

From Easter to St Catherine of Alexandria. The Metamorphosis of a Sequence

Andrea KOVÁCS

Liszt Academy of Music

Vörösmarty u. 35, H-1064 Budapest, Hungary

E-mail: met@vipmail.hu

(Received: February 2015; accepted: April 2015)

Abstract: Manuscripts and printed editions of Hungarian provenance contain 288 sequences, out of which 237 have their own music. Particular dioceses and ecclesiastical institutions could decide freely which item they would sing on a given feast. The Ascension sequence *Sursum sonet laudis melos*, besides being present in the Futaki Gradual, is found only in three manuscripts of Zagreb provenance and in the missal of that diocese printed in 1511. The item is a shortened version in seven verses of a longer, eleven-verse original, written before 1305 by an unknown author and occurring very rarely in sources outside Hungary. In its present shortened form, it is only preserved in the liturgical books of the Hungarian use. The surviving sources show that this variant of the text is the result of a deliberate recrafting that occurred in Zagreb in the first part of the 14th century.

Keywords: Ascension sequence, contrafactum, liturgical drama

The beginnings of the scholarly study of Gregorian chant in Hungary can be traced to the 1956 volume published by Benjamin Rajeczky under the title *Himnuszok és sequentiák*, as volume I of the planned series *Melodiarium Hungariae Medii Aevi*.¹ This was the first comprehensive edition of the texts of the Hungarian repertoire of both genres together with their respective melodies. Both the idea of the publication and its implementation was, from a national and international perspective alike, novel, modern and of a monumental scale. Its novelty consisted

1. *Himnuszok és sequentiák* [Hymns and Sequences], eds Benjamin Rajeczky – Polikarp Radó (Budapest: Zeneműkiadó Vállalat, 1956) (= *Melodiarium Hungariae Medii Aevi* 1).

in the new objectives not found in any contemporaneous work published either in Hungary or abroad. Its modernity is proven by the fact that the authoritative series *Monumenta Monodica Medii Aevi* was launched in the very same year, incidentally, with a volume devoted to hymns.² Its monumentality was granted by the collection's aim to comprise the hymns and sequences of all the existing notated liturgical sources known at the time, with their differences in text and music duly recorded. To achieve this end, it seemed inevitable to transcribe all items of every single manuscript, to analyse and compare their melodies, to consult foreign parallels, to reconstruct and to identify eventual borrowings. The importance of the *Melodiarium* and its impact on scholarship are shown, on the one hand, by its being sold out shortly after its publication, necessitating a new edition in 1976, and, on the other, by the fact that there is no Hungarian or foreign scholar of the subject to date who would not cite the volume as fundamental to his or her research.

Until recently, the repertoire of the sequence melodies found in Hungarian sources seemed to be completed and closed by Benjamin Rajeczky's groundbreaking edition: apart from the surfacing of a few isolated items no substantial increase of the repertoire could be expected. However, since the appearance of the 1982 Supplement to the *Melodiarium*³ a number of new sources have been discovered or become available,⁴ containing sequences lacking in the Rajeczky edition. This made it inevitable to reconsider the repertoire itself, which led to results beyond all expectation. Taking into account the contrafacta not published in the *Melodiarium*, yet indicated by their incipits, the number of notated items has almost doubled.

On musical grounds, the new pieces can be grouped into three categories. The first group is comprised of items which cannot, strictly speaking, be regarded as self-contained pieces, being bit different tonal versions of a given sequence. The most common practice, bringing about the smallest melodic change, is the alter-

2. *Hymnen* [vol. I], ed. Bruno Stäblein (Kassel–Basel: Bärenreiter Verlag, 1956) (= *Monumenta Monodica Medii Aevi* 1).

3. *Hymni et Sequentiae*. Pótkötet–Supplementband, ed. Benjamin Rajeczky (Budapest: Editio Musica, 1982) (= *Melodiarium Hungariae Medii Aevi* 1).

4. Sources of Hungarian provenance missing in the *Melodiarium* volumes, identified by their shelf marks in the RISM system, are as follows: H-Bn Fol. lat. 3522, H-Bn Ms. Mus 7240, H-Bu A 114, H-Bu A 115, H-Bu Cod. lat. 123, H-Kf Ms. 302, HR-Za 158, HR-Za II.a.31, HR-Za III.d.182, HR-Za VII. 104, HR-Zu MR 6, HR-Zu MR 10, HR-Zu MR 52, HR-Zu MR 108, HR-Zu MR 191, RO-AJ R I. 96, RO-AJ R IX. 57, RO-BRbn I. F. 67, RO-Mbe s. sign., RO-Sb 665, TR-Itks 60. Sources lacking a RISM code are: Csiksomlyó (Șumuleu Ciuc, RO), Franciscan Library 5252 (hereafter: CantCsik), Nagydisznód (Cisnădie, RO), Lutheran Rectory, s. sign. In determining the provenance of sources, the expressions “Hungarian” and “of Hungary” are used exclusively in reference to the organization of ecclesiastical hierarchy in medieval Kingdom of Hungary. The boundaries of this polity generally coincided with the ecclesiastical ones. This is only seemingly contradicted by the fact that the Diocese of Zagreb, whose territory from the 16th century on formed part of the Kingdom of Croatia, in church hierarchy belonged to the Province of Kalocsa. At the time of the foundation of the Diocese of Zagreb by King Ladislaus I of Hungary at end of the 11th century, its territory belonged not to Croatia but to historical Slavonia, then and later part of the Kingdom of Hungary. The liturgical sources of the Diocese of Zagreb are, therefore, ranked among those of the medieval Hungarian use(s) of the Roman rite.

nation between tritus and tetrardus (tones *f* and *g*, respectively).⁵ Singularly, the St Francis prosa *Caput draconis ultimum*, appearing in the sources in tone *f*, is supplemented by a doxology-like appendix in deuterus (*e*).⁶ Much bolder and unusual is the way in which the Csiksomlyó Cationale transforms the protus model melody of *Hodiernae lux diei celebris in matris Dei* into the tritus of the contrafactum *Spe mercedis et coronae*.⁷ The case is not that of an erroneous use of key, otherwise often occurring in the sources: the intentionality of the transformation is demonstrated by the adaptation of the intervals of the model melody to the new tones as well as by verse 5 and the concluding *Amen*: the first two phrases of the verse are basically identical in both items, while the third one is openly marked by a difference in tone.

While in the first group the text of the sequence and its melody, albeit adapted to a different tonality, are both identical, the second group consists of contrafacta, that is, adaptations of existing, well-known musical material to newly written texts. If both texts have the same number of syllables, phrases and verses, the adaptation can be successfully accomplished without significant changes in the melody. On the other hand, a careful and calculated modification is needed when there are less verses or, at times, phrases in the contrafactum; while a skilful musical intervention – one might even say the creativity of a composer – is required if any of these, or indeed both, are more numerous than those of the original. Partly this fact, and partly the experience that no two sources present the same sequence or contrafactum identically note by note, makes one consider the necessity, in a future comprehensive critical edition, of publishing the re-texted versions of the model melodies in their entirety. There are 81 contrafacta that could be identified in the entire repertoire known to date.

The last group is made up of sequences that are already contained in the *Meliarium* but appear with new melodies,⁸ and of others, hitherto known only as texts or not found at all in liturgical books of medieval Hungarian use.

At the time of writing this, there have been discovered eight pieces formerly known with other melodic material as well as a further thirty-eight prosas hitherto

5. *Ave sidus lux dierum* (Our Lady), *Caeli solem imitantes* (Apostles), *Corona sanctitatis et immortalitatis* (St Adalbert), *Mittit ad Virginem* (Our Lady), *Plausu chorus laetabundo* (Evangelists), *Verbum Dei Deo natum* (St John the Apostle), *Virginalis turma sexus* (St Ursula). One manuscript (SK-BRm EL 18) presents the item *Decantemus congaudentes*, assigned to the feast of St Michael the Archangel and known only from Hungarian sources, as written in tone *g* (tetrardus), instead of tone *f* (tritus) as found in two other liturgical books, while using the key signature \flat in the last three verses (7–9), giving thus, as it were, a protus ending to the piece. The melodic material, however, renders it quite difficult to interpret this passage as written either in tetrardus, or in protus.

6. SK-BRm EL 18 f. 39^r [364^r].

7. CantCsik f. 89^v.

8. *Altissima providente* (Presentation of Our Lady), *Ave Verbi Dei parens* (Visitation of Our Lady), *Corde voce mente pura* (St Stephen the King), *De profundis tenebrarum* (St Augustine), *Iubilemus in hac die* (Our Lady), *Laus tibi Christe Patris optimi Nate* (Holy Innocents), *Missus Gabriel de caelis* (Our Lady), *Plausu chorus laetabundo* (Evangelists), *Sursum sonet laudis melos* (Ascension).

undocumented from Hungarian notated sources. In what follows an attempt will be made to trace the history of a prosa taking on a new melody.

The sequence *Sursum sonet laudis melos*, besides being present in the Futaki Gradual, is found only in three manuscripts of Zagreb provenance and in the missal of that diocese printed in 1511.⁹ It is assigned in the Gradual for the weekdays after the Ascension of the Lord (*De ascensione Domini ferialis*), while in the Zagreb sources it is prescribed for the Sunday after, and the octave day of the same feast (*In dominica infra octavas ascensionis Domini et in octava eiusdem*). The item, as Edit Madas remarks,¹⁰ is a shortened version in seven verses of a longer, eleven-verse original, written before 1305 by an unknown author and very rarely occurring in sources outside Hungary.¹¹ In its present shortened form it is only preserved in the liturgical books of the Hungarian use. The surviving sources show that this variant of the text is the result of a deliberate recrafting that occurred in Zagreb in the first part of the 14th century.

The item was until now known from only one single notated source, the Futaki Gradual. Its melody there is an independent creation, evoking the style of two sequences of German origin, *Gaude Sion quod egressus* (St Elizabeth) and *Plausu chorus laetabundo* (Evangelists).¹² A different melody is found on the pages of the Zagreb Gradual, copied a century earlier. In our source, the melody of the Easter prosa *Surgit Christus cum trophaeo*, appearing for the most part in the manuscripts from the periphery of medieval Hungary (Upper Hungary, Transylvania, Zagreb),¹³ is applied to the poem on Ascension. Due to the differences in the number of syllables, phrases and verses, the adaptation could not be achieved mechanically. As contrasted with the five three-line verses (8+8+7) and the two four-line verses (8+8+8+7) of the piece on Ascension, the Easter prosa has a more varied and complex structure: two three-line verses (8+8+7) are followed by two five-line verses (4×8+7) and one six-line verse (6×8), only to be concluded by a two-

9. HR-Za III.d.182 f. 65^r, HR-Zu MR 133 f. 211^v, HR-Zu MR 170 f. 174^v, TR-Itks 68 f. 263^r, *Missale Zagradiense* (Venezia, 1511, hereafter: MissZag 1511) f. 258^v.

10. Edit Madas, "Sursum sonet laudis melos. Egy középkori magyarországi szekvencia külföldi előzményei, liturgikus és liturgián kívüli használata" [Sursum sonet laudis melos. The foreign antecedents of a sequence from medieval Hungary, its use in and outside the liturgy], in *Convivium. Pajorin Klára 70. születésnapjára*, eds Enikő Békés – Imre Tegyei (Debrecen–Budapest: s.n., 2012), 147–153.

11. *Sequentiae ineditae. Liturgische Prosen des Mittelalters*, hrsg. von Guido Maria Dreves (Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1891) (= *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi* [hereafter: AH] 10), 36–37: from the early prints of Zagreb and from a 1523 Dominican missal published in Venice. *Sequentiae ineditae. Liturgische Prosen des Mittelalters*, hrsg. von Clemens Blume (Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1900) (= AH 34), 36–37: from a Basle sequentiale of the early 16th century.

12. TR-Itks 68 f. 263^r, edited in *Hymni et Sequentiae*, 79–80.

13. A-Su M.III.23 f. [327^v], H-Bn 91 f. 173^r, H-Bn 172a f. 371^v, H-Bn 222 f. 174^v, H-Bu Cod. lat. 123 f. 294^r, H-Efkö I. 1b f. 171^v, H-Efkö I. 3 f. 306^v, HR-Za III.d.23 f. 262^r, HR-Za III.d.182 f. 63^r, HR-Zu MR 13 f. 264^r, HR-Zu MR 26 f. 215^v, HR-Zu MR 133 f. 210^v, HR-Zu MR 170 f. 174^v, PL-GNd 150 p. 723, RO-BRbn I. F. 67 f. 136^v, RO-Sb 759 f. 173^r, TR-Itks 60 f. 180^v, TR-Itks 68 f. 256^r, CantCsik f. 61^r, Gyergyószentmiklós (Gheorgheni, RO), Catholic Parish 845 f. 248^r, *Missale Quinqueecclesiense* (Basel, 1487) f. 270^v, *Missale Quinqueecclesiense* (Venezia, 1499) f. 252^v, MissZag 1511 f. 257^v.

TABLE 1 *Surgit Christus cum trophaeo* – *Sursum sonet laudis melos*

	Surgit Christus cum trophaeo	Sursum sonet laudis melos	
	scheme	scheme	melody
1a-b)	8+8+7	8+8+7	=
2a-b)	8+8+7	8+8+7	=
3a-b)	8+8 8+8+7	8+8+7	3/3–5.
4a-b)	8+8 8+8+7	8+8+7	4/3–5.
5a-b)	8+8 8+8+8+8	8+8+7	5/3–4. + 2/3.
6a-b)	8+8	8+8+8+7	6) + 5/4. + 2/3.
7a-b)	—	8+8+8+7	5/3–6.

line one (8+8). The differences in the composition of the texts are reflected in the musical material. The melodies of the first two verses fit the new text without any problem. In the case of the next two verses, a simple and rational solution was to omit the first two lines. Verses 5–6, contrary to the preceding ones, are not a simple rewording of the single verses flowing in a continuous order of lines, but is constructed from different phrases of various verses, not shunning repetition either. Thus the last phrase of verse 2 reappears as the closing line of verses 5 and 6, whereas phrase 4 in verse 5 is the musical source of the penultimate section of verse 6 in the contrafactum, missing from the original *Surgit Christus*. No model melody being available for the ending of the piece, here the musical material of verse 5 returns, this time without the first two lines (*Table 1, Example 1*).

For lack of non-Hungarian notated sources, it is impossible as yet to tell which might have been the melody of the longer text that had served as a model for our piece: either one of the two versions figuring in the two graduals, suggesting that one of the manuscripts took over the music along with the text, or a third melodic material, different from these, indicating that our sources preserve Hungarian compositions. With respect to the Futaki Gradual, the reasons given above make it impossible to answer the question, while the Zagreb contrafactum can with an almost complete certainty be regarded as being of Hungarian origin.

The first argument to support this hypothesis rests on the fact that a high level of expertise in composing – a rare phenomenon in contemporary practice, though not unprecedented – was needed to adapt the melody of a shorter piece to the text of a much longer poem. The applying of the musical material of the sequence *Surgit Christus cum trophaeo*, consisting of six – outside Hungary, sometimes seven¹⁴ – verses, to the earlier, eleven-verse variant of *Sursum sonet*, which served as a model to the Hungarian sequence, must have caused quite a headache to a *mu-*

14. After the fourth verse, some sources insert an additional one in which the questions are followed by the answers *Totum mundum tenebrari...* and *Matrem nato defraudari...*

EXAMPLE 1 Surgit Christus cum trophaeo – Sursum sonet laudis melos

1a) *Surgit Christus cum trophaeo, Nam ex a-gno factus le-o, Sol-le-mni vi-cto-ri-a.*
 1b) *Mortem vi-cti sui a-mor-te, Re-se-ra-vit se-ras por-tae Sti-ae mor-tis gra-ti-a.*

2a) *Sursum so-net lau-dis me-los: Rex vic-tu-tum scandit cae-los Cae-le-sti po-ten-ti-a;*
 2b) *Ho-sic no-stro tri-um-pha-to Et in-fer-no spo-lli-a-to Scan-dit cum vi-cto-ri-a.*

2a) *Hic est a-gnus qui pe-n-de-bat, Et in cru-ce re-di-me-bat To-tum ge-gen-o-vi-um.*
 2b) *Cu-i nul-lus con-do-le-bat, Mag-da-le-nam con-su-me-bat Do-lo-ris in-ven-di-um.*

2a) *Lau-da-cue-lum et con-gau-de, Re-demp-to-ri no-stro plau-de lu-bi-lo lae-ti-ti-ae;*
 2b) *Pa-ra-thro-nos prin-ci-pa-les, Le-va-por-tas ae-ter-na-les, Ut in-tret rex glo-ri-ae.*

3a) *Dic Ma-ri-a, quid vi-di-sti Con-tem-plan-do cru-cem Chri-sti?*
 3b) *Dic Ma-ri-a, quid vi-di-sti Con-tem-plan-do cru-cem Chri-sti? Spi-ritus spo-lli-a-ri Et in cruce sub-le-va-ri Pe-c-ca-to-rum ma-ni-bus. Spi-ritus ca-put co-ro-na-tum, Vol-tum spu-itis ma-cu-la-tum Et ple-num li-vo-ri-bus.*

3a) *Quis est i-ste glo-ri-o-sus, Su-a-for-ma spe-ci-o-sus Mi-ra-pul-chri-tu-di-ne?*

4a) *Dic Ma-ri-a, quid vi-di-sti Con-tem-plan-do cru-cem Chri-sti? Quod se Pa-tri com-men-da-vit Et quod ca-put in-cli-na-vit Et e-mi-sit spi-ri-tum.*
 4b) *Dic Ma-ri-a, quid vi-di-sti Con-tem-plan-do cru-cem Chri-sti? Ha-sta la-tus per-fo-ra-ri, Ma-nus pe-des vul-ne-ra-ri, Vi-vi fontis ex-i-lum.*

4a) *Quid est i-stud quo ve-sti-tur? Cur ma-le-stas o-pe-ri-tur, Quae non e-git te-gmi-ne?*
 4b) *Haec est ve-stis il-la pi-a: Ca-ro sum-p-ta de Ma-ri-a Si-ne vi-ri-se-mi-ne.*

5a) *Dic Ma-ri-a, quid fe-ci-sti, Post-quam le-sum a-mi-si-sti? Ma-trem flen-tem so-ci-a-vi, Quam ad do-num re-por-ta-vi Et in ter-ram me-pro-stra-vi Et ut-tram-que de-plo-ra-vi.*
 5b) *Dic Ma-ri-a, quid fe-ci-sti, Post-quam le-sum a-mi-si-sti? Post-um-guen-ta pra-e-pa-ra-vi, Et se-pulch-rum vi-sta-vi, Nec in-ve-ni, quem a-ma-vi, Plan-ctus me-os du-pli-ca-vi.*

Qua - si ün - cta san - gui - ne?
Mo - ri - ens pro ho - mi - ne.

Cur est ve - stis la - ce - rata Et hinc in - de con - ca - va - ta
Haec sunt pla - gae, quas por - ta - vit, Hic, est san - guis, quo ma - na - vit,

5a) *O Ma - ri - a, no - li fle - re, lam sur - re - xit Chri - stus ve - re.*
5b) *Cer - te mul - tis ar - gu - men - tis Red - dit si - gna re - sur - gen - tis.*

6a) *Quis tam ma - gnus co - mi - ta - tus, Tam sol - le - mmis ap - pa - ra - tus?*
6b) *Haec sunt a - ni - mae be - a - tae, De in - fer - no li - be - ra - tae, Quo pro - ce - dit rex val - la - tus Tan - ta mul - ti - tu - di - ne?*
Quae fu - e - runt ca - pti - va - tae Pa - ren - te - li cri - mi - ne.

7a) *Er - go can - tem in hac di - e Tres cae - le - stes te - rat - chi - ae Na - to vir - gi - nis Ma - ri - ae Lau - des et prae - co - ni - a*
7b) *Qui na - tu - ram con - iu - ga - tam, Su - a mo - re - re - pa - ra - tam, Qua - si spon - sam ad - or - na - tam Trans - du - xit ad pro - pri - a.*

sicus. In other words, the attachment of the melody of *Surgit Christus* to the text of *Sursum sonet* could most probably have been taken place after the composition of the shorter version of the Ascension item, within the Diocese of Zagreb itself.

As a second argument, a hypothesis can be proposed that the choice of the melody for the textual variant of Zagreb was not made simply guided by the syllable, phrase and verse numbers of the piece, since the poems, as has been shown, are of a rather different structure. If textual conformity had been the reason for selecting precisely this melody for adaptation, the re-worker could have found for himself a much more comfortable situation, being free to select from among a number of sequences with identical or similar structure. Suffice it to think of the extremely popular piece *Laudes Crucis attollamus* and its innumerable contrafacta.

The selection of the melody, then, must have been the result of a judicious decision on ground of a number of liturgical and textual criteria. All missals and graduals of the Zagreb diocese from the 14th century on give the following rubric after the Easter prosa *Victimae paschali laudes*: “During the octave of the Resurrection of the Lord and afterwards to the feast of the Ascension, the sequence *In ara Crucis hostiam*, alternating with the following two [i.e. *Illuxit dies quam fecit Dominus* and *Surgit Christus cum trophaeo*].”¹⁵ This means that in Eastertide, the most important period of the liturgical year, the sequence *Surgit Christus cum trophaeo* was returning regularly, while its contrafactum, the piece *Sursum sonet laudis melos* became a feature of the time between Ascension and Pentecost. Within this cycle, *Victimae paschali laudes*, the most widespread and best-known sequence of Eastertide was also performed. It was linked to the end of the prosa *Surgit Christus* from its second section onwards, beginning with the words *Dic nobis Maria*. Its use was in most cases hinted at by the incipit of the text or the melody, sporadically supplemented by the remarks *ut supra* or *ut infra*; in some sources a precise rule was given in a short rubric: *Dic nobis Maria quid: require in sequentia Victimae paschali*. The joining of the two pieces was not accidental: it clearly showed that the prosa *Surgit Christus* preceding the second section of *Victimae* had originated as its trope, its textual-musical commentary.

Besides the liturgical ordering of the pieces, the musical correspondence between *Surgit Christus* and *Sursum sonet* was also justified by the similarity of the design of the two poems. In both of them, after the first two verses summing up the essence of Easter or Ascension, there follows a dialogue between the actors of the story (Mary Magdalen at Easter, the angels at Ascension) and the choir: “Tell us, Mary, what did you see looking at the cross of the Lord?” (*Dic, Maria, quid vidisti contemplan-do crucem Christi?*), and: “Who is this glorious one?” (*Quis est iste gloriosus?*). The structural and, consequently, musical differences

15. *Infra octavam resurrectionis Domini et abhinc ad festum ascensionis sequentia alternatim cum sequentibus duabus*. HR-Za III.d.182, HR-Zu MR 6, HR-Zu MR 133, HR-Zu MR 170, MissZag 1511.

between the two pieces arise precisely from the different ordering of the dialogue. Whereas the Easter prosa, like *Victimae paschali*, condenses the question and the answer into a single half-verse by increasing the number of lines, the Ascension piece retains the three-line structure, questioning in part *a* and answering in part *b* of the verse (Table 2).¹⁶

The dialogue sections of the two sequences suggest the possibility of dramatization. There are no hints to such procedure in the Hungarian sources of *Sursum sonet*. However, Kálmán Timár,¹⁷ and later Sándor Bálint,¹⁸ describe a popular custom on the day of Ascension practiced in a liturgical setting: people hoist a statue of Christ with a rope up to the loft of the church, while two choirs alternately sing the verses of this sequence. The dialogue is unequivocally indicated in a hitherto unknown source of the longer version of the sequence. In the miscellany bearing the title *Horae ad usum Parisiensem*, compiled in the last quarter of the 15th century for Charles VIII the Affable, King of France (1483–1498), after the Offices of Our Lady, of the Holy Cross and of the Dead, followed by litanies and suffrages, we find the text of the prosa with the incipit *Iesum sonet* which actually names the speakers of the dialogue.¹⁹

Although it cannot be stated with an absolute certainty, a dialogized performance of *Surgit Christus* might be hinted at in the rubric preceding the sequence in the Kassa Gradual and in the liturgical books of Zagreb. They read respectively as *De resurrectione specialis prosa* and *Cum expedierit sollempnizare sequitur alia sequentia*. The sequence may have been rendered special and solemn by the personalized performance of the dialogue between Mary Magdalen and the choir. At any rate, the rubrics of non-Hungarian liturgical books (mentioning *chorus*, *cantor*, *per modum dialogi sequentia* etc.) which make the rule of a dialogized performance unmistakably clear,²⁰ allows for the hypothesis of a similar usage also in Hungary.

The evolution of the Zagreb Ascension prosa can be reconstructed as follows. Its point of departure is the sequence *Victimae paschali laudes*, which was troped in the second half of the 13th century by the piece *Surgit Christus cum trophaeo*. Around the same time, the first reference to the longer version of *Sursum sonet laudis melos* appears, followed after some years or decades, by the shorter version of Zagreb as a contrafactum of *Surgit Christus*. There is a great variety of genres as well: a sequence, a trope, a short mystery play, and a text intended for devotional or homiletic purposes surface in the process – the last one as the

16. Verse 3b (*Hic est rerum proceator...*) is lacking in the first and last liturgical sources of *Sursum sonet laudis melos* (HR-Za III.d.182 and MissZag 1511, respectively). The text of phrases 2–3 is written out on the margin of the Gradual in a later hand.

17. Kálmán Timár, “Falegény” [Wooden youth], *Magyar Nyelv* 25–26 (1929), 376.

18. Sándor Bálint, *Karácsony, Húsvét, Pünkösöd* [Christmas, Easter, Pentecost] (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1976), 329–330.

19. F-Bn lat. 1370 f. 217^v–218^v.

20. *Liturgische Prosen des Übergangsstiles und der zweiten Epoche*, hrsg. von Clemens Blume and Henry Marriott Bannister (Leipzig: O. R. Reiland, 1915) (=AH 54), 368.

TABLE 2 *Surgit Christus cum trophaeo – Sursum sonet laudis melos*

	Surgit Christus cum trophaeo	Sursum sonet laudis melos
3a)	Dic, Maria, quid vidisti Contemplando crucem Christi? Vidi Iesum spoliari Et in cruce sublevari Peccatorum manibus.	Quis est iste gloriosus, Sua forma speciosus Mira pulchritudine?
3b)	Dic, Maria, quid vidisti Contemplando crucem Christi? Spinis caput coronatum, Vultum sputis maculatum Et plenum livoribus.	Hic est rerum procreator, Adae lapsus reparator Sua fortitudine.
4a)	Dic, Maria, quid vidisti Contemplando crucem Christi? Quod se Patri commendavit Et quod caput inclinavit Et emisit spiritum.	Quid est istud, quo vestitur? Cur maiestas operitur, Quae non egit tegmine?
4b)	Dic, Maria, quid vidisti Contemplando crucem Christi? Hasta latus perforari, Manus pedes vulnerari, Vivi fontis exitum.	Haec est vestis illa pia: Caro sumpta de Maria Sine viri semine.
5a)	Dic, Maria, quid fecisti, Postquam Iesum amisisti? Matrem flentem sociavi, Quam ad domum reportavi Et in terram me prostravi Et utrumque deploravi.	Cur est vestis lacerata Et hinc inde concavata Quasi tincta sanguine?
5b)	Dic, Maria, quid fecisti, Postquam Iesum amisisti? Post unguenta praeparavi, Et sepulchrum visitavi, Nec inveni, quem amavi, Planctus meos duplicavi.	Haec sunt plagae, quas portavit, Hic, est sanguis, quo manavit, Moriens pro homine.

first written record of the piece, found by Edit Madas in a tract by the Franciscan theologian Ubertinus de Casale (1259–1328).²¹ Although the liturgical use of the Zagreb sequence was limited to a rather small area, its text intended for reading survives in two sermons by Osvaldus Lasko in Latin, and also in the *Érsekújvár Codex*, compiled for Dominican nuns between 1529 and 1531, in Hungarian.²²

21. Madas, “*Sursum sonet laudis melos*,” 149.

22. *Ibid.*, 150. The first half-phrase of the longer version is also quoted in Latin in a devotional work written in Italian, probably for the use of nuns: *Presepe spirituale composto da una venerabil monaca et priora di uno monastero vivente in osservantia regolare* (Vinegia: Gulielmo da Fontaneto, 1534).

TABLE 3 *Surgit Christus cum trophaeo* – *Surgit virgo cum trophaeo*

	Surgit Christus cum trophaeo		Surgit virgo cum trophaeo		melody
	scheme		scheme		
1a-b)	8+8+7		8+8+7		=
2a-b)	8+8+7		8+8+7		=
3a-b)	8+8	8+8+7	8+8	8+8+8	=
4a-b)	8+8	8+8+7	8+8	8+8+8	3)
5a-b)	8+8	8+8+8+8	8+7	8+8+8+8	=
6a-b)		8+8	8+8	8+8+8	5/1–2. + 4/3–5.
7a-b)		—		8+8+8+7	5/3–6.

The last stage in this history is a sequence assigned for the feast of St Catherine of Alexandria, beginning with the words *Surgit virgo cum trophaeo*, which is found among the Hungarian sources only in the Futaki Gradual and stands without any parallel to date.²³ The piece, as clearly indicated by its first phrase, is a re-texting of the Easter sequence *Surgit Christus cum trophaeo*; its almost identical poetic conception, its dialogical nature and the identical placing of the dialogues all testify to the fact that text and music were both modelled on the earlier prosa. As a result, there was not much need of changes in the process of melodic adaptation (*Table 3*). It must be added that this is not a unique example of rewriting *Surgit Christus* for the feasts of saints, since similar pieces are found in some non-Hungarian liturgical books for the Marian Masses of Christmastide²⁴ as well as on the days of St Francis of Assisi²⁵ and St Cecilia.²⁶

23. TR-Itks 68 f. 295f.

24. *Surgit radix Jesse florum: Liturgische Prosen des Übergangsstiles*, 368.

25. *Fregit victor virtualis/Surgit victor triumphalis: Liturgische Prosen zweiter Epoche auf Feste der Heiligen*, hrsg. von Clemens Blume (Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1922) (=AH 55), 155.

26. *Vocem laudis exaltemus: Liturgische Prosen des Mittelalters*, hrsg. von Clemens Blume (Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1904) (=AH 44), 90.