

Katarzyna Spurgiasz (University of Warsaw)

‘Everybody liked it / likes it / will like it’: three possible time-related approaches to *contrafacta*

What could be the reason for taking music that existed already, changing the text, and re-using it with a new one, that is, for making a *contrafact*? Was it really a better way of proceeding than to compose an entirely new piece? If we begin to trace *contrafacts* through the history of music, the sheer number suggests that the answer would have to be yes. Yet the motives for making a *contrafact* were surely diverse and related to different aspects of the cultural context. I would like to explore here an explanation for the creation of *contrafacts* that employs the dimension of time: past, present and future. Each dimension reveals specific aspects that lie behind the re-textualising of music, and each will be illustrated by examples. As we will see, the theoretical model can also be applied to other cultural circumstances and musical pieces.

1. Leaning on the Past: *Contrafactum* as Legitimization

The first approach, which may be described as a ‘past-related’, is to look backward in time for a melody that is deeply rooted in tradition and already well-known to the public. Crucially, it is not only well-known at the time when the *contrafactum* was created, but already for generations; the community is convinced of its antiquity. A *contrafact* based on such a melody may be perceived as a continuation of the same tradition. Even if the text is newly

composed, or at least adapted, it benefits from the long-lasting memory and cultural importance of the melody. The musical material and its function (especially if ritual or liturgical) are perceived as valuable, and thus the new text receives a vehicle which is already deeply rooted and legitimized. That was probably the argument for preserving the melodies of Marian antiphons in early Lutheranism. The text had to be changed for doctrinal reasons, namely, from venerating Virgin Mary to venerating Christ himself, but the melodies were such an important part of collective memory that instead of introducing a totally new piece, many communities were content to adapt the existing one. The Marian antiphon *Salve Regina mater misericordiae*, for example, which was sung by many Catholics at the end of Vespers and during burial ceremonies, received a Christocentric text (*Salve Jesu Christe rex misericordiae*, or *Salve Rex Christe pater misericordiae*, or other variants) and continued to be performed in the very same circumstances by the Lutherans: at the end of the evening prayer, or during burial ceremonies.¹ The examples from St Elisabeth Church in Wrocław, which I considered in a previous article,² testify that even after changing the original chant melody to a polyphonic setting, it was regarded as a very antique part of the repertoire; as even in the late eighteenth century it appeared in handwritten hymnbooks in its Latin version.³ This type of contrafact seems to be particularly well suited for re-working the original material, as the principle of preserving and transmitting (resounding etymologically in the term ‘tradition’) is of special importance while re-using music deeply rooted in the past. For example, it seems highly likely that the variant of chant melody written in a source from St Elisabeth Church with text *Salve Jesu Christe* corresponds to a local pre-Reformation variant of *Salve Regina* used by the Catholics up to the unification of chant

¹ For more on the topic of Marian antiphons in the early Lutheranism see e.g. Mary E. FRANDSEN, “Salve Regina / Salve Rex Christe: Lutheran Engagement with the Marian Antiphons in the Age of Orthodoxy and Piety,” *Musica Disciplina*, 55 (2010), 129–218.

² Katarzyna SPURGJASZ, “Salve Jesu Christe, Rex misericordiae. Lutheran adaptations of pre-Reformation repertoire from St Elisabeth’s Church in Wrocław,” in: *Contrafacta. Modes of Music Re-textualization in the Late Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century*, ed. Marina Toffetti, Gabriele Taschetti (Kraków: Musica Iagellonica, 2020), 173–186.

³ See, for example, a handwritten hymnbook *Vollständiges Musicalisch-Elisabetanisches Kirchen Gesang-Buch*, PL-Wu RM 2806.

melodies imposed by the Tridentine reform, and preserved in a Lutheran source with adjusted text.⁴

A special case of *contrafacta* based in the past are translations of texts, prepared with the same metrical pattern as the original, in order to allow singing the new text to the original melody. The care for preserving both melody and the meaning of the text is often found in the field of sacred music, to preserve the performance context of the original and to extend it for the translation. That is the case of vernacular translations of Latin hymns, *cantiones*, etc., or different language versions of the same text that has liturgical/devotional importance (psalms, hymns, other forms of poetry with sacred texts for private use). Indications of the incipit of the original version, as well as the concordances of metrical patterns may testify to the knowledge of the original (at least to some extent); these *contrafacta* may be traced particularly in the environments of mixed languages, which applies both to Latin/vernacular cases and to neighboring vernacular languages.⁵ However, the past-related approach to *contrafacta*-translations, resulting in preserving the text meaning while changing the language, may occur in the secular music as well; it seems that the different language versions of secular songs could be much more varied in terms of the text content, as the contextual frames were less rigid.⁶

⁴ See handwritten appendix to a collection of music prints PL-Wu SDM 241–249; description and scan of the *Salve Jesu Christe* in: Katarzyna SPURJASZ, “Salve Jesu Christe, Rex misericordiae. Lutheran adaptations...,” 178.

⁵ See, for example, Lithuanian translations of selected Psalm texts, preserving metrical patterns of Jan Kochanowski’s Polish translations of the Book of Psalms: Saliamonas Mozerka SLAVOČINSKIS, *Giesmes tikieimuy katholicam pridiarancias* (Vilnae: Typis Academicis Societatis Iesu, 1646), and: Jan KOCHANOWSKI, *Psalterz Dawidów* (Kraków: Drukarnia Łazarzowa, 1579).

⁶ See, for example, translations of the Italian balletto *L’innamorato* (*A lieta vita*) by Giovanni Gastoldi (*idem*, *Balletti a cinque voci...*, Venezia: Ricciardo Amadino, 1591): English *Sing we and chant it* (Thomas Morley, *The First Booke of Balletts to Five Voyces*, London: Thomas Este, 1595) and Polish *Chcemy li sobie. A laeta vita po polsku* (*Pieśni y tańce zabawom uczciwym gwoli*, [Kraków], 1614). The original text is about love, the English version describes delights of the youth in general, while the Polish version focuses on the good effects of drinking wine. Gastoldi’s balletto served also as a basis for a sacred *contrafactum*: German version *In dir ist Freude* appeared for the first time in Johann Lindemann’s collection of Christmas hymns (*Amor-um filii Dei decades duae ... Zwanzig Weyhenachten Gesenglein ... zum Theil unter ... Madrigalia und Balletti*, Erfurt: Georg Baumann, 1598), and was further elaborated by other composers (including Johann Sebastian Bach in his chorale prelude *In dir ist Freude* BWV 615 from *Das Orgel-Büchlein*).

At least two aspects require further investigation, based on a much broader range of source examples. The first aspect is the relation between the most durable musical repertoires and their cultural context, linked to the rites of passage and to crucial moments in time cycles (day, year etc.). It is probably not just a coincidence that the decision to preserve the melody and adapting the text (if absolutely necessary) concerned an antiphon used at the end of a day (Vespers/Compline) and of a life (burial ceremonies). The past-related approach to *contrafacta* evokes ideas of stability, permanence, and continuation; it functions mainly in the context in which ‘antiquity’ or ‘long-lasting tradition’ is valued more highly than an introduction of ‘novelty’; note, however, that as culture stays alive – that is, in motion – sometimes a text needs to be adjusted or added in order to adapt to what is changing. The second aspect that needs further examination is the question of whether this type of *contrafactum* is likely to cross the contextual boundaries within the text change. It would seem that it more often stays within more or less the same area of associations, and avoids passing, for example, from sacred to secular (or vice versa), as the paradigm of tradition/continuation may play a self-limiting role in this regard.

2. Reacting to the Present: *Contrafactum* as Propaganda

The second approach is related to the present: the melody used as a basis for a *contrafactum* does not necessarily belong to a long-lasting tradition, it is just widely popular at the moment. The new text thus receives a vehicle that is known by everyone, or almost everyone, so there is no need for publicity: in fact, the melody itself functions as publicity. What is particularly striking in this approach to *contrafacta*-making is that very often this method is used to cross different types of cultural borders with the change of text: one example is the case of popular dance melodies or operatic arias that received a sacred text and were performed during religious services.⁷

The special case of present-related *contrafacta* is the phenomenon of a public dispute led through songs. If the community is engaged in a public quarrel, for example about political or confessional matters, and on one side there appears a song which mocks or insults their adversaries, sometimes the other

⁷ On the latter case, particularly prevalent in eighteenth-century vocal-instrumental liturgical music, see e.g.: Tomasz Jeż, “Contrafacta of Operatic Arias among the Dominicans of Baroque Silesia,” *De musica disserenda* 11/1–2 (2015), 147–162.

side takes the same melody and adds a new text with the opposite meaning. It may be difficult to find out why exactly the *contrafactum* was chosen as a better fighting tool than a genuinely new piece ('live by the sword, die by the sword?'), but perhaps the explanation lies in taking advantage of the popularity the melody has already gained, or, in staying unidentified for the listeners in the public space until they are close enough to hear the words clearly... What is more, sometimes both sides of the quarrel try to convince each other (or maybe to convince themselves) that it was they who introduced the song first, it is their version that is the real, original one, and their adversaries are nothing more than uncreative and feeble imitators. Though it may seem improbable, such stories did really happen, as Jan Kvapil has shown with the example of 'song wars' between Lutherans and Catholics using the piece *Erhalt uns, Herr, bei deinem Wort*.⁸ The first group sang the song against 'two main enemies of the Holy Church: the Pope and the Turks', while the second replaced 'the Pope' with 'the Heretics', leaving the general structure (and the melody) unchanged. Besides, it was the melody of a pre-Reformation Latin hymn *Veni Redemptor gentium*, used widely with its vernacular translations, and – in the German-speaking lands – also with the text *Verleih uns Frieden gnädiglich* ('[O Lord], graciously grant us peace'), which gives a special colouring to this palette of *contrafacta*. Numerous examples of such practice, where contrafacts were used as a vehicle for political and/or confessional disputes, may be found in Rebecca Wagner Oettinger's analysis of the topic.⁹ One of the particularly widespread melodic patterns for such a discussion was the so-called *Judaslied* (*O du armer Judas*), which gained popularity due to its simple musical structure, familiarity of the original model (Latin sacred song *Laus tibi Christe*), but also the negative imagery recalled by the reference to Judas in the first German version of the text, which was then transferred to other 'addressees' of different contrafacts, mainly ecclesiastical or secular sovereigns.¹⁰ As Alexander Fisher has pointed out, the authors of particularly insulting new texts might have been held

⁸ Jan KVAPIL, *Die katholische Liedpropaganda in den Böhmisches Ländern*, doctoral dissertation (Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy, Ústav germánských studií, 2008), 171–187.

⁹ Rebecca Wagner OETTINGER, *Music as Propaganda in the German Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), chapter 4: *The Making of a Contrafactum: Music and Mockery in the Reformation*.

¹⁰ OETTINGER, *Music as Propaganda*.

responsible by city councils for a kind of public nuisance;¹¹ it seems however, that it was rather the verbal attack on the political power that was prosecuted, not the confessional polemic, how sharp it might have been.¹²

Instead of the paradigm of tradition/continuation found in the past-related type, in the present-related approach there is rather the idea of change/conquering other cultural fields. It may be clearly seen in an example of *contrafacta* of Easter liturgical pieces from sixteenth-century Germany: the sequence *Victimae paschali laudes immolent Christiani* was firstly changed into 'Invicti Martini laudes intonent Christiani' and then (by the Catholic polemist Petrus Sylvius) into 'Convicti Lutheri fraudes exhorrent Christiani', while the Easter vernacular hymn *Christ ist erstanden* (the use of which during the liturgy despite its vernacular language is documented in both pre-Reformation times and in Catholic communities after the Reformation) – firstly to 'Martinus hat gerathen' and then, by Sylvius, into 'Christ hat gerathen'. In his introduction to the edition of these texts, Sylvius expressed objections towards the Lutheran contrafacts: in the first case, he argued with placing Luther instead of Christ, while in the second he objected to the insults directed towards Catholics.¹³ However, neither the Lutheran nor the Catholic author of the contradictory *contrafacta* felt any remorse for re-using liturgical material in such kind of polemics and indeed taking it out of liturgical context altogether.

Even if this approach seems particularly free towards textual and contextual issues, the musical features (melodic variants, rhythmic patterns) are rather likely to be preserved. Even if there are no ideological reasons for it, the principle here is to build a new version based on the common knowledge of the original.

¹¹ Alexander J. FISHER, "Song, Confession, and Criminality: Trial Records as Sources for Popular Musical Culture in Early Modern Europe," *Journal of Musicology*, 18 (2001), 616–657.

¹² See e.g. Katarzyna SPURGJASZ, *Kolekcja muzykaliów Joannesa Chrysostomusa Zalaskiego jako źródło do badań kultury muzycznej Śląska w czasach rekatolizacji (1654–1707)* [Joannes Chrysostomus Zalaski's music collection as a trace of Silesian music culture in the time of re-catholicisation (1654–1707)], doctoral dissertation (Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, Wydział Historyczny, 2020), 293–296, 307–308.

¹³ See e.g. Alexander J. FISHER, *Music and Religious Identity in Counter-Reformation Augsburg (1580–1630)* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 61–62; OETTINGER, *Music as Propaganda*.

3. Projecting Future: *Contrafactum* as Recycled Material

The third type of *contrafacta* is related to the future, namely, when borrowed music with a new text is introduced to a new audience. Neither tradition nor popularity serves as the main argument for re-using music but rather its good quality that is expected to convince the listeners (probably without spending a lot of time and money on commissioning a new piece from a renowned composer). A person who decides to use this kind of *contrafactum* believes that the audience ‘will like it’; to make the entire piece even more likely to be liked, they change the text, to better meet a concrete demand or, for example, to have it in a more understandable language (not necessarily preserving the context of the original version). That might have been a motive for many editors of the anthologies of *contrafacta*, for example, for Ambrosius Profe, active in seventeenth-century Wrocław, who took Italian madrigals and motets, and added new texts that could be performed within a Lutheran devotional context while retaining the features of the original music.¹⁴ This type of *contrafactum* could be the most independent from the original since the listeners and even the performers of the piece in many cases do not know it is a *contrafactum*, and the musical material is not a significant part of collective nor individual memory and heritage. The text, context, and any kind of musical features (from arrangement to rhythmic shape) may thus be changed without any objections. It is because the listeners, not knowing the original, do not have anything to object to – at least nothing more than happens in any case of introducing new repertoire. Moreover, if the *contrafactum* is printed without any indication about the original, even if the environment of the *contrafacta*-maker was conscious about its origins, it might not have been the case of all the recipients of the print.

¹⁴ On Ambrosius Profe’s editorial activity see e.g. Adam ADRIO, “Ambrosius Profe (1589–1661) als Herausgeber italienischer Musik seiner Zeit,” in: *Festschrift Karl Gustav Fellerer zum sechzigsten Geburtstag am 7. Juli 1962*, ed. Heinrich Hüsch (Regensburg: Bosse, 1962), 20–27; Wolfram STEUDE, “Wrocławski organista Ambrosius Profius (1589–1661) jako edytor i wydawca muzyki wokalnej XVII w.,” in: *Tradycje Śląskiej Kultury Muzycznej*, vol. 6: *Księga konferencji 5–7 IV 1990* (Wrocław: Akademia Muzyczna we Wrocławiu, 1992), 51–60; Kristin Marie SPONHEIM, *The Anthologies of Ambrosius Profe (1589–1661) and the Transmission of the Italian Music in Germany*, doctoral dissertation (Yale University, 1995); Barbara WIERMANN, *Die Entwicklung vokal-instrumentalen Komponierens im protestantischen Deutschland bis zur Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002); Tomasz JEŻ, *Danielis Sartorii Musitalia Wratislaviensia* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Sub Lupa, 2017), 18–22.

4. Travelling in Time: *Contrafactum* between Past, Present, and Future

As it happens often to theoretical models, especially those newly proposed, there are many examples of contrafacts that do not fit into only one category. To complicate the model, we should consider at least two groups of contrafacts that seem to combine the aforementioned categories.

The first would be the case of melodies that ceased to be transmitted in living tradition, and were excavated from written sources centuries later. They were re-introduced to the practice with a new text, without any further links to the original, apart from designating them as being 'an old melody'. Reusing such material seems to be a hybrid of 'past' and 'future' models: antiquity is perceived as valuable (and in fact as a reason for making a *contrafactum* instead of composing a new melody), but the intended users of the final product are unaware of the original meaning and context, and the paradigm of tradition/continuation is quite limited. One of the examples of that approach to *contrafacta* may be the Advent/Christmas song *O come, o come, Emmanuel*, that became popular in different parts of Christian English-speaking world, and then received subsequent translations to other languages. The English text itself is a translation of a Latin hymn, derived from the so-called O-Antiphons (antiphons to the canticle Magnificat, sung from 17 to 24 December, that is, during the last days of Advent).¹⁵ The earliest source of the English text and the musical material joined together is the 1851 edition of the *Hymnal Noted*, edited by Thomas Helmore. The melody was labelled as taken 'from a French Missal in the National Library, Lisbon', suggesting a possibility of the hymn being a *contrafactum*, however without either detailed bibliographical data or the original text incipit.¹⁶ The impossibility of finding the original source of the melody even led to the suggestion that Thomas Helmore had actually composed the melody himself and used the indication of the hymn being a *contrafactum* only as a kind of legitimisation or publicity in a time when medieval culture was in fashion.¹⁷ The original piece was identified by Mary Berry (in a short

¹⁵ Despite the Latin hymn being labelled as 'medieval', 'twelfth-century' or even 'ninth-century' in numerous contemporary hymnbooks and editions, its origins require further investigation (the earliest traceable written sources are from the early eighteenth century).

¹⁶ *Hymnal Noted. Parts I. & II* (London – New York: Novello, Ewer and Co., 1851), 131.

¹⁷ Nicholas Temperley in *The Cambridge News*, 21.12.1965, quoted after: Mother Thomas MORE, "O Come, O Come, Emmanuel," *The Musical Times* 107 (no. 1483, September 1966), 772.

note written under her religious name Mother Thomas More) in 1966, over a century after *The Hymnal Noted* had been published.¹⁸ The melody turned out to appear in fifteenth-century *Processionale* (F-Pn Lat. 10581) used – according to Berry’s hypothesis – by French Franciscan nuns; the original text, however, had nothing in common with Helmore’s Advent *contrafactum*: it was a trope for the funeral responsory *Libera me*, with text incipit *Bone Jesu dulcis cunctis*.¹⁹ The argument for choosing that melody for an English hymn in the mid-nineteenth century probably fit into our category of past-related. But the original context (apart from the ‘old melody’ designation) was kept secret from the public to an extent that generated accusation of a kind of falsification; that adds a future-related feature of *contrafacta*-making, introducing an ‘old melody’, that is, in fact, a completely ‘new one’ for the audience. The difference between the textual content of the original and of the *contrafactum* is characteristic for the ‘future-type’; even if it does not cross the boundaries between the sacred and the secular, funeral music still seems quite distant from Advent/Christmas music.²⁰ Last but not least, it should be noted, that in this case (and probably in other examples of the mixed past/future type) making a *contrafactum* was critical for allowing the music material to become popular. Not only it was brought back to musical life after centuries of oblivion, but due to the new text the melody reached a far broader audience than it might have had if it had been introduced to a nineteenth-century hymnal with the original text of a trope to a funeral responsory.²¹

¹⁸ MORE, “O Come, O Come, Emmanuel.”

¹⁹ See F-Pn Lat. 10581, f. 89v-101r (<https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b9076629n/f91.item.r=10581.langEN>). Later sources of this piece (from sixteenth and early seventeenth century, mainly from the Paris region) have been listed by Chris FENNER (*Bone Jesu dulcis cunctis / Veni Emmanuel*, Hymnology Archive, 26 November 2018, <https://hymnologyarchive.com/bone-jesu-dulcis-cunctis>, accessed 8.09.2022).

²⁰ The author of this article began to trace the origins of the music material after asking herself why such a somber melody had been used for rather a joyful text – which may suggest that crossing of contextual boundaries might be audible in some way (but a simple hypersensitivity for *contrafacta* cannot be excluded in this case).

²¹ Apart from numerous hymnals containing *O come, o come, Emmanuel* in different languages, for liturgical or domestic use in different Christian denominations, the piece made its way to popular culture in late 20th and 21st century, being further re-used (either as instrumental arrangements or as *contrafacta*). The arrangement for piano and cello by an American duo The Piano Guys, released on YouTube in 2013, had almost 40 million views as for September, 2022; while a ‘contrafactum’ in U2’s song *White as Snow* might be perceived as a reference to the origi-

The second mixed-type of *contrafacta* combines present-related and future-related approaches. In this case, however, it is often our lack of information that prevents us from categorising a specific piece with a changed text as either an intentional (and perceivable) reference to the well-known original, or rather, apparently new material introduced to the audience which is not necessarily able to read such a palimpsest between the lines. It may become even more complicated if the *contrafacta*-maker sends his work out into the world (for example through having it printed), and the piece reaches an audience unaware of its origins (sometimes even of the fact that it is a *contrafactum* at all). Another level of entanglement comes with the time difference: when the living transmission, and the knowledge of the context are broken, the labelling of contrafacts according to the time-related model of three types may be much more difficult (as is also the identification of the pieces as contrafacts at all). Decoding the correspondence between the original and the new text – which comes sometimes with long years of research – can suggest changing the category from future-related to present-related, or leaving it somewhere in between. The research on the *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, for example, has led to identifications of possible models, which correspond to the new texts in terms of the topics and images used.²² Such a connection suggests that the new texts were chosen according to the already familiar repertoire, not just to produce a new piece in a new context. On the other hand, the examples of low-quality sacred contrafacts of operatic arias, in which the new text seems to be forcibly pressed into the frames of the original vocal part without any sense of phrasing and using repetitive patterns, provoke a question whether the author of the *contrafactum* had ever heard the original, or simply composed an exercise made on a basis of written material²³.

nal, funeral text (however with no explicit links between them, and probably prepared without a consciousness about the tune's origins).

²² See, for example, a preliminary research on Franciscan connections of *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, presented by Marie-Virginie CAMBRIELS in her paper *Centonisation and franciscan influences in the Cantigas de Santa Maria* at the conference *Awakening Sleeping Instruments: a symposium on the vielle and medieval bowed instruments*, Centro Studi Adolfo Broegg, Spello, 31.07–1.08.2021.

²³ See, for example, the manuscript PL-Wu RM 4238 with four contrafacted arias from Gaetano Carpani's *Il trionfo della fede*, copied in 1743 with both original Italian and new Latin texts for the Cistercian monastery in Lubiąż (Silesia). The material is prepared for a critical edition by the author of this article.

Another type of re-using music, which may be situated somewhere between the present-related and the future-related approach, is the case of polyphonic compositions based on *cantus prius factus* or parody technique (monodic/polyphonic model re-used with new text). Even if many of the borrowings from secular compositions for constructing a mass or a motet seem to be made because of pure aesthetic values of the music – with no reference to the text – sometimes there seems to be a hidden connection (at least hidden for contemporary musicologists and listeners, not necessarily for the recipients of the piece at the time of its composition).²⁴ A particular kind of doubt towards the intentionality of choosing pre-composed material occurs when the two texts are so different that they could be considered a violation of principles of decorum (e.g. a vulgar and obscene song re-used as a *cantus prius factus* for a mass setting).²⁵ If the composer did not lose his job, however, or was not banished, there are apparently only three possible explanations: either the melody was known with a different text (another *contrafactum*) as well, or it was completely unknown to the listeners, or the listeners had different principles of decorum than we may expect.

The theoretical model of time-related approaches to *contrafacta* is more an attempt to discuss the phenomenon from a different point of view (rather ‘why’ than ‘how’ the *contrafacta* were made) than a formula that covers the problem completely – as probably all the ‘why’ questions about history are at best only attempts at an answer. Applying the model to concrete source material may however be of some use in analysing the cultural context of contrafacts, even outside the written transmission.²⁶ Re-using music in many cases turned out to be perceived as a better option of creating a piece than composing it anew, whether for past, present or future reasons.

²⁴ See, for example, an analysis of the ‘L’Homme armé’ masses in: Craig WRIGHT, *The Maze and the Warrior: Symbols in Architecture, Theology, and Music* (Cambridge (MA)–London: Harvard University Press, 2004).

²⁵ See, for example, a melody of the song *Meiskin es u cutkin ru* in the *Agnus Dei* of Jacob Obrecht’s *Missa Scaramella*, identified by Fabrice FITCH (presented in a paper *New Obrechtiana (Or, What’s a Girl Like You Doing in a Place Like This?)* during the conference *Musical Interactions 1400–1650*, Prague, 14–17 September 2022).

²⁶ Similar approaches may be perceived in the field of traditional music, however the topic requires further ethnomusicological research (a preliminary conclusion of the possibility of applying similar models to *contrafacta* in oral transmission is drawn from conversations with musicians).

Summary

The motives for making contrafacts throughout the music history were related to different aspect of the cultural context. This text aims to discuss the approach related to the time, by proposing a theoretical model of past-, present-, and future-related *contrafacta* (as well as some mixed types), illustrated by few examples, mainly from early modern music history. The past-related type occurs when the original melody is deeply rooted in collective memory; the new text uses it as a kind of legitimization, or continuation of the same tradition. It is often the case of ritual/liturgical music, which is perceived as valuable and durable; the new text – be it adaptation to a changed context, or translation – is rather an adjustment than a substantial change. The present-related type of contrafacts is based on a temporary popularity of a specific music piece. The ideas of continuation, or stability are not evoked; the author of a contrafact needs only a well-known musical vehicle for a new text, without paying special attention to the cultural function of the original. This type of contrafacts is often used to cross different types of cultural borders with the change of the text (e.g. secular music re-used in sacred context, or different versions of a polemic text addressed vice-versa by two groups of people during a confessional or political conflict). The third type, future-related, occurs when a contrafact is introduced to a new audience, not necessarily with a previous knowledge of the original material. This type of contrafacts could be the most independent from the original (in both musical features and text meaning), as the musical material is not a significant part of neither collective nor individual memory and heritage. In the last part of the text, two mixed types (past/future, present/future) are discussed.

Keywords: contrafacts, music history, time, reception, transmission, Catholic music, Lutheran music, early modern music history.