Degrees

Author(s): Thomas Gertrnde Barry

Source: *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, Vol. 17, No. 386 (Apr. 1, 1875), p. 57

Published by: [Musical Times Publications Ltd.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3355317>

Accessed: 12-11-2015 12:21 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Musical Times Publications Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

DEGREES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MUSICAL TIMES.

SIR,—I cannot but regret that Dr. Stainer should have been so acutely nettled as to be tempted to ask Dr. Fowle (who of course will treat all such queries with contempt) where he graduated, *das ist ihm eigen*. I do not say that Dr. Stainer does not support his title by his abilities, but, I must say that I myself know foreign graduates (whose names and learning I honour) to whom certain British ones could not hold a candle. Indeed, the standard of our British curriculum is very far short of "perfection's height." Dr. Stainer should, in his calm moments, ponder the decision of the Lord Chief Baron Kelly (where he gave damages) in the case of *Dr. Kinns v. Arnold*. "The learned judge" (says the *Scholastic Register*) "knew the law, and showed clearly the right to assume the title of Dr. by reason of a diploma received from any foreign university." And why not? Such impertinence from Dr. Stainer and tawdry parade of his British Doctorship (despised on the continent perhaps even more than he despises the foreign degree), deserve the storm of derision from musical artists which the faculty would meritoriously send sweeping over his scribacious cranium had he the impudence to question them, or to ask them to put the names of their Alma Maters after their titles. Why don't they do so? Some few indeed there are who occasionally—in intervals of despair or weakness—do sound their Alma Mater trumpet. I very well remember a wealthy and popular M.D. smiling scornfully at such an appendage, which forcibly reminds me of those vendors who give us to suppose that their goods possess some *recherché* virtue, by saying "see that the label has our own stamp on, as all others are impositions." Does not Dr. Stainer know that many of the greatest and most popular men in England—in every profession—are foreign graduates (of course not imposed on by an impostor), which is a very different thing indeed from being doctorated by an Archbishop. In the former case sterling ability, approved authorship and position, secure it; but in the latter the good opinion of the *ecclesiastic* secures it. Now, which title is the more inglorious; "An Artist," says the *Musical Times* of last month, "would gain more real honour by refusing than by accepting a title at the hands of an individual which he knows can only be legitimately* granted by one of the universities."

As for Dr. Stainer's question about the Mus. Bac., his narrow judgment there reaches its climax. Indeed, I could not have believed that he would ask such a silly question. But, perhaps, he never read or knew of British or foreign subjects, having the title of Doctor conferred on them *without the Mus. Bac. shibboleth*; and those honoured men understand perhaps as much about harmonic progressions, rhythmic divisions, and the internal sense of the tones as Dr. Stainer does, *das kribbelt ihn im kopfe*. Dr. Stainer's letter is not over clear; and had he considered the subject he would not have exhibited such a spirit of the *green-eyed monster*. *Prima est eloquentia virtus, perspicuitas, et quoque ingenio minus valet hoc de magis attollere et dilatare conatur, ut statuta breves in digitos eriguntur, et plura infirmi minantur*.

Yours faithfully,

THOMAS GERTRUDE BARRY,
Mus. Doc.

THOMAS LLOYD FOWLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MUSICAL TIMES.

SIR,—I have much pleasure in replying to Mr. Fowle's queries, in the order in which they occur.

1. This question should have been addressed to the Dean and Chapter.

2. Yes.

3. I have not the smallest conception where, when, or how, Mr. Fowle became a *Doctor* and a *Master of Arts*. I am not jealous of Mr. Fowle.

4. Yes. Titles publicly used are open to public criticism.

* This is a misunderstanding, the Archbishop's degree being as perfectly legal as any other. However, its legality and honour are two very different things.

5. Certainly not. I know absolutely nothing of the printer mentioned by Mr. Fowle. I have never had any communication, signed or anonymous, with any printer, person, paper or periodical, except the *Musical Times* (in last number), on the subject of Mr. Fowle's University status, or anything else connected with him.

He is quite at liberty to take any further steps he may deem advisable, with regard to any "suspicious" letter he possesses.

I now claim the fulfilment of Mr. Fowle's promise to answer my questions printed in your last issue.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN STAINER,
M.A., Mus. Doc., Oxon.

THE WAGNER THEORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MUSICAL TIMES.

SIR,—“F. C.’s” questions bear only indirectly on my letter; but, availing myself of your kind permission, I will endeavour to answer them in as few words as possible. The notion that Wagner is merely re-propounding the theory of Gluck is a mistaken one. Gluck, like Wagner, was an earnest, true-hearted musician, who would concede nothing to popular taste, and as such he will always be revered by those who value truth before everything else; he was, *thanks to the intellectual thought he bestowed on his work*, a purifier of his art, and so far in advance of his age that many of the subsequent “less philosophical writers,” to whom “F. C.” alludes, owe him an incalculable debt; but the one fact that he was no poet (in the limited sense of the word) would alone have prevented him from being the founder of the Wagner theory. (“F. C.” may remark that neither I nor any other of Wagner’s disciples claim for him the honour of being the first musician who had a theory, but the first to whom theory taught the perfect amalgamation of music and poetry.)

To come to “F. C.’s” second question; we do not found our belief that the standard of Richard Wagner will be borne triumphantly through future ages on the simple fact that he has a theory, but on the firm foundation that that theory contains the essence of all that has been proved true and beautiful, and therefore eternal, in time past; and because, like all earnest men in art as well as religion and nature, what he *does* is the mirror of what he says.

11th March, 1875.

VERRING.

MEDDLING WITH THE OLD MASTERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MUSICAL TIMES.

SIR,—Your correspondent, “Allegro,” will find an explanation of the omission of two bars in Beethoven’s C minor Symphony, in a letter from the composer to his publisher, dated 21st August, 1810, (quoted by Professor Otto Jahn, in an article* in the *Grenzboten*, 1864.

Beethoven’s words are—“I have found the following mistake in the Symphony in C minor, namely, in the third movement in $\frac{3}{4}$ time; where, after the major, the entry of the minor stands thus. I take the bass part:

the two bars over which the + stands, are too much, and must be struck out: and, of course, the same in all the other parts, which rest.”

Jahn then goes on to say that “in the copy sent to be engraved the struck-out bars are marked (1) and the two following (2); and then, above, in red pencil, is written—‘Si replica con trio, allora 2.’” Beethoven therefore had originally intended that the whole Scherzo and Trio should be repeated, and then the Coda should follow, but had afterwards given up the repetition, which the engraver did not understand.

* Reprinted in Jahn’s *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik*, Leipzig, 1866. Jahn’s Article on “The Editions of Beethoven’s Works” contains much that is worth reading, which is not to be found elsewhere.