Hans Tischler, ed. The Parisian Two-Part Organa: The Complete Comparative Edition. Stuyvesant, N. Y.: Pendragon Press, 1988. [Vol. 1: Acknowledgments, preface, indexes, pp. vi–lxviii; Style and Evolution—Catalogue Raisonné—Office Organa, 631 p.; vol. 2: The Mass Organa and Mass-Ordinary Settings, pp. 632–1605. ISBN 0-918728-89-4. $400.00 (the set).]

The title of Hans Tischler's edition is almost an understatement because this monumental publication comprises not only the two-part organa but also all two-part passages known as "clausulae," "substitute clausulae," or (as Tischler occasionally calls them) "supplementary clausulae." In addition, it has the passages from compositions for three voices that are known to occur also as duplum in an organum or clausula for two voices. The music concerned appears in the manuscripts that most of us know as *W1*, (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August-Bibliothek, Helmstedt 628), *F* (Florence, Biblioteca Mediceo-Laurenziana, Plut. 29.1), and *W2* (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August-Bibliothek, Helmstedt 1099), as well as in a dozen smaller collections. Presenting all of this music in modern notation is a gigantic achievement in itself, but gathering the transcriptions into a "comparative" edition, as Tischler has attempted, is an even more perplexing task.

Vast logistic problems due to several well-known forms of multiple occurrences, complicate making a comparative edition. A given organum may appear in two or more sources; for a given passage of a cantus firmus, we may have several independently preserved clausulae; the music for one part of a given cantus firmus may recur in the same piece; and two or more organa may share an entire tenor or parts thereof. Ideally, all passages with the same cantus firmus are involved in a comparison, regardless of whether they have the same or a completely different upper voice. Juxtaposing all multiple versions of entire compositions is the tried and proven method for compiling comparative editions of medieval music. To a large extent, Tischler followed it for his edition of motets (*The Earliest Motets to circa 1270* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982]). In this case, however, proper juxtaposition might have required a book of unmanageable proportions. Moreover, there would have been some awkward situations; it is not exceptional to have essentially one setting for one passage of a given organum but ten for a neighboring one. In short, there is no simple and straightforward way to present every organum in a practical synoptic table.

In order to solve or, at least, reduce the logistic problems, Tischler divided each organum into sections of one or two words, and entered all settings of a given section as a self-contained unit. This method has the advantage of allowing convenient juxtaposition of at least some related passages, regardless of where they occur in the medieval sources. But it has the disadvantage that no organum is presented as a continuous composition. The resulting presentation is helpful for scholars interested in minute comparison of pitches in multiple versions, but it is cumbersome for those who want to study an organum in its entirety. For instance, the organa "Viderunt omnes" and "Hec dies" with related clausulae occupy some forty pages each; the much shorter "Alleluya Pascha nostrum" fills thirty.

In the next stage of dealing with logistics, the editor took similarities and differences in the layout of the cantus firmus as the main criterion for the order in which multiple settings of a given section are entered. One probably cannot quibble with the criterion, per se, but it is regrettable that he also decided to limit immediate juxtaposition to settings that have essentially the same music for both voices. It would have been helpful if that form of presentation had also been applied to groups of sections that share a tenor arrangement. As things stand now, multiple versions of a given section are more often printed in each other's vicinity than in synoptic tables.

Judging by a fair number of spot-checks, the edition is admirably accurate in respect to pitch level so that the transcription of pitches is beyond question a great contribution both in its quality and quantity (1,500 pages, size 9″ × 12″). But duration and vertical alignment of the two voices are treated in ways that may not meet with general ap-

proval. The original notation of the music is far from uniform; some passages clearly are in modal notation, others clearly are not, and still others are ambiguous. In the preface, the author devotes no more than a couple of pages (pp. ix–xi) to this paramount issue; in the transcriptions, all passages are in modal rhythm and, more or less in the usual fashion, the length of the ligatures is indicated with horizontal brackets above the staves. This may be satisfactory to those who accept Tischler's rhythmizations without question. But even if one is convinced that all parts of all organa were in modal rhythm, one may not agree with Tischler's interpretation of every single passage. Moreover, the old belief in the omnipresence of modal rhythm is gradually dissipating so that many users of the transcriptions would have been happier if the shape of the original ligatures rather than only their length had been represented above the staves.

With respect to score layout, the medieval scribes were relatively indifferent to vertical alignment of the voices. This attitude is of minor consequence for passages in which duration of both voices is clearly indicated by the scribe's choice of ligatures, but for almost all other sections it is a problem. The most objective evidence for this feature consists of the many discrepancies among multiple versions concerning the placement of a note or vertical line on the lower staff in respect to those on the upper staff. Thus, the transition from one chord to another often depends upon decisions made by the transcriber. In the present edition, discrepancies among the medieval sources in the alignment are recorded in footnotes, as are differences between the transcription and the medieval versions, but they are not discussed in the preface.

Since there was no simple way to order the vast and complex material, the author was wise to include a Catalogue Raisonné (pp. 93–207) in addition to several indexes (pp. xii–lxviii). Building upon the work by Friedrich Ludwig, Norman E. Smith, and Rudolf Flotzinger, he supplied an index of clausulae and one of discant passages. By and large, Ludwig's numbers of clausulae are retained, but a new numbering was devised for discant passages, so that now certain organum-passages have Ludwig numbers, Flotzinger numbers, and Tischler numbers. (Actually, as will be seen, discant passages have two types of Tischler numbers.) Among the helpful data for each clausula and discant passage are the listing of its concordances, the durational pattern of its tenor, and the number of times the tenor melody is stated. The Catalogue Raisonné contains more bits of valuable information than can be listed here, and one must admire the author for having gone into such detail in the Sectional Analysis of each piece.

In order to coordinate the various components of this book, carefully-designed combinations of letters and numerals identify sections and versions. With some minor adjustments, Ludwig's numbers are used for the organa and clausulae, just as most of his sigla identify the manuscripts. Sections of a given organum are numbered in Roman numerals, the various tenor arrangements for a given section are differentiated by lower-case letters, and the various settings using the same tenor arrangement are given numbers in parentheses. Thus, for example, "M1,IIIa(2)" identifies the first organum for the Mass, its third section, the first arrangement of the tenor-pitches for that section, and the second setting thereof. In more than one way, this system was allowed to break down. In some cases, for example, one version of a given organum is divided into VI but another version into VII sections, so that one section may have number III in the former but number IV in the latter version. In some cases, unusual subdivisions of sections were made without any apparent system for the manner in which they are identified. In the Catalogue Raisonné, the various settings of a given section have consecutive Arabic numerals preceded by the letter *D* for duplum, instead of the lower-case letters and so forth mentioned above. Another inconsistency occurs in the footnotes to the transcriptions, where the notes to an organum proper are printed in one group and numbered consecutively as if the organum had been presented as one continuous entry. The Roman numerals and the like are lacking, so that a reader interested in examining a feature mentioned in a footnote must search for it among the often widely-separated sections of the organum.

It must have taken the editor many years to prepare this gigantic and complex work: the acknowledgments section is dated June 1982, the official date of publication is 1988,

but the finished product did not appear until the early summer of 1989. In those long periods, changes seem to have been made in one part of the book without being carried over into other parts. When discussing the presentation of organa the author writes: "In order to facilitate an uninterrupted reading of any version, the scores of *F* are marked in the left margin by a vertical row of inverted triangles, those of *W1* by a row of circles, and those of *W2* by a row of squares" (p. ix). The idea was excellent, but I have not been able to find any of these markings. The change of heart is regrettable, especially so since the sigla of the manuscripts are printed exclusively before the first, not before subsequent staves of a given section. Similarly, something seems to have gone awry in the process of reading the page proofs. In the preface and the essay on Style and Evolution, for instance, one finds many references to other pages in the present edition, but no page numbers were filled in. Some of the page numbers in the table of contents are rather far off the mark.

Recurrent motives and phrases form a paramount part of a comparative edition. The number of concordances listed in various places of this work is impressive and worthy of praise, but the manner in which they are treated is uneven. On the positive side, there are many instances in which the editor correctly and clearly indicates that either the tenor or both the tenor and the duplum for a given section (i.e., a passage with its own Roman numeral) recur elsewhere. For passages shorter than a complete section, however, he only considers the upper voice; there is not even any reference to the character of the tenor. I have not been able to find any discussion concerning how Tischler determines what are recurrent passages, although it is clear that what he accepts as such need not be the same pitch for pitch. A given passage in the upper voice is considered recurrent, regardless of whether it recurs with the same or with a completely different tenor, regardless of whether it recurs in the same or in a different rhythm, and regardless of whether it recurs at the same or at a different pitch-level. The manner in which these short concordances are identified in the transcriptions, in the Catalogue Raisonné, and in the list of formulae (pp. lxv–lxiii) is complex and inconsistent. This lack of tidiness is regrettable because, together, the short ones may well form the majority of all concordances listed.

The book proper begins with a lengthy essay on "Style and Evolution of the Parisian Organa" (pp. 1–88). In very specific and almost forbidding detail, it deals with the chronology of organa versions and sections thereof. To some extent, the title of the essay is a misnomer because, as explained in the opening section significantly titled "The Problem," it primarily treats the respective roles of Leoninus, Perotinus, and other composers as well as the relation between the *Magnus Liber* and the extant manuscripts. Like many other writings on these issues, it does not go to the root of the problem, namely the few sentences by Anonymous IV, our sole source of information about Leoninus, Perotinus, and the *Magnus Liber*. Tischler does not mention Wilhelm Meyer who, in 1898, was the first to state, but not prove, that the organa in *W1*, *F*, and *W2* were copied from the *Magnus Liber* mentioned by Anonymous IV. Almost without mentioning Ludwig's interpretation of Meyer's thesis, Tischler concentrates on disproving the elaborations upon it by Heinrich Husmann and Rudolf Flotzinger. Unwittingly, he proves that the theory itself is wanting. Our manuscript *F* proves that once there was at least one big (or great) book with organa. His description of the repertoires shows that Anonymous IV was familiar with such a book. But no one has ever found any corroboration for his opinion that the organa stem exclusively or primarily from two composers. Nor has any evidence been found for Meyer's theory that the extant manuscripts were copied from one book. Research on the origin and development of organa might progress much better without the anonymous references to Leoninus, Perotinus, and their big book.

In the end, one wonders to what extent and in what respect this is a *comparative* edition. It appears to this reviewer that, first and foremost, the edition was designed to publish the results of the editor's own numerous and extensive comparisons, especially those included in the essay, "Style and Evolution of the Parisian Organa." It contains all the material upon which his evaluations and conclusions are based. But the manner in which organa and clausulae are subdivided into sections, as well as the total

layout, seem to be more the result than the goal of the comparisons. Enabling others to compare multiple versions seems to be of secondary importance; in other words, the editor did the comparing for us. In the long run, that may turn out to be the weakest aspect of this otherwise monumental work.

The usefulness of this publication depends upon the training of its users. Beginners may have difficulty finding their way through its maze of organa, clausulae, sections, versions, and other subdivisions. It is likely to save much time and effort for scholars familiar with the material and engaged in detailed research, but it does not come as close as it might have to replacing the photocopies of the manuscripts.

HENDRIK VAN DER WERF
The University of Rochester