

“To how many shameful deeds must you lend your image”: Schubert’s Pattern of Telescoping and Excision in the Texts of His Latin Masses

By John Gingerich

In allen Messen jedoch fehlt—und dies ist die bedeutsamste und wohl auch in ihrer Konsequenz kaum als Versehen erklärbare Auslassung—der die Kirche betreffende Glaubensartikel ‘et unam sanctam catholicam Ecclesiam.’ Die Aenderungen des liturgischen Textes dürfen indessen weder dogmatisch noch text-kritisch überwertet werden.

However all the masses are missing—and this is the most important, and because of its consistency an omission scarcely susceptible to explanation as an oversight—the article of faith concerning the church, “et unam sanctam catholicam Ecclesiam.” Nevertheless, the changes in the liturgical text should not be given undue dogmatic or text-critical importance.

Doris Finke-Hecklinger, foreword to *Messe in As* in *Neue Schubert Ausgabe* (1980, I/3:XIII)*

I.

A constant of Schubert reception has been the image of an unintellectual composer. From the early stories of songs gushing from his pen at near-performance tempo, to the Biedermeier Liederfürst, and the shy but good-natured tippler of *Dreimäderlhaus*, an image of subconscious creativity became wedded to a popular persona of childlike innocence: tubby, chubby, bespectacled Schwammerl, slightly befuddled in a lovably helpless way, shielded from the harsh cares and calculations of this world by an absent-minded preoccupation with beautiful melody and convivial drink.

This image of Schubert, long uncontroversial, now seems at best risibly quaint. Nevertheless, its grip remains deceptively tenacious. The more recent emphasis on Schubert’s darker side—his unruly sexuality, his alienation, his venereal disease, his preoccupation with death—has reinforced the ambient image of Schubert as a creature of instinctual drives, and concomitantly, of somnambulant, clairvoyant creativity. The deep current of Schubert’s reception as an instinctive genius sustains the new eddies swirling around Schubert the self-indulgent hedonist. Beneath the turbulent surface, Schubert, no longer childlike, remains innocent of sustained and serious thought.

Nowhere has intellectual condescension to Schubert been more acutely and persistently evident than in discussions of excisions from the Latin texts he used for his six settings of the Ordinary of the mass. A long line of musicologists from Otto Wissig in 1909 to Hans Jaskulsky in 1986 has commented on Schubert's mass texts. Of these, Jaskulsky's is by far the most thorough and thoughtful treatment, but Jaskulsky shares with his predecessors a reluctance to draw the relevant conclusions from his evidence. Speculations and explanations as to why Schubert set these truncated texts have included ignorance of Latin, ignorance of the orthodox version of the texts, carelessness, forgetfulness, the existence of a yet-to-be-discovered master text that Schubert unwittingly copied, and the existence of local oral traditions whose only known trace is Schubert's masses, and whose use by Schubert presumably had no bearing on his own beliefs. All of these explanations explicitly or implicitly deny Schubert agency, intention, knowledge, and responsibility, and obviate the asking of further questions about why Schubert set the texts he did, and what he may have meant by doing so.

In the Breitkopf and Härtel critical edition of Schubert's complete works, published in 1897, now reprinted by Dover, the mass texts appear as Schubert set them. The evidence contained in this central source, then, is not new; it has merely become harder to ignore. Since Jaskulsky's work, all but the most diehard defenders of Schubert's innocent virtue have abandoned the arguments that deny him any share in knowingly preparing his own mass texts. But most of the old explanations live on within new hybrid explanations designed to minimize Schubert's share in, or his knowledge of, the texts he was using. A popular contemporary explanation concedes that Schubert likely was aware of what he was doing when he cut the affirmation of belief in the "catholic Church" from the Credo, perhaps even when he cut the words affirming an expectation of resurrection, but this explanation maintains that carelessness probably accounts for the rest of the omissions (Hoorickx 1979:253-54; McKay 1996:237). It is frequently followed by an exhortation not to take Schubert's deviations from orthodoxy too seriously, as in the quotation at the beginning of this article, or in the statement by Kurt von Fischer (1985:127): "These omissions, in part intentional (leaving out 'Et unam Sanctam Ecclesiam' in all the masses, for example), but in part more likely accidental, should not be given undue importance."¹ Still another argument does grant Schubert agency, but also asks us not to take Schubert's text too seriously, since he sacrificed it to the music. Finally, there is the argument that since in Schubert's Vienna almost everyone played fast and loose with mass texts, Schubert's particular peccadilloes are merely the reflection of his carefree and careless time and place.

A state-of-the-art hybrid of arguments old and new is Manuela Jahrmärker's summary of the current consensus, written for the *Schubert Handbuch* in 1997:

The earlier assumption that Schubert simply handled the text carelessly or hastily, or that he did not have the complete text at hand, has now largely given way to the view that the consistent omission of the passage "et in unam sanctam catholicam ecclesiam" reflected Schubert's private position, as did his avoidance of setting the affirmation of the resurrection, "et expecto resurrectionem." Also held responsible for some text omissions are an insufficient knowledge of Latin, and considerations of musical form: when in the Gloria of the Mass in G the relative clause "qui sedes ad dexteram Patris," in the Mass in B-flat the plea "suscipe deprecationem nostram," and in the next Mass in C both phrases are missing, then in each case the formal balance of the respective paragraphs is the cause (Jaskulsky, 124 ff). But beyond all this, attention has been directed most emphatically to the historical fact that very few masses of the time set the text without any deviation, and only as a result of the Caecilian reform movement did a full text become compulsory (1894 [the year in which Pope Leo XIII issued the first edict against text omissions in musical settings of the mass]; Hoorickx, 251 ff., Kantner, *Schubert-Studien*, 137). (Jahrmärker 1997:353–54)²

Jahrmärker's diplomatic summary leaves much unsaid. Why is consistency the measure of Schubert's "private" positions? Which omissions are due to faulty Latin? (Only one omission has ever been associated with faulty Latin, and that is "et expecto resurrectionem," which Jahrmärker identifies as Schubert's "private" position.) If the formal balance of musical paragraphs "caused" text omissions, then ostensibly in each case the preceding or following phrase of text (with its musical setting and its "formal balance") received priority; did Schubert's "private" positions shape these choices? And if some of the omissions are due to Schubert's "private" positions, what are we to make of the "historical fact" that he was not alone in his excisions? Did other Viennese composers also hold private positions? How does the "historical fact" that a complete mass text was not yet compulsory affect whether or not Schubert cut text out of conviction, and why is our attention directed "emphatically" to precisely this ambiguous point? Close scrutiny of the internal logic of Jahrmärker's paragraph reveals stresses not easily reconciled.

The question of whether Schubert intentionally prepared his own mass texts needs to be considered first, separately from the question of why he

did so. The question of agency is logically prior, in any case; it is also simpler, and more likely to yield a clear and definitive answer. By considering agency separately we can also avoid the kind of logical short circuits repeatedly encountered in the literature, such as the frequent finding that since Schubert was pious he could not have been the author of his unorthodox text excisions (for example, Badura-Skoda 1990a, 1990b, *passim*), or the argument made by Leopold Kantner (1978:137), who finds that the excision of “et exspecto resurrectionem” means that Schubert did not believe in life after death, which he finds inconsistent with the retention of “remissionem peccatorum mortuorum,” which Kantner thinks requires belief in life after death. He therefore concludes that since Schubert either intended all the cuts or none, an “ideological interpretation” of the text omissions is inappropriate. Almost every step of his reasoning seems questionable: “life after death” and resurrection need not mean the same thing, and “forgiveness of the sins of the dead” does not necessarily have anything to do with life after death. The larger point remains, that to begin by deciding what the omissions mean (generally without due consideration of the meaning of the remaining text Schubert actually did use, and without taking the setting into account), and then, based on those findings, to draw conclusions about whether Schubert intended the cuts is a time-tested method of producing all reflection and no light.

II.

The central evidence concerns the omissions from Schubert's Mass texts of words or phrases present in the standard version of the *Missale Romanum*. Examples 1 and 2 demonstrate the pattern of those omissions in the Gloria and the Credo.

The pattern is one of steadily increasing omission, with the Masses in B \flat and C presenting some anomalies. The one passage omitted in all of Schubert's masses is “Et unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam” (H); the next most consistently omitted passage, absent in all except the first mass, is “Et exspecto resurrectionem” (I). The only passage restored to the text of the last two masses after having been omitted in earlier masses is “ex Maria Virgine” (G). This passage, first omitted from the Mass in C, and later from the finished 1822 version of the Mass in A \flat , was restored when Schubert revised the A \flat Mass once again four years later. In the last year of his life, for the Mass in E \flat , he set exactly the same text he had finally used for the 1826/27 version of the A \flat Mass. The last two masses are the only two masses to use precisely the same text—a text that omits all of the passages excised from any of the previous masses, except for (G).

Example 1: Passages in context.

Bracketed text is omitted in at least one of the masses.
 Italicized text is telescoped in at least one of the masses.

Gloria

Gloria in excelsis Deo.

Et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis.

Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te!

Gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam.

Domine Deus, Rex caelestis, Deus Pater omnipotens.

Domine Fili unigenite, Jesu Christe.

Domine *Deus, Agnus Dei, Filius Patris.*

Qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis.

Qui tollis peccata mundi, [suscipe deprecationem nostram.] (A)

[Qui sedes ad dexteram Patris,] (B) miserere nobis.

Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus,³ [Jesu Christe.] (C)

Cum Sancto Spiritu, in gloria Dei Patris.

Amen.

Credo

Credo in unum Deum, [Patrem omnipotentem,] (D)

factorem caeli⁴ et terrae, visibilium omnium, et invisibilium.

Et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum.

Et ex Patre *natum ante omnia saecula.*

Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero.

[*Genitum, non factum,*] (E) [*consubstantialiam Patri:*] (F)

per quem omnia facta sunt.

Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de caelis.

Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto [ex Maria Virgine:] (G)

Et homo factus est.

Crucifixus etiam pro nobis: sub Pontio Pilato passus, et sepultus est.

Et resurrexit tertia die, secundum Scripturas.

Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram Patris.

Et iterum venturus est cum gloria, iudicare vivos et mortuos:

cujus regni non erit finis.

Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Dominum, et vivificantem:

qui ex Patre Filioque⁵ procedit.

Qui cum Patre et Filio simul *adoratur et conglorificatur:*

qui locutus est per Prophetas.

[Et unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam.] (H)

Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.

[Et exspecto resurrectionem] (I) mortuorum.

Et vitam venturi saeculi.

Amen.

Example 2a: Chart of passages omitted.

Mass in F (Summer 1814)								H	
Mass in G (Mar. 1815)		B	C					H	I
Mass in B \flat (Nov. 1815)	A					F		H	I
Mass in C (July 1816)	A	B	C		E		G	H	I
Mass in A \flat (1819–22)	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
revised (1826/27)	A	B	C	D	E	F		H	I
Mass in E \flat (June 1828)	A	B	C	D	E	F		H	I

Example 2b: Passages Omitted.⁶**from the Gloria**

A. suscipe deprecationem nostram.

B. Qui sedes ad dexteram Patris

C. Jesu Christe

from the Credo

D. Patrem omnipotentem

E. Genitum, non factum

F. consubstantialem Patri

G. ex Maria Virgine

H. Et unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam

I. Et exspecto resurrectionem

This evidence alone—of the mass texts themselves, and of the pattern of omission when they are compared in chronological order—creates a strong presumption in favor of one explanation: that Schubert himself intentionally made every one of the excisions. The initial excision of (H) by the independent-minded seventeen-year-old; additional cuts and some back and forth on other passages as the teenager matured, left home, and cast his lot with a new circle of intellectuals; and the mature text settled on at twenty-nine and kept at thirty-one—the pattern of excisions matches what we might expect from a young thinker wrestling with difficult articles of faith, and over the years making the mass text his own.

Consideration of another, related, factor helps to strengthen the presumption of Schubert's intention. Since the Gloria and particularly the Credo are by far the wordiest movements of the mass, one might reasonably expect from a composer indifferent to some or all of the text, along with omissions, some shortening by presenting successive phrases of the text simultaneously. Schubert's use of text telescoping—folding successive phrases together, analogous to the overlapping cylindrical sections of a telescope—is in fact quite rare, but where it does appear it reinforces the pattern of text omissions. And telescoping of text cannot be ascribed to ignorance, carelessness, or lack of intention.

Two categories of telescoping should be distinguished from the outset: (1) the text appears only once, in the presence of differing text, and is thus never presented alone; and (2) the text appears in conjunction with another text, but is repeated, and usually appears alone at some point. In the first category, the telescoping obscures the text, and we could reasonably infer that Schubert considered it unimportant to his expressive aims, or possibly even found it problematic. We could expect instances of the first category to correlate with text passages retained in the early masses, but later omitted. In the second category, the telescoping highlights the text by insisting on its relationship to a second text; both texts are repeated, together and alone, to be sure they can be understood. We might expect instances of the second category to correlate with passages either directly preceding or following omissions, where the omitted text was sacrificed in order to highlight neighboring passages; we would also expect telescoping of the second category to correlate with extensive text repetition. Schubert's setting of the passage beginning with "Domine Deus, Agnus Dei" and leading to the "Quoniam" from the Gloria of the Mass in G illustrates both categories of telescoping (see ex. 3). Telescoping occurs throughout, with solo outer voices presenting "Domine Deus, Agnus Dei" and "Filius Patris, qui tollis peccata mundi" against choral inner voices singing first "miserere nobis," and then "suscipe deprecationem nostram." "Miserere nobis" is prominent in three choral tuttis in which it has no competition from any other text; in addition "miserere nobis" is omnipresent, a plea that colors all the appellations against which it is juxtaposed. These—"Domine Deus, Agnus Dei" and "Filius Patris, qui tollis peccata mundi"—gain prominence because they are sung as solos, through repetition, and in the case of "Domine Deus," because its beginning coincides each time with rests in the other vocal parts; there is no doubt that the appellations and "miserere nobis" are both meant to be heard as modifying the other, and no doubt of their classification as telescoping of the second type. "Suscipe deprecationem," on the other hand, appears just once, *piano*, in the chorus, in the middle of the texture, completely covered by not one but two other texts, and is an instance of telescoping of the first type.

The chart below (ex. 4) shows all the occurrences of text telescoping of the first category in the six masses, underlined and in bold, combined with the omissions, not underlined.

Only the passage labeled (e) does not form part of a pattern between masses. In three instances (A, E, F) the telescoped text in an earlier mass is a predictor of omitted passages in later masses, and in the case of (F) a telescoped text fills a chronological gap between two omissions. The telescoping of the passage labeled (h) in the Mass in B \flat is an instance of local

Example 3: Mass in G, Gloria (from "Domine Deus"): Telescoping.

Violino I

Violino II

Viola

Soprano

Alto

Tenore

Basso

Organo e Violone

tens, Do - mi - ne Fi - li u - ni - ge - ni - te Je - su Chri -

tens, Do - mi - ne Fi - li u - ni - ge - ni - te Je - su Chri -

Detailed description: This system shows the beginning of the 'Domine Deus' section. It features a full orchestral ensemble (Violino I, Violino II, Viola, Organo e Violone) and four vocal parts (Soprano, Alto, Tenore, Basso). The music is in G major and 4/4 time. The vocal parts enter with the text 'tens, Do - mi - ne Fi - li u - ni - ge - ni - te Je - su Chri -'. The instrumental parts provide harmonic support and texture.

p

p

p

Solo

Tutti

p

Tutti

p

Solo

p

stel Do - mi - ne De - us, a - gnus

mi - se - re - re no - bis,

mi - se - re - re no - bis,

Fi - li - us Pa - tris, - qui

Detailed description: This system continues the 'Domine Deus' section. It features the same instrumental ensemble and vocal parts. The music is marked with a piano (*p*) dynamic. The vocal parts enter with the text 'stel Do - mi - ne De - us, a - gnus'. The instrumental parts provide harmonic support and texture. The system includes dynamic markings for piano (*p*) and instructions for 'Solo' and 'Tutti' performance.

Example 3 (cont.)

De - i, mi - se - re - re no - bis. Do - mi - ne
 mi - se - re - re, mi - se - re - re no - bis,
 mi - se - re - re, mi - se - re - re no - bis.
 tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, mi - se - re - re no - bis.

Tutti *Solo*

De - us, a - gnus De - i,
 mi - se - re - re no - bis, mi - se - re - re,
 mi - se - re - re no - bis, mi - se - re - re,
 Fi - li - us Pa - tris, qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta

Solo

Example 3 (cont.)

The musical score is written in G major and 4/4 time. It consists of two systems of music. The first system includes piano accompaniment (Grand Staff) and vocal parts (Soprano, Alto, Tenor, Bass). The second system continues the piano accompaniment and vocal parts. The lyrics are in Latin and describe the 'Se-re-re' prayer for the Holy Spirit.

System 1:

Piano: The piano accompaniment features a steady eighth-note pattern in the right hand and a more active bass line in the left hand, often with triplets and slurs.

Vocal Parts:

- Soprano:** *Tutti* mi - se - re - re no - bis, *Solo* Fi - li - us
- Alto:** mi - se - re - re no - bis, sus - ci - pe
- Tenor:** mi - se - re - re no - bis, sus - ci - pe
- Bass:** *Tutti* mun - di, *Solo* Do - mi - ne De - us,

System 2:

Piano: Continues the accompaniment with similar rhythmic patterns and dynamics.

Vocal Parts:

- Soprano:** Pa - tris, mi - se - re - re no - bis, no -
- Alto:** *Tutti* mi - se - re - re no - bis.
- Tenor:** de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem no - stram, mi - se - re - re.
- Bass:** de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem *Tutti* no - stram, mi - se - re - re.
- Bass (continued):** a - gnus De - i, *Tutti* mi - se - re - re no - bis.

Example 4a: Chart of passages omitted with first category telescoping shown underlined.

Mass in F (Summer 1814)	<u>A</u>							H	
Mass in G (Mar. 1815)	<u>A</u>	B	C		<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>		H	I
Mass in B \flat (Nov. 1815)	A				<u>e</u>	<u>F</u>		<u>h</u>	H I
Mass in C (July 1816)	A	B	C		E	<u>F</u>	G	H	I
Mass in A \flat (1819–22)	A	B	C	D	E	<u>F</u>	G	H	I
revised (1826/27)	A	B	C	D	E	F		H	I
Mass in E \flat (June 1828)	A	B	C	D	E	F		H	I

Example 4b: Texts telescoped (italicized).

- A** Mass in F, "*suscipe deprecationem nostram*" simultaneous with "*miserere*"
 Mass in G, "*suscipe deprecationem nostram*" simultaneous with
 "Domine Deus, Agnus Dei, miserere nobis" and
 "*Filius Patris, miserere nobis*"
- E** Mass in G, "*Genitum, non factum*" simultaneous with "*consubstantialem Patri*"
- F** Mass in G, "*Genitum, non factum*" simultaneous with "*consubstantialem Patri*"
 Mass in C, "*consubstantialem Patri*" simultaneous with "*per quem omnia sunt*"
- e** "*natum*" simultaneous with "*ante omnia saecula*"
- h** "*simul adoratur*" simultaneous with "*conglorificatur*"

text illustration: Schubert set "simul adoratur et conglorificatur" as literally simultaneous texts; the Mass in E \flat also has a simultaneous setting of these words, but presents them sequentially as well. In the Masses in G, C, and A \flat , in which "adoratur" and "conglorificatur" are not presented simultaneously, they are presented in parallel clauses: "qui cum patre et filio simul adoratur, qui cum patre et filio conglorificatur," achieving through the repetition of "qui cum patre et filio" a less literal form of the same word painting.

A similar consistency in the relationship between text, music, and omissions is revealed by the telescoped passages of the second category (marked in example 5 with @ to show proximity to the relevant omitted passage).

In all six masses Schubert set as a discrete section within the Gloria the portion of text that begins with "Domine Deus, Agnus Dei" and runs until a new section starts with "Quoniam" (ex. 3 shows this section of the Mass in G); in five of the six masses this section is set with music of minor tonality, contrasting with the major of the rest of the Gloria. It is within this section that the omissions (A) and (B) occur. What all the masses also share—the later ones that cut both (A) and (B), the earlier ones that cut only one of those passages, and the first mass which cuts neither passage—is a treatment in which the same text is privileged. That text is "miserere nobis," which, as the chart shows, is telescoped with other text in several of the masses. Most frequently solo or unison statements of "Domine Deus," "Agnus Dei," "Filius Patris," either separately or as a unit, are answered

Example 5: Chart of passages omitted with both categories of telescoping shown.

Mass in F (Summer 1814)	<u>A</u> @ <u>A</u>									H
Mass in G (Mar. 1815)	<u>A</u> @ <u>A</u>	B @ <u>B</u>	C			<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>			H I
Mass in B \flat (Nov. 1815)	A				<u>e</u>	F			<u>h</u>	H I
Mass in C (July 1816)	A @ <u>A</u>	B @ <u>B</u>	C			E	<u>F</u>	@ <u>F</u>	G	H I
Mass in A \flat (1819–22)	A	B	C	D		E	F		G	H I
revised (1826/27)	A	B	C	D		E	F			H I
Mass in E \flat (June 1828)	A	B	C	D		E	F			H I

responsorially by repeated tutti statements of “miserere nobis,” or by the full sentence “Qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis” in full choral harmony. This is the case in the Masses in F, B \flat , A \flat , and E \flat , the first two of which employ additional telescoped presentations of “miserere.” The Mass in G differs only in that, instead of beginning the section in minor, Schubert begins in major and twice modulates to minor (from A major to B minor and then from G major to B minor). The Mass in G uses the most complex vocal texture Schubert ever attempted for this passage, by combining, as can be seen in example 3, a responsorial treatment (solo appellations and tutti responses of “miserere nobis”) with ongoing telescoping of three different texts. In the Mass in C, he eliminated the responsorial treatment, and relied for the contrasting forces with which he consistently associated these texts on a solo soprano telescoped against a choral “miserere nobis” throughout the section.

The basic interpretation of the text, the contrast between the exclamations of direct address to God and the plea “miserere nobis” expressed through interaction between spare and full textures, or soli and tutti, remained constant from the first mass in 1814 to the last in 1828. What changed were the technical realizations of this idea, both locally and formally, and Schubert’s gradual willingness not just to telescope (A) and (B) with “miserere nobis” but to sacrifice them completely to the larger idea. Far from choosing a formal scheme as a procrustean bed for his text, Schubert’s formal designs and “formal balance” (see Jahrmärker’s comments, above) were chosen as the means to successfully realize his overriding conception of the text, a conception evident in all six of the masses.

If the pattern of omissions creates a strong presumption that Schubert himself intentionally made the excisions from his mass texts, when combined with the pattern of telescoping, that conclusion is inescapable. The telescoping cannot have occurred as a result of absentmindedness, carelessness, or oversight, and the fact that the pattern created by telescoping of the first type dovetails with the pattern of omissions extends the palpable trace of Schubert’s hand to the omissions.

Resistance to ascribing Schubert's own intent to the omissions from his mass texts has understandably made much of the seemingly whimsical and inconsistent nature of some of the cuts. What could have possibly offended him in those ten words he cut from the Gloria? Why should he have objected to "Qui sedes ad dexteram Patris" in the Gloria, and retained "sedet ad dexteram Patris" in the Credo? Why would he cut "Patrem omnipotens" in the Credo, and keep "Deus Pater omnipotens" in the Gloria? All of these questions assume that the answer lies in the missing words, and part of it, especially in the Credo, surely does. But just as surely the answer also lies in the words—and the music—that remain. Asking not only "Which affirmations of faith was Schubert avoiding?" but also "What was Schubert trying to say?" allows us to pursue the meaning of the text and the music that remain. The clustering of telescoping of the second type in areas where Schubert also cut text is a clue, in addition to the seeming inconsistencies noted above, that some of his excisions, particularly (A) and (B) in the Gloria, resulted from privileging portions of the remaining text. Further, the telescoping of the second type helps to reveal to which text Schubert did assign great importance: in this case, "miserere nobis."

Nevertheless, Schubert's mass texts, even when examined with their musical settings, do not provide a blueprint to his religious convictions. His masses do not directly represent his beliefs as he would have expressed them, but rather an intersection of his beliefs with the affirmations that he believed the words of the mass expressed. In setting the mass so that it did not violate his conscience, he would have had to struggle for clarity in his own convictions, and avoid affirmations that violated those convictions; in setting the mass so that it expressed his beliefs he would have had to make the most of the affirmations that were most important to him; and, most difficult, he had to decide what to do about those affirmations to which he was relatively indifferent. This complex process required time; not until 1826/27 did Schubert settle on his final mass text. The pattern of telescoping and omissions, combined with the music, illuminates important stations along the path Schubert traveled toward his final two masses.

For a surprising length of time the complete list of omissions remained obscure in spite of the ready availability of the 1897 edition; the related pattern of telescoped texts is noted here for the first time. Writers on Schubert remarked on isolated instances of text omission, most frequently the absence of (H) (Wissig 1909:34–35; Stefan-Gruenfeldt 1928:107; both cited by Jaskulsky 1986:60–61), while the absence of (A), (C), (G), and (I) in at least one mass also did not escape occasional notice (Werlé 1941:58;

Vetter 1953, 1:205–6, both cited by Jaskulsky 1986:61; Einstein 1951:62). From this fragmentary picture grew traditions of explanation that might never have taken root had the complete pattern been appreciated. The first attempt at a comprehensive accounting of Schubert's mass text omissions was Ronald Stringham's dissertation (1964:92–93), still the best English language study of Schubert's masses, followed by the more accurate listings of Reinhard van Hoorickx (1979:249–58) and Hans Jaskulsky, who gives the complete Gloria and Credo texts of all six masses (1986:61–66).

But clarity has not ensued. Stringham accounted for the pattern by replacing ignorance and carelessness with forgetfulness as his explanation (see below). Hoorickx listed each omission accurately, even noted the unusual amount of telescoping in the Mass in G, but since he instantly explained each separate omission with a short dismissive characterization, it is hardly surprising that he failed to appreciate that the many separate omissions might add up to a larger pattern. Hoorickx's characterizations of each successive excision form a virtual catalogue of complacent condescension: an "evident slip of the pen" (*offenbar ein Schreibfehler* [1979:249]); a "small error" (*kleiner Irrtum* [249]); an omission that "can hardly have been made purposely" (*kann kaum absichtlich gemacht worden sein!* [250]); words Schubert "probably overlooked" (*Wahrscheinlich aber ist, daß Schubert hier diese Worte übersehen hat* [250]); "evident increasing carelessness and negligence in the late masses" (*Anscheinend behandelt Schubert in seinen späteren Messen seine Texte mit fortschreitender Sorglosigkeit und Nachlässigkeit!* [251]). Hoorickx's conclusions, based on an accumulation of breezy snap judgments, found that just possibly Schubert might have intended to omit the "catholic church" clause (H) as well as the "virgin Mary" clause (G), but that other omissions are due to "a certain carelessness or a temporary absentmindedness" (*einer bestimmten Sorglosigkeit oder vorübergehender Zerstretheit* [253–54]).

Others, too, have continued to write about Schubert's mass texts as if there were omissions but no pattern of omissions (Badura-Skoda 1990a; Benedikt 1997; Newbould 1997:128). Likewise, the consensus opinion—the position taken by those who refer to Schubert's mass texts only in passing, without wishing to give offense or engage in argument—has shifted, not in response to the logic of the evidence that, thanks especially to Jaskulsky, is now difficult to ignore, but in response to a shift in the diplomatic middle ground: Schubert is now granted agency and intention for (H), and more rarely (I), based on the consistency of these two omissions. However, these two omissions and their consistency were widely acknowledged well before Stringham's dissertation—and (H) is the one omission noted since 1909 by everyone who has written more than a paragraph or two on Schubert's masses.

III.

The chart of text omissions makes use of a bare-bones chronology. A brief survey of the circumstances surrounding the composition of the six masses will put some flesh on those bones, and give the abstract progression revealed by the chart some body and depth. This survey should also help us gain some insight into the importance of these masses to Schubert, both personally and professionally, and how much or how little time and care he took over them.

The first performance of Schubert's first mass, the Mass in F (D. 105), could be seen as a rite of passage, a public display of accomplishment marking his transition from apprenticeship to professional independence. The occasion was a grand one, Tuesday, September 25, 1814 (Benedikt 1997), a service to mark the centenary celebration of his local parish church in Lichtental, and the church did not stint, employing a number of professional musicians to augment its usual forces. Never before had a piece by Schubert been heard in public. The composer himself conducted; his brother Ferdinand played the organ; Michael Holzer, his first teacher, was the choirmaster; Josef Mayseder, one of Vienna's leading violinists, was the concertmaster; Therese Grob, Schubert's favorite singer and long identified as his "first youthful passion" (Deutsch 1958:59), sang the soprano solo; and his teacher Salieri was in attendance, honoring the occasion with a "piccolo Terzetto" (Benedikt 1997:65) of his own composition. (For this mass, as for his later masses, Schubert ignored the imperial decree of December 19, 1806 that forbade women singers in church, excepting relatives of the choir director [Wagner 1996:34].) Schubert thus began his public career as a composer in the bosom of his home parish, surrounded by family, friends, and teachers, the cynosure of all eyes in his role as conductor, as yet unknown to the wider world, but chosen by his home community to represent them when they wanted to show what they could do to mark their hundredth anniversary.

Schubert soon moved from the place of honor in his home parish to a stage before a much wider and more worldly public. According to Ferdinand, Franz again conducted his first mass ten days later, October 4, 1814, this time at the prestigious St. Augustine's Court Church "before an audience that no doubt would have included foreign dignitaries attending the Congress of Vienna" (Gibbs 2000:40). Salieri, *maestro di capella* of the Imperial chapel, no doubt secured this performance for his pupil on the important occasion of the name-day of emperor Franz (Benedikt 1997:64). (The name-day was celebrated in preference to the birthday; this was also the name-day of Schubert and of his father.) The success of these first two public performances of Schubert's music, and the pride felt at his son's triumph, may have even won over Schubert's father for a time:

he shortly thereafter presented to Franz a new fortepiano, the family's first, a five-octave Graf (Gibbs 2000:38, 40; Deutsch 1964:34; 1958:36).

The next three masses, dating from March 1815 through the summer of 1816, were also very likely written for the Lichtental parish church, since all of them are designed to accommodate the Lichtental performing forces and their particular skills, and since the Mass in C (D. 452) is specifically dedicated to Michael Holzer on the title page of the manuscript of 1816 (Jaskulsky 1986:116, 140–41, 176; Dürr 1983:63; Scattolin 1982:XIII). Particularly noteworthy is that Schubert had the Mass in C published as op. 48 by Diabelli, again dedicated to Holzer, and performed in St. Ulrich's Church (also known as Maria Trost), both in September 1825; no other mass by Schubert was published during his lifetime.

In addition to the masses for the Lichtental church, Schubert wrote small, easy sacred pieces for the use of his brother Ferdinand at the Vienna orphanage, where he was a teacher, and at the Alt-Lerchenfelder church, where he took up the post of choirmaster in early 1820. The pieces for the orphanage included the German Requiem (D. 621), which Schubert wrote so Ferdinand could present it as his own work (Deutsch 1964:63–64) for an exam in music theory in December of 1819, and which Ferdinand published under his own name in 1826. To help Ferdinand make a good start in his new post at the Alt-Lerchenfelder church, Schubert wrote the Six Antiphons for Palm Sunday (D. 696), and possibly also the German Mass (D. 872; see below). Schubert also composed short liturgical compositions for St. Ulrich's, such as the *Tantum ergo* (D. 739), which was performed at the same concert in 1825 as the Mass in C, along with the Graduale (D. 136) and the Offertorium (D. 223).

Unlike all of these, Schubert's last two masses were not occasional works. He began working on the Mass in A \flat (D. 678) in November 1819, and by November 1820 he had drafted the entire mass in its first version and completed scoring of all but the *Dona nobis pacem* (Denny 1991:75). That December he broke off work on the mass, and did not return to it until the fall of 1822, when he finished it in short order. (Beethoven worked on his *Missa solemnis* during the same three years, 1819–22.) At the time in late 1820 when Schubert broke off work on the mass he also abandoned a number of other large-scale works: three operas, including *Sakontala*, perhaps *Lazarus*, the *Quartettsatz*, and the D-Major Symphony (D. 708A) (Denny 1991:75). The mass was the only one of these projects Schubert later returned to.

The Mass in A \flat was the first since the Mass in F explicitly designated as a *missa solemnis* (Fischer 1985:121), and to the large forces he had used for his first mass he now added a flute, the only flute used in his masses. In its

scoring, its length, and above all its difficulty, Schubert's Mass in A \flat took little account of performance limitations, rendering it unsuitable for Lichtental or any other church employing largely amateurs. Yet, as Schubert wrote to his friend Josef von Spaun in December of 1822, he was planning to have the mass performed, and, since he esteemed it a success, he was thinking of dedicating it to the emperor or the empress (Deutsch 1964:173); he also spent a considerable sum having the parts and the score copied in preparation for a performance (Dürr 1983:64). No record survives of where and when the mass was given; we have only Ferdinand's recollection that during Schubert's lifetime the mass had been done "no more than once or twice, and then most unsatisfactorily" (Schubert's first biographer, Heinrich Kreissle von Hellborn 1861:117, as quoted by Dürr 1983:64, n. 13).

In 1826/27 Schubert revised the Mass in A \flat (Winter 1982:242). The most extensive revision was a new fugue for the "Cum sancto spirito" section at the end of the Gloria, but he rewrote numerous other passages to make them more singable, and, most important for our purposes, he added the text "ex Maria Virgine" under the music of the "Et incarnatus est" section of the Credo (Fischer 1985). Schubert's revisions are usually thought to have had some connection with his unsuccessful application for the post of Vizehofkapellmeister in 1826, an application turned down, according to Josef Hauer's recollections of a conversation with Schubert (Deutsch 1958:177-78), by the court Kapellmeister Josef Eybler with the remark that the mass was good, but not in the style the emperor liked. Schubert subsequently tried to persuade Eybler at least to perform the mass, again without success.

In February 1828, as part of an effort to get published abroad, Schubert sent a letter to the music publisher Schott of Mainz that included a list of works for sale. To this list of works he added a postscript: "This is the catalog of my finished compositions except for three operas, a mass, and a symphony. These last I mention only to acquaint you with my striving after the highest in art" (Deutsch 1964:495). Schubert's "highest in art" comprised the operas *Alfonso und Estrella* (D. 732), *Die Verschworenen* (D. 787), and *Fierabras* (D. 796), the great C-Major Symphony (D. 944), and the Mass in A \flat . The other works in these genres—numerous operas and Singspiele, six completed symphonies, and four masses—were not worth mentioning.

The rejection of Schubert's application for the Vizehofkapellmeister post was official by January 24, 1827 (Deutsch 1964:402, 404). It marked the last in a series of frustrations and disappointments with the reception of his Mass in A \flat , and yet by May or June of the next year he was already starting work on another mass, in E \flat , which he finished in September

(Dürr 1996:VII). The Mass in E \flat (D. 950) is, like the Masses in F and A \flat , a *missa solemnis* in its scoring and length: it omits the flute and organ of the Mass in A \flat , but otherwise employs identical forces, and in performance it surpasses the length of the Mass in A \flat .

Schubert had planned to travel to Gmunden and the surrounding mountains during what was to be the last summer of his life. But, as a letter of July 4, 1828 from his friend Johann Baptist Jenger to Marie Pachler in Graz explained, "financial embarrassments" prevented such travel. "Thus he is still here, working diligently on a new mass, and awaits only—come from where it may—the necessary money in order to fly away to upper Austria" (Deutsch 1964:525). "Come from where it may" does not give the impression that Schubert was expecting immediate income from his mass, nor does it suggest a commission from a particular patron (Dürr 1996:XII).

Although Schubert seems to have composed his last mass without a monetary commission, the mass has always been linked to the Trinity church, also called the Minorite (Franciscan) church, in the Alser suburb. It was in the Trinity church that the premiere of the Mass in E \flat took place on October 4, 1829, almost a year after Schubert's death, with Ferdinand Schubert conducting the Alservorstadt Music Society. The extensive newspaper review of the concert cites a threefold occasion for the performance: "the glorious name-day of His Majesty, our most gracious and universally beloved Emperor, then the Feast of the Minorite Friars, and finally the anniversary of the local church music society" (*Theaterzeitung*, October 22, 1829; Brusatti 1978:37–40). Not enumerated was another occasion: Franz Schubert's own name-day. The review also claims that the premiere at the Trinity church on this occasion represented the wishes of the composer.

Schubert did have ties with the Trinity church: the Alsergrund borders on Lichtental, Schubert's boyhood parish; the choir director of the church and founder of the Alservorstadt Music Society was Michael Leitermayer, a boyhood friend of Schubert's, and a fellow pupil of Michael Holzer's (Deutsch 1964:535); Schubert had attended the church on March 29, 1827 for Beethoven's funeral service; and for the occasion of the consecration of a new church bell on September 2, 1828 Schubert had written a short choral piece, "Glaube, Hoffnung, Liebe" (D. 954).

Whatever arrangements Schubert may have made for the performance of his mass, he did not tailor it or his schedule to the practical requirements of the Trinity church or the Alservorstadt Music Society: he missed the only real deadline in the story, the dedication of the bell, and the mass was far too difficult for the church choir alone, and too difficult for the Music Society without lengthy preparation. Walther Dürr ar-

gues that Schubert would not have spent a penurious summer writing a mass for an organization yet to be founded, an organization planning in any case to present the work not at its inaugural concert, but rather for its first anniversary. A much more plausible scenario is that Schubert began work on the mass for his own reasons, that the mass was well-advanced before he began searching for an opportunity to have it performed, and that the unexpected prospect of performing it may well have led Leitermayer to found the Alservorstadt Music Society (Dürr 1996:V).

Schubert's masses marked some of the high points in his life and career. It is hard to imagine a beginning more inspiring of confidence in one's choice of vocation than the public debut Schubert made with his Mass in F. On this momentous occasion when Schubert stood on the threshold of his public life, around him the family, church, teachers, and friends who had nurtured and shaped him, before him the larger public world of his work to come, on this occasion which represented a summary of his past achievement and future promise, his mass text omitted "et in unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam."

The Mass in C was the only work for large performing forces Schubert succeeded in having published before he died—no other masses, no symphonies, and no operas. The publication occurred in conjunction with a performance in 1825, more than nine years after Schubert had finished the composition. For the publication he kept the text with its omissions exactly as it had been in 1816, even though it could now become an object of systematic public scrutiny. In the meantime, between the composition of the Mass in C and its publication, he had spent three years writing his Mass in A \flat , which contained two new text omissions beyond those found in the Mass in C.

Schubert wrote his last two masses for his own reasons, whether personal or professional or both. Certainly he had professional incentives: he consistently had greater success in gaining a public hearing for his masses than for his symphonies, and he had some hopes of a Kapellmeister post for which the revised Mass in A \flat could have proved useful. But the time he lavished on the first version of the Mass in A \flat , the letter to Schott, and the priority he gave to writing his Mass in E \flat after hopes of the Kapellmeister post had vanished—all indicate that the mass meant more to Schubert than a career opportunity. When Schubert decided to write these last two masses instead of composing more songs, symphonies, or string quartets, it was surely because the mass allowed him to say something offered by no other genre. And that something could only have concerned his faith and his church, expressed through his music and his text.

Schubert began his life in music as a choirboy, his first great triumph was a composition for the church, and a part of him always remained a church musician. His six masses and other liturgical compositions kept him involved with churches throughout his life: the Lichtental parish church, St. Augustine's Court church, St. Ulrich's, Alt-Lerchenfelder, Trinity, the Synagogue in Vienna, and possibly others unknown. He maintained warm relations all his life with church music directors who included his brother Ferdinand, his first teacher and the dedicatee of his Mass in C, Michael Holzer, and his boyhood friend Michael Leitermayer. Unlike Beethoven's *Missa solemnis*, which, in spite of its complete, orthodox text, has always found a more comfortable home in the concert hall than in the church, Schubert's two late solemn masses, in spite of their spacious amplitudes, were conceived for the church and are still appropriate there. In those two masses Schubert needed to express something that could only be said in a mass; he needed to speak to the church.

IV.

Let us return to the reasons given for claiming that Schubert did not know what he was doing with his mass texts, or that we should not take too seriously what he did with his texts.

(1) Was Schubert's Latin sufficient to comprehend and emend the mass text?

Stringham (1964:86) raised this question, and, as we have seen, Jahr-märker's 1997 summary of the prevailing consensus answers it in the negative.

From the fall of 1808, when he was eleven, until the fall of 1813, when he was sixteen, Schubert was a student at the Akademisches Gymnasium, and lived with his fellow students at the k.k. Stadtkonvikt (the Imperial and Royal City Seminary). This elite school is generally considered to have offered the best schooling available in Vienna (Wagner 1996:13). The education he received there during four years of grammar school and one year of humanities studies was "strongly oriented toward the classics, and within that tradition emphasized Latin far more strongly than Greek: half or more of the students' class time was devoted to Latin" (Gramit 1987:26). A large amount of time was spent studying elements of style, rhetoric, and grammar with excerpts from Latin authors arranged by genre and rule rather than chronologically (Gramit 1987:27). On a grading scale "em(inent), 1, 1-2, 2" (Deutsch 1964:28), Schubert scored a "1" for nine semesters and a "2(1)" for one semester in Latin, and a consistent "1" for all ten semesters in religion (Deutsch 1964:11, 14, 17, 21, 28). A grade of "1" was sufficient to maintain academic standing and ensure continued enjoyment of scholarship stipends.

One more year of humanities studies, and two more years of studies in philosophy would have prepared Schubert for university (Deutsch 1964:28). Even after his voice changed in the summer of 1812, Schubert could have continued his studies at state expense, on the condition of raising his mathematics grade from a "2" to a "1." Both a week before and two days after the great victory over Napoleon at Leipzig (the "Völkerschlacht"), Emperor Franz found the time personally to approve papers granting a continued scholarship to Schubert (Deutsch 1964:27, 29). But Schubert felt that his studies were already robbing him of time he wanted to spend composing. Instead of a prolonged course of study he elected to equip himself quickly with qualifications to practice a trade that would tide him over until he could make music pay. The trade he chose was teaching, his father's business.

After a subsequent year of teacher training at the k.k. Normal Hauptschule, a much less prestigious school, Schubert took exams in August 1814 for which he received grades of "m(ittelmäßig)" in "theoretical knowledge" of Latin and religion, a "g(ut)" in "practical knowledge" of Latin, and a "sch(lecht)" in religion (Deutsch 1964:33-34). What may have constituted "practical knowledge" as opposed to "theoretical knowledge" at Schubert's teachers' college is a matter of conjecture, but it likely had to do with pedagogy and doctrinal soundness rather than knowledge of the subject. What is certain is that less than a month after finishing his Mass in F, Schubert's "practical knowledge" of religion was found wanting, whereas for the previous five years, in a more prestigious school less concerned with "practical knowledge," it had uniformly passed muster.

In conclusion, Schubert was much better educated in Latin, at least formally, than in German. He remained, of course, capable of making mistakes; and he was capable, of course, of reading, understanding, and parsing the Latin text of the mass. As a matter of perspective: Schubert's knowledge of Latin was undoubtedly far superior to the Latin Beethoven learned at the Tirocinium in Bonn (Thayer-Forbes 1967:58-59), and to the Latin Beethoven knew when he composed his *Missa solemnis*.

(2) Did Schubert know the orthodox version of the mass texts?

The nearly complete text of the Mass in F shows that Schubert knew the orthodox text of the mass. He had also put in years of service as a choir boy singing masses, first for Michael Holzer at Lichtental, and then at the Court Chapel. Presumably the pupils of the Konvikt, for whom the friars of the Piarist order served *in loco parentis*, attended mass regularly even when they were not singing. According to Otto Biba the numerous surviving mass books from the archdiocese of Vienna from this period and from

the previous century all give the orthodox text from the *Missale Romanum* (Jaskulsky 1986:69, n. 43), so the orthodox text was readily available to Schubert throughout his life.

Besides knowing the words, Schubert almost certainly “knew” the mass in a deeper sense. To judge by the pedagogical approach used for Latin, the five years of formal religious instruction Schubert received at the Konvikt from his religion teacher, Josef Tranz (Deutsch 1964:11, 14, 17, 21, 28), would have concentrated on dogmatics, including a catechism of the creed, with scarcely a mention of church history. In addition to the religious instruction Schubert received at the Konvikt, at age seventeen he had already had ample opportunity to ponder religious matters, because they formed a constant source of friction between his free-thinking brother Ignaz (12 years older than Franz) and his dogmatically orthodox father; Ignaz and Franz formed a furtive alliance in their free-thinking rebellion against their father (see the letter from Ignaz to Franz of October 12, 1818, Deutsch 1964:71–72, and Franz’s reply of October 29, Deutsch 1964:75).

(3) Can forgetfulness or carelessness account for Schubert’s mass text omissions?

Stringham hypothesized that since Schubert’s “carelessness” exhibits an orderly pattern, perhaps, as he got older, and further removed from his Piarist schooling he forgot more and more of the text (1964:96–99). This would explain why Schubert’s first five Masses, written between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five, progressively omit more text. Stringham, to be fair, was not entirely satisfied with his theory of juvenile dementia and cast about for a more convincing explanation—but could think of none.

If we had only one or two masses by Schubert we would have to entertain forgetfulness or carelessness as a possible explanation for the text omissions. We have six masses, however. The progressive pattern of omissions, combined with the pattern of telescoping, precludes carelessness, even in the three masses in G, B \flat , and C that share characteristics of the *missa brevis*. The cumulative pattern of omissions in the first four masses leads to the Mass in A \flat , whose text omits every passage previously omitted in any mass. Schubert spent three years over this first version of the Mass in A \flat . Haste was not a factor. Oversight or sloppiness would hardly have led to omission of precisely those passages previously omitted—all of them. When he reworked portions of the Mass in A \flat four years later he took the trouble to add “ex Maria Virgine,” but did not restore any of the other omitted passages. One cannot suppose that text omissions made through haste or error in the first four masses would have been retained

by Schubert through the lengthy process of working on the Mass in A_b, a process that included a significant textual revision. This revised text, arrived at after seven years of intermittent work on this one mass, was precisely the same text he used for his last mass. These are the only two of the seven texts that do match precisely. This pattern is orderly, not random; it is cumulative; it culminates in a mass that Schubert returned to, and reworked over a longer period of time than anything else he ever wrote, and in which he took pride as "the highest in art." Carelessness or forgetfulness cannot account for these facts. The pattern, however, is precisely what one would expect from a prolonged process of reflection and refinement culminating in the text retained by the last mass. Jaskulsky's conclusion, "Memory slips can thus be accepted, if at all, for some places in the early masses; for the late masses they could probably be eliminated"⁷ (1986:68), does not take into account the cumulative pattern of omissions, and is thus unduly cautious.

(4) Was Schubert following an unorthodox master text?

Otto Wissig (1909:34) first hypothesized that Schubert was working from a text that omitted "et unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam." Alfred Einstein also entertained that possibility, and his reasoning is instructive:

It would be wrong, however, to interpret this as a deliberate protest on Schubert's part. That might be the answer, if the omission occurred only in his later Masses, but it cannot be true of a youth of sixteen or seventeen. The simplest and most trivial explanation would be that he made a copy of the text of the Mass, in which he inadvertently omitted these seven words, and that he continued to use this copy whenever he sat down to compose a Mass. But it is also possible that there existed in the Vienna of the Emperor Joseph's time a liturgical edition of the text which set no great store by this particular part of the Creed. (1951:61)

For Einstein, as sympathetic and insightful as he was, it was plainly unthinkable that the same Schubert who could compose a mass and who several months later set "Gretchen am Spinnrade" could have had the intellectual wherewithal—as well as the independence, principle, and spine—to omit the seven words of belief in the catholic church. The same consistency of omission that now makes of (H), and less securely of (I), an exception to the rule that Schubert could not have known what he was doing with his text, was just as self-evidently for Einstein the reason why Schubert could not have known.

Although Einstein was aware of (C) (1951:62) at least, he chose to ignore all the omissions except (H); understandably so, because his theory that Schubert “continued to use that copy whenever he sat down to compose a mass” is incompatible with textual inconsistencies too serious and too numerous to qualify as scribal errors. The task of keeping Schubert ignorant of all the peculiarities of his mass texts has become more difficult since Einstein’s day. Ignoring most of the omissions is no longer a viable explanatory strategy, which means the master text theory needs help, since six masses with five different texts cannot all be copies from the same original. If the master text theory cannot get the job done alone, then ignorance, carelessness, and forgetfulness must help out. The remaining difficulty is the inherent incompatibility between the consistency of blind copying on the one hand, and the inconsistencies of egregious carelessness and writing from memory on the other. Paul Badura-Skoda proposed a solution that minimizes this incompatibility. In order to rescue Schubert from the “impudence” (*Frechheit*) of “forcing his private beliefs on a congregation,” Badura-Skoda embraced the hypothesis that (H) was the product of a faulty master text, while, according to Badura-Skoda, the gradual accretion of mistakes in the late masses probably followed from Schubert’s undue reliance on his “phenomenal memory” (1990b:132).⁸ The problem with Badura-Skoda’s solution is that the master text does none of the work; it does not even explain the consistency in the omission of (H). Because if Badura-Skoda’s theory is to avoid the unlikely scenario that Schubert consulted his master text only when copying in the vicinity of (H) but consulted his memory the rest of the time, then his theory amounts to Schubert copying the text of the Mass in F in 1814 from a faulty original, but succumbing to a faulty memory in preparing the texts of all subsequent masses, from the spring of 1815 to 1828. The master text, then, does not help account for the progressive pattern of omissions, and as we have seen, carelessness or forgetfulness cannot.

Other scenarios employing the faulty master text hypothesis run into similar difficulties. Which mass text should we be looking for? No matter how that question is answered, the progressive pattern of text omissions means that they could not have been arrived at by copying from any one master text, whether written or belonging to a local Viennese oral tradition. If, for example, we were to find a printed mass text from Vienna in the early 1800s that agrees in all particulars with Schubert’s final mass text, should we conclude that Schubert possessed this text in 1814, and after thirteen years of ever-weakening resistance finally succumbed to its seductions in 1826/27? Even such an absurd assumption would not absolve Schubert from thinking about the text on his own. If, on the other hand, we were to find the hypothetical master text for the Mass in C, then we

would still have to explain why there are fewer omissions in the preceding masses and more omissions in the masses that follow. Even if we assume five or six different master texts, all of which Schubert blindly copied without noticing their differences, the orderly chronological progression of omissions still defies explanation. Thus Jaskulsky's conclusion that although Schubert's use of one or more written sources or of oral traditions is dubious, they "cannot be ruled out until a written source or other convincing proof is found" (1986:69, 72) misses the larger point: no matter what master text the future may bring, Schubert's knowing participation in the process of editing his own mass texts cannot be explained away.

(5) The "catholic Church" exception

The received image of Schubert's intellectual incapacity exerts a powerful force even on those willing to grant him some part in the fashioning of his mass texts. The only text excised from Schubert's first mass, when he was seventeen, is the statement of belief in the catholic Church, "Et unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam" (H), and this passage continued missing right through his sixth mass, the year he died. The consistency of this excision is habitually cited as the reason for making an exception and granting it as Schubert's own intention.⁹ Yet the logic of this exception is hard to credit. First, the "catholic Church" clause is distinguished from all the other omissions by its greater consistency in the first four masses—since all omissions are consistent in the last two masses. Why should Schubert's consistency between the ages of seventeen and nineteen ([H] in the first four masses) count for so much, when his much greater consistency between the ages of twenty-two and thirty-one (all the cuts in the last two masses) counts for so little? Second, had Schubert been equally consistent with all his excisions, had he begun at age seventeen to use the text he would always use, then the case for an unorthodox master-text would be greatly strengthened. Logically, it is precisely the lack of consistency, the general pattern of added cuts in each of the first four masses, culminating in the consistency of the last two, that speaks for Schubert's intention.

But logic, I suspect, has nothing to do with the "et unam sanctam et apostolicam Ecclesiam" exception. The "catholic Church" clause is not only the most consistent excision, it is the only excision whose meaning seems relatively plain. Unlike all the other cuts, the possible significance of this one can be summarized in one sentence: "Schubert was anti-clerical," or, with more nuance, "Schubert rejected the claims to exclusive authority of the institutional church." It is not impossible to imagine a free-thinking seventeen-year-old with enough theological sophistication to entertain such sentiments; most musicologists have gradually come to feel

that even Schubert might have been capable. But since the other excisions are more difficult to explain—they certainly require more than one sentence—Schubert could not have been capable of them.

(6) Was it common in Schubert's Vienna for composers to omit text from mass settings?

Schubert had some precedents among Viennese composers for omissions from the text of the mass, although to my knowledge none of these composers omitted as many passages, or were as consistent in omitting the same passages. In addition, most of the precedents involve a *missa brevis*, which helps explain them.

Schubert admired the masses of Michael Haydn who worked in Salzburg where the rules were strict; none of his mature masses omit any text. Mozart's *Missa brevis* in C (K. 257) omits "Deum verum de Deo vero." In Eisenstadt, where usage was more relaxed than in Salzburg but supposedly not as easy-going as in Vienna, Michael's brother Josef left out "Et in unum dominum Jesum Christum, filium Dei unigenitum" from his *Missa brevis St. Joannis Deo*, from his *Missa brevis* in F, and from his "Lord Nelson" Mass; he omitted "qui cum patre et filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur" from his *Paukenmesse*, and "qui ex patre filioque procedit" from his *Heiligenmesse* and his *Theresienmesse*. In Vienna, the court Kapellmeister Josef Eybler, whom we have already met, left out "et incarnatus est" from his Mass in B \flat (Finke-Hecklinger 1980:XIII). A *Mass in C* by a certain Huber, given in the Lichtental church shortly after 1800, omits "Et unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam," and Joseph Preindl's printed *Missa in Es* omits "et exspecto resurrectionem mortuorum" (Benedikt 1997:67). These examples (undoubtedly more could be found) show that it was not unknown for Viennese composers to take a certain degree of liberty with the mass text; these examples also show that it was not usual practice for composers to take the degree of liberty taken by Schubert.

Erich Benedikt says of the different rates of text omission in the Archbishopric Salzburg, Eisenstadt, and Vienna, "That is how greatly usages differed for quite a while yet, but not faith" (1997:68).¹⁰ He is almost certainly correct, statistically speaking. But his argument concerning Schubert's beliefs amounts to the syllogism "All Austrians (no matter how freely they treated their mass texts) were orthodox Catholics. Schubert was Austrian. Therefore . . ." This we know, as a matter of historical fact, to be untrue.

The examples of text lacunae in Viennese masses of the early nineteenth century are not irrelevant to Schubert's own text omissions. While they can tell us nothing of Schubert's intentions and knowledge, they confirm that he had no need to fear legal or professional reprisals, or even so-

cial opprobrium for his omissions. This was not because the Viennese were uniformly orthodox yet easy-going, but rather because Habsburg officialdom and the Austrian ecclesiastical hierarchy itself retained many adherents to two streams of thought inimical to orthodox Catholicism as defined by Rome: the Josephinian Enlightenment, and pantheism.

Josephinian Enlightenment

The so-called Josephinian Enlightenment sought to make the church a rational, enlightened servant of the state, promoting policies conducive to happiness and welfare in this world, guided by enlightenment notions of the perfectibility of individuals and of society through the application of reason. Theological controversy, and the pomp and mystery of the Austrian Baroque liturgy were considered wasteful at best, at worst a preying on the superstitions of those who knew no better (Bunnell 1990:35–41). Under Joseph the regulation of the church was enforced by an army of bureaucrats, and even though many of Joseph's reforms were subsequently reversed by his brother Leopold and Leopold's son Franz, the "bureaucracy of the church—the governmental agencies that dealt with church affairs and the church hierarchy that was appointed by the emperor and his government—was Josephinist throughout the period [until 1848], loyal to the concept of the church as servant to the state" (Bunnell 1990:42; Okey 2001:43–44, 58, 66, 100). Many Josephinist "liberal churchmen" remained in positions of power, and although they were often obliged to fight rear-guard skirmishes against both the church hierarchy in Rome and some of Metternich's more recent appointees, they were sufficiently entrenched to hold their own.

Pantheism

Pantheism stresses the all-embracing inclusiveness of God, conceived as divine immanence (i.e., the indwelling presence of God), as compared with the emphasis in traditional theism on God's transcendence, or separateness from the world. In practice it emphasized the revelation of God in nature. Pantheism had been popular among intellectuals ever since Spinoza (1632–1677) formulated a thorough system of rationalistic pantheism, and pantheism gained a much more extensive diffusion in the early nineteenth century through the Idealisms of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. Goethe, for example, claimed to be a follower of Spinoza, but in fact his beliefs owed much to later developments since he "championed human individuality, opposed mechanical necessity, and held a vitalistic position, in which nature was organic, a living unity" (Cross and Livingston 1985). Pantheism was especially congenial to early romanticism, since it could be interpreted as more critical and rational than traditional

Christianity, while at the same time allowing the infinite mystery of God to infuse the concrete mundane reality of the natural world. Because of its rational intellectual pedigree, pantheism also appealed widely to the Josephinian church bureaucracy; the mystical and rational strains did not necessarily clash, since they tended to play out in different spheres of activity, the mystical in poetry and the rational in metaphysics. Predictably, ultramontanist Austrian Catholics established as one of their chief goals the defeat of the pantheist heresy, which they detected all around them—pantheism was the “secular humanism” of the early nineteenth century.

The most important churchmen in Schubert's life were all either Josephinians, or pantheists, or both. Schubert had probably known Johann Philip Neumann since 1816 (when Schubert lived briefly with Professor Watteroth, who was Neumann's cousin), and their long friendship was punctuated by two collaborations: Neumann wrote the libretto for Schubert's unfinished opera *Sakontala* (1820), and he also wrote the text of the “German Mass” which Schubert set in 1827. Neumann, a theologian and professor of physics, was a champion of the Josephinian reforms, and a believer in eighteenth-century rational deism (Deutsch 1964:459). A comparison of the Gloria and Credo from Neumann's “German Mass” (ex. 6) with the traditional versions is informative.

Neumann's Gloria is a hymn of praise to God, the creator of nature. His Credo begins with the same sentiment; the first strophe presents God the creator, in his archetypal Enlightenment guise as bringer of light and order. The second strophe treats the theme of Christ, the bringer of light. The third strophe argues against salvation by faith alone (Luther's doctrine), and stresses the necessity of acting according to the commandments and Christian duty. The fourth strophe enlarges on this statement by adding discipleship, according to Christ's model, to the prescriptions of duty (without, however, specifying which elements of Christ's life should be imitated). Neumann's Credo completely omits the central concern of the traditional Credo, the explication of the trinity, and it omits as well any mention of the Holy Ghost, of Christ's birth, crucifixion, and resurrection, of sins and judgment, of the catholic church, and of the resurrection of the dead.

Josef Spendou was another Josephinist churchman and a special patron of the Schubert family. He was the founder and governor of the orphanage at which Ferdinand Schubert taught from about 1809 onward. Spendou was until 1816 “Oberaufseher der Deutschen (Elementar-) Schulen” and took a special interest in musical education. For the twentieth anniversary celebration of the orphanage, Schubert wrote a cantata (D. 472) in honor of this long-time family friend (Deutsch 1964:40, 73–74).

Example 6: Neumann, "For the Gospel and the Credo."

1. The creation still lay formless, according to holy writ.
Then spoke the Lord: Let there be light! He spoke and it was light!
And life stirs, and order emerges.
And everywhere, praise and thanks rise up.
2. Man too, lay in spiritual night, numbed by dark delusion.
The Savior came and it was light! And bright day dawns.
And his teaching's holy ray wakens life near and far.
And all hearts beat thanks, and praise God the Lord.
3. But the holy voice speaks a warning: faith alone avails not,
only the performance of your duty can lend it life.
Give us, therefore, a believing nature! And give us too, oh God,
a loving heart, which devoutly and faithfully obeys the commandment.
4. Lend us strength and courage, not only to see the ways
that our Savior trod, but also to strive to follow.
Thus let your gospel be our good news
and lead us, Lord, by your grace into the realm of joy.¹¹

Johann Ladislaus Pyrker von Felső-Eőr was a Josephinian and a pantheist. He became Patriarch (Archbishop) of Venice in 1820 and first met Schubert that year at the home of the poet Matthäus von Collin (Deutsch 1964:128). They spent time together again in August of 1825 at Gastein, and Schubert "treasured the memory of this meeting as one of the great experiences of his life" according to his brother Ferdinand and Anton Schindler (Deutsch 1958:37, 318). Schubert set Pyrker's poem "Die Allmacht" (D. 852) and later chose to include it on the program of the only concert he ever gave dedicated exclusively to his own music, which took place on March 26, 1827, the anniversary of Beethoven's death; either Schubert felt that Pyrker's name on the program would add the right sort of prestige, or the poem itself was of great personal importance to Schubert, or both. The poem expresses Pyrker's theology of Nature as the immanent Spirit of God.

The Almighty

Great is Jehovah, the Lord! For Heaven
And earth proclaim his might.
You hear it in the roaring storm,
in the loud, rushing call of the forest stream,
You hear it in the green wood's whisper,
You see it in the golden, waving grain,
In loveliest flowers' glowing bloom,

In the sparkle of star-strewn heavens.
 It booms terrifyingly in the rolling thunder
 And blazes in the lightning's swift jagged flash.
 But your throbbing heart reveals still more palpably
 The might of Jehovah, of the Eternal God,
 If you look up pleadingly, hoping for grace and mercy.¹²

Schubert had great respect for Pyrker and chose "Die Allmacht" for the most important concert of his life. Pyrker's God of Nature obviously held great appeal for Schubert, and "Die Allmacht" expresses sentiments Schubert could embrace without qualification or reservation. The Credo in the cut version begins, like "Die Allmacht," with a statement of belief in God, the creator of nature; by omitting an affirmation of God's omnipotence (D), Schubert made belief in the God of Nature the starting point for the Credo.

In addition to Josephinist and pantheist father figures in the church hierarchy with whom Schubert discussed theology, we know that some of his closest friends argued about theological issues. In June 1828 Eduard von Bauernfeld noted in his diary: "Outings with Schober and Mayerhofer (who lives with me). Quarrels between M[ayerhofer] and Sch[ober], the latter denies immortality and personal continuation. Which embitters the other. I mediate as best I can" (Litschauer 1986:69).¹³ Franz von Schober, the circle's most notorious libertine, was Schubert's closest friend after 1816. This worldly young man cared enough about religion to argue about doctrine, and his only published work, *Palingenesien*, was a book of sonnets on Old Testament themes (Jean Paul had written a book in 1798 with the same title). Eduard von Bauernfeld had undertaken a study of the New Testament in the original Greek with his two roommates in 1823–24, but confessed, "I don't possess the talent for faith" and preferred, after as before, Goethe, Lessing, and Kant (Bauernfeld 1873:30). He became fast friends with Schubert in 1825 (Deutsch 1958:227). The greatest rift within the Schubert circle was caused by Franz von Bruchmann's opposition in 1824 to his sister's secret engagement to Schober, which can be seen as the first visible sign of Bruchmann's eventual religious conversion. After serving as the circle's philosopher-in-chief, much drawn to the ideas of the Schlegel brothers, and after studying with Schelling in Erlangen in 1821 and 1823, Bruchmann found religion in 1826, married a bluestocking in 1827, joined the Redemptorist order in 1830, and eventually became the head of its upper German province. So far as is known, Schubert and Schober never again spoke to Bruchmann after his betrayal, as they saw it, of Schober in 1824.

Faith, then, was far from monolithic in the Vienna of Schubert's time, and far from monolithic within his circle of closest friends. Schubert was

exposed to every contemporary variety of belief and practice, from atheism, to pantheism, to enlightenment rationalism, to ultramontane Catholicism (the Redemptorists and Friedrich Schlegel), and very likely to every variety of debate. The oft-quoted letter from Ferdinand Walcher (Deutsch 1964:403) shows at the very least that Schubert discussed religious matters with his friends, and that his peculiarities of belief were part of their common coin. The argument that as a child of his time and place Schubert was perforce a pious and uncritical orthodox Catholic has no merit. The historical fact that Caecilian reforms had not yet taken hold merely means that Schubert had more latitude for liberty.

(7) Did Schubert amend his mass texts for musical reasons?

The answer to this question is twofold: Of course! By no means! These responses are contradictory because the question is false. It presupposes that a musical setting can be neatly deconstructed into two separate utterances, with two separable meanings, one for the music, and one for the text. In this case it presupposes a mass text that is routine, banal, utterly known, and therefore utterly unproblematic, and it presupposes a task assigned to the music of adding some interest, some feeling, some piety. Given these presuppositions the question is justified, and the composer is fully justified in taking liberties with the text, and in allowing the music to shape the text. But these presuppositions are not very flattering—either to religion, piety, music, or to the composer who would let himself in for such a job.

Quite a few writers do not shrink from just such unflattering assumptions of Schubert's relationship to his mass text. Here are two of the more explicit examples:

Kurt von Fischer:

For him this text functions as a model bound by tradition, whose established wording relieves the composer to a great extent from textual problems. That is why Schubert can proceed relatively freely with this text, i.e. allow himself to be merely stimulated by the text as a whole; which means that the text repetitions too, for example, have almost no specific semantic meaning, as opposed to the case in some songs, especially late ones. (1985:127)¹⁴

Brian Newbould:

Schubert composed fast, often without care for less essential details (such as dynamic indications, slurs and ties, or consistency of notation as between an exposition and a recapitulation). Could it be that for him the text of a mass was among the less essential details? The

mass text was, unlike the poems Schubert set as Lieder, always 'there'; it had been a part of his daily furniture since youth, and he thought he knew it by heart. But it was in an alien tongue, and despite what was presumably a good education in the classics he may well have had an imperfect grasp of its vocabulary and syntax. Knowing that he could always check details later, if he remembered or had time to do so, he could well have made assumptions at certain points in mid-composition where the Muse was favouring him and the musical invention was 'taking over'. (1997:129)

Jahrmärker too, gives us a Schubert concerned exclusively with the formal properties of the text, especially with the formal problems imposed by traditional treatments, rather than the meaning of the words. In the quotation cited above (p. 63), and throughout her essay, she has much to say about Schubert's novel modifications of traditional sectional divisions of the text, and an increasing employment in his later masses of strategies for unifying not only sections and movements, but the work as a whole. In her essay these novel modifications take place in an expressive and ideological vacuum, presenting a Schubert seemingly inspired to compose masses through a concern with innovation and unity as ends in themselves.

Walther Dürr (1983) has demonstrated a different way to conceive of Schubert's relationship to his mass text and his music for the masses. He traces Schubert's use in his last two masses of a time-honored musical symbol for the cross: in the E \flat Mass, for example, the G-F \sharp -G-A \flat -G in the trombones at the start of the "Dominus dei, Agnus Dei" section, and G-A \flat -F \sharp -G to start the "dona nobis pacem" at the close of the mass. The connection between the plea for mercy ("miserere nobis") at the center of the Gloria, and the plea for peace ("dona nobis pacem") is strengthened by the pared-down text Schubert had arrived at for the "Dominus Dei, Agnus Dei" section of his last two masses, creating a parallel wording and structure to the last movement's text (compare ex. 7 with the text in ex. 1).

Example 7: Schubert, Mass in E \flat , central section of the Gloria.

... unigenite, Jesu Christe.

[*Andante con moto*, G minor]

Domine Deus, Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis.

Domine Deus, Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis.

Filius Patris, Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis.

Domine Deus, Agnus Dei, Filius Patris, Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis!

[*Tempo I*, B \flat Major]

Quoniam ...

The cross figure also appears in the “Cum sancto spiritu” fugue at the end of that Gloria (E \flat –D–F–E \natural) in the E \flat Mass, and in the “Crucifixus” of the Mass in A \flat . Dürr links all these appearances of the musical cross figure to a letter Schubert wrote in 1825 after viewing the site of a massacre of Bavarians by Tyroleans in the Lueg Pass, a letter that comes as close to any testimony we have in Schubert’s own words to describing his theology, as well as his attitude toward what he considered hypocritical conventions of piety.

This . . . they sought, with a chapel on the Bavarian side and a rough cross in the rock on the Tyrolean side, partly to commemorate, and partly, through the use of such holy signs, to expiate. You, glorious Christ, to how many shameful deeds must you lend your image. You yourself, the most gruesome memorial of human abomination, there they set up your image, as if to say: Behold! the consummate creation of the great God we have trampled with impudent feet, would it trouble us to destroy with a light heart the remaining vermin, known as humans? (Deutsch 1964:320)¹⁵

Dürr endeavors to show not only how Schubert formally unified his two late masses, but how the themes of Christ’s suffering, the suffering of humanity, the futile plea for peace, and the hope of expiation permeate and unify especially the Mass in E \flat .

Dürr’s conclusions, because hermeneutic, are not empirically provable. He gives us a Schubert consistent with all the known facts, based on an incisive analysis informed by passion. He also gives us a Schubert who wrote music not as decoration for a text of untouchable sanctity, but to reawaken the meaning of its dead letters.

Dürr’s interpretation of Schubert’s last two masses is not only more attractive and aesthetically compelling than the views of Fischer, Newbould, and Jahrmärker presented above; it also has a much greater explanatory power. Dürr’s Schubert cut text, not merely to avoid affirmations he did not want to own, but in order to help him express what he had to say. Beginning with his first mass he employed an unusual division of the Gloria text, combining “Domine Deus, Agnus Dei, Filius Patris” with the text that follows instead of with the preceding text. Then, as mentioned above, a golden thread runs through Schubert’s settings of the “Dominus Dei, agnus Dei” section in all six of his masses—the conspicuous treatment he gives to “miserere nobis.” From this idea he gradually moved toward giving the section as a whole an ever more dominant and central place in the Gloria, and toward making its connection with the Agnus Dei movement ever more explicit. Part of that process involved telescoping some of

the text that did not contribute to his conception of the section and, eventually, cutting it. The pattern of telescoping and omissions does more than establish Schubert's agency and knowledge in the shaping of his text; it also helps reveal the maturation process of ideas not fully realized until the final mass.

V.

The story of Schubert's mass texts is also the story of Schubert's reception. For a long time now we have been willing or unwilling dupes of expert opinion, advising us that Schubert did not know what he was doing. An unprejudiced presumption must always have favored Schubert's agency, intention, knowledge, and responsibility; is there another composer in all of music history presumed ignorant of the text he or she was setting? But what would seem a common sense assumption was unthinkable to those who thought they knew Schubert best, and what would seem a logical starting point for investigation, the mass texts themselves, was not pursued systematically until 1964. Instead every possible hypothesis has been tried to circumvent or explain away the obvious. These efforts to preserve Schubert from thought continue: I have cited as examples, sometimes at length, the two most recent full-length biographies of Schubert as well as the *Schubert Handbuch*, which was published to provide a state-of-the-art summary of Schubert research on the occasion of his two-hundredth birthday. Every argument in my list of seven has a contemporary following. The first two arguments against Schubert's knowledge of his own mass texts, concerning his knowledge of Latin and of the orthodox text, require us to embrace a Schubert unobservant, uninformed, and incapable of profiting from his own background, schooling, and daily exposure to Latin and the church—they require us to imagine Schubert stupid. The explanations three through five—carelessness, forgetfulness, the missing master text, the “catholic Church” exception—are all disproved by the pattern of text telescoping and omissions. This pattern, of the telescoping as well as the omissions, has been sitting on the shelf since 1897, readily available to anyone actually seeking to investigate the omissions rather than explain them away; the list of omissions, without noting the pattern they form, has been available since 1964 to anyone who reads the musicological literature, apparently a somewhat larger group. The explanation with the widest contemporary currency, the “catholic Church” exception, forfeits its logical foundation once the larger pattern of omissions is examined; it owes its continued favor to its facile explanatory utility rather than to its solidity. The argument that Schubert was merely a careless and care-free member of a careless and carefree society is not really an argument at all; the only portion that actually addresses the issue of Schubert's role

in his mass texts is the statement that implies that all Austrians were easy-going yet orthodox. Some of these arguments are outlandish, some of them are silly, and none of them can bear any but the most casual scrutiny. Their persistence can only be attributed to the dogged persistence of the image of Schubert from which they spring.

The final argument, that Schubert sacrificed his text to his music, is much more insidious. Insidious, because much analysis shares uncritically the impoverished understanding of music attributed to Schubert; our habit of talking about music, even texted music, as if it were autonomous, and our propensity for talking only about music's structural or formal properties without going on to discuss how or what it communicates, lend a superficial plausibility to the assumption that Schubert could compose music for his masses without caring about what the text actually said. I have focused on the "Dominus Deus, Agnus Dei" section of the Gloria to show that Schubert's local treatment of the text, including telescoping and excisions, precedes and is more consistent than the formal solutions he found in his late masses. Schubert cared about both the meaning of his text and its form, but form, textual and musical, quite literally followed meaning.

Schubert has always been known first and foremost as a composer of lieder. We have grown used to living quite comfortably with the irony that Schubert, the most literary composer of his time, the one most inextricably associated with his skill at putting music to words, is presumed to have composed six masses with an ignorant and careless disregard for his text. The lied is a short form, rooted in popular culture and the Volk, and not overly taxing to the listener; the lied lends itself to patronizing Schubert in the guise of affection. With the mass the patronizing is more obvious, the affection less so. What have we missed in Schubert's music by investing so heavily for so long in a Schubert incapable of intellectual thought?

Notes

*All translations are mine unless otherwise noted.

1. "Diese teilweise zwar absichtlichen (z.B. Weglassung des 'Et unam Sanctam Ecclesiam' in sämtlichen Messen), teilweise aber wohl eher zufälligen Auslassungen sollten nicht überwertet werden."

2. "Die frühere Annahme, Schubert sei einfach sorglos oder flüchtig mit dem Text umgegangen oder der Text habe ihm nicht vollständig vorgelegen, ist heute überwiegend der Ansicht gewichen, die konsequente Auslassung der Passage 'et in unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam' bezeugte Schuberts private Position, ebenso wie die Scheu, stets das Bekenntnis der Auferstehung 'et exspecto resurrectionem' zu vertonen. Auch werden für das Fehlen mancher Textteile unzureichende Lateinkentnisse oder kompositorische Form-Ideen verantwortlich gemacht: Wenn im Gloria der G-Dur-Messe der Relativsatz 'qui sedes ad dexteram Patris', in der B-Dur Messe die Bitte 'suscipe deprecationem nostram' und in der

folgenden C-Dur-Messe beide Textteile fehlen, dann jeweils um der formalen Balance der entsprechenden Abschnitte willen (Jask. 124f). Mit Nachdruck hat man darüber hinaus auf den historischen Sachverhalt hingewiesen, daß in den wenigsten Messen der Zeit der liturgische Text ohne jede Abweichung vertont wurde und erst infolge der Reformbestrebung des Cäcilianismus die Textvollständigkeit verbindlich wurde (1894; Hoorickx, S 251 f., Kantner, Schubert-Studien, S. 137)."

3. In each of his masses Schubert's text reversed the order of the second and third phrases of this line, placing "tu solus altissimus" before "tu solus Dominus."

4. "Caeli" is the version of the Missale Romanum; Schubert's text always used "coeli," and used the "oe" in all forms of the word.

5. In his masses in G and in B \flat , Schubert's text reads "et Filio" instead of "Filioque."

6. Other text changes:

In the Sanctus, "Deus" was omitted from the Mass in C, and a final "Deo" was added to the Sanctus in the Masses in B \flat , A \flat , and E \flat .

In the Agnus Dei, the third "qui tollis peccata mundi" was omitted from the Mass in F and the Mass in A \flat .

7. "Gedächtnisfehler können also für einige Stellen der frühen Messen angenommen werden, wenn überhaupt—für die beiden späten Messen dürften sie ausscheiden."

8. "Es wäre doch einfach eine Frechheit, den vom Auftraggeber gewünschten Text absichtlich so zu verstümmeln, daß zum Teil Unsinn herauskommt. Nein, selbst wenn ein nichtgläubiger Komponist für eine fromme Gemeinde schreibt, nimmt er auf deren Gefühle Rücksicht. Wer möchte Schubert zumuten, er habe der Kirchengemeinde seine privaten Glaubensmeinungen aufoktroieren wollen?"

9. See, in addition to Finke-Hecklinger (1980), Fischer (1985), and Jahrmärker (1997), all cited above, McKay (1996:237).

10. "So verschieden waren eben die Bräuche noch eine ganze Weile lang, aber nicht der Glaube."

11. "Zum Evangelium und Credo"

1. Noch lag die Schöpfung formlos da, nach heiligem Bericht;
da sprach der Herr: Es werde Licht! Er sprach's, und es ward Licht!
Und Leben regt, und reget sich, und Ordnung tritt hervor.
Und Überall all überall tönt Preis und Dank empor.

2. Der Mensch auch lag in Geistesnacht, erstarrt von dunklem Wahn;
der Heiland kam und es ward Licht! Und heller Tag bricht an.
Und seiner Lehre heil'ger Strahl weckt Leben nah und fern;
und alle Herzen pochen Dank, und preisen Gott, den Herrn.

3. Doch warnend spricht der heil'ge Mund: Nicht frommt der Glaub' allein,
nur die Erfüllung eurer Pflicht kann Leben ihm verlei'h'n.
Drum gibt ein gläubiges Gemüth! Und gib uns auch, o Gott,
ein liebend Herz, das fromm und treu stets folgt dem Gebot!

4. Verleih' uns Kraft und Muth, dass wir nicht nur die Wege sehn'
die der Erlöser ging, dass wir auch streben nachzugeh'n.
Lass so dein Evangelium uns Himmels Botschaft sein,
und führ uns, Herr, durch deine Huld ins' Reich der Wonnen ein.

12. "Die Allmacht"

Gross ist Jehova, der Herr! Denn Himmel
Und Erde verkünden seine Macht.
Du hörst sie im brausenden Sturm,
In des Waldstroms laut aufrauschendem Ruf;
Du hörst sie in des grünen Waldes Gesäusel,
Siehst sie in wogender Saaten Gold,
In lieblicher Blumen glühendem Schmelz,
Im Glanz des sternebesäten Himmels,
Furchtbar tönt sie im Donnergeroll
Und flammt in des Blitzes schnell hinzuckendem Flug.
Doch kündet das pochende Herz dir fühlbarer noch
Jehovas Macht, des ewigen Gottes,
Blickst du flehend empor und hoffst auf Huld und Erbarmen.

13. "Ausflüge mit Schober und Mayerhofer (der bei mir wohnt). Streit zwischen M[ayerhofer] und Sch[ober], letzterer leugnet die Unsterblichkeit und persönliche Fortdauer. Das erbittert den Andern. Ich vermittele nach Kräften."

14. "Dieser Text fungiert bei ihm als traditionengebundenes Modell, dessen festgelegter Wortlaut den Komponisten weitgehend von Textproblemen entlastet. Deshalb kann Schubert auch relativ frei mit diesem Text umgehen, d.h. sich vom Text bloß allgemein anregen lassen, wobei z.B. auch Textwiederholungen, im Gegensatz zu manchen Liedern besonders der Spätzeit, kaum spezifisch semantische Bedeutung zukommt."

15. "Dieses . . . suchte man durch eine Capelle auf der Baiern Seite und durch ein rohes Kreuz in dem Felsen auf der Tyroler Seite zum Teil zu bezeichnen, und zum Teil durch solche heilige Zeichen zu sühnen. Du herrlicher Christus, zu wie viel Schandthaten mußt du dein Bild herleihen. Du selbst das gräßlichste Denkmal der menschlichen Verworfenheit, da stellten sie dein Bild auf, als wollten sie sagen: Seht! die vollendetste Schöpfung des großen Gottes haben wir mit frechen Füßen zertreten, sollte es uns etwa Mühe kosten, das übrige Ungeziefer, genannt Menschen, mit leichtem Herzen zu vernichten?"

References

- Badura-Skoda, Paul. 1990a. On Schubert's Mass Texts. *American Choral Review* 32: 5-7.
———. 1990b. Schuberts korrumpierte Meßtexte—Absicht oder Versehen?
Gedanken zum Buch von Hans Jaskulsky *Die Lateinischen Messen Franz Schuberts. Das Orchester* 38: 131-34.
Bauernfeld, Eduard von. 1873. *Gesammelte Schriften von Bauernfeld*. Vol. 12, *Aus Alt und Neu Wien*. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller.
Benedikt, Erich. 1997. Notizen zu Schubert Messen—mit neuem Uraufführungsdatum der Messe in F-Dur. *Oesterreichische Musikzeitschrift-Schubert Special* 52: 64-69.

- Berio, Talia Pecker. 1990. Foreword to *Messen I. Neue Schubert-Ausgabe*, ser. I, vol. 1a, IX–XV. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Biba, Otto. 1978. Besetzungsverhältnisse in der Wiener Kirchenmusik. In *Zur Aufführungspraxis der Werke Franz Schuberts*, edited by Vera Schwarz, 180–87. Munich: Katzbichler.
- . 1985. Kirchenmusikalische Praxis zu Schuberts Zeit. In *Franz Schubert: Jahre der Krise, 1818–1823*, edited by Werner Aderhold, Walther Dürr, and Walburga Litschauer, 113–21. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Brusatti, Otto. 1978. *Schubert im Wiener Vormärz: Dokumente 1829–1848*. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt.
- Bunnell, Adam. 1990. *Before Infallibility: Liberal Catholicism in Biedermeier Vienna*. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Cross, F. L., and E. A. Livingston, eds. 1985. S.v. "Pantheism" and "Panthemism." In *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 1027–28. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Denny, Thomas. 1991. The Years of Schubert's A-flat-Major Mass, First Version: Chronological and Biographical Issues, 1819–1822. *Acta musicologica* 63: 73–97.
- Deutsch, Otto Erich, ed. 1958. *Schubert: Memoirs by his Friends*. Translated by Rosamond Ley and John Nowell. London: Adam & Charles Black.
- , ed. 1964. *Schubert: Die Dokumente seines Lebens*. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Dürr, Walther. 1983. *Dona nobis pacem: Gedanken zu Schuberts späten Messen*. In *Bachiana et Alia Musicologica: Festschrift Alfred Dürr zum 65. Geburtstag am 3. März 1983*, edited by Wolfgang Rehm, 62–73. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- . 1996. Introduction to *Franz Schubert, Messe Nr. 6 Es-Dur, Faksimile der autographen Partitur und der überlieferten Entwürfe*. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Einstein, Alfred. 1951. *Schubert*. Translated by David Ascoli. London: Cassel.
- Finke-Hecklinger, Doris. 1980. Foreword to *Messe in As: Erste Fassung. Neue Schubert-Ausgabe*, ser. I, vol. 3a, VIII–XIV. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Fischer, Kurt von. 1985. Bemerkungen zu Schuberts As-dur-Messe. In *Franz Schubert: Jahre der Krise, 1818–1823*, edited by Werner Aderhold, Walther Dürr, and Walburga Litschauer, 121–29. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Gibbs, Christopher H. 2000. *The Life of Schubert*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gramit, David. 1987. *The Intellectual and Aesthetic Tenets of Franz Schubert's Circle: Their Development and Their Influence*. Ph.D. diss., Duke University.
- Hoorickx, Reinhard van. 1979. Textänderungen in Schuberts Messen. In *Schubert-Kongreß: Wien 1978: Bericht*, edited by Otto Brusatti, 249–54. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt.
- Jahrmärker, Manuela. 1997. Von der liturgischen Funktion zum persönlichen Bekenntnis: Die Kirchenmusik. In *Schubert Handbuch*, edited by Walther Dürr and Andreas Krause, 345–78. Kassel, Stuttgart, and Weimar: Bärenreiter and Metzler.
- Jaskulsky, Hans. 1986. *Die lateinischen Messen Franz Schuberts*. Mainz: Schott.
- Kantner, Leopold. 1978. Franz Schuberts Kirchenmusik auf dem Hintergrund stilistischer Zusammenhänge und persönlicher Einstellung. In *Schubert-*

- Studien: Festgabe der Oesterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zum Schubert-Jahr 1978*, edited by Franz Grasberger and Othmar Wessely, 131–41. Vienna: Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Kreissle von Hellborn, Heinrich. 1861. *Franz Schubert*. Vienna: Druck und Verlag der Typographisch-literarisch-artistischen Anstalt.
- Litschauer, Walburga, ed. 1986. *Neue Dokumente zum Schubert Kreis, Aus Briefen und Tagebüchern seiner Freunde*. Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag.
- McKay, Elizabeth Norman. 1996. *Franz Schubert: A Biography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Newbould, Brian. 1997. *Schubert: The Music and the Man*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Okey, Robin. 2001. *The Habsburg Monarchy: From Enlightenment to Eclipse*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Scattolin, Pier Paolo. 1982. Forward (*Messe in C*) to *Messen II. Neue Schubert-Ausgabe*, ser. I, vol. 2, XIII–XIV. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Stanley, Glenn. 1997. Schubert's Religious and Choral Music: Toward a Statement of Faith. In *The Cambridge Companion to Schubert*, edited by Christopher Gibbs, 207–23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stefan-Gruenfeldt, Paul. 1928. *Schubert*. Berlin: Volksverband der Bücherfreunde, Wegweiser-Verlag.
- Stringham, Ronald. 1964. *The Masses of Franz Schubert*. Ph.D. diss., Cornell University.
- Thayer-Forbes. 1967. *Thayer's Life of Beethoven*. Edited by Elliot Forbes. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Vetter, Walther. 1953. *Der klassiker Schubert*. 2 vols. Leipzig: C. F. Peters.
- Wagner, Manfred. 1996. *Franz Schubert: Sein Werk, Sein Leben*. Vienna: Holzhausen.
- Werlé, Heinrich. 1941. *Franz Schubert, der Mensch und sein Werk*. Bayreuth: Gauerlag Bayreuth.
- Winter, Robert. 1982. Paper Studies and the Future of Schubert Studies. In *Schubert Studies: Problems of Style and Chronology*, edited by Eva Badura-Skoda and Peter Branscome, 209–75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wissig, Otto. 1909. *Franz Schuberts Messen*. Leipzig: Poeschel & Trepte.