

Dr. Terry and Dr. Haberl

Author(s): J. R. Milne and R. R. Terry

Source: *The Musical Times*, Vol. 57, No. 879 (May 1, 1916), p. 249

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/910507>

Accessed: 29-12-2015 13:24 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*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Correspondence.

DR. TERRY AND DR. HABERL.

(See December No., p. 715.)

TO THE EDITOR OF 'THE MUSICAL TIMES.'

SIR,—Will you permit me to say a word in vindication of the late Dr. Haberl against what seem to me the unworthy attacks of Dr. Terry? One may be quite convinced of the immense superiority from the archæological point of view of the new Solesmes-Vatican revision of Church Plainsong, and yet remain as convinced of the good faith of Dr. Haberl in his connection with the previous official edition published at Ratisbon. Dr. Terry's attacks induced me carefully to read over again what Haberl wrote in his own defence in his 'Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch' of 1902, and in some numbers of his 'Musica Sacra,' when the accusations which Dr. Terry repeats were first made. To Haberl's own distinct assertion, and the evidence he adduces in its favour, that 'the reproduction of the Medicean edition was not undertaken on his initiative or that of F. Pustet,' Dr. Terry thinks it sufficient to reply that 'a flat contradiction of this will be found' in a writing of M. Gastoué in 1913. But Dr. Haberl's detailed account of the negotiations of 1868-70, which preceded the Ratisbon publication, is surely as worthy of credit as any 'flat contradiction' in 1913 by M. Gastoué, who as a member of the new Papal Commission is naturally interested to find reasons for the later Roman disavowal of the previous official edition? Dr. Haberl's whole account goes to show that the Congregation of Sacred Rites was itself responsible for the choice of the Mediceæ as the standard for revision as well as for every step taken in the course of revision. And surely it was more to the interest of a Roman Congregation to uphold the credit of a previous Roman edition of 1614 than it could be to Haberl or Pustet. But if, as Dr. Terry and others allege, the Congregation of Sacred Rites was only successfully hoodwinked by the commercial 'astuteness' of Haberl and Pustet, to an impartial outsider this would seem so much the worse for Roman authority and the Congregation of Rites. It is also important to remember that these negotiations took place just before and after the Vatican Council of 1870, when for the sake of securing unity and uniformity throughout the Roman Church there was the strong determination to assert the claims of local Roman authority without overmuch regard to history and tradition. And how stood then the case with regard to Plain-song and its historical investigation? Dr. Terry refers to 'the labours of Mgr. Alfieri which met with no encouragement at Rome.' Dr. Haberl tells us that it was for the purchase of Alfieri's manuscripts that Pustet was first approached, and this led to himself being commissioned to examine them and ascertain whether their publication would be authorized by the Congregation of Rites. Examination disclosed the fact that the manuscripts were quite unusable, and that the Congregation had already decided against them. Outside Rome the Mechlin version of Plain-song partly based on the Mediceæ mainly held the field, and the Mechlin authorities were endeavouring to have it declared authoritative for the whole Church. On the other hand there were various French editions based more or less on archæological principles, but all disagreeing with one another. Under the circumstances what was more natural than for Roman authority to cut the knot of all difficulties by insisting on the adoption of the Mediceæ as the standard for revision in order to secure unity and uniformity? It was not till 1880-83 that the Solesmes publications began to bring further light into the historical investigation. As it would hardly do for Roman archæologists to allege directly that Roman authority itself had been at fault, it was found convenient to transfer the whole blame of the Ratisbon publication to Dr. Haberl. More recently the controversy was carried further back, mainly by the book of Molitor to which Dr. Terry refers, in which the Mediceæ of 1614 is also discredited as a mere publishing speculation with even less of official sanction, in spite of the claim on its title-page 'cum cantu Pauli V. Pont. Max. jussu reformato.' And yet Dom Molitor is obliged to recognise, what indeed the title of his book ('Die Nachtridentinische Choral-reform') implies, that the Mediceæ was the outcome of a movement proceeding from the Council of Trent itself in 1562,

in favour of what was then universally regarded as a much-needed reform and purification of Plain-song by the removal of alleged 'barbarisms' and 'corruptions' in its traditional form. Historically the Mediceæ may be as 'spurious' as Dr. Terry declares it to be, but in the eyes of the musical reformers and church authorities of the 16th century, it was the traditional Plain-song which was regarded as a falsification of the original. And now, after the further investigations of Gevaert and M. Gastoué himself, it can hardly be pretended that Plain-song has not been subject to a good deal of alteration in the course of its history. On the whole, it does not seem much to the credit of those modern Roman authorities to whom Dr. Terry appeals, that they should seek to make Dr. Haberl the scapegoat for the mistakes of their own predecessors, as for instance, when it is alleged that he misled the Congregation of Rites as to the value and authority of the Mediceæ by his view as to Palestrina's share in it. It is a strange confession for Roman officialism to excuse its own mistake of 1870 by representing itself as duped by the 'astuteness' of Dr. Haberl and F. Pustet, and this is all that Dr. Terry's case against Dr. Haberl amounts to. Dr. Haberl's great mistake was his excessive reliance on Roman authority, which in his case proved a broken reed.

J. R. MILNE.

Smallburgh, Norwich.

(1.) My point was the faulty scholarship of Dr. Haberl. Your correspondent answers me with epithets in lieu of argument. Nowhere does he deal with the essential fact that not only did Haberl assert the claims of a spurious text against every other scholar in Europe, but that the machinery of the Cæcilienverein was used to burke every inquiry into the claims of that text (*witness the successful breaking up of the Arrezzo Congress: a gathering of earnest scholars with no publisher behind them, and no commercial axe to grind*).

(2.) Your correspondent's letter (save on two points) is a *réchauffé* of the correspondence in *The Tablet*. My replies are on record, and I refer him to that newspaper.

(3.) Of the two points above named, (a) I never claimed technical knowledge for Alfieri; I merely noted that he failed to inspire Romans with any zeal for Plainsong. (b.) I do not propose discussing your correspondent's strictures on the Roman Curia,—not because there is no answer, but because it raises sectarian issues unsuited to a musical journal. But it may be said that as regards our own domestic affairs, we poor Papists may fairly be presumed to have fuller knowledge than outsiders. Consequently I can assure Mr. Milne that his deductions (*e.g.*, that S.C.R. made a scapegoat of Haberl, &c.) are not in accordance with the facts.

R. R. TERRY.

PRESENTATION TO MR. J. S. SHEDLOCK.

TO THE EDITOR OF 'THE MUSICAL TIMES.'

SIR,—In your interesting account of the presentation made to Mr. J. S. Shedlock by his colleagues of the musical Press, you mentioned the names of Mr. Robin Legge and myself as 'prime movers.' May I add that Mr. Francis E. Barrett (*Morning Post*) was equally concerned in the conspiracy, and that he took a large share in the necessary secretarial work.—I am, Sir, &c.,

H. C. COLLES.

Mr., Robert D. Steedman, of 44A, Blackett Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne, writes to ask the name of the author who wrote 'Musical recollections of the last half century.' (Two vols., published by Tinsley Bros. in 1872.)

The Musicians' Company's 'Andrew Carnegie' Open Scholarship of the value of £23 per annum, providing a complete musical education at the Guildhall School of Music, will be competed for during the months of June or July next. Candidates may be of either sex, but must be British born, and under eighteen years of age. The Scholarship will extend over a period of at least three years. Forms of entry can be obtained from the secretary, Guildhall School of Music, Victoria Embankment, E.C.