Document generated on 04/23/2024 4:09 p.m.

Canadian University Music Review
Revue de musique des universités canadiennes

Canadian University Music Review

Nicholas Thistlethwaite and Geoffrey Webber, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to the Organ.* Cambridge Companions to Music. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. xiv, 340 pp. ISBN 0-521-57309-2 (hardcover), 0-521-57584-2 (paperback)

Lynn Cavanagh

Volume 20, Number 2, 2000

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1014463ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1014463ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Canadian University Music Society / Société de musique des universités canadiennes

ISSN

0710-0353 (print)
2291-2436 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this review

Cavanagh, L. (2000). Review of [Nicholas Thistlethwaite and Geoffrey Webber, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to the Organ.* Cambridge Companions to Music. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. xiv, 340 pp. ISBN 0-521-57309-2 (hardcover), 0-521-57584-2 (paperback)]. *Canadian University Music Review / Revue de musique des universités canadiennes*, *20*(2), 105–113. https://doi.org/10.7202/1014463ar

All Rights Reserved © Canadian University Music Society / Société de musique des universités canadiennes, 2000

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/

érudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

https://www.erudit.org/en/

work, and a more restrained approach to electric action than Douglass implies. Moreover, when we consider his preservation of the Saint-Sulpice organ in tandem with his often expressed admiration for the builder, it seems improbable that Dupré, at the end of his own long life and nearly three quarters of a century after Cavaillé-Coll's death, would put words in the latter's mouth.

The evidence Douglass offers to support his accusation is not convincing. We do not know exactly why, late in the 1890s, Cavaillé-Coll discarded electric action in the instrument of Saint-Augustin in Paris; the reasons are unclear and, unless new evidence comes to light, they will remain so. In an 1890 letter that Douglass quotes, moreover, Cavaillé-Coll writes that he has "not had the courage" to embark on a thorough study of the new electrical systems, phrasing that can hardly be read as a blanket condemnation of them. These are shaky premises on which to slur Dupré's veracity. Douglass's attack is unfortunate, and adds nothing to this account of Cavaillé-Coll's career.

One's view of *Cavaillé-Coll and the French Romantic Tradition* thus varies according to circumstance. Libraries possessing Douglass's 1980 study might regard the new title as superfluous, in that nearly all its contents are derived from the earlier work. To those libraries and individuals without the 1980 study, the present volume is a fascinating account of part of the career of a magnificently gifted artist and builder, a man of genius who changed the course of organ building and provided the tonal inspiration for a new school of composition. It is also of great value for its illustrations. Most striking among them are Cavaillé-Coll's shop drawings of the organs of Saint-Vincent-de-Paul (figures 7–9) and Saint-Sulpice (figures 14–17). Though considerably reduced from their 1980 dimensions, the reproductions remain clear. They testify to another of Cavaillé-Coll's virtues, the care with which he laid out these large and complex instruments, and show us how the internal beauty and symmetry of Cavaillé-Coll's organs echo the opulence of their sound.

In an important sense, then, Yale University Press's promise of "a new and expanded edition of *Cavaillé-Coll and the Musicians*" remains unfulfilled. We await a full account of Cavaillé-Coll's life and work. In the interim, this reissue of material that is the better part of a generation old is of value chiefly to those without access to Douglass's earlier study.

Thomas Chase

Nicholas Thistlethwaite and Geoffrey Webber, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to the Organ*. Cambridge Companions to Music. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. xiv, 340 pp. ISBN 0-521-57309-2 (hardcover), 0-521-57584-2 (paperback).

In contrast to other instruments treated in the Cambridge Companions to Music series, the organ is by far the most complex and diverse, and has a repertoire with the longest history, of any present-day instrument. The amount of information surveyed here is prodigious. The twenty chapters are by sixteen specialists (British, American, and Australian) on subjects relating to the instrument

(six chapters), the player (three chapters), and selected repertoires (eleven chapters). Other one-volume guides to the organ and its repertoire are currently available, but none attempts to treat its subject with the comprehensiveness, nor the scholarly expertise, of the *Cambridge Companion*.[1] Adding to the quality of their collected work, each author brings a fresh point of view to his or her specific topic. In whole or in part, the book will be of interest to performers, musicologists, students, and aficionados of the organ. What follows focuses on four features of the book that particularly caught my attention.

First, at the end of a century in which controversy has surrounded coexisting extremes in organ design principles and multiple fashions in organ recital programming, the *Cambridge Companion to the Organ* manages to strike a balance by adopting an unusually keen historical perspective. By focusing on historical context in its relation to the present day, the authors are able to thematicize the interdependence of musical style and organ design, and of organ repertories and their geneses, in ways that mediate between the extremes. Some examples will illustrate.

One controversy surrounds the aims of studying organ performance practice. Nicholas Thistlethwaite (in the preface and in chapter 1, "Origins and Development of the Organ") immediately demonstrates a judicious attitude by stressing that historical knowledge—of national musical styles, shifts in aesthetic aim, and organ building practices linked to chronological periods and geographic locations—is not meant to limit a repertoire to one, narrowly described instrument, but to assist in making the decisions necessary to achieve an artistically successful performance on an available instrument (pp. xiv, 1–2). The reader-performer is thus freed to explore all of the organ music to be described but, at the same time, charged with applying the book's information wisely.

The larger and more basic controversy concerns the very nature of the instrument. Much literature on the organ written since mid-century assumes the historic and present-day artistic superiority of the mechanical action instrument—particularly mechanical action with classical tonal design—over organs having pneumatic- or electro-pneumatic-assisted action.[2] Stephen Bicknell, the contributor of three chapters in Part I, repeatedly demonstrates that this bias is historically and technologically unaware. For instance, in his description of mechanisms for engaging or silencing particular ranks of pipes, he touches upon the nineteenth-century replacement of the *slider chest* (characteristic of

[1] Other currently available guides to the organ and its music are each by a single author. These include Peter Hurford, *Making Music on the Organ*, rev. (paperback) ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990) for student performers and David Baker, *The Organ* (Risborough: Shire Publications, 1991) aimed at lovers of organ music in general.

[2] An example is the long-standard treatise in the mid-twentieth century for organists and churches, Hans Klotz's *The Organ Handbook: Structure, Design, Maintenance, History, and Function of the Organ*, 7th ed., trans. Gerhard Krapf (St. Louis, Miss.: Concordia, 1969; first published in 1937 as *Das Buch von der Orgel*), which is a rigorous product of the Organ Reform Movement (and tellingly missing from the bibliography concluding *The Cambridge Companion to the Organ*). Large portions of Hurford's chapters "How the Organ Works" and "The Technical Bases of Movement and Expression" are confined to the assumption of mechanical action (Hurford, *Making Music*, 14–24 and 52–60).

mechanical-action instruments), in which sliders open one channel per *note* to the wind stored in the wind chest, by the *sliderless chest*, in which an entire *rank* is brought into play by admitting wind to a channel (and each note for that rank is accessed by a separate valve). He arbitrates between the two mechanisms thus:

> The slider chest is difficult to design and make and, until the use of man-made materials in its construction became practical and widespread after c1950, it was not well suited to extremes of temperature and humidity. However, the provision of one channel per note is considered to assist blend and, of course, automatically gives absolute unanimity of speech. The sliderless chest is cheaper and allows a much faster stop-action; it is typically associated with late romantic instruments where quick changes of registration are considered desirable (p. 22).[3]

Strongly implied here is that the artistic advantage afforded by the slider chest for the classical organ repertory was (and is, with respect to some historic organs) negated by climate conditions in certain locations, a dilemma that was only circumvented over 600 years after slider chests were first built.

Similarly, among present-day organists familiar with the sensitivity of touch afforded by the mechanical key action of modern instruments, there is a tendency to disparage the nineteenth-century invention of pneumatic assistance for key action. But Bicknell points out:

> Since 1960 there has been a considerable revival of the use of all-mechanical actions. The application of modern engineering to the design of pallets and to the development of low-friction bearings has made it possible to provide all-mechanical actions even in quite large instruments without producing an unduly heavy touch ... (p. 24).

Elsewhere, he observes, almost with glee: "Fisk and van den Heuvel, amongst others, have revived the use of the pneumatic lever [to lighten the key action of otherwise mechanical action organs] and, with renewed interest in the romantic repertoire and the large organs that go with it, there is now a very real prospect that the debate over the virtues of electro-pneumatic action in 'art' organ building may revive" (p. 87).[4]

Facts such as these vindicate the nineteenth-century adoption of pneumatic

[3] "The sliderless chest is cheaper." As in this passage, one occasionally detects (an unintentional?) semantic bias toward the mechanical action instrument in Bicknell's writing: electro-pneumatic action had its "hey-day" (p. 24); some present-day builders of instruments with all-mechanical action "resort to" electric action for the manual couplers (p. 24).

[4] This is in contrast to Hurford, ten years earlier, in his only paragraph on features new to the nineteenth-century organ: "With the advent of the later Romantic repertory, and the decline of the player's control over action and touch, changes of dynamic and of colour gradually assumed a greater importance. Simultaneously, increased technical demands upon the player's hands (arising from a more orchestral use of the instrument) meant that some form of assistance had to be provided, so that the organist could make rapid adjustments to dynamic level and colour during the course of the music" (Hurford, *Making Music*, 35). Here, in order to make the point that nineteenth-century design innovations are artistically inferior, Hurford suggests that—rather than motivated by a desire

and electro-pneumatic actions. They suggest: first, that the colourful and varied timbres that characterize romantic music necessitated the nineteenth-century move away from a type of action invented when manual couplings, and stop changes within a piece, were rare; second, that large, mechanical action organs such as survived into the nineteenth century (and beyond), did not necessarily operate as easily or reliably as their late-twentieth-century counterparts. In short, comparison of organ-building technologies makes it clear that the habitual dubbing of the eighteenth century as the "Golden Age" of organ building is an oversimplification.[5]

Without rancour, but wherever the subject comes up, the book gives brief mention to the musical low point of organ building (ca. 1890–1930).[6] Bicknell accounts for the unpleasant sound of these instruments by pointing not to technological innovation per se but to motivations that employed technology out of pride in machines rather than pride in artistry (p. 82). A consistent understanding of the book's theme would draw a connection between the unmusical nature of so many new organs in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including some built for North American auditoriums,[7] and the fact that virtually no major twentieth-century composer has created a significant repertoire for the instrument.[8] In the essay "Organ Building Today," Bicknell decries the fact that today still, particularly in North America, many new organs are factory-built in accordance with "commercial" aims—economy, utilitarianism, and versatility—rather than crafted with "artistic" aims—tonal and visual beauty—in mind (p. 89). One cannot help but admire the author's informed and reasoned polemic on why the organ (as it is meant to be) is a singular amalgam of timeless craft, the visual arts, and musical arts. But, given the irony that today's factory-built organ only manages to sound as fine as the best electronic sampler (which is to say, the organ, for listeners exposed only to the commercial product, is indistinguishable from its much less costly electronic substitute) one also wonders whether the art of organ building in North America will be able to survive the next century.

By the very choice of subjects singled out for treatment in separate chapters of Parts I and II, *The Cambridge Companion* demonstrates a revisionist ap-

---

to explore the new musical style—interest in dynamic shading and new timbres gradually *followed* design change, as the result of the need to compensate for the loss of responsiveness of touch that goes with pneumatically assisted key action. Then, by misattributing the increase in technical demands in nineteenth century organ music (usually understood as resulting from the influence of piano technique) to "more orchestral use of the instrument"), he plants a barb in readers' impression of the symphonic tradition of organ music that concomitantly arose in France.

[5] Conversation with Steve Miller, organ technician, 13 August 1998.

[6] Thistlethwaite introduces the subject with, "by the 1890s influences were making themselves felt which increasingly separated the organ from much of its legitimate repertoire" (p. 16). See also brief remarks in the chapter "North American Organ Music after 1800," 304.

[7] Some American concert organs built during the nadir, and music written for them, are mentioned by Douglas Reed on pp. 300–307.

[8] Thistlethwaite interprets the relationship between the instrument and its twentieth-century repertoire somewhat differently when he says that the present-day absence of *a single style of organ composition* parallels the absence of *a single style of organ building* in the twentieth century (p. xiii).

proach to study of the instrument and its repertoire. "The Physics of the Organ" is covered in a separate chapter, contributed by the Australian physicist John Mainstone, in place of the usual cursory explanation during a description of the instrument's mechanism. "Temperament and Pitch" are also given a chapter, written by Christopher Kent, whereas these topics are often skirted entirely (or assigned to an appendix, as in Hurford's book). Yet another chapter concerned with the instrument (again, by Bicknell) is about "The Organ Case." In keeping with the paperback's striking front cover, it deals with the organ as architectural feature and explains the role played by the visual design of the instrument: both practical and decorative aspects of the casework, along with visual and aural principles of pipe arrangement characteristic of different styles. The chapter most copiously illustrated with photographs, it strongly reflects modern scholarship's heightened awareness of the codependency of the arts.

The extramusical context that begat and shaped a genre of organ music is customarily treated in a vague fashion within a survey of a specific repertoire; here the subject "Organ Music and the Liturgy" is given its own chapter in Part II, "The Player." Edward Higginbottom presents evidence for the specific ways in which plainchant performed by the organist—organ versets, typically improvised—and sung plainchant interacted in the Latin mass, and discusses the philosophy behind this practice. In the concluding portion of the chapter he summarizes the functions and geneses of surviving organ repertoires in the principal Protestant liturgical traditions. Attention to these subjects, here and in the repertoire surveys of Part III, places the book in the wider arena of present-day music history and criticism, which seek to understand music in its social and humanistic contexts.

Another strength of the book is the first chapter of Part II, an uncommonly intelligent summary of the principles of organ technique by Kimberly Marshall. This is particularly true of its treatment of pre-1750 music, two of whose subjects, accent and articulation, are rarely explained in such direct and detailed fashion as Marshall explains them here. Her approach to both subjects is descended from principles first advocated by Harald Vogel in the 1970s, when serious misunderstandings prevented their general acceptance.[9] Beginning with accent, she explains why and how minuscule silences, finely distinguished in length, are necessary to express metre in early organ music (pp. 96–98).[10] Then tackling articulation, she clearly describes the two articulations unique to music of the Baroque and earlier: the prevailing norm is a legato that juxtaposes the sounds of decay (the diminuendo as the pallet closes) and attack (the speaking noise as wind enters the next pipe) without intervening silence ("structured legato"); for slurred passages and ornaments, a legato that overlaps half of the next attack with the preceding decay is appropriate ("balanced legato"). Both

[9] See, for example, John Obetz, "An Interview with Harald Vogel," *The American Organist* 13 (August 1979): 38.

[10] Hurford, on the other hand, gives attention to minuscule silences that express melodic line and phrase shape, but does not acknowledge the role of silence in expressing or establishing metre. Hurford, *Making Music*, 52–66.

types of legato are distinct from modern legato—in which the degree of overlap causes no portion of either attack or release to be heard on a mechanical-action instrument (pp. 99–102). All three, of course, are distinct from staccato and non-legato, special effects associated with all actions.[11] (A sixth type of articulation mentioned is the rarely used "over-legato.") In the descriptions of historic fingerings that follow, and later, in her chapter "A Survey of Historical Performance Practices," Marshall sensibly interprets historic fingerings as guides to producing the metric effects and phrasing desired, not as definitive indications of articulation (pp. 103–4, 117).

Equally admirable in concept, but not as successful, is Christopher Stembridge's attention to modal theory as a tool for interpreting the oldest organ repertoires. In an appendix to the book, he supplies "an introduction to the modes, the basis of all organ music through to the seventeenth century," in the form of a summary of the twelve-mode system, drawn largely from Part IV of Zarlino's *Le istitutioni harmoniche* of 1558 (pp. 316–18). Two summarizing methods are immediately noticeable: Stembridge abstracts from Zarlino only the easily codified information for each mode: "final," range of each voice part for polyphonic composition, and one or two sentences concerning modal affect; although he prefaces the list with a brief commentary, he does not contextualize Zarlino's 1558 treatise as only one of many historical attempts to explain the pitch materials of Renaissance music. It is important to understand that these decisions limit the usefulness of the information.

Earlier, in his essay "Italian Organ Music to Frescobaldi," Stembridge had emphasized that the modes embody a "notable dimension" of early music: "[w]e can appreciate the full significance and musical effect of innovatory modulations ... or [the significance of] extended voice-ranges ... only if we have some inkling of how the modes functioned"; knowing the mode of a polyphonic piece is "of considerable help to the performer in understanding the character of a particular piece" (p. 156).[12] It is easy to agree that in order to appreciate the originality of a sixteenth-century composition featuring chromaticism or extreme voice ranges, an impression of diatonicism and restricted compass as norms is necessary. What is misleading in Stembridge's advice is the implication that, by assimilating a set of fundamental facts from the appendix and further reading, we can understand a mode and the functioning of that mode when encountered, in a manner common to all composers of pre-tonal organ music. This is an extreme generalization based upon what Bernhard Meier has shown to be evident in particular repertoires.[13] It is problematic in three ways.

[11] In contrast, Hurford teaches that the prevailing norm for articulation on mechanical action instruments is *legato*, achieved by employing overlap of attack and decay so as to result in *minimally audible attacks*. The type of touch in which all three speech characteristics—attack, tone, and decay—are fully audible he terms *détaché*, whether the space between tones is negligible, or, for effect, gradually increased. Hurford, *Making Music*, 55–60.

[12] Similarly, Marshall, in her summary of Diruta's treatise on playing keyboard instruments (*Il Transilvano*, 1593), observes that "his discourse on registration shows his concern with evoking the moods associated with the musical modes," and refers the reader to the appendix (p. 118).

[13] Bernhard Meier, *The Modes of Classical Vocal Polyphony Described According to the Sources*, trans. Ellen S. Beebe, with revisions by the author (New York: Broude Brothers, 1988); *Alte Tonarten,*

First, modern scholars do not agree on the relevancy of the purported "characters" or affects of the modes to interpreting medieval and Renaissance music. Most medieval and Renaissance theorists affirmed the doctrine of modal affect, and did so partly if not wholly out of obligation to respected authorities of classical antiquity who reported the ethic properties of the Greek modes; therefore, like much music theory of the time, this affirmation may have been prescriptive, rather than descriptive.

As for the specific affects of individual modes, prior to Glarean's 1547 treatise, *Dodecachordon*, theorists generally agreed with ecclesiastical sources and with each other on the finals and compasses of eight (rather than twelve) distinct modes, but they did not agree on the modal affects. Therefore, interpretation of affect on the basis of mode (where mode can be determined, and if modal affect is relevant) is contingent on questions of influence. Whereas students of Zarlino, and their students in the seventeenth century, may have made a point of choosing tempi, registration, and the like in keeping with modal characteristics reported by the venerable Italian theorist, German musicians would just as likely have been familiar with Glarean's somewhat different characterizations of the twelve modes.[14] If one is concerned with music prior to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the choice of Zarlino, not Glarean, as authority on the characters of individual modes is particularly questionable. Glarean appears to have believed strongly in modal ethos, and attempted to base his ethical attributions on observations of plainchant and motets that he found particularly characteristic of each mode.[15] Zarlino, on the other hand, made it clear that he had assembled a compendium of what others in the past had said about modal affects and, as Palisca has observed, did not even trouble himself to point out cases where he knew their opinions to be based on misunderstandings. As a basis for interpreting the character of prior music, then, Zarlino's commentary on modal ethos is not only unreliable—it also casts doubt on the entire enterprise.[16]

Second, even sources that concur on the number of modes and on some of their affects do not concur on how the modes may be recognized in polyphonic composition, whether by obvious markers such as final sonority or internal markers such as cadences or ranges of voice parts. In short, there was no contemporaneous agreement as to whether, or how, the concepts attached to a particular mode need be played out in a polyphonic composition. As one modern scholar has put it, mode is "a concept that could never have been developed from a study of the music only."[17] Stembridge is correct in urging us to regard

---

dargestellt an der Instrumentalmusik des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts, 2nd ed. (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1994).

[14] Heinrich Glarean, *Dodecachordon*, trans. Clement A. Miller (n.p.: American Institute of Musicology, 1965), vol. 1.

[15] Clement Miller, commentary on Glarean, *Dodecachordon*, 1:12.

[16] Palisca is of the opinion that Zarlino seems to have been more interested in his own discovery that the modes fall into two categories, based upon whether the harmonic third above the final is major or minor. Claude V. Palisca, Introduction to *On the Modes*: Part Four of *Le Istitutioni Harmoniche*, 1558, trans. Vered Cohen (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), xv–xvi.

[17] Frans Wiering, "Internal and External Views of the Modes," in *Tonal Structures in Early Music*, ed. Cristle Collins Judd (New York: Garland Press, 1998), 87.

the old pitch systems as more than adumbrations of major-minor tonality, but he makes the task of modal assignation in early organ music seem easier than it is in practice.

Third, despite the fact that Stembridge says that all organ music through to the seventeenth century is based on the modes, the modes do not accurately describe one particular, large repertory of the Renaissance and Baroque: collections of organ versets, organized by "tone," intended for alternatim performance of psalms, the Magnificat, and other canticles when they are sung to any of the eight liturgical "psalm tones."[18] What is distinctive about compositions based on the psalm tones is that, just as the terminal pitch of most psalm tones is variable—and not necessarily the same as the final of the associated mode—each instrumental verset derives its pitch shape or, at the very least, its ending pitch, from the psalm tone it replaces.[19] To take an example, tone 3, unlike mode III, has as its most commonly chosen termination the pitch A, appropriate for linking it with the melodic type common to many antiphons classified as mode III. Correspondingly, surviving examples of Magnificat versets in the third tone tend to cadence with A at the top and bottom of the final chord.[20] Someone with only a little knowledge of modal theory risks confusing psalm tone 3 with modes IX or X of the twelve-fold system. Therefore, to complement the information Stembridge gives, a table of the eight psalm tones and their customary endings, with brief commentary, is needed to complete what is, admittedly, a mere appendix, and not a full-scale introduction to the topic.

The chapters surveying specific repertoires and their styles of instrument sustain the book's themes. Authors include, among others, Higgenbottom on the French classical school, Patrick Russill on "Catholic Germany and Austria, 1648–c1800," Geoffrey Webber on the north German school, David Yearsley on the organ music of J. S. Bach, and Gerard Brooks on French and Belgian organ music after 1800. Most welcome at the end of each repertoire chapter is a list of recommended editions.

A minor error of fact and small faults in production could be noted. Toward the end of his brief history of organ pitch (p. 54), Kent gives 1938 as the date the British Standards Institution adopted a^1=440, but in fact the BSI endorsed a^1=440 following an international conference that was held in London in May 1939.[21] The chapter on the French classical organ school unfortunately is missing its concluding page: p. 190 should contain the continuation of the paragraph on

[18] See *The Liber Usualis*, ed. Benedictines of Solesmes (Tournai: Desclée, 1956), 111–17 and 207–13.

[19] Certain of the tones were customarily transposed for singing. The resulting set of eight "tonalities" is sometimes referred to as the "church keys" (the *tons de l'église* mentioned by Higginbottom on p. 178 in connection with music of the French classical school). The distinction between the church keys and the twelve-mode system is the basis of an essay by Michael R. Dodds, "Tonal Types and Modal Equivalence in Two Keyboard Cycles by Murschhauser," in *Tonal Structures in Early Music*, 341–72; see particularly pp. 342 and 351.

[20] For an early, published example, see the Magnificat *Tertii toni* in the *Second Organ Book of 1531*, originally published by Pierre Attaingnant (Kalmus Organ Series no. 4473), 38–39.

[21] Llewelyn S. Lloyd, "International Standard Musical Pitch," *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 98 (16 December 1949): 74–75. The incorrect date seems to have been derived from the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 14:785.

"Recommended Editions" that begins near the bottom of p. 189. The first topic sentence on p. 276 refers to "the early part of the nineteenth century" in a context where the early part of the twentieth century is meant, and there are unobtrusive proofreading errors (pp. 49 and 87). The general impression, though, is of a carefully prepared book.

The editors of *The Cambridge Companion to the Organ* are to be congratulated for two overall achievements: for having remapped the organ world so as to extend beyond the usual, worn topics, while yet preserving the character of a general-interest guide, and for having chosen contributors who, within the limitations of an introduction to each topic, are able to offer fresh points of view.

Lynn Cavanagh

Maniates, Rika, ed. *Musical Discourse from Classical to Early Modern Times: Editing and Translating Texts*. Papers given at the Twenty-Sixth Annual Conference on Editorial Problems University of Toronto, 19–20 October 1990. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997. xii, 149 pp. ISBN 0-8020-0972-7 (hardcover).

The studies published in this collection were initially presented as papers at the Twenty-Sixth Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, held at the University of Toronto, and organized by Maria Rika Maniates, Professor Emerita in the Faculty of Music at the University of Toronto. It was the first time that this conference was devoted to musical questions, and the resulting volume constitutes a first-rate addition to a mere handful of excellent essay series publications on medieval and Renaissance music that have emerged within the last two decades.[1]

The essays are multidimensional in their content and interdisciplinary in nature and approach. They address both the obvious and subtle problems encountered by scholars in the course of editing and translating ancient, medieval and Renaissance treatises, the comprehensive study of which has always exceeded the expertise of any one field, and an accurate understanding of which with regard to the theoretical concepts themselves as well as to their transmission processes pose, among other queries, the intriguing question of "contemporaneous and current author as translator or interpreter?" Rika Maniates's introduction, which presents the contributors—who include musicologists, ethnomusicologists, and philosophers—and provides summaries of their presentations, is followed by five essays.

The first essay ("Fidelities and Infidelities in Translating Early Music Theory"), by Claude V. Palisca, deals with problems of translation from the

[1]Among them, Susan Rankin and David Hiley, eds., *Music in the Medieval English Liturgy: Plainsong and Medieval Music Society Centennial Essays* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); Christian Meyer, ed., *Jérome de Moravie: un théoricien de la musique dans le milieu intellectuel parisien du XIIIe siècle* (Paris: Éditions Créaphis, 1992); Stanley Boorman, ed., *Studies in the Performance of Late Medieval Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); and Iain Fenlon, ed., *Music in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Patronage, Sources and Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).