THE current issue of *Empirical Musicology Review* (EMR)—Volume 6, Number 1—contains three target articles and one commentary.

In the first target article, Randolph Johnson presents a theory of orchestration that is derived from analyses of nineteenth-century symphonic works. His framework is concerned with a tripartite division of functions that instruments in the orchestra are best suited to serve; i.e., omnipresent ‘standard’ instruments; ‘power’ instruments that provide contrast; and sparingly used ‘color’ instruments that attract the listener’s attention. According to Johnson, composers use combinations of standard, power, and color instruments in the service of expressive goals and when fashioning orchestral ‘gestures’ designed to communicate structural relations between musical phrases to the listener.

The second article, by Alistair Sung and Dorottya Fabian, addresses the question of how the interaction between mainstream and historically informed performance practices in the late 20th century has affected stylistic conventions governing musical interpretation. Adopting a case study approach, the authors compare recordings of Bach’s *Suite No. 6 for Solo Cello* over a thirty year period to determine overarching trends and individual differences in performance style.

In the third article, Justin London reports a detailed investigation of how perceived tempo is affected by a range of factors, including surface rhythm, beat rate, attentional focus, and sensorimotor activity (tapping along with the beat). An intricate pattern of results suggests that tempo perception is not a simple matter of apprehending the beat rate, or ‘tactus’. Bruno Repp’s in-depth commentary on this piece points to a possible role of choosing a particular level of the metric hierarchy as a ‘referent’ when judging tempo. Thus, he argues that the concept of the ‘subjective tactus’ may be a decisive determinant of perceived tempo.

At this point I would like to make a corrigendum to the contents of Volume 5, Number 4 of EMR. In the editorial of that earlier issue, it was stated that ‘Hans Wiering’ co-authored a commentary (de Haas & Wiering, 2010). Professor Wiering’s given name is actually Frans. I apologize to Frans Wiering (and to anyone who goes by the name of Hans Wiering) for this typographical error. Although the source of the error is difficult to determine, the fact that another paper (Hirjee & Brown, 2010) in Vol. 5 No. 4 dealt with rhyme (in rap lyrics) may not be entirely coincidental.
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