* with itself). This creates two versions of the same *soggetto*. In the derivative Kyrie, as shown in Example 1b, Francisco de Santa Maria combines these two versions. He uses the head motif, *sol-mi-fa-mi*, as first heard in the altus of the motet, with the continuation, *fa-sol-la-fa-sol-ut*, as first heard in the superius. The *soggetto* is presented in a pair of imitative duos of non-adjacent voices, with the onset of the following voice at the fifth below the onset of the leading voice. The second duo is an exact transposition of the first to the upper fourth, resulting in entries on three different notes: *d'*, *g*, *g'*, and *c'*. Due to the regular time interval of entries, the first half of the module of vertical intervals from the first duo repeats inverted at the twelfth after the onset of the leading voice of the second duo, which partly overlaps the following voice of the first duo. The opening of the Sanctus follows the exact same pattern, although the imitative duos occur in adjacent voices, making it a non-mechanical self-transformation of the opening of the Kyrie. This same presentation type—imitative duos of non-adjacent voices at regular time intervals with entries on three different notes—appears in the opening of the Kyrie of Missa [*sine nomine*]. A similar pattern can also be seen in the second Lamentation at ‘Cogitavit Dominus’.³⁰ It begins with a pair of non-imitative duos in non-adjacent voices, using invertible counterpoint at the octave. To accommodate this, the *soggetto* in the second duo required an adjustment of its first melodic interval—from an ascending fourth to an ascending fifth—while the entries occur on *e'*, *a*, *d*, and *a* again.

Hellinck, *In te Domine speravi*: *soggetto* of segment I
 In te Do - mi - ne spe - ra - vi non con - fun - dar

[F. de Santa Maria], Missa [*In te Domine speravi*], Kyrie I: *soggetto* I
 Ky - ri - e e -

A - gnus De - i, A - gnus De - i, De -

A - gnus De - i, A - gnus De - i, De -

A - gnus De - i, A - gnus De - i, De -

A - gnus De - i, A - gnus De - i, De -

6 5 5 5 4

Example 2. [Francisco de Santa Maria], Missa [*In te Domine speravi*], *Agnus Dei*, bb. 1-8

³⁰ An edition of the Lamentations is found on the *Lost&Found* project, at <<https://lostandfound.fcsh.unl.pt>>; the second Lamentation, *De Lamentatione. Heth. Cogitavit*, is at <<https://lostandfound.fcsh.unl.pt/work/lfworks0012>> (both accessed 17 October 2024).

A different type of stacked entries is found in the opening of the Agnus Dei from Missa [*In te Domine speravi*], as shown in Example 2. The *soggetto* is a self-quotation from the Kyrie and a non-mechanical rhythmic transformation of the first *soggetto* in Hellinck's motet.³¹ It is presented through a series of periodic entries at the lower fifth and upper octave. The five alternating statements at these intervals result in entries on three different notes: g' , c' , c'' , f , and f' . Although the initial presentation of the *soggetto* in the altus might suggest free imitation, given the imitative entrance of the tenor, this is an additional entry that precedes the main series of periodic entries. The position of the voices reverses in each entry, causing the resulting module of vertical intervals to alternate as an inversion at the twelfth. After the fifth statement of the *soggetto*, free imitation continues until an overlapping cadence on C in bars 12-13.

44 S 5 4 3 5 3 1 3 3 1 A
Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis, [ho - san - na in ex -

8 S Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis, CtS² CtS

S Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis, ho -

CtS Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis, S ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis,

Example 3. Francisco de Santa Maria, Missa *O beata Maria*, Sanctus, bb. 44-51

Pedro Guerrero, *O beata Maria*: altus and cantus versions of the *soggetto* of segment X
76 - - - - - spes u - ni - ca pec - spes u - ni - ca pec - ca - to - rum

8 - - - - - sis, in ex - cel - sis. sis, in ex - cel - sis. sis, in ex - cel - sis. sis, in ex - cel - sis.


8 - - - - - sis, in ex - cel - sis. sis, in ex - cel - sis. sis, in ex - cel - sis. sis, in ex - cel - sis.

S sis, in ex - cel - sis.

Example 4. Francisco de Santa Maria, Missa *O beata Maria*, Sanctus, bb. 76-84

³¹ An edition of Lupus Hellinck's *In te Domine speravi* based on RISM 1539/6 is available on *CRIM – Citations: The Renaissance Imitation Mass Project*, at <https://crimproject.org/pieces/CRIM_Model_0031> (accessed 17 October 2024).

In conclusion, the consistency in compositional processes and stylistic characteristics observed in the examples discussed, combined with the analytical insights from the *Lost&Found* project, allow us to confidently attribute the main layer of Coimbra MM 3—i.e., excluding the Marian antiphons and hymn setting—to Francisco de Santa Maria. This attribution further reinforces the hypothesis of the manuscript's holographic nature, raising it to a significant level of certainty. Furthermore, the identification of models for five of the six Masses in the manuscript, along with the analysis of their borrowing processes, deepens our understanding of both the composer's technique and style, as well as the practice of *imitatio* in mid-sixteenth-century Portugal.

João Pedro d'Alvarenga is a Principal Researcher with Habilitation at the School of Social Sciences and Humanities at Nova University Lisbon. He has served as the Coordinator of the Early Music Studies Research Group and as the Executive Secretary of the Board of CESEM – Centre for Music Studies. He also coordinated the 'Archives' Thematic Line at IN2PAST – Associate Laboratory for Research and Innovation in Heritage, Arts, Sustainability, and Territory. His research has focused mainly on Aquitanian-Iberian medieval chant and its sources, keyboard music, and Iberian polyphony from around 1500 to the early decades of the eighteenth century. ORCID  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2106-9333>.

Recebido em | *Received* 14/05/2024

Aceite em | *Accepted* 12/02/2025