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Since its establishment (1795), the Paris Conservatoire has attracted top-ranking flutists who, through their playing, teaching, writings, and attitudes, (toward the Boehm flute, for example), have influenced flutists and composers throughout Europe. Through Paul Taffanel, who founded the Societe d'Instruments a Vent in 1876, standards of woodwind playing reached new heights.

When Taffanel's students, Georges Laurent and Georges Barrere, emigrated to the United States, they influenced the style and development of flute-playing in this country. Through Barrere's famous student, William Kincaid, there arose what might be termed the American school.

The intent of this paper is to place these flutists in perspective. The professors are discussed chronologically; information on the style, works, students, and influence of each man is included.
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CHAPTER I

THE FOUNDING OF THE CONSERVATOIRE DURING

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

The Paris Conservatoire Nationale de Musique came into existence in 1795 during the turmoil of the French Revolution. It was formed by decree of the Convention nationale, the current national governing body, from the merger of two previously existing schools, the École royale de chant et déclamation lyrique and the Institut nationale de musique.

The Conservatoire underwent slight name alterations with almost every change in the national government for the next few years. Although it is a national conservatory, it gradually came to be called simply the Paris Conservatoire, and, as such, it struggled, survived, grew, and strongly shaped French music for many decades, unrivaled by any other national institution until the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Admission to the new Conservatoire was free and open to members of both sexes. Students were accepted by audition. The Convention nationale decree stipulated that there were to be 600 students, proportioned equally among both sexes and among all departments and 115 teachers (3, pp. 21-22).
Orchestral instruments, piano, organ, voice, theory, solfege, and composition were taught.

The two schools from which the new government-sponsored conservatory was formed also were products of the changes occurring in France in the last decades of the eighteenth century. The École royale de chant was established in 1784 because the musicians and administrators of the Paris Opéra felt the need for a school of voice. François Joseph Gossec was its first director. In June, 1786, a class for dramatic declamation was added, causing the name to be altered to the École royale de chant et déclamation lyrique.

The instrumentalists on the new school's faculty were part of the Institut nationale de musique, which had military origins as indicated by this organization's original title, the École gratuité de la garde nationale. The band of the Garde nationale was directed by Bernard Sarrette. To give his musicians additional employment, Sarrette helped form the École gratuité de la garde nationale in 1792 under government sanction. [In 1793, the school's name was changed to the Institut nationale de musique. The monarchy had fallen.]

In 1795, Sarrette became the first director of the new Conservatoire, and many of his bandsmen were among the original faculty, including flutists François Devienne, Antoine Hugot, and Jacques Schneitzhoeffer.

Throughout most of the eighteenth century, France was at war with one country or another; consequently, military
bands were part of the daily scene. The band of the Garde nationale was the elite of these bands, and it took an important role in France's revolution, as will be shown.

France During the Revolution

Between 1792 and 1824, the government of France changed back and forth from monarchy to various forms of a republic eight times (2, p. 578). France was at war with most of the countries of Europe; and the rising Napoleon, who was to rule with increasing control from 1799 to 1814 and briefly in 1815, was busily changing the map of Europe, annexing countries, and installing relatives on various thrones.

France had been in a state of flux and turmoil throughout the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Poor economic conditions, heavy taxes, an inefficient government headed by Louis XVI, a rising middle class (which was able to read the writings of Rousseau, Voltaire, and other agitators advocating the destruction or reformation of monarchy and church) all led inexorably to the French revolution. When the revolt came, it erupted with violence, riots, dictatorial power, and terror. In 1792, the Convention nationale, which had decreed the beginning of a musical institution, abolished another institution, the monarchy, and Louis XVI was condemned to death. Between 1792 and 1795, during the Reign of Terror, thousands were imprisoned and guillotined. The death carts, carrying their bloody burdens, were a common occurrence (2).
A Musician's Life in the Revolution

If musicians were careful to stay on the right side of the political fence, and agile enough to leap over when the regime changed hands, they were able to keep their jobs and their heads. The most talented musicians, or those favored by the regime, were granted deferment from military service. Generally, "musicians in France did not allow politics seriously to disturb their professional life, and were quite accommodating in becoming Republicans, Imperialists, or Monarchists, as circumstances demanded" (1, p. 16).

After France became a republic in 1792, patriotic fervor was at a high pitch. Musicians were kept busy playing and parading in the regimental bands, in addition to writing and performing music for the great outdoor festivals that were so much a part of the revolution. Thousands of singers and instrumentalists took part, with the Garde nationale band taking a leading role; its members often directed portions of the huge body of singers, as well as performing (3, p. 20). These festivals brought such great public admiration for the Garde nationale band that, as a consequence, wind instruments became very popular (3, p. 27).

The new Conservatoire took part in the activities, too. It was required to provide a daily corps of musicians to perform for the legislative body (3, p. 21).

In addition to the huge patriotic festivities, there were twenty-three theaters that gave regular performances
during the days of the revolution (4, p. 227). Dancing was also popular in those hectic years.

All classes of society were seized by the same frenzy; the lowliest teacher of the quadrille and the polka made a fortune and the poorest of musicians earned, for scraping his violin or squealing on his clarinet, six crowns or six livres a night together with three litres of wine (4, p. 227).

Perhaps concerts and dancing kept one's mind off the fearful uncertainty of tomorrow, for despite the hardships and turmoil, musical life went on.

Although the wars and political upheavals which disturbed the peace of Europe before and during the early years of the nineteenth century were bound to react to some extent on the musical life of the time, the effect was never so shattering as might have been expected. . . .

Three revolutions did not paralyze the musical life of Paris, or bring irretrievable disaster to its musical institutions (1, pp. 15-16).

The revolution may have brought "irretrievable disaster" to non-musical institutions, but it gave birth to a musical institution. Having painted the scene into which the Conservatoire was born, the musicians—specifically the flutists—who helped give life to the new institution will be examined in following chapters.


CHAPTER II

THE FIRST FLUTE PROFESSORS OF

THE PARIS CONSERVATOIRE

The decree formulating the Conservatoire stated that there would be six flute professors among a total of 115 faculty members. Only five flute professors were specifically named—François Devienne, Antoine Hugot, Jacques Schneitzhoeffer, Johann Georg Wunderlich, and Nicholas Duverger. Devienne, Hugot, and Schneitzhoeffer are listed under "Professors of the First Class," and Duverger and Wunderlich are on the roster of professors of the second class. On this first record for 1795, some of the teachers were listed by last name only, and few of these have an instrument indicated following their names. Therefore, whether or not a sixth flute professor was hired cannot be determined (15; pp. 124-129).

The classes were based on age and talent; the more talented and older students were in the first class. Younger students were assigned to the second or third class. Records do not indicate whether the enrollment goal of 600 was met. Whatever the case, if 600 students had enrolled, the average number of students per teacher would have been six. The most prominent of these first flute instructors was François
Devienne, who in addition to holding teaching and performing responsibilities, was one of the four teachers appointed to serve on the administrative staff of the new school (15, p. 128).

Francois Devienne

Devienne was born in Joinville, Haute Marne, in 1759, the fourteenth child of a harness-maker (4). He was brought up by his brother, a musician employed by the Prince of Deux-Points. Devienne showed his musical ability at an early age, and he played flute in the regimental band. At ten, he composed a mass to be accompanied by wind instruments that was performed by the regimental musicians (7, p. 10).

Devienne was also an accomplished bassoonist; he held professional positions on both instruments, often simultaneously. It is not known with whom he studied bassoon. His flute teacher was Felix Rault, a noted eighteenth-century virtuoso, whose teacher has been Michel Blavet.

Devienne's first position was a brief period in the service of the Cardinal of Rohan. During the 1780s, his name appeared on the rosters of several musical organizations, including the band of the Gardes suisses, and the orchestra of the Concert spirituel. From the history of this orchestra, which was written by nineteenth-century historian Constant Pierre (14), we have access to a considerable amount of information concerning Devienne's varied musical activities within this organization.
Devienne's Activities in the Concert spirituel

The Concert spirituel was formed in 1725 to provide public concerts of spiritual music in order that people could attend concerts on religious holidays and other days when the Opéra was closed. The repertoire of this new orchestra soon expanded beyond the spiritual, and its membership, along with the Opéra, included the best musicians in Paris. By Devienne's time, it had gained considerable repute; it performed an average of twenty-five concerts a year (14, pp. 232-244). Devienne's name appears on the program of thirty-seven concerts between 1780 and 1790, which was the last year of that orchestra's existence (14, pp. 314-344, 351).

Pierre cites all the concerts given by the orchestra in its years of existence (14). The lists give dates, soloists, and works, although the concertos and symphonies are not identified by key or number. Indeed, the works were probably fresh from the pen since many of the composers were contemporary. According to Pierre's concert records, Devienne did an impressive amount of composing and performing on bassoon and flute, particularly between 1782 and 1790. Table I shows what types of Devienne's works were performed; he played his own works or the compositions of other composers (14).

Since many of the concerts were only days apart, it seems reasonable to assume that some of the performances included repetitions of the same work. Without complete identification,
**TABLE I**

PERFORMANCES OF THE CONCERT SPIRITUEL INVOLVING DEVIENNE, 1780-1790*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devienne's Compositions</th>
<th>Devienne Performing</th>
<th>Others Performing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bassoon concertos</td>
<td>5 (B)**</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flute concertos</td>
<td>7 (F)***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin concerto</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor de chasse concerto</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphonies concertants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horn &amp; bassoon</td>
<td>2 (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oboe &amp; bassoon</td>
<td>2 (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarinet &amp; bassoon</td>
<td>1 (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flute, oboe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarinet &amp; bassoon</td>
<td>5 (F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flute, clarinet &amp; bassoon</td>
<td>1 (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 clarinets</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 violins &amp; flute</td>
<td>1 (F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice &amp; orchestra</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Works of other Composers | |
|--------------------------||
| Symphonie concertante    | |
| flute & horn             | 1 (F) |
| flute & bassoon          | 1 (B) |

*Data compiled from Pierre, Histoire du Concert spirituel (14).

**B = Devienne playing bassoon
***F = Devienne playing flute
we cannot determine which of Devienne's concertos for the same instrument were performed. However, certain conclusions can be drawn. Devienne composed a considerable number of works featuring woodwinds; his compositions were popular in his own time (which later historians corroborate), and he gave solo performances on two instruments. All of this indicates, along with his duties in other orchestras, that he was an extremely productive musician.

Devienne was also listed on the roster of the orchestra of the Théâtre de Monsieur in 1788 as a bassoonist; by 1784, he was playing the flute in the Loge Olympique orchestra. It is very probable that he participated in the premiere performances of Haydn's Paris Symphonies (Nos. 82-87), which were commissioned and performed by the Loge Olympique orchestra in 1785-1786 (2, p. 76).

In 1793, Devienne is listed as a sergeant in the band of the Garde nationale, which was organized by Sarrette (5, p. iii). This connection led to Devienne's employment in the newly-formed Conservatoire.

Devienne the Flutist

Although he still played bassoon in the Opera orchestra, Devienne's reputation as a virtuoso flutist grew steadily after joining the Conservatoire faculty (5, p. iii). He was old-fashioned in his preference for the one-keyed flute of the eighteenth century, an instrument fraught with intonation
problems and awkward cross-fingerings, which was ill-equipped to handle the increasingly virtuosic compositions of the nineteenth century.

In the last quarter of the eighteenth century, two-to-four keys were being added to the existing simple-system flute in an attempt to cope with the demands of current compositions. (It would be another thirty-five years to Theobold Boehm and his creation of a new, mechanically-superior flute.) Although Devienne recommended the multiple-keyed instruments to his students, he adhered to the eighteenth-century flute throughout his life. He also condemned the fairly new technique of double-tonguing and triple-tonguing fast passages, which he described as "stammering" (16, p. 560). When one examines the allegro movements of his concertos, it is important to realize that Devienne played these works single-tongued and with few slurs (5, p. iii). However, even by eighteenth-century standards, he must have been an impressive performer because all historians describe him as a virtuoso. An anonymous contemporary admirer wrote the following description.

The only flute concert that has been pleasing in the entire season is the one performed by M. Devienne; this young artist joins to a beautiful quality of sound a clean and gifted embouchure . . . . (14, p. 213).

In the words of an early twentieth-century flutist, a later product of the Conservatoire, Devienne as a virtuoso marked the transition from the "brilliant eighteenth-century
school to that, no less brilliant, yet musically much less valuable, of the nineteenth-century flutists" (8, p. 536). Devienne's fame as a flutist was immortalized in a painting by the well-known nineteenth-century artist, Jacques Louis David, which hangs in the Brussels Museum of Fine Art.

One of Devienne's students at the Conservatoire was Joseph Guillou, who later became a professor at that institution. Devienne is listed on the staff of the Conservatoire for the academic year, 1803-1804 (13, p. 353). Tragically, he did not complete that term. Toward the end of his life, strained by a heavy work load, the flutist became mentally unstable. Placed in the asylum of Charenton shortly before his death, Devienne died there on September 5, 1803. He was forty-four.

**Devienne the Composer**

Devienne's music is relatively unknown to the musical world. Even among flutists and bassoonists, his works do not represent a basic part of the repertoire. He composed in a period when no French composers ranked among the best, a fact brought into greater relief by the towering greatness of Mozart and Haydn. One can speculate on the effects that the revolution had on the quality of French composition, but to do more than that would require considerable investigation.

Devienne composed more than 500 works. In addition to the concertos and symphonies concertantes for winds, he also
wrote a flute method book, patriotic songs and hymns, a patriotic overture for winds, and eleven operas and comic operas. His opera, Les Visitandines (The Sisters of the Visitation), was played at the height of the revolution and met with great success. It was produced in Vienna in 1808, and revived with some success in Paris after World War I.

It is generally accepted that as a genre, the symphonie concertante developed in Paris. Devienne's compositions, which were played so often by the Concert spirituel, certainly contributed to the development of that idiom. Unfortunately, few of those works are now in print.

Devienne's Nouvelle Méthode théorique et pratique pour la flûte, published in Paris in 1795, became the major method for the flute for the next years (6). Although largely superseded by subsequent methods, it continued to be used well into the nineteenth century, undergoing several reprintings. In 1978, a reprint edition of the method was published by Knuf in Amsterdam (6). [The prohibitive cost ($28.50) and the unavailability of this work through Interlibrary Loan made it inaccessible for examination.] This work should serve as a valuable resource to those flutists interested in authentic performance practices of the eighteenth-century flute.

The method is more widely available in a 1909 edition, revised and edited by the flutist-composer, Philippe Gaubert (3), who was a professor at the Conservatoire. Gaubert's insertions of late nineteenth-century solo excerpts and a
chart of fingerings for the Boehm flute were a sincere attempt to update a worthy method book. However, the historical value is lost in this edition since it is impossible to tell whether the commentary on breathing, dynamics, and tone production originated with Devienne or Gaubert. The method contains more than thirty short duets of Devienne's that show him to be a composer of worth even in simple, instructive pieces. The duets have been played by thousands of young flutists in the twentieth century; they appear in several method and duet collections.

Of the thirteen concertos Devienne wrote for his instrument, six are extant; five of these concertos are available in current editions. An examination of these concertos discloses pleasant surprises. They contain energetic, rhythmic allegros, lyrical, singing melodies, simple, vocally-ornamented adagios, and sprightly rondos.

Devienne's Concerto No. 5 in G Major, published ca. 1792 (5), contains several beautiful melodies that are somewhat Mozartian in character. The opening measures of the orchestral exposition of the first movement, the allegro (Figure 1), show the first theme to be a simple, singing melody, not unworthy of Mozart.

The accompaniment is scored for paired oboes, horns, and strings—an orchestration that occurs in Mozart's early symphonies. The orchestral accompaniment is unified to the solo by repeated tutti passages in driving triplets.
Another unifying device is the imitative treatment of a motive that occurs principally in the accompaniment. This motive first appears in the introduction, concluding the tutti passage before the second theme, in the dominant. In the solo exposition, when the flute reaches the second theme area, this motive reappears one measure before the flute entrance (Figure 2). This same motive is again treated imitatively in the recapitulation. Finally, in the last seven measures, the motive sounds in unison in the orchestra, closing the movement.

This concerto has no second movement, but gives a brief adagio introduction of eight measures to the last movement, a theme and variations, a form used frequently in the nineteenth century. The graceful, elegant theme is French in character. The variations, which include one in the parallel G minor, are not excessively virtuosoic. The final variation
begins with a flute solo in an arpeggiated obbligato over the theme in the first violin. The last section of this variation begins with a rhythmic, vigorous orchestral bridge in thirty-second notes, yielding to the flute after four measures for a brief, triumphant burst of virtuosity.

The first movement of Devienne's eighth concerto, also in G major, provides some interesting comparisons with
Mozart's Concerto in G for flute (K. 313, composed in 1778). The first movements of each of the two concertos are characterized by wide leaps, rhythmic drive and vitality, and lyrical second themes. The opening phrase of the Mozart states the following annunciatory theme in wide intervals (figure 3), which can be compared with the same beginning measures of the flute exposition of Devienne's eighth concerto (Figure 4), revealing also a majestic opening and some similarity in intervals and note values.

![Fig. 3--Mozart, Concerto in G, Allegro maestoso, opening of solo exposition, measures 31-34.](image)

Devienne's operatic interests can be seen in his ability to write lyrical themes, such as the new theme in E minor (Figure 5) that appears in the development. Devienne states the theme simply, then immediately restates it ornamented.

Devienne's second movement begins with an almost operatic melody, poignant in the parallel minor. The first theme of this second movement (figure 6) is titled adagio.
Like Mozart's Concerto in D for flute (K. 314, Mozart's own transposition of his oboe concerto, K. 314), the final movement of Devienne's eighth concerto is a sprightly rondo, titled *Tempo di Polonaise* (Figure 7). Some of the figuration in the development of this movement (Figure 8) is also reminiscent of Mozart's D Major Concerto, K. 314. While the harmonies are not the same—Devienne alternates dominant with tonic in the second key area of D, and Mozart alternates harmonies on every beat of the first measure—there is a similarity in the flute-like figuration (Figure 9).
Mozart's genius shows in his greater organization of the form. He introduces a limited number of themes and develops them skillfully and creatively. His works have greater strength and interest through the use of slightly
more complex harmonies, such as fully diminished seventh chords and borrowed chords. Also, he generally modulates to more keys in the development section. Devienne's Concerto No. 8 in G Major is in a fairly straightforward sonata form, but his lesser skill shows in the development section where he develops the themes less fully than does Mozart in both of his solo flute concertos. Devienne's virtuosic extensions, though not excessive, are something that Mozart would not have done even if he had liked the flute. (Every historian and writer of record jackets is fond of reminding us that Mozart disliked the flute.)

There is an even more intriguing connection between Mozart and Devienne. Ernest Hess, in his article "Is the Bassoon Concerto K Appendix 230a by Mozart?" presents an argument supporting Devienne as the composer (10). Schoenbach, former first bassoonist of the Philadelphia orchestra, says

Fig. 9--Mozart, Concerto in D Major, Allegro aperto, recapitulation, measures 128-131.
that the bassoon concerto is "without a doubt by Devienne" (17).

These comparisons are not made in any attempt to elevate a lesser composer to the level of a classical genius. Devienne, like his more brilliant contemporary, was capable of writing a good melody, simple and lyrical, showing a mutual interest in opera. Obviously, Devienne was more sympathetic toward and knowledgeable of the flute, a handicap as well as an advantage in view of the temptation to yield to virtuosity.

In light of the excesses in virtuosity yet to come, Devienne as a performer and composer belonged in the main to the eighteenth century. His works convey grace and elegance and are "fertile in charming ideas" (9, p. 54). His chamber music also deserves reinvestigation.

Antoine Hugot

Antoine Hugot was born in Paris in 1761 and came from a family of musicians. His teacher was a flutist named Atys, who was well known in Paris in the eighteenth century. Hugot also studied with Felix Rault who, according to an early admirer, "ought to be applauded to have a student like Hugot;" the same source praised Hugot as one of the "master flutists" of his time (14, p. 213). In many respects, Hugot's life parallels Devienne's. He also taught in the Institut nationale de Musique and moved from this position to the first staff
of the Conservatoire as a teacher of the first class of students.

Hugot was a colleague of Devienne's in the orchestra of the Concert spirituel, performing solos in nine concerts between 1781 and 1789. On two occasions, he performed his own concertos. In January of 1785, Hugot performed his flute concerto and Devienne soloed in his own bassoon concerto at the same concert. Later that same year, Hugot played flute and Devienne played bassoon in a symphonie concertante composed by LeJeune. On Christmas Day in 1789, Hugot, Devienne, and clarinetist Jean Xavier LeFevre performed a symphonie concertante by Devienne for those three instruments (14, pp. 316-343).

Beginning in 1789, Hugot played first flute in the orchestra of the Bouffons Italiens along with his elder brother, the second flutist. When the Bouffons Italiens was succeeded by the Opéra comique, Hugot remained as first flutist. Hugot also played in the orchestra of the Théâtre de la rue Feydeau in the early 1790s.

It was in the Opéra comique orchestra that Hugot achieved his greatest successes as a performer. He was regarded as one of the fine virtuosi in Paris. Hugot's "correct intonation, fine tone, and brilliant execution" produced the "general impression that his performance was the most perfect that had ever been heard in France" (16, p. 563).
Hugot composed a variety of works, largely for flute, most of which are out of print. His works include four sets of six duos for flute, a variation for flute alone, three trios for two flutes and bassoon, six trios for two flutes and bass, twenty-five grand etudes, three easy sonatas, and six concertos (16).

Hugot's major surviving work is a flute method book that has great historical value, particularly to flutists who are studying the performance of early music on period instruments. While working on the Méthode de Flûte, Hugot was "attacked by a nervous fever, during a paroxysm of which he stabbed himself several times, jumped from a window four stories high, and died" (16, p. 564). Hugot's untimely demise occurred on September 18, 1803, two weeks after Devienne's death in the madhouse. It would seem that the strain of living through a bloody revolution exacted a toll.

The position of leading flute professor at the Conservatoire then fell to another colleague, Johann Georg Wunderlich, who undertook to collect and edit Hugot's Méthode. An analysis of that work will follow in the section on Wunderlich.

Johann Georg Wunderlich

Johann Georg Wunderlich was born in Bayreuth in 1775. He took his first flute lessons from his father who was an oboist in the service of the Margrave of Anspach. He came to Paris at the age of twenty or twenty-one, where he took
some lessons from the famous Rault. Through his talent, he began to make his way into the orchestras of Paris, including that common meeting place, the Concert spirituel (14).

Following Wunderlich's first solo appearance with the Concert spirituel on June 7, 1778 [which was one week before that orchestra gave the first performance of Mozart's Paris Symphony (K. 297) (12, p. 179)], he performed on six other occasions with the Concert spirituel orchestra between 1778 and 1782, each time playing a flute concerto by an unnamed composer (14, pp. 309-21, 369). He also played in the King's Chapel during the reign of Louis XVI, beginning in 1782. That same year he became second flutist in the Opera orchestra and was promoted to principal in 1787. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, he was considered (according to one source) "the leading flautist" in Paris (1, p. 75).

When the Conservatoire was formed, Wunderlich was appointed to teach the students of the second class. In 1797, he began to instruct eleven-year-old Jean Louis Tulou, a future virtuoso. In 1802, the Conservatoire underwent reorganization, reducing its personnel; consequently, Wunderlich was dropped from the staff. With the tragic deaths of Devienne and Hugot, he was recalled to the faculty and was the only professor of flute listed until 1815 (13, p. 368). Wunderlich retired from the Opéra orchestra in 1813, relinquishing his post to his illustrious pupil, Tulou.
Wunderlich died in 1819 at the age of sixty-four, having made a successful career for himself in Paris despite the war and his foreign birth. If lack of information is any indication, his death was peaceful.

Like most performers of the day, Wunderlich did some composing, most of which is no longer in print. He does not seem to have been a composer of great merit, however, and he is chiefly remembered as the teacher of future virtuosi—Tulou, Benoit-Tranquille Berbiguier, and Paul Camus—and for compiling Hugot's Méthode.

The Conservatoire accepted and published the method in 1804 as its official flute tutor (11). The book is a well-organized, detailed, step-by-step method consisting of 152 pages, including eleven sections or "articles." The articles deal with the history of the flute, fingering charts, formation of embouchure, articulation, phrasing, ornamentation, and technique. Musical illustrations are included in each section. One hundred and thirty pages contain technical exercises, duets, and sonatas was a bass line.

Hugot provides fingering and trill charts for the old one-key flute (La flute ordinaire), and for the newer four-keyed flute (which they called the three-keyed flute, referring to the three keys added to the basic one-keyed flute). By 1900, four to six keys were appearing on the simple system flute. Figure 10 illustrates the one-keyed flute and the four-keyed flute. Hugot preferred to use the four-keyed
Fig. 10—the 1-keyed flute and the 4-keyed flute.
flute for the following reasons: to produce better intonation of all the semi-tones (particularly in the low octave), to perform trills more brilliantly, to give strength to the low register, to give force to the F natural and F sharp, and to facilitate performance of more difficult works. The author disapproved of the two extra keys on the six-keyed flute (C natural and C sharp) because the notes produced were barely audible (11, p. 2).

Hugot discusses breathing in terms of phrasing, but contrary to present practice techniques, he does not go into the technical aspect of diaphragmatic breathing, mentioning that students tend to breathe too often--the flute teacher's bane since time immemorial! However, the author concedes that long phrases are difficult to play in one breath. Figure 11 shows an example of breathing within an harmonic phrase, which Hugot stresses.

![Fig. 11--Méthode (11, p. 17).](image-url)
Another indication of the method's forward-looking practices is its explanation of dynamics, using crescendo and decrescendo markings.

It is interesting to note that the author takes the article on ornamentation from the Conservatoire method for voice. Hugot explains the appoggiatura as approaching the principal note from above by half or whole step; when the principal note is approached from below, the interval is always a half step. Double appoggiaturas are used at the discretion of the performer. By the early nineteenth century, the port de voix could approach a principal note from any note above or below.

The author provides three examples of the trill starting on the principal note to stress it (Figures 12A, B, and C), but the general preference seems to be to start the trill on the note above, in the eighteenth century manner. The trill progresses in speed and terminates in various manners.

Article eleven begins a series of two-note exercises to develop technique for the playing of awkward fingerings. To see such fingerings as E♭ to F♯ described as "difficult" makes one more appreciative of the advantages of today's instrument! Since this method was published for the use of Conservatoire students, it is easy to see the considerable influence it would exert on the choice of instrument at that time.
Fig. 12--Méthode, pp. 22-23.
A description of the accepted ideal tone in France at the time can be perceived from Hugot's article (four) on tone. His remarks, taken from another method of the Conservatoire that he did not identify, state that the ideal tone is essentially sweet and must be nothing but that, but there is a brilliance, a strength, a fullness, a softness, relative to the possibility of the instrument...these are indispensable qualities that constitute the beautiful tone (11, p. 7).

The author states that every flutist hopes to have a good embouchure, but that if one does not have correctly formed lips (which he does not describe), practice will not develop a good embouchure.

In the article on articulation (six), two kinds of tonguing (coups de langue) are permitted. The first, formed by articulating the syllable "tu," is for sustained notes and moderato scale-like passages. The second, recommended for lively passages, requires the touching of the tongue at the end of the palate behind but not on the front teeth, pronouncing the syllable "du." Rockstro (16, p. 438) incorrectly states that the Hugot Méthode recommends striking the tongue against the teeth; he further declares that this "unfortunate custom" originated with Devienne's method. Without access to Devienne's original treatise, Rockstro's claim cannot be disputed.

It is interesting to note that Hugot clearly does not agree with Devienne on the use of slurs. There are numerous
examples of slurring—from two notes together to as many as seven to eight notes together.

After these specialized exercises, Hugot proceeds through the keys up to four flats and five sharps, major and minor, with four- and five-line exercises. Many of the exercises extend beyond the normal classical range to high G, A, A-flat, and B-flat (Figure 13).

![Figure 13-- Méthode (11, p. 132).](image)

Most of the sonatas and duets present little of melodic interest, and in general they lack creative imagination. They are instructive as to form and acceptable modulations, which include keys that are a major or fifth higher and the relative minors or majors.

The method is impressive and valuable for several reasons. It lay the foundation for future Conservatoire methods with its logical, thorough, and assiduously-detailed exercises; it provides authentic insight into flute
performance standards and aspirations at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The large portion devoted entirely to musical examples indicates that music performance was passing from the upperclass amateurs of the eighteenth century to the professional musicians of the nineteenth century (11, p. ix).

Some of the exercises are relatively difficult on the present-day flute. If the students of that time could produce such notes with ease on their simple instruments, they were impressive performers.

Schneitzhoeffer and Duverger

The two remaining professors on the original staff of the Conservatoire, Nicholas Duverger and Jacques Schneitzhoeffer, held minor positions. Lassabathie (13, pp. 341-352) lists them as professors of the second class from 1795 through 1802-1803. When the Conservatoire reduced its ranks in 1802, both of these professors were discharged along with Wunderlich.

Schneitzhoeffer was born in Dunkirk in 1754. He played flute and oboe in the Opéra from 1789 to 1820. He joined the band of the Garde nationale in January, 1792. No information can be found about this flutist between 1803 and his death in November, 1829.

Duverger is listed as second flutist in the Concert spirituel in 1773 (1, p. 492). According to the concert lists given in Constant Pierre's history of that orchestra
Duverger participated as a soloist in only one concert; he played in a symphonie concertante composed by Haydn for violin, cello, flute, oboe, and hunting horn on April 7, 1786. Virtually nothing else is known about this flutist.

Many superlatives have been used to describe these early flutists. They played technically demanding music on flutes that required awkward fingerings and that were difficult to play in tune. But would their standards meet ours? Adam Carse (2, p. 164) states the question.

Was there a race of super-players in those days who could play these parts perfectly on such primitive instruments? Or did they just muddle through them as best they could? . . . we can only speculate and wonder. No doubt the technique was carried as far as was humanly possible . . . . All these famous wind-players wrote and played concertos by the dozen, so they must have given some pleasure to their auditors; but would they have pleased our fastidious ears? Probably not.

We shall never know for certain. Whatever the case, the next professor at the Conservatoire, Joseph Guillou, was a controversial figure, whose contemporaries are not unanimous in conferring on him the title "virtuoso."
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The nineteenth century ushered in Romanticism and a new breed of virtuoso who represented the spirit of revolutionary freedom and exuberance that began to appear in music. The eighteenth century virtuosi were mostly wealthy amateurs who performed for the limited, elite audiences of the court; the nineteenth century soloist, however, was a professional who played for the public. The more talented performers quickly gained a loyal following who attended their concerts and clamored for more. In addition, the nineteenth century soloist began to make concert tours. The French found this idea particularly attractive because a tour made it possible to avoid military service as well. These travels, perhaps more than in previous times, led to an awareness of national styles of playing. An examination of these styles will provide perspective on the French school of the time.

The first of the great English flutists, who established the typical English style in the nineteenth century, was Charles Nicholson (1795-1837). Nicholson, the son of a flutist, became the pride of the English public as a young boy. His style included lavish embellishments, a violin-like
vibrato (which was not used by French flutists), sensitive fingerings (unorthodox fingerings for technical ease or special effects), and flourishing runs and trills. The most striking feature of Nicholson's playing, however, was his tone. Nicholson had the tone and embouchure holes of his flute enlarged to produce a strong, reedy, almost metallic tone. Nicholson declared his intention was to produce a tone "as reedy as possible, as much like the oboe as you can get it, but embodying the round mellowness of the clarinet" (1, p. 320). When the Royal Academy of Music was founded in 1822, Nicholson was appointed professor of flute; he set the style of English flute playing for much of the century, which was characterized by robustness and a big sound, especially in the low register.

The best known German flutist in the first half of the nineteenth century was Anton Fuerstenau (1792-1852). Fuerstenau's tone was "supple and pleasant" but it had insufficient volume (10, p. 59). He did not approve of double-tonguing, which placed him among the conservatives. Theobold Boehm (1794-1881), a celebrated German flutist from Munich, became better known by mid-century for his new flute invention. The virtuoso Frederick Kuhlau (1786-1852), is now remembered for his many flute duets and trios.

The French style was refined and elegant, with emphasis on taste and exquisite phrasing. The French sound was smaller in volume than the English tone, and it seemed weak to
Englishmen accustomed to the vigorous metallic sound of Nicholson and his students. What was refined to the French was "too tame" and lacked "fire and dash" to English ears (7, p. 199). The ideal French tone had a "silvery purity and sweetness of tone rather than volume" (7, p. 217). The French virtuosi of the early nineteenth century included Joseph Guillou, Jean-Louis Tulou, and Louis Drouet.

Joseph Guillou

Joseph Guillou has received neither kind nor thorough treatment at the hands of historians. Those that even mention him disagree on the dates for events in his life from birth to death. Taffanel and Fleury, who give biographical information on all the professors except Guillou, merely list his dates (1787-1850) and term at the Conservatoire (1816-1828) (19, p. 1521). Fétis states Guillou died in 1853 at the age of sixty-nine, which would place his birth date in 1784 (5, p. 161). Adrien Girard also omits biographical information on this musician except to state that Guillou, a flutist of "lesser merit," delayed Tulou's appointment at the Conservatoire (10, p. 58). Since the Conservatoire records cited by Pierre give Guillou's dates as 1787-1853, the later birthdate will be used (16, p. 770).

Guillou entered the Conservatoire in 1797 at the age of ten. He studied flute with one of the second class teachers for a year before changing to Devienne, under whose
tutelage he obtained second prize in 1798. After this early success, he apparently did not continue to progress smoothly. When the Conservatoire was reorganized in the same year that Devienne and Hugot died, the number of students was reduced. Wunderlich was the sole teacher, and Guillou was one of the students dropped from the school (16).

However, according to Fétis, the kindest of his biographers (5), Guillou did not allow himself to become discouraged. He reentered the Conservatoire sometime after 1803 to study with Wunderlich, and in 1805, at the age of eighteen, he received first prize.

The next few years were lean ones, apparently, because records show only that he was employed in the Théâtre Fey-deau and the Théâtre Italien. Part of Guillou's problem was that during this period he was being eclipsed by more talented (or at least more sensational) rivals, Jean-Louis Tulou and Louis Drouet, who held some of the better positions. By 1815, however, Guillou replaced Tulou as second flutist in the Opera orchestra, not, from all accounts, through musical superiority, but because Tulou's political opinions were unpopular with Louis XVIII (5; 6).

In the same year, Guillou also obtained the second chair position in the King's Chapel orchestra under Drouet, the first flutist. If Guillou had anti-monarchical feelings, he apparently was wise enough to keep his opinions to himself.
Drout left that orchestra to concertize in other countries, and Guillou moved to first chair. In 1816, Guillou received the appointment at the Conservatoire. Tulou, annoyed at having been passed over, resigned from the Opera orchestra in 1822; consequently, Guillou moved into first chair there, also. Thus, within a relatively short period, Guillou "passed from obscurity to one of the very good positions that a flutist could desire in Paris" (5, p. 10).

Teaching at the Conservatoire, Guillou applied himself with diligence and zeal, and he produced good students (5, p. 160). During his dozen years there, ten of his students received the coveted first prize (15, pp. 149-158). These included Gabriel Leplus, first prize winner in 1825 (who became professor of flute at the Lille Conservatoire) (15, p. 109), and Vincent Joseph Dorus, who would become professor at the Paris Conservatoire.

Guillou did some performing abroad during the 1820s. The foreign correspondent to the London periodical, the Harmonicon, reported on Guillou's playing in a Dresden concert in 1827.

Another concert we must not fail to mention, that of M. Guillou, first flutist, from Paris, and a member of the Conservatoire. Undoubtedly this artist is a virtuoso of the first class; his power in movements of the bravura kind is overwhelming, and his artful management of his instrument leaves one in wonder and astonishment (8, p. 141).

Every performer would like to receive such praise from a reviewer. The correspondent had some doubts, however, for he continued,
When, however, leisure is left us for reflection, we find that his playing has but little foundation; we miss that true test of a perfect master, the tender and affecting adagio, and begin to discover he is rather a flutist of the orchestra than of the chamber (8, p. 141).

This review points out that at least one person thought Guillou had a big sound, in seeming contradiction to the ideal French sound. Also, in addition to telling us that contemporary opinion was not entirely favorable toward Guillou (to support this, other early sources will be cited), we learn that Guillou may have been playing chamber music in Dresden. It is possible that he was playing woodwind quintets with fellow Parisians, for we know he concertized in Europe with such an ensemble. An interesting and important contribution of Guillou's, which few writers mention, is his membership in the original ensemble for whom Antonin Reicha composed his woodwind quintets (14, p. 48).

Guillou and a New Genre, the Woodwind Quintet

Reicha, who taught counterpoint and fugue at the Conservatoire, wrote twenty-four woodwind quintets, which are among his best compositions, in Paris between 1810 and 1820. Reicha is generally credited with being the founder of this new genre because he was the first to explore fully the qualities and sonorities of the individual instruments (14).

The novelty of this new instrumental combination was an all-around delight to audience, composer, and performers; it brought acclaim to Reicha and the performers. Indeed, "the
artists who first brought the woodwind quintets into prominence were associated with the works long after the initial series of performances (14, p. 68).

Reicha, aware that he was creating a new medium of expression, was generous in praise of the performers for their contribution and support. His autobiography states that

I owe their success to those admirable musicians Messieurs Guillou, Vogt, Boufil, Dauprat and Henry, whose perfect rendition of them at public concerts and private musicales started all Paris talking about them (17, p. 349).

Not only did Guillou and the other quintet members perform these works, they urged Reicha to write more (14, p. 48). The quintet members, all musicians in the Opéra orchestra (except the clarinetist), performed these works with much success at the Conservatoire, at the Theatre Italien, and in various cities abroad.

There is no doubt that the acclaim these quintets received was due partly to their novelty. Laing says,

It would appear that the early performances of the woodwind quintets so surprised and charmed the critics that they reported only the favorable aspects of the works. Later reviews, while continuing in praise of the works, are much more objective (14, p. 72).

In writing his quintets, it is certain that Reicha was influenced by the abilities of the artists, which was typical of the standard of wind instrument performance in Paris in the early nineteenth century, and of the degree of development of their instruments (14, p. 48). Guillou played an
eight-keyed flute that would encompass the range of these quintets which span nearly three octaves from d\textsuperscript{1} to b\textsuperscript{blll}.

As a genre, the woodwind quintet did not catch on with other composers until much later in the century; it became even more popular after World War I. Perhaps Reicha's unevenness of creativity accounts in part for this curious lack of interest. However, his works made a worthy contribution to woodwind repertoire and augmented the reputation of the performers as well.

**Guillou as a Performer**

It is difficult to ascertain the true extent of Guillou's capabilities. It appears certain that Tulou and Drouet were more popular, despite Guillou's prominent positions and successes with the quintets. It may be that he tried to overcome what he lacked in talent with mannerisms and style, possibly in emulation of his rivals. During the 1820s, young Berlioz was a student in Paris and spent many evenings at the Opera with his friends, commenting on the performers and the opera. His memoirs indict Guillou's playing.

The conductor ought to keep an eye on Guillon [sic] the flute-player, who is just coming. He takes the strangest liberties with Gluck. In the religious march in Alceste, for example, the composer has written for the low register of the flute, so as to obtain the special effect of the deep flute tone. Guillon [sic] does not approve of this; he must take the lead. He will be heard; and so what does he do but play his part an octave higher, destroying the author's effect, and turning an ingenious idea into a common and puerile one (3, p. 54).
Poor Guillou! The conductor and the administrative powers may have been "keeping an eye" on him, for in 1827 Tulou was reinstated as first flute of the Opéra orchestra. Perhaps the affront was too much for Guillou, for in 1828 he resigned from the Conservatoire and his orchestral positions, and in 1830 he left Paris to search for a position abroad.

He commenced on a concert tour of Brussels, Berlin, Hamburg, Stockholm, Copenhagen, and St. Petersburg. On this tour, he continued to provoke divided opinions of his playing. On Guillou's performance at the Königstadt Theater, a Berlin reviewer remarked that "his splendid skill found more applause than his tone, which often blared out too strongly. The staccato and double-tonguing of this virtuoso are splendidly skilled and accomplished" (2, col. 561).

The reviewer of a Copenhagen performance in 1830 declared that Guillou was "one of the first virtuosi of his instrument, and earned, to a great degree, the applause which was given to him" (13, col. 205). One wonders about the unexplained qualification "to a great degree."

Guillou went to St. Petersburg and settled there permanently. Of his performance in that city with the German opera, a critic wrote that "Guillou, Frenchman, first flutist, possesses much skill," but the reviewer objected to his "small tone" and excessive display of technique (22, col. 727).
Each of his reviewers had positive comments as well as criticisms. Whether Guillou's tone was "too small" or "blared out too strongly" seems to be a matter of opinion and local preference. The quality of his tone may have been one of the reasons that Guillou's playing was less favored than Tulou's in France. In any event, Guillou became discouraged and stopped playing altogether, becoming a cleaner and dyer. Since he had neither the skill nor the taste for this work, he soon gave it up and turned to writing articles for music journals (5, p. 161). The former flutist then founded a journal, *L'Artiste russe*, written in French on Russian musicians, which was not too successful. Guillou died in St. Petersburg in September, 1853, at the age of sixty-nine, separated in time and distance from his Parisian musical life.

**Guillou's Compositions**

As was the custom, Guillou tried his hand at composing. His works, all for flute, include two concertos, a concertino composed for the Conservatoire repertoire, several theme and variations, fantasies for flute and piano, and flute duets. None is in print today.

**Jean-Louis Tulou**

Tulou was the son of a bassoonist who was on the first staff of the Conservatoire. Tulou's father saw to it that his young son, who exhibited talent early, was enrolled at
the Conservatoire in 1796 at the age of ten. It is uncertain as to who was his first teacher, but the next year he studied with Wunderlich. In 1801, only fifteen, he won first prize. According to Fétis (6, p. 267), Tulou deserved to win a year earlier, but the prize was withheld because he was so young. Considering his father's influence and Tulou's talent, it seems strange that he did not study with Devienne or Hugot, the first class teachers.

After receiving first prize, Tulou played second flute in the Opéra orchestra under his teacher, Wunderlich. Three years later, in 1804, he was appointed first flute in the Opéra Italien orchestra where he remained until 1813. Also in that year, his teacher retired from the Opéra orchestra and Tulou succeeded him as first flutist; he had obtained two prominent first chair positions at the age of eighteen. As previously observed, young Tulou openly expressed opposition to the monarchy. His brilliant talent seems to have saved him from serious difficulties, but his outspoken views did affect his career adversely. As one source states, "flutists do not seem to have been the wisest of political animals" (12, p. xiv).

**Tulou the Virtuoso**

Tulou, at fifteen, was becoming quite well known as a talented performer. According to the French ideal, his tone was perfect, his technique precise and brilliant. His style
showed "grace and refinement" (18, p. 587). Significantly, his intonation was reputed to be excellent despite the deficiencies of the flute at that time.

From all accounts Tulou was an extroverted performer; with his flamboyant actions, he aroused admiration and provided excellent copy for the critics. He was also at times a bit careless. Fetis recalls one incident at a concert given by Madame Catalani in the Opéra hall; moments before Tulou was to perform a solo, he discovered that his flute was cracked. In full view of the audience, he pulled out cord and wax, repaired the crack, then played his difficult solo "with much verve, grace, and perfection," receiving enthusiastic applause (6, p. 268). One must speculate that the applause was as much for his daring as for his performance!

Tulou's principal rival was not the hapless Guillou, but Louis Drouet, a child prodigy and son of a French barber in Amsterdam. At seven, it is said, Drouet dazzled the court of Louis Bonaparte with his playing. The great Napoleon Bonaparte, brother of Louis, invited Drouet to come to Paris (about 1814) to be his Court Flautist. Drouet soon developed a following and was dubbed "the Paganini of the flute" for his rapid execution (7, p. 199). It is perhaps a measure of the times that a contest of skill between Drouet and Tulou was suggested and duly held in 1816. Tulou was considered the winner; although Drouet played fast passages sensationallly,
his adagios were out of tune and lacked tonal color (7, p. 199). Tulou's victory solo was from the opera *Le Rossignol* by LeBrun.

In 1817, Tulou left France to avoid the draft. He went to London where, perhaps to his surprise and certainly to his dismay, his performances were coolly received. The English public has its own idol, Charles Nicholson, whose tone and style was "the very antithesis of the French school" (7, p. 208). Accustomed to Nicholson's loud, metallic tone, the people found Tulou's sound unappealing. According to Rockstro, the average Englishman lacked the refined taste necessary to appreciate the "artistic elegance and delicacy" of the finest French flute playing because it was "utterly beyond his sense of appreciation" (18, p. 588).

Tulou, although a "very elegant and finished performer, was treated with an indifference which his talents by no means deserved" (18, p. 588). Fitzgibbon was less generous. He described Tulou's style as very smooth, notably lacking in staccato, resulting in a performance which "suffered from monotony" (7, p. 197).

In October, 1827, the Paris correspondent to the *Harmonicon* reported briefly that "on the 5th September M. Tulou returned to his place in the orchestra of the Academie Royale de musique" (9, p. 214). That single, simple statement foretold the end of Guillou and the continuation of Tulou's career in Paris.
In 1828, Tulou assumed the professorship of flute at the Conservatoire where he remained until 1859. During his thirty-one years there, he taught many fine students, several of whom developed virtuosi reputations.

Jules Demersseman.---Demersseman came from Holland to study at the Conservatoire where he received first prize at the age of twelve. [Like his teacher, he was opposed to the Boehm flute, a feeling which may have prevented him from succeeding Tulou; Demersseman is reported to have been a fine performer and well qualified (7, p. 202).]

Jean Remusat.---Remusat played in some of the better London orchestras for several years. At the age of fifty, he tried without success to master the Boehm flute. Remusat joined the Philharmonic Society of Shanghai where he died in 1880 at the age of sixty-five.

Victor Coche.---Coche, a successful graduate, taught the second class of students for some time during Tulou's term. His contributions to the Boehm flute, negative and positive, will be dealt with in the next chapter.

James Gordon.---Gordon came from Switzerland; he was a Captain of the Swiss Guards in Paris where he studied with Tulou. Gordon was known for having invented a flute similar to Boehms.
Alexis Asvedo.--Asvedo became a music critic in Paris.

Johannes Donjon.--Donjon soloed with the Opéra and the Société des Concerts of the Conservatoire. He is remembered mainly for his popular set of etudes.

Eugene Walckiers.--Walckiers was a minor composer and performer who lived in Paris.

Tulou and the Société des Concerts du Conservatoire

In 1828, an orchestra was formed whose members would include outstanding present and former students of the Conservatoire. Tulou was one of the persons instrumental in creating this new orchestra, the Société des Concerts du Conservatoire. When the Revolution brought an end to the Concert de la Loge Olympique in 1789 and to the Concert spirituel in 1790, Paris was without a regular concert orchestra for some time. Several attempts were made to provide orchestral concerts, but except for the Société des Concerts du Conservatoire, none lasted for more than a few years (15; 16).

The Société des Concerts had its roots in the student practice concerts that were open to the public and had been held since a short time after the opening of the Conservatoire. These concerts, les Exercices des élèves du Conservatoire, were led by the first-prize winner of the violin class of each year. When François Habeneck (the first-prize
violinist in 1804) directed the orchestra, he showed himself to be so capable that he was appointed regular conductor. In 1807, under his direction, the student orchestra gave the first Paris performance of Beethoven's first symphony (4, p. 90).

The orchestra's activities ceased when the Conservatoire was closed for a few months in 1815. When the school reopened in 1816 on a much smaller budget, the concerts were not continued. Habeneck turned to directing elsewhere in the city, but he apparently kept in touch with his colleagues in the orchestra, many of whom served in the major theater orchestras of Paris. On November 22, 1826, having obtained the parts of Beethoven's Eroica, Habeneck invited a number of musicians to his home for lunch and rehearsal. More than thirty musicians came, including Tulou and Guillou; they practiced with such concentration on the Eroica that lunch was delayed until four in the afternoon (4, p. 91). Describing the orchestra's reaction to the Eroica, Carse says that "at first the symphony merely astonished the select group of instrumentalists, but after further meetings had been held, astonishment gave way to intense admiration" (4, p. 91).

The orchestra continued to rehearse privately under Habeneck's direction during 1827. In 1828, Habeneck asked the Conservatoire director, Cherubini, if he would obtain permission from the Ministry of Arts for the orchestra to give concerts in the Conservatoire's hall, with the musicians
underwriting all the expenses. Cherubini received permission and a grant of 2,000 francs to cover expenses (4).

The first concert was held on March 9, 1828, in the large concert hall of the Conservatoire. There were eighty-six members in the orchestra, drawn from the best younger musicians of Paris, all Conservatoire trained. Appropriately, the Eroica was performed at that first concert (4).

The new orchestra, the Société des Concerts, became an established part of the Conservatoire with Habeneck at its helm. A season of six regular concerts per year was planned, with additional concerts for special occasions. Under Habeneck's careful, demanding direction, the orchestra soon became admired throughout Europe, mainly because of its performances of Beethoven's symphonies. During the next thirty-two years, this orchestra brought all nine of Beethoven's symphonies to the public in a total of 280 performances (4, p. 94).

Habeneck conducted the orchestra until April, 1848, less than a year before his death; by this time, it was highly regarded also by musicians and composers as the finest orchestra in Europe. At least three reasons could account for its quality. It had been united under one conductor for twenty years, its personnel came from the same school (which gave the group a unity of style and timbre), and, most importantly, each performed work was rehearsed at length and with assiduous care (4, p. 94).
**Tulou as a Composer**

Tulou published more than a hundred compositions, all involving the flute; very little of this work is available in current editions. His works include five concertos, fifteen "grand solos," two symphony concertants, several fantaisies, nocturnes, and seventeen sets of duets. Only a few categories of Tulou's work was published outside of France. Several German publishers brought out sets of duets and the fifteen grand solos. Franz Vester lists publishers in his catalogue from Amsterdam, Milan, and London, each of which published a few of Tulou's compositions (23, pp. 239-240).

Currently in print are the Concerto No. 3 in D, six of the grand solos, one fantaisie brilliante, six sets of duets, one set of trios, and a reprint edition of the *Méthode de flûte*. Significantly, at least five of these works were reprinted in the 1970s.

It is not possible to evaluate conclusively Tulou's compositional merit from so few works. However, an examination of the surviving concerto and one grand solo provides a basis for certain observations on his style and resources.

Concerto No. 3 in D has three movements, Allegro moderato, Adagio, and Rondo. This concerto exhibits traits of early romanticism. The first movement begins with dramatic, introductory material in the orchestra that leads to a pause on the dominant in the twelfth measure. A slower motive is heard that ends four measures later with a phrygian cadence in the relative key of B minor (Figure 14).
After this second fermata, the sixteenth notes resume, the work modulates to A major, and a lyrical second theme appears. The original key, D, returns; however, nine measures before the solo entrance, the mode shifts to D minor. With the entrance of the flute, the movement returns immediately to D major (Figure 15). The flute enters with a theme that was not introduced in the orchestral exposition. This theme is given extensive virtuosic treatment; it moves without break through a chromatic run over a sustained V of V to the second theme in A. After its initial presentation, this theme is treated virtuosically with arpeggiated and scale-like passages, ending with a fermata on the III of B minor.
a brief largement section in B minor, the movement returns to an allegro tempo and cadences in B minor.

An orchestral tutti is followed by a brief recapitulation of the solo's first theme that now includes a motive from the orchestral exposition. This motive, in quarter and half notes, is interspersed between four fermatas, all occurring within twelve measures.

There is no real development of the solo exposition. Themes are stated and given virtuosic treatment, but not in the order introduced in the orchestral exposition. The composer uses devices that provide drama and emphasis in the solo line. However, these devices--the abrupt key changes with the solo's entrance, the fermatas, sudden changes in note value or tempi--seem awkwardly contrived. The orchestra's
role is subservient to the flute, providing only a backdrop for the display of technical bravura. During solo passages, the orchestra generally maintains a simple, homophonic accompaniment in Alberti bass patterns or in repeated eighth notes, a single harmony to a measure. The constant vertical sonorities and lack of rhythmic drive are typical of the less meaningful accompaniments of the era. The movement overall reflects Tulou's long association with the Paris Opéra Orchestra as first flutist, a time in which he was exposed to florid arias and ornate flute obbligatos.

The second movement, an Adagio in G major, is more normal in form. Again, there is an operatic melody for the flute, heavily ornamented, a theme that seems to call for rubato interpretation (Figure 16).

![Musical notation](image)

**Fig. 16--Concerto in D, Adagio, measures 6-12 (20).**

The construction of the movement does not allow for a cadenza, but a two-measure quasi-cadenza occurs after a half cadence, fifteen bars before the final cadence.
The final movement, a Rondo, is ABACDA in form, concluding with a codetta. The orchestra is again relegated to a secondary role while the flute performs a bright rondo melody containing disjunct intervals and ornaments that must be executed rapidly in tempo. In the closing cadetta, the flute performs acrobatic arpeggios over tonic and dominant chords.

The Third Grand Solo, Op. 74, is in a free form. The emphasis is on the vocal-like flute solo, characterized by wide leaps, ornamentation, dramatic accents, and sudden pauses. Like the concerto, this work was written to allow the flutist to display his technical facility. The tonality moves through the keys of D minor, F major, D^b major, G minor, and D major, in segments with varied tempos. Modulations occur by means of fully-diminished sevenths and augmented sixth chords. The piano accompaniment has many of the slender characteristics of the concerto and is allowed the melody only in tutti passages (21).

Although Tulou uses devices typical of early romanticism, such as free forms, tertian key relationships, and augmented sixth chords, his compositions lack the substance and sonority found in the works of the German Romantics, Schubert and Weber, and other more skillful composers of the time. Instead, his melodies reflect his years in the opera during an era when Meyerbeer, Rossini, Boieldieu, and Halevy were writing for a new and relatively uncultured middle class who seemed to
care for "sentiment and sensationalism" above all. This was
a public for whom "librettists and composers seemed willing
to sacrifice both dramatic and musical integrity wherever
necessary to produce an effect" (11, p. 374). In short, in
these two works, at least, Tulou shows that he was a Parisian
of his own time.
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CHAPTER IV

THE BOEHM FLUTE AND THE INFLUENCE OF COCHE AND DORUS

The eighteenth-century flute was adequate for chamber works, but its small sound could not vie with the stronger-voiced cello, violin, piano, or other instruments (such as the clarinet with its enticing new sonority). Key after key had been added to the old flute in an attempt to keep pace with the chromatics and technical difficulties of the compositions of the nineteenth century. These additions resulted in more awkward cross-fingerings, and they did nothing to strengthen the tone or improve intonation.

The Boehm Flute

Theobold Boehm, German flutist, goldsmith, and inventor, was one of several farsighted musicians who realized early in the century that the flute would have to be completely redesigned to meet the demands of current compositions, particularly orchestral works. In 1832, Boehm introduced to the musical world a radically different flute; its design was based on the acoustically-correct placement of the tone holes. Boehm's product, the result of lengthy, careful experimentation, allowed all the fingers to remain in natural positions, and awkward reaches were avoided.
This new flute had other innovations that Boehm had worked out carefully and scientifically. The tone holes were larger to allow the flutist to obtain a stronger, clearer tone. The idea for enlarged tone holes had been used by the English flutist, Charles Nicholson, whose big sound had impressed Boehm. Looking back, in 1881, Boehm wrote to a friend, saying,

I did as well as any continental flutist could have done in London, in 1831, but I could not match Nicholson in power and tone, wherefore I set to work to remodel my flute. Had I not heard him, probably the Boehm flute would never have been made (2, p. 8).

Boehm's 1832 model (Figure 17) had fourteen holes to be controlled by nine fingers. The right thumb was used only to support the flute. The fingers closed some of the keys to cover remote, acoustically-centered holes by means of horizontal rod-axles and ring keys. Unlike the simple flute, Boehm's model did not have a tuning slide. His flute was also slightly longer and reached to low C (C⁴). It had an open G sharp key that drew objections from flutists. An adjustable wooden crutch was attached to the body of the flute to help the left hand support the flute comfortably and steadily.

The Boehm flute did not meet with immediate acceptance. The new fingering system discouraged many flutists, particularly the older, established players such as Tulou who were not willing to learn a new set of fingerings. Even more, many flutists (particularly in Boehm's own country, Germany)
Fig. 17--Boehm's 1832 Model Flute (2, p. 9).
objected to the flute's more open sound (1, p. 121). Despite the deficiencies of their old instrument, the flutists were slow to accept a change.

Most people think indeed it suffices to invent a new instrument or to transform those already existing, and the musical world will meekly follow the inventor's lead into a novel age. This is a grave mistake. New possibilities do not of necessity entail new tastes (5, p. 20).

Reactions varied. "The Germans tended to ignore Boehm's invention, the French, to adopt it almost universally, and the English, to complicate it" (7, p. 122). The English were not the only ones to produce a more complicated flute; an incredible number of flutes from all countries were developed in the nineteenth century, ranging from keyless, simple tubes to multi-keyed, odd-shaped monstrosities.

Although Boehm turned to other work, he continued to study and experiment on his new flute. (In 1847, he would bring out an improved model, although the remainder of the century would pass before his flute was universally adopted. The flute of today is essentially unchanged from the 1847 cylindrical model.) Boehm's 1832 model, however, provoked interesting and varied responses in Paris before it was adopted by the French flutists.

There is some confusion as to which flutist first introduced the Boehm flute to Paris and in what year. According to Philip Bate (1), Paul Camus, the first flutist of the Opera Italien, used the flute in 1837 (or possibly as
early as 1835). Camus, who was enthusiastic about the flute, acted as Boehm's agent in Paris, and he brought a sample to the instrument-maker Buffet who copied it carefully. [Boehm had not patented the 1832 flute. He acknowledged that he did not invent all the innovations involved in this instrument, but had made use of them in a scientifically worked-out manner (2).] According to Taffanel and Fleury, however, the person principally responsible for the instrument's acceptance was Vincent Dorus who succeeded Tulou at the Conservatoire (6, p. 1521).

Dorus' colleague, Victor Coche, played a less magnanimous role in connection with the new instrument. Boehm presented his flute to the Paris Academy of Sciences for examination in 1832. The flute might have received valuable support, "but its proper consideration was effectively interfered with by the Paris player Victor Coche, whose professional jealousy was disguised behind a show of friendly help" (1, p. 121).

Victor Coche

Victor Coche (1806-1881) was employed at the Conservatoire during Tulou's term from 1831 to 1841 as an assistant professor in charge of teaching the preparatory students. Coche had been a talented student of Tulou's, and he is mentioned because of his somewhat notorious activities in connection with the Boehm flute.
Although Coche had interfered with the approval of Boehm's flute before the French Academy of Sciences, he nevertheless acquired and learned to play a Buffet version of Boehm's instrument. In collaboration with Buffet, Coche made changes on the flute, including a closed G sharp key and a trill key for C sharp to D sharp in the second and third octaves. The G sharp key was not adequately vented and did not survive, but the trill key was a valuable contribution.

By 1838, the flute had gained considerable attention in Paris, and it was brought before the Royal Academy of Fine Arts. The flute examined by that august body was one that had been subjected to improvements suggested to Buffet by Coche. While Boehm and Buffet were virtually ignored, Coche received generous praise (1, p. 240).

About this same time in Paris, an unfortunate rumor surfaced which alleged that Boehm was not the true inventor of the new flute, and that he had copied the ideas of James Gordon, the Swiss army captain who had studied with Tulou. Actively taking up the cause of Gordon, after corresponding with Gordon's wife, Coche wrote an accusing letter to the unsuspecting Boehm (1). [Unfortunately, Gordon himself could not reply. He was in an insane asylum where he would spend his remaining years. Knowledge of Gordon's whereabouts added fuel to Coche's campaign against Boehm.] Ignoring Boehm's denials, Coche published an essay, *Examen critique de la Flûte ordinaire comparée à la Flûte de Böhm*, that
examined the flute and credited Gordon with its invention. Coche also published a method for the Boehm flute that contained sound practical instruction, but it had "a title that must be hard to equal for grandiloquent impudence," Méthode pour servir a l'Enseignement de la nouvelle Flûte, inventée par Gordon, modifiée par Böhm et perfectionée par V. Coche et Buffet, jeune (1, p. 240).

Although Coche tried to discredit Boehm, he did help to familiarize Parisians with the new flute. The trill key that he devised is essentially the same as the one on the flute of today. Extensive research has since thoroughly supported Boehm as the originator of this new flute, but unfortunately Coche's charges launched considerable furor and heated debate by flutist-writers throughout the century and Boehm's life (1).

Vincent-Joseph Dorus

Dorus' full name was Vincent Joseph Louis Van Steenkiste Dorus (most sources refer to him as either Vincent-Joseph or Louis), and he was professor of flute at the Conservatoire from 1860 to 1863, although Fétis (4, p. 49) states that he succeeded Tulou in 1858. Born in Valenciennes in 1812, he entered the Conservatoire at the age of ten as a student of Guillou's. Obtaining the first prize in 1828, Dorus soon after joined the orchestra of the Théâtre de Variétés. In 1834, he obtained several important musical positions--first
flutist of the Paris Opéra and of the Société des Concerts at the Conservatoire, plus membership in the Emperor's band.

In 1837, Dorus played in open-air concerts in the Champs-Elysees. He traveled in 1841 to London where he appeared with the London Philharmonic orchestra. Dorus was "an admirable virtuoso" noted for "perfection of execution" and a "purity of style" (6, p. 1521). He often performed in concert with his sister, Madam Dorus-Gras, a renowned singer.

**Dorus' Contributions to the Boehm Flute**

Dorus became convinced as early as 1833 of the superiority of the Boehm flute, and he practiced on it secretly for more than two years (6, p. 1521). In 1835, when he felt that he had mastered the new instrument, he appeared in public, and his performance "was such a revelation, that the cause of the new flute was won" (6, p. 1521). Whether it was Dorus or Camus who first played the Boehm flute in Paris, it appears certain that France was indeed one of the first countries to adopt the new instrument, and that both Dorus and Camus were Boehm's supporters.

Despite the master Tulou's efforts, the Conservatoire adopted the Boehm instrument in 1838 (7, p. 76). Thereafter, from 1838 until the remainder of Tulou's term at the Conservatoire in 1860, there were two factions of flutists--those who remained loyal to the renowned Tulou and the old flute, and those who ventured forth with the new innovation.
Records available do not show who assisted Tulou after Coche left in 1841. It is very possible Dorus was an assistant professor giving instruction on the new instrument before he assumed the principal position (4).

The open G sharp key on Boehm's flute, although logical acoustically, met resistance among the Paris flutists who found the fingering awkward. Dorus invented a closed G sharp key that was installed on Paris-manufactured flutes, making the fingering of that note more acceptable. At Dorus' suggestion, Godfroy and Lot manufactured cocuswood Boehm flutes with silver keys (7, p. 72). Dorus, however, preferred an all-silver flute by 1855. After Dorus' time, the French began to use all-silver flutes (7, p. 187).

**The Compositions of Dorus**

Dorus composed a few works for the flute, including the traditional themes and variations, fantasies and variations on melodies of Donizetti and Weber, and a method book for the Boehm flute (3). One of the first method books for the new flute, Dorus' work is based on Devienne's method, as he states in the introduction. All commentary is in French, however, and the student may not be aware that many of the compositions are Devienne's, transposed to more difficult keys in keeping with the greater capacities of the Boehm flute. Of the 105 pages that comprise the book, the largest section is devoted to musical examples. The introductory commentary is confined
to a brief explanation of the elementary principles of music and the fundamentals of flute playing. A fingering chart for the "flûte nouvelle" is included that is based on the 1847 Boehm flute. Further into the text, Dorus explains the execution of ornaments. It is noteworthy that none of the given examples has the trill starting on the upper auxiliary. The trills do progress in speed, however, in the eighteenth century manner (Figure 18).

Fig. 18--Dorus, Méthode pour la flûte, ca. 1850 (3, pp. 39-40).

Exercises in the method range up to five flats and five sharps in both major and minor keys. In addition to the usual exercises on intervals, arpeggios, and chromatics, exercises for double-tonguing are included. Intervals in the exercises extend to two octaves; the range of the exercises is from low C to B³ (3).

Twenty-eight of the first set of simpler duets in this method can be positively identified as Devienne's. Dorus
has transposed many of them to more difficult keys with three and four sharps and flats. Access to an unabridged edition of Devienne's method would probably show that most of this first set are his because they are contrapuntal, and, although simpler, they are more interesting melodically than the set of six sonatas for two flutes that appear later in the method (3). All of the French methods examined use duets as a teaching device in order to provide the beat in an exercise on syncopation, to provide the harmony, or to help the student to develop good intonation.

The set of sonatas for two flutes by Dorus that is included in this edition are all in three movements; they are quite homophonic in contrast to the set by Devienne. The second part is less difficult and usually remains in the lowest octave, assuming an accompanying role in simpler note values. Five of the six sonatas modulate to parallel minor keys or to the dominant. The sixth has the outer movements in G major and the inner movement in A minor. Five of the Six have a rondo for the last movement. The final movement of the fourth sonata, the only duet generally included in methods used today, is a theme and variations (3).

None of Dorus' flute and piano works is in print at the present time, nor does his method book receive wide use. Dorus was reputed to be an excellent teacher at the Conservatoire. One of his talented students, Paul Taffanel, was destined to become one of the finest musicians in France in
the last decades of the century, eventually teaching at the Conservatoire after Dorus' successor, Joseph Henri Altès.
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CHAPTER V

THE STATE OF MUSIC IN FRANCE, 1850-1900;
JOSEPH HENRI ALTES AT THE CONSERVATOIRE

Throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, opera had been the predominant musical interest in France. At the Paris Opéra, the most popular works of the time were those of Rossini, Donizetti, Meyerbeer, Auber and Halevy. Between 1852 and 1870, only five new French works were produced—Herculanum by Felicien David, Hamlet by Ambroise Thomas, and Sapho, La Nonne Sanglante and La Reine de Saba by Charles Gounod. At the Opéra-comique, the works of Boieldieu, Adolphe Adam, and Daniel Auber were the main fare at mid-century (5, p. 10).

Between 1790 and the 1850s, there were no regular orchestras for the performing of instrumental music except for the Société des Concerts, which served a limited segment of the population. In 1861, Jules Pasdeloup, a piano graduate of the Conservatoire, established an orchestra to provide the Concerts populaires, which were inexpensive Sunday programs of instrumental music for the public. In these performances, Pasdeloup gradually introduced his audience to the works of Schumann, Beethoven, and Mendelssohn (5).
Before 1850, few instrumental chamber groups functioned on a regular basis. Choral musical interests centered around the opera and the church. The Conservatoire composition teachers, such as Massenet, naturally directed their students' interests toward opera (8, p. 13).

In such an atmosphere, contemporary French composers had few outlets for their creativity. Berlioz died in 1869, not fully appreciated in his country during his lifetime. When Pasdeloup's orchestra performed Bizet's *Souvenirs de Rome* in 1869, the audience hissed (5, p. 11). Instrumental graduates of the Conservatoire either entered the ranks of the theatre orchestras, turned to teaching or non-musical professions, or left the country.

As far as French musicians were concerned, music in France was clearly in need of a change. Alterations began to occur after the Franco-Prussian War, 1870-1871, which awakened in the people a new national awareness. One of the first evidences of that new concern occurred in 1871 when a group of determined young French composers and musicians banded together and formed the Société nationale de musique française. The purpose of the group was to encourage composition and organize performances of chamber and orchestral works of modern and living French composers. The founders were the composer Camille Saint-Saens and Romaine Bussine, a voice professor at the Conservatoire. Included in the initial group were Cesar Franck, Gabriel Fauré, Jules Massaenet, Theodore Dubois, and Paul Taffanel (11, pp. 268-302).
In this same period of fomenting ideas, the French began to be more interested in the history of music. In 1871, the first lectures on aesthetics and general music history were instituted at the Conservatoire (11, p. 302). The voice students at the Conservatoire, however, had been studying the history of opera since 1848 (9, p. 349). As a result of the new lectures, the next generation of students would be more aware and informed in music history. In general, interest in musical research and in the master composers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries began to increase.

Institutions were established for the study of specialized areas. Chief among these was the Schola Cantorum, founded in 1894 by the church choir director, Charles Bordes, the organist, Alexandre Guilmant, and Vincent D'Indy, composer and disciple of Cesar Franck. The original purpose of the school was to revive and study the works of Palestrina and Gregorian chants in order to elevate the standards of church music.

Whereas an energetic awakening had occurred in many areas of music during the latter part of the nineteenth century, flute composition still lagged behind. (The compositions of Dorus, Tulou, and Altès were typical of the flute music of the time.) Throughout the century, flutist-composers churned out fantasies, variations on airs and opera melodies, and numerous similar "fireworks" (7, p. 384). For instance, one of the most popular and frequently
performed solos was a set of variations on *God Save the King* (4, p. 317). The works of Tulou and Altés dominated the repertoire at the Paris Conservatoire. Tulou composed a solo for the annual Concours every year between 1832 and 1860. His compositions, along with those of Altés, continued to be the main Concours selections throughout Altés term (9, p. 624) (see Appendix II). [To emphasize his objections to these shallow technical solos, Gabriel Fauré composed a simpler solo for the Concours in 1898 (12, p. 45).]

Many questions now arise. Were the flutists writing the solos for the Conservatoire examinations in accordance with tradition or because of the deficiency of the contemporary repertoire? Did these frothy works—in all countries, not just France—grow out of the zealous excesses of Romanticism or the flutists' attempts to compete with the Liszts of the piano and the Paganinis of the violin in an effort to please the public? Fitzgibbon, a flutist during the last part of the nineteenth century, expressed his feeling that the public was responsible.

The public taste was not educated: it was the age of the *air variée*. The great professional soloists naturally played the kind of music which pleased their auditors and pupils most. Every suitable or unsuitable operatic aria, every Welsh, Irish, Scottish, or English tune was adapted by them for the flute, and tortured into all sorts of interminable scales and exercises . . . with double-tonguing, skips from the highest to the lowest notes and such-like tricks; written to show off the executive skill of the performer and to make the audience wonder how it was all done (6, p. 109).
Writing a generation later, Louis Fleury (who studied with Taffanel at the Conservatoire) was inclined to blame the flutists themselves. The moment flutists tried to compete with violinists, giving themselves over to fireworks and the expression of hectic sentiment, people of good taste would have no more to do with them (7, p. 384).

Apparently, public taste began to expand in the latter part of the century. Fitzgibbon (6) quotes one disgruntled 1890 contributor to *Musical Opinion* who gave the following description of flute performances.

... air first, then common chord variation (staccato) "runs" variation, slow movement with a turn between every other two notes, and a pump handle shake that wrings tears of agony from the flute; then the enormously difficult finale, in which you are up in the air on one note, then drop with a bang, which nearly breaks you, onto low C, only to bounce up again, to hold onto a note, shake it (wring its neck in fact), scatter it in all directions and come sailing down triumphantly on a chromatic (legato) with a perfect whirlpool of foaming notes, only to be bumped and pushed about until you are exhausted (6, p. 110).

These comments indicate that the air and variations did not vanish with the new invention of the Boehm flute. On the contrary, the new instrument made such works easier to play. The years of confusion over the Boehm flute, during which flutists displayed both a lack of direction and unity concerning their instrument, provided a major reason for composers to neglect the instrument. The major composers wrote all too few solo and chamber works for the flute in the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century. There is no doubt that they were attracted to other instruments
that were mechanically better developed. The simple-system flute was ignored, and until flutists could resolve their family squabble over the Boehm flute and settle on an acceptable version, it, too, would be largely avoided by composers. Eventually, the Boehm flute was accepted; the interests of composers once again turned to the flute, and the taste of performers and public alike was altered.

During a large part of these years of musical upheaval and change, Joseph Henri Altès was professor of flute at the Conservatoire. His contributions to the flute repertoire and to the musical scene in Paris were curiously uneven.

Joseph Henri Altès

Born in Rouen in 1826, Altès showed early talent and entered the Conservatoire in 1840 where he became one of Tulou's best pupils. At some unknown time, he changed to the Boehm flute. How this was arranged with Tulou—the staunch partisan of the simple-system flute—is not known. It is uncertain whether Altès had already made the change to the Boehm instrument when he obtained second prize in 1841 and first prize in 1842. Altès played in the orchestra of the Concerts vivienne in 1844 and joined the ranks of the Opéra-comique in 1847. He entered the Opéra orchestra in 1848 as second flutist to Dorus, eventually succeeding him as first flutist. Altès yielded the first chair position to Paul Taffanel in 1864, but he remained in the orchestra until
1876. Altès was also first flutist of the Société des concerts orchestra from 1851 until 1869 (9, p. 626).

Altès assumed the professorship of the Conservatoire in 1868 where he remained until 1893, the longest term of any previous professor except Tulou. Remarkably little information is available about Altès during his long tenure at the Conservatoire. Although a highly competent flutist, the loss to Paul Taffanel of the first chair positions of the two highest-ranking orchestras (the Opéra and the Société des Concerts) seems to indicate that Altès was less capable than the younger man. Apart from duties in the Opéra, Altès apparently devoted most of his energies to teaching at the Conservatoire and composing works for the flute. The remarkable method that he produced, which will be discussed later, indicates that he was highly systematic and concerned with all aspects of the student's musical development. His pupils included Leopold LaFleurance, Georges Barrère, and Adolphe Hennebains. Hennebains later taught at the Conservatoire and Barrere continued his studies with Taffanel.

Altès' Compositions

Altès wrote principally for the flute, following the tradition of his predecessors. His compositions include a number of fantasies, variations on operatic melodies, works for voice and flute obbligato, and a flute method book. Altès also frequently composed solos for the annual competitive
examination, the Concours du Prix. During his twenty-five years at the Conservatoire, twelve of his solos were performed at the Concours (9, p. 624). None of these remains in the current repertoire.

Altes' only composition in print today is his method, a large, comprehensive two-volume work that is of interest and value to the serious flutist. Originally published as the Grande Méthode pour la flûte in 1906, the only edition available today is a 1956 revision by flutist Fernand Caratgé that is titled the Célèbre Méthode complète de flûte (2). Notwithstanding, the Altes Méthode can be considered the oldest major French method for the Boehm flute still in widespread use. The commentary, printed simultaneously in French, German, English, and Spanish, indicates the extensive use of this treatise.

The introduction states that Altes insisted on his students learning music theory concurrently with instrumental technique. This concern is evident in the preliminary pages which offer a clear, concise, and more advanced presentation of theory than any previous method examined.

The Méthode reflects the change of interest that occurred in music in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Included are illustrations explaining note values of pre-Baroque music, a description of the metronome, diagrams illustrating the direction of the conductor's beat in various time signatures, and explanations of the treble, tenor, alto, and bass clefs.
The manual guides all aspects of the flutists' development from beginner to Conservatoire level in a logical, assiduously systematic order. Step-by-step exercises are presented on rhythm, long tones, phrasing, articulation, ornamentation, and technique.

In the tradition of Devienne, Altès makes frequent use of the duet form as a teaching tool. The simpler duets are contrapuntal, but the more difficult ones are largely homophonic, with the second flute accompanying in simpler note patterns to supply the harmony and aid intonation.

The method includes special fingerings to use in technically awkward or rapid passages and for notes that present intonation problems. Table II illustrates these special fingerings. According to Rockstro, flutists have used alternate fingerings since the days of Hotteterre (10, p. 457). [Although outside the scope of this paper, it would be interesting to pursue Rockstro's line of thought to discover how many of the seventeenth-century fingerings were adapted to the Boehm flute.]

The second, more difficult part is intended for the use of the serious student pursuing a musical career. The twenty-six etudes in this part have been published in a separate volume, and they are used widely in the United States today (3). Romantic in content, they show Altès to be a competent composer. Figure 19 depicts the opening measures of Etude No. 8, a lively, rhythmic allegro.
TABLE II
ALTÈS' SPECIAL FINGERINGS TO "FACILITATE THE PERFORMANCE AND ADJUST THE PITCH OF CERTAIN NOTES"

These fingerings must be used only when the notes are grouped as shown

*Based on the table in Altès' Méthode (2, p. 92).

**A = hole open, ring closed
B = hole and ring closed
C = hole in key 3/4 closed, ring closed

**• = hole open
○ = hole closed
Δ = hole partially closed
Φ = key open
● = key closed
TABLE II--Continued

D     E     F

* * * * *  

**D = hole 1/2 closed  
E = hole 1/2 closed  
F = hole 1/3 closed
Etude No. 10 (Figure 20) shows dramatic accents and the changes in dynamics and tempo that are characteristic of Romantic music.

It is very likely that the comments on the production of sound, accompanied by drawings of the lips and the air stream, were added in the 1956 edition because analytical explanations were not used until well into the twentieth century. The Méthode states specifically that the tongue is placed on the teeth to start the tonguing of a note (2, p. 17).

The lengthy duet arrangement of the Scherzo from Mendelssohn's *Midsummer Night's Dream* is a tour de force,
well worthy of examination. In general, the Altes method has much of timeless value, especially the melodious etudes and duets.

During Altes' years at the Conservatoire, Paul Taffanel, a forceful personality, was more actively involved in Paris' musical awakening than Altès. Taffanel made a significant contribution to the elevation of the status of the flute and
the upgrading of its repertoire, as will be shown in the next chapter.
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CHAPTER VI

CLAUDE PAUL TAFFANEL, 1844-1908

The Conservatoire was completing its first hundred years when Paul Taffanel assumed the professorship of flute in 1893. No flutist more richly deserved to inherit a century of French virtuoso playing, nor had one more capably expanded and refined his heritage. He has been described as the founder of the modern French school of the flute (7, p. 65).

A man of diverse musical skills, Taffanel was born in Bordeaux in 1844. His father, a capable flutist and bassoonist, provided the boy's early musical training. In 1860, at sixteen, Taffanel entered the Conservatoire to study with Dorus, and he obtained first prize the same year. Within a short time, he obtained positions in the orchestras of the Opéra-comique, the Palais royale, and in Pasdeloup's Concerts populaires. In the same period, he studied theory at the Conservatoire, winning first prizes in theory in 1862 and in counterpoint and fugue in 1865. Few students have achieved the distinction of being awarded three first prizes (6).

In 1861, Taffanel entered the Opéra orchestra, Paris' highest-ranking theater orchestra. By 1864, he had succeeded Altès as first chair in the Opéra pit and the following year
replaced him in the Société des Concerts. Established in the city's best orchestras at the age of twenty-seven, Taffanel settled into a career as a performer that continued for more than twenty-five years (6).

Taffanel's Style of Playing

Because of Taffanel's great reputation and his proximity to the present time, there is more information on him from first-hand observers—particularly from his students who are unanimous in their praise of him. Georges Barrère, former professor at the Juilliard School of Music, states that

Taffanel was not only the best flutist in Europe but I doubt if any one can ever fill his place. Quality as well as quantity of tone and fine technique were only a small part of his splendid characteristics as a flute player (1, p. 187).

Taffanel's tone was characterized by brilliance and an "extraordinarily velvet" purity (8, p. 657); he projected more volume than most pre-Boehm flutists. Taffanel's emphasis was not on volume but on simplicity of line and phrasing. His tone was forthright and without vibrato, which was considered in bad taste in France as it had been throughout the century. "He loathed cheap sentimentality, excessive expression, endless vibrato or shaking of tone, in a word all the cheap tricks which are as undignified as they are unmusical" (1, p. 187). These words of Barrère, quoted in DeLorenzo (1), indicate the attitude in Paris around 1900. During the years of Taffanel's performing career (from the
1860s to the 1890s), we can observe a moving away from the style of the earlier virtuosi, a movement largely wrought by Taffanel. A similar change occurred in the repertoire. Another distinguished student observed that "Taffanel left the Conservatoire just when flutists' repertory was nothing but airs with variations and potpourris, all beneath contempt . . . . The more his powers of execution grew, the more refined became his taste" (5, p. 384). Taffanel's taste led him to explore the works of Mozart, Bach, and other early masters, and to join with other young musicians in effecting changes in the repertoire and the quality of performance.

Taffanel's Involvement in Musical Organizations

The talented young flutist was inevitably drawn into the musical revitalization that was generated in Paris at that time. Along with other leading musicians, he became interested not only in the revival of past works but in giving encouragement to the writing of new compositions. He was one of the founding members of the Société national de musique française, which was formed in 1871 to foster and support the compositions of young French composers.

Taffanel became interested in enlarging the repertoire for chamber ensembles. In 1872, in collaboration with Jules Armingaud, a violinist in the Opéra orchestra, and Leon Jacquard, a professor of cello at the Conservatoire, Taffanel formed a chamber music society for a double quintet of
strings and winds (12, p. 856). A contemporary journal announced the first concert, which took place in 1875, as follows,

Tomorrow evening, 2d February, in the Erard Hall, the first session of the Societe classique, with M.M. Armingaud, Jacquard, Taffanel, Grisez, etc (11, p. 144).

It appears that three years passed between organization and first concert.

From his work with the strings in this organization, Taffanel became convinced that woodwind performance standards and repertoire could and should be improved. He wanted to achieve precise attacks, flawless accuracy, and a fusion of timbres in wind ensembles (8, p. 657). To achieve these objectives, he founded in 1819 a chamber music society for winds, the Société de musique de chambre pour instruments à vent, that became a highly successful organization which "toured Europe many times and did much to raise the level of wind playing all over the continent" (14). This talented group displayed individual competence as well as sensitive ensemble rapport. Through new compositions and transcriptions of music by earlier composers (such as Mozart and Beethoven), they exploited the sonorities of the wind ensemble with a brilliance and sensitivity that thrilled audiences and inspired composers (8, p. 657). The woodwind quintet, which had been abandoned after Guillou's group disbanded about 1830, was revived as an important genre.
Inspired by the French group, other wind ensembles began to form throughout Europe.

Several works were commissioned by and dedicated to this ensemble, including a suite for woodwind quintet by Charles Lefébvre. Principally as a result of the ensemble's efforts, a considerable number of compositions for various combinations of winds were written in the final years of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries. Composers who wrote works for wind ensembles in this period include Albert Roussel, Gabriel Pierné, Carli Zoller, Theodore DuBois, Charles Gounod, A. Barthe, and Paul Taffanel. The compositions of Gounod, Barthe, Lefebvre, Roussel, and Taffanel are still an important part of the repertoire. There is no doubt that all this activity laid the groundwork for the major contributions of later composers, including Jacques Ibert, Claude Debussy, and Maurice Ravel (8).

Taffanel's organizational and leadership abilities led naturally to another outlet—conducting. He was appointed conductor of the Paris Opéra orchestra in 1887, and he proved to be a sensitive, demanding conductor. His interest and experience with the works of new composers became valuable to the Opéra, where, after so many years, new compositions were being performed. Under his direction, between 1893 and 1906, the Opéra performed Wagner's Tannhauser, Die Meistersinger, Siegfried, and Tristan und Isolde. Taffanel also revived Weber's Der Freischutz and conducted first
performances of Massenet's Thais, Verdi's Otello, and many other works (8, p. 658).

In 1892, Taffanel was appointed director of the Société des concerts orchestra at the Conservatoire. He introduced the student ensemble to the works of early masters and to contemporary French composers. Under Taffanel's guidance, the orchestra revived and performed the works of Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Berlioz, and Bizet, as well as new compositions by Brahms, Franck, and Gounod. "He brought to the preparation of new works a conscience, a concern for perfection that is rarely found" (8, p. 657). Taffanel was a meticulously thorough conductor who insisted upon rehearsing until he was satisfied that the work was ready for performance. He concerned himself with all aspects of an "impeccable performance," even to the marking of bowings. Taffanel's constant concern was "to render the least intentions of the composer" (8, pp. 657-658).

The Compositions of Taffanel

Taffanel's numerous activities left little time for composing. He transcribed several older works, including Chopin's Nocturne, Op. 15, No. 2 and Valse, Op. 64, No. 1, and Gluck's Scene des Champs-Elysee from Orphée, all for flute and piano. Taffanel's own contributions include cadenzas for Mozart's Concertos in G and D Major, Weber's Fantasy on der Freischutz, Andante Pastorale et Scherzettino
for flute and piano, a quintet for winds, and a method book for flute. The brilliant, difficult Mozart cadenzas were very popular during the first half of the twentieth century, but they are now regarded by some flutists as too Romantic for Classical works.

The *Fantasy* is a tour-de-force and one of the better late French Romantic showpieces (10). In the present revival of Romantic compositions, this work is receiving renewed attention. Taffanel's major contributions to flute literature, however, are the *Méthode complète* (15) and the *Quintette pour instruments à vent* (14), both published by Alphonse Leduc.

The *Quintette* is a major Romantic work for the standard wind ensemble, flute, oboe, clarinet, French horn, and bassoon. Composed in 1879 for the group he founded, the work demonstrates the skill in composition that Taffanel had exhibited as a student at the Conservatoire. The lengthy three-movement work explores the range and sonorities of the five instruments in ensemble, and in solos it is sensitively idiomatic.

The first movement, allegro con moto, flows and ebbs, subsiding into cadences, then driving to new melodies. The harmonies are rich and full; the accompaniment passages are skilfully handled. The entire movement sustains interest and accelerates to an exciting conclusion.
The Andante, ABA$^1$ in form, begins with a pastoral horn solo that is delightfully whimsical (Figure 21).

Fig. 21--Taffanel, Quintette, Andante con moto, French horn solo, measures 1-34 (15).
The B section is a piu mosso in which the oboe begins a new theme, alternating with the flute and clarinet. The accompaniment figures in sixteenth and thirty-second notes add forward motion to this section. In the final varied section of the movement, the A theme of the horn is not played in its entirety. Instead, fragments of the theme are heard in each voice.

The third movement, a vivace in six-eight meter, abounds with energetic leaps and acrobatic passages for the three upper winds. The melodies are lively and bright and supported by sonorous harmonies in the lower octaves of the bassoon and horn. The entire quintette is masterfully crafted and shows the composer to be thoroughly acquainted with each instrument and the techniques of composition. Through the simultaneous use of different rhythms and the exploitation of the timbres and full ranges of the instruments, the composer produced a work varied in texture and tonal color.

Taffanel suffered a lingering illness toward the end of his life, and he was unable to complete his vast method book. The book was assembled and edited after Taffanel's death by his student and friend, Philippe Gaubert (15). Since Gaubert was so well acquainted with Taffanel's ideas and was so close to him in time, it is reasonable to assume that the resulting publication is a fairly accurate representation of the older man's ideas.
The material is directed toward the serious flutist. Unlike Altès, Taffanel and Gaubert do not include basic theory or general principles of music. The main thrust and emphasis is on phrasing, breathing, style, technique, and the development of the tone with varied coloring. Style is inextricably connected with breathing and phrasing.

The breath is the soul of the flute, and the culminating point in the art of playing. The disciplined breath must be a docile agent, now supple, now powerful, which the flutist should be able to govern with the same dexterity as that with which a violinist wields his bow. It is the motion force behind the sound and the spirit which animates it, giving it life, becoming a voice capable of expressing all the emotions (15, p. 185).

The Méthode clearly states the French opposition to vibrato.

There should be no vibrato or any form of quaver, an artifice used by inferior instrumentalists and musicians. It is with the tone that the player conveys the music to the listener. Vibrato distorts the natural character and spoils the interpretation, fatiguing quickly a sensitive ear (15, p. 186).

The method has the usual etudes and exercises to develop technique. The Daily Exercises portion is a set of exercises based on intervals, scales, and arpeggios; it continues to be used extensively in higher institutions of learning. Taffanel's etudes, however, are not as melodic as Altès', and are seldom used in the United States.

The work is the first Conservatoire method to devote entire sections to style and to orchestral excerpts. Although some of the latter are from works not in the current repertoire, which is always subject to change, many of the excerpts
are useful to the flutist, including the works of Bizet, Beethoven, Wagner, Berlioz, and Rossini. The solo from *Daphnis and Chloé* by Ravel must have been added by Gaubert because it was composed in 1914, six years after Taffanel's death. Several compositions by J. S. Bach, including the two-part inventions, are transcribed and included.

In the section on style, the suggestions for ornamentation in Bach's flute sonatas are outmoded; later research has revealed more accurate interpretations of Baroque ornamentation. However, the suggestion that Bach and the early masters should be approached with simplicity is timeless in its validity (15, p. 186). Taffanel's cadenzas for Mozart's Concertos in G and D are included in the section on style. The composer's interpretation of his own cadenzas conveys a rare insight into his ideas, advanced for the time. He believed that to be interesting a cadenza should provide contrast in tonal color and should indicate the harmonic structure. For example, note how the grace notes in the cadenza for the second movement of the D Major concerto imply the harmonies and the modulations (Figure 22).

Throughout the *Méthode*, the commentary is written in a gracious, flowing style, conveying with clarity ideas that are still relevant today although worded with the elegance of a past era. Even though the range of the music in the *Méthode* does not extend above high B, the book as a whole is
a worthwhile reference for the serious flutist for personal study and as a tool for teaching.

Fig. 22--Taffanel, Cadenza for the Adagio (2nd Mov.) of Mozart's Concerto in D Major, K. 314 (15, p. 193).

Taffanel's Influence on Musical Education

Records indicate that even before his appointment to the Conservatoire and during his years as a performer and conductor, Taffanel maintained an interest in students' activities. On at least two occasions during Altès term, Taffanel was a member of the jury presiding over the annual Concours. Music journals of the time record him as a member of the jury in 1874 (13, p. 159) and in 1880 (2, p. 89). It is very likely that he was involved in many of the juries between the early 1870s and 1893, the year of his appointment.
Taffanel at the Conservatoire

Taffanel was forty-nine when he became the flute professor at the Conservatoire after Altès' retirement. With his fame and his many successful activities, one can imagine that his students would have been in awe of him. In the fifteen years in which he taught at the school, his influence was immense and distinctive.

From all available accounts, Taffanel was an exacting, brilliant, and inspiring teacher. His arrival at the school immediately produced "a remarkable impetus" among the flutists (6, p. 1526). He individualized instruction by assigning to each student the works that would enable him to make steady progress. Taffanel used the master class, rather than private lessons, to convey his ideas; there is no indication, however, that Taffanel was the first teacher to use the master class means of instruction. It is probable that he was continuing a tradition, one which is still in practice. "While he was teaching one pupil, the remainder of the class would listen attentively to every observation or suggestion made to improve our friend's work" (1, p. 188). As in his other activities, Taffanel revived the works of Baroque and Classical composers and assigned them to his students. Bach sonatas, cornerstones of the present repertoire, were not taught at the Conservatoire before Taffanel's arrival (5, p. 308).
His former student, Fleury, states eloquently,

... Mozart's concertos, neglected for the last fifty years in favor of Tulou's, began to be heard at concerts. Bach's sonatas, those wonders long buried in the dust of libraries, awakened to find a real interpreter (5, p. 384).

Taffanel's inquiring sensitivity led his students to look for a beautiful line in a wider range of compositions than ever before explored. Even in etudes, he taught them to "find many beautiful things which would otherwise have passed unnoticed" (1, p. 188).

The master flutist, with all his activities, gave generously of his time, often staying after class to listen to students play solos, which he would then perform for them "in his own inimitable style." Taffanel regarded each student as a "musical son," and he continued to be helpful and interested in his students even after they left the school (1, p. 188).

Taffanel's Students (12)

Aside from such generous comments from his students and contemporaries, perhaps one of the best testimonies to Taffanel's teaching is the impressive accomplishments of several of his students. Taffanel's varied successes and exploring mind undoubtedly inspired his pupils to follow his example of pursuing diverse endeavors. In addition to outstanding performing and teaching careers, his students turned to composing, editing, writing, conducting, and the
formation of chamber music groups. The following are some of Taffanel's more well-known students.

**Philippe Gaubert** (1879-1941)—Gaubert was awarded first prize in flute in 1894 at the age of fifteen. A virtuoso flutist, he also became a successful conductor and composer. Gaubert was awarded second prize in the Prix du Rome composition examination in 1905. He composed a wide variety of works including ballets, symphonies, chamber works, a violin concerto, and several compositions for flute and piano. Gaubert directed the Opéra orchestra for several years, and he also conducted the Société des Concerts orchestra from 1918 to 1938. He was flute professor at the Conservatoire from 1919 to 1941.

**Louis Fleury** (1878-1926)—Fleury was a talented flutist, the first prize winner in 1900 who turned to writing and editing with considerable success. He uncovered and edited many works of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Fleury also wrote for numerous French and foreign music periodicals, as well as completing the chapter on flute (which was begun by Taffanel) for Lavignac's *Encyclopédie de la Musique* (6). The flutist-writer developed a style that is imbued with wit, "delicacy and irony" (7, p. 67).

**André Maquarre** (1875-1936?)—Maquarre, a first-prize winner in 1893, did considerable professional playing in
French, Monte Carlo, and the United States where he performed variously with the Boston Symphony, the Philadelphia Orchestra, and the Los Angeles Philharmonic. He composed a set of technical exercises, Daily Exercises, that are still in use (9).

Daniel Maquarre (1881-?) -- The younger brother of André, Daniel won first prize in 1986. At one time Daniel taught at the New England Conservatory and played with the Boston Symphony; he also performed with the New York Philharmonic and the Philadelphia Orchestra. According to DeLorenzo, both brothers retired to France (1, p. 252).

Frederick Griffith (1867-1914) -- Griffith was a Welsh flutist who studied first at the Royal Academy of Music in London, then with Taffanel. Griffith played in the Covent Garden Opera orchestra in London, and at one time he also toured with singer Nellie Melba. Griffith achieved an "exquisite delicacy of tone" by always practicing very softly, and he was "probably the greatest flautist Wales has ever produced" (4, p. 215).

Marcel Moyse (1889- ) -- This distinguished and world-renowned flutist has, at ninety-one, the honor of being the only person still living who studied with Taffanel. The accomplishments of this remarkable man are so extensive that he merits a work unto himself. Only the highlights of his career are presented in this paper. Moyse, like his teacher,
obtained first prize in his first year (1905) at the Conservatoire, at the age of sixteen. After leaving the Conservatoire, he held chairs in several orchestras in France, including the Opéra, the Opéra-comique, the Lamoureux, Concerts populaire, and Colonne. In 1913, he toured the United States with the Singer Nellie Melba. Moyse taught at the Conservatoire for some time before and after World War I (3, pp. 79-84). He formed the Moyse trio with his son, Louis (piano) and daughter-in-law, Blanche Honnegger Moyse (violin), which toured Europe, the United States, and South America. The family emigrated to the United States in 1949 to settle in Vermont where, in company with Rudolph Serkin, Adolph and Herman Busch, Moyse founded the distinguished Marlboro School and Festival of Music. The venerable flutist has written more than two dozen pedagogical works for the flute as well as numerous articles for music periodicals. Moyse has given wind seminars and has coached ensembles at major conservatories and in cities all over the world, including Paris, London, Tokyo, and Philadelphia. At this time he is still actively engaged in coaching wind ensembles in the United States and abroad.

Georges Laurent (1886-1964) and George Barrère (1876-1944)—Both of these men emigrated to the United States early in the twentieth century. Because of their respective positions and influence in the United States, they are discussed in the following chapter.
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In the first two decades of the twentieth century, several Conservatoire flutists came to the United States where they played in American orchestras and taught in American institutions. Chief among these were André and Daniel Maquarre (who were discussed in Chapter VI), Georges Barrère, and Georges Laurent; Barrère and Laurent had the greatest impact on American flute playing.

Georges Barrère, 1876-1944

Barrère emigrated to the United States in 1905 to play with the New York Symphony under Walter Damrosch. Prior to that time, his life had been the usual success story of a flutist who had graduated from the Conservatoire with the distinguished first prize. He had held first chair in the Colonne orchestra and fourth in the Opéra orchestra. He had also performed with the Concerts of Chatelet orchestra. In 1895, the year he obtained first prize, he organized a woodwind chamber group, the Société moderne de instruments à vent, taking as his model Taffanel's famed group which had disbanded in 1893. Barrère also taught for a while in the Schola Cantorum and in the Stanislas College, both in Paris.
When Walter Damrosch invited him to play first flute in the New York Symphony, Barrère responded to the appeal to perform with a young orchestra in a new country. Barrère settled down in New York and began to make his influence felt in various musical activities, exhibiting diverse interests and talents much in the manner of his famous teacher. In addition to performing in the New York Symphony (where he remained until 1928), he participated in the Barrère-Britt-Salzedo Trio for flute, cello, and harp that toured the United States and Mexico. In 1910, he formed a Wind Ensemble that expanded into the Barrère Little Symphony in 1914. Barrère directed this group on concert tours throughout the United States and in its summer appearances at Chautauqua, New York. As a flutist, he also performed with the dancer, Isadora Duncan, and her ensemble.

Barrère's Style

There are at the present time several distinguished musicians who, as young men, studied with Barrère. Their words provide the most meaningful description of Barrère's style. Musicians recall his outstanding technique and his ability to communicate color and phrasing through a beautiful tone. Bernard Goldberg, first flutist of the Pittsburgh Symphony, states that "the things he would do in articulation were not only beautiful and clear but they were simply charming and winsome" (4, p. 38). Samuel Baron, professor
of flute at Juilliard, asserts that Barrère's playing was "probably unrivalled in color and variety" (4, p. 33).

During Barrère's lifetime, the vibrato, much deplored in Taffanel's generation, slowly gained acceptance. Barrère was not fully convinced that vibrato enhanced tone quality. When asked late in his life how vibrato was produced, he replied, "for the fifty years I had been tooting my instrument, my daily care was to avoid the vibrato" (1, p. 194). His students, however, remember that Barrère played with vibrato; "he used a fast vibrato which was the rage then, but he phrased beautifully and had thorough command technically" (11). Flutist Goldberg recalls that

During my first year at Juilliard, he was still playing and there were times when he would demonstrate the vibrato—which was simply unforgettable because of the quality of his tone and the intensity of his communicative power (4, p. 38).

In its early, controversial years of use, the vibrato was not comfortably accepted. Unable to free himself completely from a strong French prejudice, Barrère regarded vibrato as a "necessary evil" (1, p. 194). He told his students that "for three hundred years flutists tried to play in tune. Then they gave up and invented vibrato" (5).

Barrère was not unaware of his virtuoso heritage. Moreover, his popularity as an outstanding flutist was enhanced by his distinctive appearance and manner—well-trimmed beard and pince-nez glasses and his humorous Gallic wit and French accent added charm to his image.
Barrère the Teacher

Barrère taught at the Institute of the Arts which merged with Juilliard in 1931; he continued to give private lessons and to coach wind ensembles at Juilliard. Barrère's teaching was an extension of his personality and style of playing. He was not extremely articulate or explicit in his comments. Often his suggestions to woodwind ensembles would consist of anecdotes (11). His usual procedure was to listen to the student and then demonstrate how he thought a passage should be played (7, p. 3). Barrère emphasized that the fingers should remain close to the keys for smoother, faster action (4, p. 39). He advised students to "play straight forward and frankly" (1, p. 192), and he believed that musical expression "should be a sincere, natural, true utterance" (4, p. 39).

Professor George Morey, who as a young boy won a scholarship to study with the great Barrère one summer at Chatauqua, New York, recalls his first lessons. After listening to several "don'ts," toward the end of the lesson the awed teenager asked, "Mr. Barrère, would you play something for me?" Barrère complied, and his actions "were a compendium of all he had told me not to do." Barrère took out his flute, rather carelessly letting the sections fall onto a table, and assembled it roughly; but then he proceeded "to play Syrinx magnificently!" (8)
Barrère taught many of the fine woodwind players who today occupy prominent positions in American orchestras and higher institutions of learning. They include Samuel Baron (Bach Aria Group, Juilliard), Bernard Goldberg (Pittsburgh Symphony), Arthur Lora (Juilliard), George Morey (Professor, North Texas State University), Quinto Maganini, Carmine Coppola, and George Possell. [George Morey continued his studies with Georges Laurent at the New England Conservatory and with William Kincaid at the Curtis Institute.]

In the generation that preceded these flutists, however, Barrère taught a talented young man who had a profound and widespread affect on flute playing in the United States; William Kincaid (1895-1967) studied with Barrère at the Institute of the Arts from 1911 to 1914. Although Kincaid was thoroughly grounded by Barrère in the French school, he soon developed his own vigorous, unique style, which became known throughout the world because Kincaid was first flutist with the Philadelphia Orchestra from 1921 to 1960. Kincaid displayed a brilliant, silvery sound in an orchestra noted for its sensitive dynamics, big sound, and ensemble precision (6).

For many years William Kincaid was synonymous with the flute in the United States; he was America's first virtuoso. Through his teaching at the Curtis Institute and his solo performances with the Philadelphia Orchestra, his influence on American flutists was enormous.
Kincaid's pupils and his pupils' students are in fine orchestras and higher institutions of learning throughout the United States. The words of John Krell, a Kincaid student and member of the Philadelphia Orchestra, amount to a consensus of opinion.

To a great degree, he was responsible for developing a robust style that might be called the American school of flute playing (6, p. vii).

Thus a distinctive American style developed from the French school of flute playing. This was surely Georges Barrère's greatest contribution.

Georges Laurent, 1886-1964

Several French woodwind players were established in American orchestras, particularly in Boston, by the time that Georges Laurent emigrated in 1919 (8). France had become the leading country in the production of fine woodwind performers due to the efforts of Charles Lefebvre, Philippe Gaubert, Louis Bas, Georges Gillet, Paul Taffanel, and others.

Laurent studied with Taffanel only a few years before the older man's death; he was awarded the first prize by a unanimous vote for a performance of the Andante and Scherzo by his contemporary, Louis Ganne (3, p. 200). Laurent graduated with first prize under Taffanel in 1905, but he continued to study with Philippe Gaubert.

In addition to the Société des Concerts orchestra, Laurent played in the Colonne orchestra under Gabriel Pierné
and in the Monte Carlo orchestra under Louis Ganne. His career was interrupted by World War I, during which he served in a military hospital. The long French tradition of exempting musicians kept him out of the front line of duty.

As first flutist of the Société des Concerts, Laurent traveled to the United States in 1918 on a concert tour. Conductor Pierre Monteux heard the young flutist and offered him first chair of the Boston Symphony. Laurent accepted and arrived the following year to take up his duties with the orchestra.

In addition to playing in the Boston Symphony, Laurent taught in the New England Conservatory, and he was active in forming musical organizations. In 1921, he founded the Boston Flute Players Club. The group lapsed into inactivity during World War II, but it was later reestablished. Laurent took an active role in the group's activities, and as late as 1951 he conducted its members in concert (2, p. 5). Laurent, like Taffanel, was interested in early music. He founded the Boston Society of Ancient Instruments that performed on authentic instruments such as the viola d'amore, viola da gamba, harpsichord, and flute.

Laurent as a Teacher

Laurent gave private lessons at the New England Conservatory during the school term. In summers, students from all parts of the United States sought to study with him. He was a capable, conscientious teacher, concerned with helping
the student to develop sound practice techniques and a solid background. Laurent emphasized important standard solos, including the Bach Sonatas, Mozart Concertos, and Andersen etudes. He also had a preference for nineteenth century Conservatoire works, such as the solos of Tulou and Demerssemann. In his teaching, he concentrated on the complications of a work rather than performance level (8).

Like Barrère, Laurent was not specific or articulate in the matters of sound production; "he did very little analyzing and very little explanation [sic]," recalled James Pappoutsakis (4, p. 16), who taught at the New England Conservatory until 1979. Pappoutsakis described a lesson with Laurent in these words,

The procedure would be this--you'd go in; he'd greet you and it was always formal, never by first name or anything like that, and you would begin by playing four pages of scales, and he'd make some remark such as, "Good, but watch the intonation." You'd play a four page Andersen and he'd say, "One mistake is all right but two, you don't know it yet." But at the end of the lesson, he would pick up his flute and play perhaps eight bars or so, and you'd walk out in a trance, it was so gorgeous! So beautiful! (4, p. 16).

In Pappoutsakis' student days, the early 1930s, verbal analysis from the teacher had not yet developed. Pappoutsakis explains that

. . . when I studied, a student was afraid to ask questions for fear that he would be thought of as being without talent . . . . If you asked what the tongue did or [asked] about the column of air, they'd say, "Perhaps you don't have natural talent." But since then we've gone into a great deal of analysis--sometimes I wonder if it isn't too much (4, p. 16).
Pappoutsakis believes that Laurent's lack of precise analytical criticism forced the student to think harder in order to discover what the French teacher meant and what was needed to improve one's playing. "You went home thinking, 'Well, he said the staccato wasn't good but he didn't say whether it was too hard or too soft.' You explored and explored until you found it" (4, p. 16).

Laurent's Style of Playing

Laurent had a beautiful tone, very pure and limpid, that was modeled after the sound of his teachers, Gaubert and Taffanel (9, p. 30). George Morey says,

His tone had a very fragile sound, yet was pointed and focused, with a wonderful floating quality. It made me think of Prelude to the Afternoon of a Faun and La Mer. His was the kind of sound I would like to hear in these works (8).

Although verbal analysis was completely alien to Laurent's manner, a more recent writer tried to analyze the Frenchman's sound in modern terminology. Roger Mather believes that the key to Laurent's playing was his fine development of embouchure control. To give his tone "life," Mather asserts, Laurent used a lot of air speed. The Boston flutist's playing was "full of feeling and verve, never at the expense of control." Laurent also had a rapid vibrato that was well-integrated into his tone (9, p. 30).

Laurent's tone projected, but it was personal rather than orchestral in concept (8). During the years that Laurent was first flute in the Boston Symphony (1919-1952), William
Kincaid's star was rising in Philadelphia; Kincaid, with his bigger, more orchestral sound, began to eclipse the Frenchman. The Philadelphian's influence diverted many American flutists toward a different, bolder concept and away from the more intimate French style.
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CHAPTER VIII

A SUMMATION OF THE CHARACTERISTICS AND CONTRIBUTIONS
OF THE CONSERVATOIRE FLUTISTS

Since the early nineteenth century, the main emphasis in French flute playing has been on phrasing and the development of a brilliant, fluid tone, rather than on volume. As evidenced by the meticulously-detailed methods, technique was always stressed. Articulation tended to be slightly different from that of other countries because of the French pronunciation of the syllable "tu." Placing the tongue on the teeth was advocated at different times. There is some evidence that Devienne approved this technique, but it was not espoused by Hugot and Wunderlich a few years later in 1804. At the present time, Conservatoire Professor Jean-Pierre Rampal states that the tongue should be placed "very close to the opening between the teeth" but not "between the lips" (9, p. 5).

The French flutists did not teach vibrato during the nineteenth century. Even today it is a sensitive area. Rampal says,

It is very difficult to speak about vibrato because vibrato is something that should be natural. If you must practice it, it is unnatural (9, p. 6).

The key word in Rampal's statement is "natural" because it describes the approach the French tend to take with respect
to expressive playing, vibrato, and interpretation. Detailed verbal analysis is not the Gallic way, although this does not mean that the French do not understand molecular properties of tubing, air velocity, focused air streams, and other terms in the current vocabulary.

It is easy to see that the French manner of communicating ideas through demonstration, gestures, analogies, and colorful imagery evolved from the nineteenth century virtuoso style (3; 4; 5; 7). What factors contributed to such a unified approach to flute playing and to the unique French style that continues to the present day?

One can discuss general national characteristics, but the truly significant answer lies in the continuous, powerful influence of the national Conservatoire. Looking back, the most striking fact is that, without exception, each flute professor was a graduate and first prize winner of the Conservatoire; this policy continues to the present time, and even allowing for individual differences, it undoubtedly contributes to a continuity that forges a strong unity of style and ideas. Serving at the national Conservatoire has always been an honored calling, a position of great distinction. Branches of the national Conservatoire were established during the nineteenth century in various parts of France, but the parent school in Paris continues to be the most influential.
Each professor brought to the position his experience as a performer in the many theaters, orchestras, and chamber ensembles of Paris. They all played in the Paris Opéra orchestra, as well as those of other operas, an experience that gave them an understanding and appreciation of the voice; this greatly influenced their approach to the flute, and it resulted in a fluid, vocal, often decorative style.

Most of the professors also performed outside France, touring as soloists or with an ensemble, adding to the reputation of the Conservatoire. Such active concertizing is largely responsible for the elevation of the concert flutist to a level comparable to that of the violinist or pianist.

Each professor produced methods of instruction that have varying degrees of value, but all are arduously thorough; they reveal a consistent, serious approach to guidance and toward the total development of the flutists' abilities for a professional career. The Daily Exercises portion of the Taffanel-Gaubert method continues to "constitute a bible of technique for the conscientious flutist" (2, p. 25). The melodious etudes of Henri Altes are still important to the repertoire (3), and the duets from Devienne's method are widely popular with young flutists.

A strong national conservatoire, steeped in tradition, offers an endowment of pride and prestige to students and faculty alike. The drawbacks, however, of such unified solidarity are that a lack of ideas from outside sources can
result in a static style, ingrown methods, and overconfidence which is not balanced with objectivity. Any institution, weighed down with years of tradition and customs, could be resistant to growth and change. It is true that the conservatism of the school in the last decades of the previous century contributed to the development of other institutions (such as the Schola Cantorum) which were oriented to meet different needs. With respect to the flute, however, the shallow sameness of the repertoire and performance practices all over Europe during the nineteenth century indicates that stagnation was not limited to France.

The challenge of new ideas ultimately affected the Paris institution through the young men who, sensitively seeking to improve the quality of performance, brought their skills into the Conservatoire. The talented, exploring generation of Paul Taffanel exerted a positive, long-lasting influence on the national school. The confident and exploring efforts of the men of this era fostered an improved national style of wind playing that gave impetus to the general growth and development of musicianship in other countries, particularly the United States.

Currently, such national solidarity of style has been healthily challenged by the availability of recordings and televised concerts of flutists from many nations. While several fine European conservatories existed in the last century, the present advanced state of travel and communication
renders a more effective challenge to the Paris school today from such institutions in Europe and the United States.

The activities and power of the Conservatoire also influenced composers. Certainly the French flutists shared in the negative influence on composers during much of the nineteenth century. However, the efforts and organizations of Paul Taffanel and his contemporaries and the flutists emerging from Taffanel's studio prompted composers to write once again for the flute. The number of important works by major composers inspired by or dedicated to individual Conservatoire flutists and their ensembles is impressive. One can point to the Ibert Concerto, dedicated to Marcel Moyse, *Density 21.5* by Edgar Varese, written for Georges Barrère, and Debussy's *Syrinx*, dedicated to Louis Fleury. Many fine works were written expressly for the Concours du Prix of the Conservatoire.

The Concours du Prix, the annual competitive examination in which all students strive to participate, embodies and exemplifies many of the traditions so unique to the Paris Conservatoire. Since its beginning years, the Paris Conservatoire has held a yearly performance examination (usually during the summer months), the Concours du Prix. Generally, students must attend classes for one academic year and pass a preliminary examination before participating in the Concours.

The jury (judges) consists of eight or nine professors and distinguished musicians from outside the school, presided
over by the director of the Conservatoire; a teacher may not sit on the jury for his own students. After the performances, the jury retires to cast secret ballots; prizes are awarded by majority vote. The prizes include first, second, and first and second accessits (honorable mention or encouragement awards). In any category, more than one student can win the same prize. A coveted honor is the Unanimity first prize that is awarded when all the judges vote for the same student. Unlike other music schools, the Paris Conservatoire does not regard its students as honorably graduated until a first prize is won, although a student may leave without winning a first, as many have done.

The earliest recorded winner of a first prize in flute was in 1797. The prizes have varied throughout the years, consisting of money, musical instruments, music, or for the accessit winners, medals of silver or bronze. According to Conservatoire records of 1817 (the first year that a specific award is mentioned for flute), the first prize consisted of 100 francs to be used for the purchase of a flute. The second prize was music valued at fifty francs (6, pp. 321-625).

As early as 1797, distinguished officials attended and took part in the proceedings, emphasizing the government's control and connection with the school. In that year the Minister of the Interior was asked to make a speech and award the prizes. The following year, the Council of the Minister of the Interior approved an allotment of 4,000 francs to be distributed in prizes (6, pp. 132-134).
Through the early years, the solos were chosen (and often composed) by the professor with the approval of the Director of the Conservatoire and a committee; more recently, however, the composition has been chosen by a committee. The same work is performed by each student of a particular instrument.

Since the late 1800s, compositions by contemporary composers other than the flute professors have been chosen (6, p. 625). In addition, each student is asked to sightread a new solo. It is uncertain when the sightreading requirement was added although it has been in practice at least since 1876 (1).

In more recent years, the students have had to perform a solo from the Baroque or Classical period as well as a contemporary work. If the contemporary selection is newly-composed, it is one especially commissioned for the occasion, either by a promising young composer or a more established one. The students are given the solo only four weeks before the Concours (3).

The entire procedure of the Concours is characterized by an aura of gravity, tradition, and formality. The Director of the Conservatoire rings a bell to begin the sessions, then formally greets the student who is properly attired for the occasion. The student then performs for the jury and audience (the Concours is open to the public, by admission). The audience, charged with anticipation and keen interest,
often contains conductors and composers as well as competing students and other interested persons. The Concours therefore serves at once as the premiere of a new work and as an informal audition leading to possible future employment for some of the fortunate students (3).

The decisions of the jury are announced after all students of a particular instrument have performed. If the audience does not agree with the committee's choices, it does not hesitate to express objections with boos or hissing (3). After announcing the first prize winners, the newly-created openings for each instrument are posted.

Student performances are well-rehearsed with accompanists who are employed by the school on a yearly basis. As a result, the students bring to the examination a high degree of ensemble, unusual for a college-level jury. In the face of the intense pressure of performing before such an important audience, and the effect that the outcome could have on their future careers, the thoroughly-rehearsed performance is vital to the student (3).

No other school offers such a momentous examination, which is designed to be a potential entrance into a professional career. Through the Concours du Prix, the Conservatoire fulfills the purpose of its existence—to provide the expert training and challenging experiences that prepare talented students for performing careers. The Conservatoire continues to produce aspiring virtuoso flutists who seek
"to communicate to the world outside the most exclusive nuances, the thousand inflexions of the music with its infinite variety" (8, p. 185).
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APPENDIX I

A CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD OF FLUTISTS
DESCENDING FROM THE FRENCH SCHOOL*

Michel Blavet (1700-1768)
Felix Rault (1736-1800)

Devienne (1759-1803)  Coche  Alétès
Guillou (1787-1853)  (1806-1881)  (1826-1899)
Dorus (1812-1896)  Wunderlich  Adolphe Hennebains
Taffanel (1844-1908)  (1862-1915)

Moyse  Fleury  Barrère  Gaubert  Laurent
(1889- ) (1878-1926)  (1876-1944)  (1879-1941)  (1886-1964)

Wummer  Baron  Morey  Kincaid  Goldberg

Joseph Mariano**  John Krell  James Pellerite
Eastman  Philadelphia  * U. Indiana
Doriot A. Dwyer  Albert Tipton**  Robert Cole
Boston  Detroit  U. Wisconsin
Julius Baker  Elaine Shaffer***
New York  recitalist  George Morey
Robert Willoughby  Maurice Sharp
Oberlin  Cleveland  N. Tex. State
Harold Bennett  Kenton Terry**
Philadelphia  Donald Peck
Kenton Terry**  Philadelphia  Chicago

*partially based on Girard, p. 69.
**retired
***deceased
------ = principal teacher
----- = secondary teacher
### APPENDIX II

**SOLOS OF THE ANNUAL CONCOURS DU PRIX***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Solo</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>5th Concerto</td>
<td>Berbiguier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Grand Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Grand Concerto</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>6th Grand Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Concerto</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Grand Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>10th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>11th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>12th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>13th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>14th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>13th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Fantaisie, No. 99</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>11th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Fantaisie sur Marco Spada</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>13th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>12th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Fantaisie</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>13th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Plaisir d'amour, Op. 107</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>15th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>5th Concerto**</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Altès</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Grand Concerto Pathetique**</td>
<td>Lindpaintner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>3rd Grand Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Concertino de C. G. Reissiger**</td>
<td>Dorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Fantaisie sur des airs Ecossais</td>
<td>Boehm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>4th Concerto**</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Concertino</td>
<td>Briccialdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>13th Concerto</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>12th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>2nd Solo</td>
<td>Altès</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Only a portion of the work was performed.
### APPENDIX II--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Solo</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1st Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>6th Solo</td>
<td>Altès</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>3rd Solo in A Major</td>
<td>Altès</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>4th Solo in A Major</td>
<td>Altès</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>2nd Solo in G Major</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>3rd Solo in D Major</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1st Solo</td>
<td>Altès</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>5th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>6th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>8th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>7th Solo</td>
<td>Altès</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>4th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>8th Solo</td>
<td>Altès</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>5th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>9th Solo</td>
<td>Altès</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1st Solo</td>
<td>Demersseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>10th Solo</td>
<td>Altès</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>11th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>3rd Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>2nd Solo</td>
<td>Demersseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>7th Solo</td>
<td>Tulou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>8th Solo in A Minor</td>
<td>Altès</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Concerto in G Minor</td>
<td>Langer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Morceau de Concert</td>
<td>Andersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>6th Solo in F</td>
<td>Demersseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>2nd Solo de Concert in G Minor</td>
<td>Andersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Fantaisie</td>
<td>Fauré</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Concertino</td>
<td>Duvernoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>6th Solo</td>
<td>Demersseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Andante et Scherzo</td>
<td>Ganne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Concertino, Op. 107</td>
<td>Chaminade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Ballade</td>
<td>Perilhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Cantabile et Presto</td>
<td>Enesco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Andante et Scherzo</td>
<td>Ganne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Nocturne et Allegro Scherzando</td>
<td>Gaubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Andante Pastoral et Scherzettino</td>
<td>Taffanel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Prelude et Scherzo, Op. 35</td>
<td>Busser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Eglogue, Op. 29</td>
<td>Mouquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Ballade</td>
<td>Perilhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>A La Kasbah</td>
<td>Georges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Information for years 1901-1974 compiled by Dr. George Morey, Professor of Flute, and Myrna Brown, D.M.A. candidate, North Texas State University.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Solo</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Dans La Forêt enchantée</td>
<td>Moreau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Fantaisie</td>
<td>Hue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Sicilienne et Burlesque</td>
<td>Casella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Sicilienne, Op. 60</td>
<td>Busser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Fantaisie</td>
<td>Fauré</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Promenade et Danse</td>
<td>Bachelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Concerto in D, 1st movement</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Theme and Variations</td>
<td>Busser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Fantaisie</td>
<td>Gaubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Cantabile et Presto</td>
<td>Enesco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Introduction et Allegro</td>
<td>Aubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Nocturne et Allegro Scherzando</td>
<td>Gaubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Incantation et Danse</td>
<td>Delmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Nocturne et Allegro Scherzando</td>
<td>Gaubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Andante et Allegro</td>
<td>d'Ilone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Romance et Scherzo</td>
<td>Grovlez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Ballade</td>
<td>Gaubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Premiere Tempo du Concerto en D (Taffanel cadenza)</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerto</td>
<td>Langer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Divertissement Pastoral</td>
<td>Mazillier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Cantabile et Presto</td>
<td>Enesco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Andalucia</td>
<td>Busser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Concerto, 3rd movement</td>
<td>Ibert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Ode à Marsyas</td>
<td>Le Boucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Prelude et Scherzo, Op. 35</td>
<td>Busser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Concerto in D, 1st movement</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Andante et Scherzo</td>
<td>Ganne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Agrestide, Op. 44</td>
<td>Bozza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Sonatine</td>
<td>Dutilleux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Chant de Linos</td>
<td>Jolivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Concertino</td>
<td>Tomasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Sonatine</td>
<td>Sancan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Fantaisiestück</td>
<td>Martelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Andante et Scherzo</td>
<td>Brun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Sonate en cinq Parts</td>
<td>Migot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Impromptu</td>
<td>Pepin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Concertino</td>
<td>Szalowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Le merle Noir</td>
<td>Messiaen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Diptyque</td>
<td>Rueff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Concertino</td>
<td>Boutry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Divertissement</td>
<td>Gallois-Montbrun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Solo</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Pastorale d'Arcadie</td>
<td>Brun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Improvisation et Rondo</td>
<td>Gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Prelude et Scherzo, Op. 35</td>
<td>Busser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Introduzione e Allegro, Op. 40</td>
<td>Cortese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Variations sur un Tanka</td>
<td>Chaynes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Petite Suite</td>
<td>Petit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Concertino dell' Amicizia</td>
<td>Aubin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Sonate</td>
<td>Hugon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Ballade</td>
<td>Rivier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Idylle</td>
<td>Hubeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Chant de Parthenope</td>
<td>Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Movement choregraphique</td>
<td>Bondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Chaconne</td>
<td>Merlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Concerto in G Major</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Pour Flute et un Instrument</td>
<td>Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K. 315 and K. 84</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Sonata in A Minor</td>
<td>Bach, J. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Esquisse</td>
<td>Charpentier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Concerto in C</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Silhouette</td>
<td>Gartenlaub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Concerto in D</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Pantomime</td>
<td>Brenet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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