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Paul Robert Fauchet's Symphonie pour Musique d'Harmonie, known in the United States as Symphony in B-flat, is a four-movement composition spanning nearly thirty minutes in length and written in the style of the late romantic composers. Despite its place as one of the first symphonies for wind band, a performance of the piece that represents the composer's 1926 orchestration is difficult due to the inclusion of instruments that are no longer in common practice, including bugles, alto horns, and saxhorns. Later American editions of the work by James Robert Gillette (1933) and Frank Campbell-Watson (1948/1949) replaced these instruments, but also took several other liberties with orchestration and voicing. The primary purpose of this study was the creation of a performance edition of the Symphony for modern wind band that is accessible to a larger audience of performers and listeners. The method involved in creating the modern edition eliminates errors of extant editions and clarifies a number of the discrepancies surrounding the symphony's multiple publications. This edition attempts to retain the composer's voicing and orchestration choices. To accomplish this, the present project considered where modern instrumentation differed from the original sources and attempted to balance timbral similarities between those instruments, while also considering ease of comprehension for a modern ensemble to perform the work. Sources used to create this edition included all published editions of scores and parts, as well as a newly created full score of the 1926 printed parts. The study concludes with the inclusion of the full score of the new performance edition.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background and Significance

Paul Robert Fauchet’s *Symphonie pour Musique d’Harmonie*, known in the United States as Symphony in B-flat, is a four-movement composition spanning nearly thirty minutes in length and written in the style of the late romantic composers. Editions Musicales Buffet-Crampon published the first printed edition in 1926, and since that publication, two other editions of the work have been published. Unfortunately, little is known about the origin of this composition for the wind band and no written account of a premiere performance has been discovered. The purpose of this study is to shed further light on the history of the composition and, through research of the symphony and its numerous printed editions, create a performance edition that is available to a larger audience of performers and listeners.

Most published materials about the Symphony state that it was premiered by and composed for the famed Garde Républicaine Band under the direction of Guillaume Balay.\(^1\) Supporting this postulation is the fact that the 1926 publication called for an almost identical instrumentation to that of the Garde Républicaine Band during the same period.

For nearly seventy years the Symphony remained virtually unknown in its native France.\(^2\) Fauchet’s contemporaries overshadowed him as a composer and, although he was successful in France as a teacher and organist, little remains of his large-scale works, with the Symphony for band likely being his most expansive composition. Six years after the first

---


publication of the Symphony, the work became highly regarded in the United States when James Robert Gillette, conductor of the Carleton College Symphony Band in Northfield, Minnesota, arranged the first and fourth movements of the work in 1932/33. Gillette programmed the movements extensively on a tour of the Midwest. The tour included performances in a number of cities throughout Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana, with notable concerts in Grand Rapids and at Orchestra Hall in Chicago. Frank Campbell-Watson later arranged the middle two movements that were published by M. Witmark & Sons in 1948 and 1949.

Gillette’s arrangement of the first and fourth movements of Fauchet’s Symphony, and his subsequent tours with the Carleton Symphony Band, helped expose American audiences to the work. Gillette was a highly regarded band director during his tenure at Carleton College from 1923 to 1937 and an early pioneer of the wind ensemble concept. Early wind-band leaders Edwin Franko Goldman and Frederick Fennell praised Gillette’s contributions to the field. Goldman, while guest conducting in Skinner Memorial Chapel at Carleton College on November 13, 1932, told the audience that, “without question, the Carleton Symphony Band was the greatest college band in America, which meant, in the world.” Frederick Fennell, founder of the Eastman Wind Ensemble and an influential figure in the history of the wind band, wrote about Gillette:

...Off to the north, in Northfield, Minnesota, James. R. Gillette (born May 30, 1886) was finding the time amidst duties as chapel organist at Carleton College to develop his personal musical interest, the Carleton College Symphony Band. As its conductor he had brought this trim little group of 40 some players to a high point of performance

---

3 “Carleton Band to Leave for Concert Tour,” Carletonian (Northfield, MN) LIII, no. 23, January 21, 1933.
perfection, finding many of the players who would become students at the top-rated liberal arts school during his visits in summer to that eternal well spring called Interlochen. It was Gillette who gave us the name “Symphony Band,” later adopted by me and by William D. Revelli and others as the name of the groups we would conduct.5

Highlighting the importance of Fauchet’s Symphony to early band conductors, Fennell also provided the following statement about Gillette:

Gillette was also a composer and a transcriber, as well as an enterprising promoter of the Symphony Band idea. He began the publication of a series of symphonic transcriptions by convincing M. Witmark to publish his edition for American instrumentation of the French original of Paul Fauchet’s pioneer three-movement *Symphony in Bb for Band*, believed to be the first work published in this form. Gillette had opened the publisher’s door to an expanded instrumentation and had given the band another name; yet the man and all traces of his work seem unfortunately to have vanished.6

Gillette advertised the premiere of the American edition of the Symphony during the Carleton Symphony Band 1933 concert tour. The first performance of Gillette’s edition was most likely held on Monday, January 16, 1933 at a preview concert at West High School in Minnesota. A contemporary review of the concert cites there was “a small but enthusiastic audience” with the Carleton Symphony Band “presenting the program which they will use on the February tour.”7

Another review of the tour on February 18, 1933, at the Civic Auditorium in Grand Rapids, Michigan, stated that the performance was part of a benefit concert for the “needy people in Grand Rapids,” sponsored by William A. Jack and the emergency relief committee.8

There were two performances at this event, an afternoon concert, primarily for children, and an

---

6 Ibid., 29.
7 “Carleton Band to Leave for Concert Tour,” *Carletonian* (Northfield, MN) LIII, no. 23, January 21, 1933.
evening concert for a general audience. Reviews of this performance highlighted the fact that Gillette had performed three movements of the Symphony on his concert tours, even though Gillette only published arrangements of the first and fourth movements. The following reviews highlight critical reception of the work’s early performances:

The most interesting of all the numbers... was the “Symphony in B Flat (Militaire),” in three movements, by French operatic composer, Paul Fauchey... The Carleton Band is playing the symphony for the first time in the United States this season.

The first movement, “Maestoso—Allegro très décide,” which partakes in a general way of the overture form, is indeed majestic, with plenty of color and a persistent, exciting, almost hortatory throb.

“Lentement,” the second movement, with its mood of remoteness and delicate passages, was played with admirable sensitiveness.

The last movement, “Allegro Vivace,” is a return to the melodic robustness of the first part with an added briskness and swelling of tone.⁹

These contemporary reviews, along with Fennell’s previously mentioned comments about the symphony, refer to Gillette’s performances of the work as containing only three movements. These statements unfortunately typify the confusion that often surrounds the Symphony. At the time of the premiere, Gillette had only discovered scores for the first and fourth movements, but was anxious to be the first in America to perform the work. Donald I. Moore, the first horn in the Carleton Symphony Band from 1929-1933, commented on these discrepancies:

[Gillette] composed a middle movement, which he called “Lentement.” He did not indicate on the program that it was not Fauchet’s, and several critics acclaimed it as the “most musical of the movements.” I recall that Mr. Gillette asked the band members not to reveal the secret, and it is very interesting to note that when the two inner movements by Fauchet were later found and published there was little or no notice

---

taken of the discrepancy. ¹⁰

M. Witmark later published the work Gillette composed and advertised as the second movement of the Symphony under the title *Vistas*. The manuscript for *Vistas*, as well as originally published parts, are located in the James Robert Gillette archives at Carleton College. Additional research on this early work for wind band is certainly warranted, particularly given the critical acclaim the piece received during the time.

The following year, Gillette again planned to perform Fauchet’s Symphony on tour. An article in the November 29, 1933 publication of *The Carletonian*, Carleton College’s school newspaper, noted that Gillette and the Carleton Symphony Band would perform Fauchet’s Symphony with both the second and third movements listed on the program. The third movement “scherzo” was listed correctly by name, but the second movement remained listed under the title “Lentement” instead of Fauchet’s original title, “Nocturne.”¹¹ The James Robert Gillette archives provide a possible answer to this discrepancy. The archives contain Gillette’s personal copies of the Symphony’s 1926 scores for the first and fourth movements, as well as hand-transcribed instrument parts that the Carleton Symphony Band members used for performances. The same do not exist for the second or third movements. It is possible that Gillette hoped to perform all four movements during the fall tour and advertised the full symphony in advance, but was not able to accomplish the task in time. Gillette unexpectedly resigned from Carleton College in 1937, having become increasingly discouraged by the lack of financial support from the college and subsequent drop in quality of the ensemble.¹² He took a

¹¹ “Band Concert to be Given Next Sunday,” *Carletonian* (Northfield, MN) LIV, no. 9, November 29, 1933.
position as an organist in Lake Forest, Illinois and apparently, and unfortunately, disconnected himself from the wind band community.

The middle two movements, “nocturne” and “scherzo,” were eventually transcribed and published in 1948 and 1949 by Frank Campbell-Watson. A note in the score of the second movement states, “with the publication of this, the second movement of the Symphony, the entire work is now available in an American edition.” With these releases, the first and fourth movements that Gillette arranged also appear to have received a second printing, correcting some of the errors from the original publication. The movements of the Symphony continued to be distributed and sold separately even after all four movements were completed.

The arranger for these two middle movements, Frank Campbell-Watson, was the music editor for New World Music and a classically trained organist. He studied organ with Karl Straube and composition with Max Reger in Leipzig. As an arranger, he is perhaps best known for his association with the works of George Gershwin. He orchestrated the most commonly performed editions of Gershwin’s *An American in Paris* and Concerto in F for Piano and Orchestra. He also oversaw other projects involving Gershwin’s library. Campbell-Watson is viewed controversially by a number of Gershwin’s biographers, and was often condemned for his editorial liberties and criticism of Gershwin’s instrumentation choices. Ira Gershwin, George Gershwin’s brother, questioned Campbell-Watson’s editorial credibility when he eventually appealed to the publishers after George’s death upon discovering that many of his brother’s

---

scores had been “tampered with” prior to publication. Campbell-Watson’s editorial liberties are present throughout his edition of the middle movements of Fauchet’s Symphony as well.

By necessity, the Gillette and Campbell-Watson editions of Fauchet’s Symphony required rescoring due to the different instrumentation of the American and French bands. The “Instrumentation” chapter of this study provides further details on the orchestration differences between the three printed editions of the Symphony. Gillette and Campbell-Watson set the movements for American band instrumentation of the era that did not include the additional brass commonly found in French bands from the time period. These instruments primarily included the saxhorn family. Saxhorns were brass instruments manufactured by Adolf Sax starting in the 1840s. The instruments were pitched in E-flat and B-flat and built in differing sizes to create a soprano, alto, tenor, and bass family of instruments. Sax did not “invent” these instruments as many of them had been around Europe during this time period, although they were often listed by different names such as the Altohorn, tenor horn, and basstuba.

Unfortunately, beyond these necessary changes, the editions strayed from the composer’s original scoring in other ways as well. In one particular example, Fauchet began the opening twelve measures of the second movement, “Nocturne,” with a tutti clarinet statement that Campbell-Watson rescored for solo horn in F.

While many of these re-orchestrations were due to the far smaller American brass sections of the time, others, such as the horn/clarinet substitution, appear to be personal.

---

choices of the arrangers. This is not surprising, as both Gillette and Campbell-Watson held
strong opinions in regard to large ensemble orchestration. Gillette published a number of
articles on instrumentation and ensemble balance in educational journals such as The School
Musician, while Campbell-Watson has been portrayed by many Gershwin biographers as
someone that “took it upon himself to revise (by which he meant improve) [Gershwin’s]
concert works.” The American edition therefore was integral to the survival of Fauchet’s
Symphony, but it was not an edition that held true to the composer’s original orchestration
concept of the work.

Beyond orchestration changes, the introductory notes of Gillette and Campbell-
Watson’s editions also contain two unfortunate attributions. One states, “to Paul Fauchet, born
in 1858, goes the distinction of having written, so far as has been ascertained, the first
Symphony for band.” Jon Mitchell notes in a 1985 Journal of Band Research article that this
unfortunately neglects Berlioz’s Symphonie Funèbre et Triomphale, Op. 50 (1840), and Francois
Gossec’s Symphonie Militaire (1793-94). Gossec’s Symphony was likely just becoming familiar to
the American band world at the time. It wasn’t until 1933 that Richard Franko Goldman and
Roger Smith “rediscovered” and edited their edition of Gossec’s Symphony. An additional
oversight is Anton Reicha’s Commemoration Symphony (c. 1808).

However, the rather shocking oversight is that James Robert Gillette himself wrote three
Symphonies for band while working at Carleton College. The Symphonies, likely overlooked
because they were unpublished, were: Symphony: “Four Attributes” (1928), Symphony No. 1:
“Pagan” (1932), and Symphony No. 2 (1933). Ronald Rodman, Professor of Music at Carleton College and current Director of the Carleton Symphony Band, has provided significant historical information on these symphonies and also recorded the works.

The second unfortunate statement from the score’s introductory notes reads:

“Fauchet’s First Symphony in B-flat, according to the strict meaning of the word, is not actually a symphony, but rather a Suite of four movements – an Overture, Nocturne, Scherzo and Finale.” Analysis of the Symphony reveals that the work more correctly fits under the category of a symphony, not a suite, as the program note suggests. Though the first movement is entitled “Overture,” it is written in sonata form, containing an introduction, repeated exposition, development, recapitulation, and coda. The middle movements, “Nocturne” and “Scherzo,” are typical of the symphony genre. Additionally, the “Finale” is a sonatina form.

Wallace Berry’s text, *Form in Music*, defines a suite as “almost all sets of pieces mainly in forms smaller than those of the sonata” and regarding the use of the term suite in recent periods, he notes that they are “…consisting of movements which lack the expansive and vigorous thematic manipulations and tonal fluctuations of the sonata.” Fauchet’s Symphony certainly does not fall under this definition of a suite. Totaling 373 measures, the first movement is certainly expansive, and the 124-measure development (mm. 178-302) contains both thematic manipulation and tonal fluctuations. Tonally, the recapitulation of the first movement resolves with a tonic realization of the movement’s secondary theme (mm. 317-341), also a typical characteristic of sonata form.

---

In 2010, Editions Alphonse Leduc and Editions Robert Martin in France co-edited a new publication of the Symphony as the first work in their *Prestige de la Musique Française* collection. The stated purpose of this new edition was to “provide a renaissance to this neglected piece for as many orchestras as possible as this piece is an example of the French musical heritage for wind instruments and in doing so, to rediscover the original French composer’s intentions regarding sonority.”

The instrumentation of this edition is almost identical to Fauchet’s 1926 printed score and parts, maintaining the saxhorns. Primary work on the project was lead by Miguel Etchegoncelay, in collaboration with Félix Hauswirth. Etchegoncelay obtained the 1926 parts and created a new edition that remains faithful to Fauchet’s publication, while cleaning up many of the errors that appear in the 1926 printed parts and score. The program notes in the score indicate that the work can be performed by a contemporary wind band without the use of saxhorns, and also lists a number of *ad libitum* parts that allow for performance of the piece if those instruments cannot be found. Primary concerns when performing this edition with a contemporary wind band include the E-flat alto horn parts and the Baryton 1 and 2 parts, all members of the saxhorn family. More details for each edition of the symphony will be discussed later in this presentation.

---

State of Research

This study revealed a number of discrepancies to the state of research for both the symphony itself and Paul Fauchet. Bibliographical information on Fauchet is limited in both America and his native France. He is most widely known in American literature due to the Symphony in B-flat, and in France he was primarily known as a teacher at the Paris Conservatory and composer of organ music.

The most extensive biography on Fauchet exists in the program notes for the 2010 Robert Martin edition of the *Symphonie pour Musique d’Harmonie*. The notes, written by François Dru, outline Fauchet’s academic career and accomplishments, as well as bring to light several of his other works, in particular his instrumental pieces.\(^{24}\) Dru, who worked directly with Editions Robert Martin in collecting historical information on Fauchet and his Symphony, researched these materials directly from the Paris National Conservatory Archives.\(^{25}\)

Regarding the symphony itself, the state of research is blurred, in part, due to the three separate publications the piece has received since its 1926 premiere. Until 2010, the most readily available edition of the symphony was the American publication, compiled by Gillette and Campbell-Watson. Individual parts for the 1926 publication can be found in a number of European band libraries, but no full score of that edition was created, a typical publication practice of the time.

Research concluded that the only readily available score of Fauchet’s 1926 publication


was a two to five-stave reduction transposed in B-flat, a standard practice in early twentieth-century European band scores. Research for this study included collecting condensed scores for each of the 1926 edition’s four movements and copies of the printed parts for each instrument. The scores and parts were primarily collected from three sources: the Portuguese National Republican Guard Band, the production manager of the Orchestre de la Region Centre in Orleans, France, and the James Robert Gillette Archives at Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota. Similar to the research for this study, the staff of Editions Robert Martin collected the 1926 printed parts and score from other European libraries to piece together their 2010 edition of the Symphony.

There are still many mysteries surrounding the origin of the Symphony and, unfortunately, there are few published articles regarding the piece. Prior to the 2010 edition by Editions Robert Martin, only two published articles on the Symphony were discovered in France. One was a 2007 article in *Le Journal del la Confédération Musicale de France* by Francis Pieters, former president of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles (WASBE). In the article, Pieters primarily cites American sources for information such as an article in the 1985 *Journal of Band Research* by Jon C. Mitchell. When contacted via email, Pieters stated that he was only aware of two printed articles regarding the Symphony: Jon Mitchell’s *Journal of Band Research* article, and an extract by Ronald Rodman from *Eine Publikation der Internationalen Gesellschaft zur Erforschung und Förderung der Blasmusik.*

The other French article that refers to the Symphony is an homage to Paul Fauchet,

---

27 Ibid, e-mail message to author, July 30, 2010.
published shortly after his death in 1937 by his former student at the Paris Conservatory, Pierre Dupont. The article, entitled *Pieux Hommage à Paul Fauchet*, was published in the journal *Musique et Concours* in November of 1937. Essentially an obituary, Dupont primarily states sentiments about Fauchet’s impact as a teacher on his students, though he does make a short note about the Symphony and briefly mentions an analysis of the work that was previously published in the same periodical (*Musique et Concours*).

The recent discovery of a study score for the 1926 edition published in the 1920s has revealed a handwritten note in one of the margins referencing this article and listing its publication as volume number 37 of *Musique & Concours* (Figure 1). The French National Library contains a holding for the journal *Musique & Concours*, but unfortunately it is incomplete, and volume number 37 does not exist in their collection. Researching the existing holdings of this publication, the author believes the article was published in 1933. The discovery of this article is important as it confirms the publication of the only known contemporary review and analysis of the piece. It is the author’s hope that the article will also shed additional light on the origin and premiere of the Symphony.

Beyond this, there are two published articles that include a brief history and theoretical analysis of the Symphony. The first is the previously mentioned 1985 article by Jon Mitchell published in the *Journal of Band Research*, and the second is a teacher’s resource guide available in *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band, Volume 3*, written by Lawrence Dale.
Both articles deal directly with the American edition of the Symphony and do not account for the 1926 edition of the work. Harper has also provided one of the most widely distributed recordings to date of the Symphony through his recording with the Wisconsin Wind Orchestra. Although these articles provide an overview of the Symphony and have served as scholarly work on the American edition, they unfortunately have no reference to first edition.

One of the primary goals of this project was to draw attention to the current state of research for the Symphony, but to also create two new resources that will serve to aid wind band conductors: a full score of the 1926 edition, and a new performance edition for modern band instrumentation. The full score of the 1926 publication provides the most accurate depiction of the composer’s original instrumentation and orchestration, while the new score for modern wind band instrumentation provides a performance edition that attempts to remain true to the original orchestration, while also remaining readily accessible to a large number of wind bands.

---

Need and Purpose

A performance of Paul Fauchet’s Symphony in B-flat that best represents the composer’s original orchestration, while also remaining accessible to the modern wind band, continues to be difficult. Both the 1926 edition and the American edition by Gillette and Campbell-Watson are out of print. Performance of the 1926 edition requires a number of instruments that are uncommon to the modern wind band and, as previously outlined, the American edition contains several orchestration changes that draw the performance away from Fauchet’s original score. While the instrumentation of the 2010 publication by Editions Robert Martin corrects many of the errors found in the 1926 publication, it also contains a number of instruments in the score that present obstacles for conductors and ensemble members. Though the program notes to this edition state that the score contains many doublings, there are instances in the score where the absence of instruments such as the E-flat alto horns lead to incomplete chord voicing (for example, mm. 10-11 of the first movement).

The purpose of this study is to further the research on the Symphony and also bring to light some discrepancies and performance obstacles caused by the different editions and limited information on the piece and composer. Additionally, this study included the creation of a full score from the 1926 parts, providing conductors and scholars with the most accurate depiction of the composer’s compositional intent. Finally, the new performance edition for modern wind band instrumentation makes the work more accessible to a larger breadth of modern ensembles, while attempting to retain the composer’s orchestration choices.
CHAPTER 2

HISTORY

Research on the historical significance of the composer, alleged premiere ensemble, and three printed editions of the symphony was integral to inform the editorial process of a new edition for modern wind band. Investigation began first with the composer.

Paul Robert Marcel Fauchet

Paul Robert Marcel Fauchet was born and died in Paris, France. Fauchet worked as a composer, organist, teacher, and choir conductor. Limited information is available on Fauchet, even in his native France. Further confusing the composer’s biography is the existence of two composers living in France during this period that shared almost identical names. Paul Fauchey was incorrectly identified as the composer of the Symphony at the American premiere in 1933, a credit that would later be duplicated in the program notes of Gillette and Campbell-Watson’s editions. Composer Paul Fauchey, with the same first name and phonetically similar surname, was twenty-one years Fauchet’s elder and also worked primarily in France.

Both composers are listed in Baker’s Biographical Dictionary of Musicians, and Fauchet is correctly identified as the composer of the Symphonie pour Musique d’Harmonie. Baker’s dictionary contains incorrect birth and death dates for Paul Fauchet. Official documents obtained from the Paris Conservatory, where Fauchet studied and eventually taught from 1927

---

until his death, list Fauchet as born January 29, 1881 (Paris, France) and died October 12, 1937 (Paris, France).  

Fauchet studied organ and composition at the Paris Conservatory with Louis Vierne, Paul Vidal, Charles Lenepveu, and Alexandre Guilmant. He excelled as a student, receiving several prizes, including: second prize for harmony (1899), first prize for fugue (1904), first prize for organ (1907), and first prize in piano accompaniment (1910). Guilmant appears to have respected him as a student, later dedicating the second song of his _Chorals et noëls pour orgue_, op. 93 to Fauchet. The song, “Noël pour le temps de l’Avent (Marie dans son oratoire priant Dieu dévotement, D-minor),” is dedicated: à mon élève Paul Fauchet (to my student Paul Fauchet). 

Fauchet held several posts, including, the organist at the Notre-Dame church in Versailles (1896), organist and head of Master Choir at Saint Pierre de Chaillot (Paris), and was nominated Chapel Master at Saint Thomas d’Aquin. He recorded several 78 LP records for Pathé Recording Company, including the works of Saint-Saëns, A. Adam, and J.S. Bach. He also served as guest conductor for the Societe des Concerts du Conservatoire Choir, Théâtre Lyrique, and Garnier Opéra. In November 1927, Fauchet was nominated as Harmony Professor at the Paris Conservatory.

---

32 François Dru, e-mail message to author, October 20, 2010.
33 Alexandre Guilmant, _Chorals et noëls pour orgue_, op. 93, score (Alexandre Guilmant), 1909.
Research for this study revealed some of Fauchet’s published compositions, which include a number of sacred works, three masses for choir and orchestra, some motets, and a work for choir and string quartet. He published some organ works, including a symphonic piece for organ and orchestra, a Larghetto for cello and organ, and Four Sketches for organ. As a pedagogue, Fauchet also published some of his harmony lessons and at least two books, *Cinquante leçons d’harmonie (Parijs: Éditions E. Gaudet)* and *Quarante leçons d’harmonie, 2 vols, (Parijs: Éditions Salabert en Éditions E Gaudet).*

Fauchet was admired as a teacher, as is evidenced in the previously mentioned article by Pierre Dupont. Fauchet’s former students include: Jacques de la Presle, Raymond Loucheur, Georges Taconet, José David, Marcel Landowski, and Lucien Cailliet. Cailliet is familiar to many wind band conductors as a prolific arranger and transcriber for bands in the early and mid twentieth century.

The Garde Républicaine Band

Fauchet has been credited with composing the Symphony in B-flat for the Garde Républicaine Band of France. In 1848 the Garde Républicaine replaced the Gendarmerie ensemble of Paris that had been established in 1802. This ensemble served a similar purpose to the American military bands stationed in Washington DC. Francis Pieters notes that the Garde Républicaine consists of ensembles, including: a symphonic band (*musique*), a string

---

orchestra (orchestra), a marching band (Batterie-fanfare), and a mounted cavalry band (Fanfare de Cavalerie).  

When Fauchet wrote his Symphony for the Garde Républicaine Band, it was already an established organization in France and had grown to personify the spirit of the nation. Many of the members of the band performed as principals in the major ensembles of Paris. Nearly all of them were honors graduates of the Paris Conservatory and, in some cases, they taught there.

The conductor at the time of the Symphony’s premiere was Guillaume Balay, who led the ensemble from 1911 to 1927. Balay was a distinguished cornet player, composer, and conductor. As a leader, Balay increased the resources and quality of the band, an amazing accomplishment considering his tenure coincided with World War I. Pierre Dupont, a former student of Fauchet’s at the Paris Conservatory, succeeded Balay in 1927. Dupont conducted the ensemble from 1927 to 1945.

Unfortunately no written report exists to confirm that Fauchet’s Symphony was composed for the Garde Républicaine Band. The ensemble though did encourage the composition of new works beyond their many patriotic duties, particularly during Balay and Dupont’s tenures as directors. This was evidenced when Florent Schmitt composed Dionysiaques in 1913 for the group, though the work was not premiered until 1925.

---

CHAPTER 3

PRINTED EDITIONS

Evette & Schaeffer Edition (1926)

Fauchet’s Symphony has received three printings since it’s initial composition. The first edition of the Symphony was published by Editions Musicales Buffet-Crampon in 1926. Evette & Schaeffer later purchased Buffet-Crampon from Pierre Goumas. Both Buffet-Crampon and Evette & Schaeffer appear on the copyright information of the 1926 published scores and parts. Correspondence with Editions Alphonse Leduc, the current European owners of the copyright for the 1926 edition, revealed that the legal registration was not put in place while Fauchet was alive, and the original printed score and parts were destroyed.\textsuperscript{42} Additionally, no physical score is available at the National Archive Library in France and only parts for the first movement were available in the French National Library.

The 1926 publication consisted of printed individual parts for each instrument. The only printed scores for the 1926 edition were condensed scores of each movement. The movements are printed as separate works instead of as one continuous publication. The scores for each movement are transposed to the key of B-flat, sounding a major second lower than written, a common practice for French band scores of the time.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{42} François Dru, e-mail message to author, August 12, 2010.
As detailed earlier, the second printed edition was for American bands and scored over a twenty-six year period by James Robert Gillette and Frank Campbell-Watson. Also noted earlier, Gillette could only find parts and condensed scores for the first and fourth movement.

Figure 2 shows Gillette’s personal copy of the fourth movement, procured from the “James Robert Gillette Collection” at the Carleton College Archives. To this point, it is unclear how Gillette became aware of Fauchet’s Symphony, although a possible connection could be explored with the discovery of a stamp mark found on the back of Gillette’s condensed score of the fourth movement.

Figure 2. Paul Fauchet, Symphonie pour Musique d’Harmonie, Movement 4 “Finale,” 1926 edition. James Robert Gillette’s copy of the 1926 publication conductor score. The stamp in the bottom margin indicates it was distributed by Albert J. Andraud Woodwind Music from Cincinnati. © COPYRIGHT 1926, 1933 (Copyrights Renewed) WB MUSIC CORP. Reproduced by permission of Alfred Publishing Co., Inc.
The stamp reads “Albert J. Andraud Woodwind Music. 962 Burton Ave. Cincinnati, OH.”

During that time, Fauchet’s previously mentioned student, Lucien Caillete, worked for this publisher and is a possible source for Gillette’s discovery of the Symphony. With Gillette’s reputation in the band world during this time (note Edwin Franko Goldman’s comment earlier in this study regarding the quality of the bands at Carleton College44) it is certainly possible that Caillete may have been interested in sharing his former teacher’s composition with Gillette, in hopes that his band at Carleton College would perform the work.

The American edition appears to have undergone several different printings beyond the original publications from 1933, 1948, and 1949. What likely happened with the printings was that in 1948 and 1949, when Campbell-Watson released the third and second movements respectively, the publishers also republished the first and fourth movements. The program notes to the second movement read, “the entire work is now available in an American edition,”45 which was likely a marketing tool used by the publishers. Beyond this, there are publications that were created after the 1948 and 1949 printings. Jon Mitchell noted in his 1985 article that, “all four movements of the American edition have been recently reissued by Warner Brothers-Seven Arts.”46

The copyright for the American edition currently belongs to Alfred Music. In 1929, M. Witmark was purchased by Warner Brothers, which then merged its three music publishing companies (Witmark, Remick, and Harms) into one company: Warner Bros. Music, now known

as Warner/Chappell Music. In 2005 Alfred Music purchased Warner Bros. Publications and acquired the rights to Warner/Chappell Music. Correspondence with the contract and licensing administrator at Alfred Music in 2015 revealed that the 1926 composition is under Warner/Chappell’s copyright and Alfred is the exclusive print administrator for Warner Chappell’s copyright.\footnote{47 Troy Schreck, e-mail message to author, Feb. 24, 2015.} Alfred Music was contacted and permission was granted to reprint and arrange the edition for this study.

As noted in the “Background and Significance” portion of this study, Gillette and Campbell-Watson made editorial decisions that changed the orchestration of the work in their respective editions. In rescoring the middle two movements, Campbell-Watson sought to provide an instrumentation that would complement what Gillette had done twenty-five years earlier. The program notes in the score for the middle two movements state “the transcriber of this particular movement has used the same instrumental scheme employed in the first and last movements by Mr. Gillette, with the omission of the soprano saxophone in favor of an additional alto saxophone.”\footnote{48 Paul Fauchet, “Symphony in B-flat – Nocturne,” ed. Frank Campbell-Watson, (New York: M. Witmark & Sons, 1949).}

The brass saxhorns that were so vital to the French bands of the early twentieth century would have made the work virtually unplayable by most American bands of the time, so both arrangers voiced the saxhorns parts for other brass instruments. The brass section of the American edition called for: four cornets, four horns in F, four trombones, one baritone (containing 34 measures of \textit{divisi} in the first three movements, while the fourth movement is predominantly written \textit{divisi}), and one tuba (the first and fourth movements have no \textit{divisi},
whereas the second and third movements have some *divisi* almost exclusively at the octave).

Each movement has a separate printed String Bass part as well.

Beyond the instrumentation changes, both arrangers chose to re-voice passages throughout the work. Most apparent was Campbell-Watson’s decision to begin the second movement “Nocturne” with a horn solo instead of the entire clarinet section playing the haunting G-Dorian melody. Other examples include rescoring many of the conical saxhorn lines for cylindrical instruments such as the trombone (mvmt. 1, mm. 4-7).

While many of these re-orchestrations were due to the far smaller brass sections used in American bands at the time, others, such as the horn/clarinet substitution, appear to be personal choices by the arrangers. The American edition therefore was not an edition that held true to the composer’s original orchestration of the work.

**Editions Robert Martin (2010)**

Editions Robert Martin published the most recent edition of the Symphony in 2010. Miguel Etchegoncelay, a conductor at the Strasbourg Conservatory of Music, collected the 1926 parts and conducted a performance using those parts in Austria in 2009. Correspondence with Etchegoncelay in 2010 revealed that the original hope was to release two new editions, “one with the original instrumentation and another one somewhat ‘purified’ for modern bands.” The final publication was only one edition, not surprising considering the scope and pricing necessary to produce two editions simultaneously. The 2010 edition remains true to the 1926

---

49 Miguel Etchegoncelay, e-mail message to author, January 6, 2011.
50 Ibid., July 19, 2010.
edition, with the few alterations and editorial decisions outlined in the accompanying program notes.

Though the program notes for the 2010 edition state that the score contains sufficient doublings to allow a performance without the saxhorn instruments, there are instances where the absence of instruments lead to incomplete chord voicing. An example is found in measures 10-11 of the first movement. In this passage, the alto horns are voiced on the fifth of the D-major chord and are not doubled elsewhere in the ensemble.

The 2010 edition is published through Edition Robert Martin’s *Prestige de la Musique Française* collection. This series of new editions seeks to preserve the heritage of French music for as many orchestras as possible\(^1\) and has since been expanded to include a number of other French works for band.

\(^1\)Ibid., Jan. 6, 2011.
CHAPTER 4

INSTRUMENTATION

Figure 2 shows the instrumentation for the original 1926 edition, broken down by movement. Because each movement of the Symphony was printed separately, instrumentation differs slightly between movements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement 1</th>
<th>Movement 2</th>
<th>Movement 3</th>
<th>Movement 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petite Flûte Béc</td>
<td>Petite Flûte Béc</td>
<td>Petite Flûte Béc</td>
<td>Petite Flûte Béc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Grandes Flûtes</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Grandes Flûtes</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Grandes Flûtes</td>
<td>Grandes Flûtes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Hautbois &amp; Cor Anglais</td>
<td>Hautbois Ut &amp; Cor Anglais</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Hautbois</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Hautbois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petites Clarinettes Mib</td>
<td>Petites Clarinettes Mib</td>
<td>Petites Clarinettes Mib</td>
<td>Petites Clarinettes Mib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Clarinette Sib Solo</td>
<td>1st Clarinette Sib Solo</td>
<td>1st Clarinette Sib Solo</td>
<td>1st Clarinette Sib Solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Clarinette Sib</td>
<td>1st Clarinette Sib</td>
<td>1st Clarinette Sib</td>
<td>1st Clarinette Sib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Clarinette Sib</td>
<td>2nd Clarinette Sib</td>
<td>2nd Clarinette Sib</td>
<td>2nd Clarinette Sib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinette Alto (Alto Sax part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinettes Basses (Tenor Sax part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxophones Altos Mib</td>
<td>Saxophone Altos Mib</td>
<td>Saxophone Altos Mib</td>
<td>1st nd 2nd Saxophone Altos Mib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxophones Ténors Sib</td>
<td>Saxophones Ténors Sib</td>
<td>Saxophones Ténors Sib</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Saxophones Ténors Sib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Saxophones Baryton Mib</td>
<td>Saxophones Baryton Mib</td>
<td>Saxophones Baryton Mib</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Saxophones Baryton Mib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxophone Basse Sib (ad lib.)</td>
<td>Saxophone Basse Sib (ad lib.)</td>
<td>Saxophone Basse Sib (ad lib.)</td>
<td>Saxophone Basse Sib (ad lib.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Bassoon Ut (ad lib.)</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Bassoon Ut (ad lib.)</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Bassoon Ut (ad lib.)</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Bassoon Ut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Cors en Fa</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Cors en Fa</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Cors en Fa</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Cors en Fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Cornet à Pistons Sib</td>
<td>1st Cornet à Pistons Sib</td>
<td>1st Cornet à Pistons Sib</td>
<td>1st Cornet à Pistons Sib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Cornet à Pistons Sib</td>
<td>2nd Cornet à Pistons Sib</td>
<td>2nd Cornet à Pistons Sib</td>
<td>2nd Cornet à Pistons Sib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Trompettes Sib</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Trompettes Ut</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Trompettes Ut</td>
<td>1st Trompettes Ut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Trombone en Ut</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Trombone en Ut</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Trombone en Ut</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Trombone en Ut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd &amp; 4th Trombone en Ut</td>
<td>3rd &amp; 4th Trombone en Ut</td>
<td>3rd &amp; 4th Trombone en Ut</td>
<td>3rd &amp; 4th Trombone en Ut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Bugles Sib</td>
<td>1st Bugles Sib</td>
<td>1st Bugles Sib</td>
<td>1st Bugles Sib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Bugles Sib</td>
<td>2nd Bugles Sib</td>
<td>2nd Bugles Sib</td>
<td>2nd Bugles Sib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Alto Mib</td>
<td>1st Alto Mib</td>
<td>1st Alto Mib</td>
<td>1st Alto Mib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd &amp; 3rd Altos Mib</td>
<td>2nd &amp; 3rd Altos Mib</td>
<td>2nd &amp; 3rd Altos Mib</td>
<td>2nd Alto Mib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Barytons Sib</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Barytons Sib</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Barytons Sib</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Barytons Sib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Basses Sib</td>
<td>Bases Bb</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Basses Sib</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd Basses Sib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrebasse Mib</td>
<td>Contrebasse Mib</td>
<td>Contrebasse Mib</td>
<td>Contrebasse Mib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrebasse Sib</td>
<td>Contrebasse Sib</td>
<td>Contrebasse Sib</td>
<td>Contrebasse Sib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrebasse à Cordes</td>
<td>Contrebasse à Cordes (CB Sib part)</td>
<td>Contrebasse à Cordes (ad lib.)</td>
<td>Contrebasse à Cordes (ad lib.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbales Fa-Sib</td>
<td>Timbales</td>
<td>Timbales</td>
<td>Timbales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tambour</td>
<td>Tambour, Triangle, Timbres</td>
<td>Tambour</td>
<td>Tambour &amp; Triangle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of this instrumentation to that of the 1925 Garde Républicaine Band roster shows that only the sarrussophone is not present in Fauchet’s score.\textsuperscript{52} With the exception of the saxhorn family, much of the instrumentation would have been comparable to an American band in the 1920s.

The editorial process for this new edition involved exploring the 1926 instrumentation. The following is a detailed description of the original 1926 publication instrumentation.

Woodwind Instrumentation

The D-flat piccolo part was common in band arrangements of the time. The flute and oboe parts are typical for the time as well. The oboe part for the second movement is not listed as separate oboe 1 and 2 parts in the publication, though there are passages marked “solo” which distinguish the first part. The English horn is only used in the first and second movements, cued in the oboe part of the first movement and printed as a separate part in the second movement.

The clarinet family was also standard for the time period. There is only one E-flat clarinet part printed for each movement, though the printed parts use the plural label, “Petites Clarinettes,” indicating more than one player. Each movement contains a minimal amount of \textit{divisi} in these parts (forty-eight total measures throughout the entire work) and the passages where one player is preferred are marked “solo.” Also typical for the time period, the principal B-flat clarinet part is labeled as “solo clarinet” and the additional B-flat clarinet parts are labeled “clarinet 1” and “clarinet 2.” The fourth movement deviates from the previous

movements in that it contains an added “clarinet 3” part, for a total of four separately printed B-flat clarinet parts. Each part, except for the added clarinet 3 part in the fourth movement, contains *divisi* sections. The roster for the Garde Républicaine Band in 1925 lists four E-flat clarinet players and seventeen B-flat clarinet players, providing more than ample instrumentation numbers for the published parts of Fauchet’s Symphony.

A special note about the clarinet section is that there are only printed parts for the alto and bass clarinets in the first movement. These parts are alto saxophone and tenor saxophone parts, respectively, that are listed parenthetically as optional for alto and bass clarinet. The 1925 roster for the Garde Républicaine Band does not list any alto clarinet players, although there are two members employed as bass clarinet players. There are no printed parts for the other movements and the alto and tenor saxophone parts for those movements do not have the same parenthetical note as the first movement.

The saxophone parts are standard for the period, distributed for alto, tenor, and baritone saxophone. All three instruments require a minimum of two players to cover the written parts. Additionally, there are parts provided for bass saxophone in movements two, three, and four, however the parts for movements two and three are marked *ad libitum*. The Garde Républicaine Band in 1925 employed one bass saxophonist.

There are two bassoon parts for each movement of the Symphony, although they are parenthetically listed *ad libitum* in every movement except the fourth.
Brass Instrumentation

The brass writing employs two parts for horn in F (the second horn contains six measures of *divisi* in the first movement, although the notes are doubled by other voices in the ensemble), two B-flat cornet parts, two C trumpet parts (although the first movement calls for trumpet in B-flat instead of trumpet in C), and four trombone parts. Additionally, the publication calls for a full complement of saxhorns, including two B-flat bugles, three E-flat alto horns, two B-flat barytons, two B-flat basses, one E-flat contrebasse, and one B-flat contrebasse.

The fourth movement calls for a slightly enlarged instrumentation, adding parts for E-flat bugle and a third trumpet in C. Again, this instrumentation matches precisely with the Garde Républicaine Band in the 1925. Figure 3 shows the saxhorn instrumentation called for in Fauchet’s 1926 edition compared to the saxhorn roster employed by the 1925 Garde Républicaine Band, one year prior to the publication of the Symphony.  

---

Figure 3. Saxhorn instrumentation of 1926 Symphony publication and the instrumentation employed by the 1925 Garde Républicaine Band.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1926 Symphony Publication</th>
<th>1925 Garde Républicaine Instrumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petite Bugle Mi♭</td>
<td>Saxhorn Soprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugles Si♭</td>
<td>Saxhorns Contralto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto Mi♭</td>
<td>Saxhorns Alto Mi bémol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barytons Si♭</td>
<td>Saxhorns Baryton Si bémol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basse Si♭</td>
<td>Saxhorns Basse Si bémol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrebasses Mi♭</td>
<td>Saxhorn Contrebasse Mi bémol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrebasses Si♭</td>
<td>Saxhorns Contrebasse Si bémol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The saxhorns provide the biggest challenge when performing or arranging this work for modern concert bands. As mentioned earlier, the saxhorns played an integral role to French bands during the early twentieth century. It is also important to note that Fauchet wrote specifically for the saxhorns as an instrumental family within the ensemble. Figure 4 illustrates an example of this orchestration from the introduction of the first movement. The saxhorns play a brass fanfare in response to the opening horn solo (mm. 4-7) and repeat the gesture three bars later in response to the trumpet solo (mm. 10-12). For the second statement of the brass fanfare, Fauchet adds F horns. The conical-bore of the horn characteristically blends with the saxhorns, creating a thicker texture for the second statement. The saxhorn family provides a much thicker brass texture to the ensemble, something Fauchet used extensively throughout the Symphony.
As stated earlier, James Robert Gillette was a pioneer for the wind ensemble movement that Frederick Fennell would champion in the later part of the twentieth century. Because Gillette utilized a far smaller ensemble than other American bands at the time, the number of brass players in his ensemble was half of what the Garde Républicaine Band employed. This created an immediate problem for Gillette as to how he could cover all of the brass voices using a smaller brass section. The compromise was often to substitute trombones for the saxhorns.
(as seen in the same opening passages of movement one previously mentioned – mm. 4-7 and mm. 10-12). Additionally, Gillette only used four cornet parts in his score, whereas Fauchet’s original instrumentation called for two cornets, two trumpets, and two bugles.

Beyond the problems created by having fewer instruments in the ensemble, there was also a compromise in timbre when Gillette and Campbell-Watson rescored Fauchet’s Symphony. The tubing in a saxhorn is a wide conical bore with a considerable expansion at the last part that leads to the bell. Additionally, the valves are situated near the narrow end of the tube and the lead pipe, entering the valve system at the first valve slide, leaving the largest expansion of the pipe to happen between the valve mechanism and the bell. This system allows the conical tubing to expand further without interruption. This is in contrast to the modern cornet, where the largest length of expansion in the pipe occurs between the mouthpiece and where the pipe enters the valve system at the third valve.

This additional choice to substitute cylindrical-bore instruments such as trombones for the conical-bore saxhorn family affects the tonal sonority of the brass in the piece. Additionally, the French musical heritage for wind instruments in which the saxhorns played an important role as established by the Garde Républicaine Band, is unfortunately lost in Gillette and Campbell-Watson’s editions.\(^4\)

The 2010 edition is certainly the closest to the 1926 premiere. The woodwind parts remain true to the original and the brass are almost identical to the original publication. The only change is that the E-flat and B-flat contrebasse parts have been condensed to a single

Contrebasse in C part. The French National Police Band, with Jérôme Hilaire conducting, made a recording of this edition in the spring of 2011. Saxhorns were used for the recording and the sonorities they provide to the Symphony can be heard in the ensemble, creating an excellent resource for the piece.
CHAPTER 5
EDITORIAL PROCESS

Once all known sources were consulted, the editorial process for this edition began. Categorizing the editorial process was initially difficult due to the lack of an autograph manuscript as well as the lack of a full score for the 1926 edition. Upon entering all individual parts into the music software Sibelius and creating a full score of the 1926 parts, examination of the subsequent full score served as the primary resource in the editorial process. Additionally, the function of this new edition had to be determined based on current editorial standards. The Grove Online article by James Grier on editing states, “four types of edition should satisfy the needs of most potential users of music editions: the photographic facsimile; the edited print that replicates the original notation; the interpretative edition; and the critical edition.” Unfortunately, lack of an autograph manuscript eliminated the ability for a photographic facsimile, while the 1926 printed edition already served the purpose of one that replicates the original notation.

According to Grier, the priority for a critical edition is, “clarity in the presentation of many different types of information to the user, including pitch, rhythm, meter, instrumentation, tempo, dynamics, articulation, and even bowing, pedaling, registration, breathing or, in vocal music, literary text.” The scope of this edition involved a number of these elements, with emphasis placed on the clarification of instrumentation to a modern audience, but the rescoring of instruments that are no longer in common practice prohibits it.

---

56 Ibid.
from being classified as a critical edition. Therefore, this edition was approached through an alternate approach, as a performance edition, attempting to balance timbral similarities between the older instruments and their modern equivalencies, while also considering ease of comprehension for a modern ensemble to perform the work.

With the creation of a performance edition that seeks to replace instruments that are no longer in common practice, there is a difficulty in recreating the sounds of the early twentieth-century instruments. Even with instruments that have undergone little physical change over the past century, the tone concepts have changed over time. Additionally, pedagogical practices have changed as well. As changes in concept of the sound have evolved, instrument makers have responded by creating instruments that more easily conform to prevailing tone concepts.

The problem is exacerbated when dealing with instruments that are not as common in practice, such as the saxhorn family. Saxhorns are conical with an upright bell, affecting the timbre of the instrument. The E-flat alto horn, in any of its configurations, produces a smaller more direct sound than a modern F horn. The saxhorn sound differs from many modern brass instruments because of the upright bell and quicker response of the instrument. The tenor saxhorn and modern baritone are likely the closest in timbre when comparing a saxhorn to a modern brass instrument still in common use. While this edition attempts to rescore these instruments with modern equivalencies, it is not the purpose of the edition to replicate the “sound” of the 1926 edition, but rather provide an edition that is close to these timbres while remaining accessible to a breadth of modern ensembles. It would be safe to say that it is
impossible to replicate the sound of the Garde Républicaine Band of 1926 with contemporary performers and instruments.

Once the editorial philosophy was chosen, work on orchestration began. A full score was created with the software Sibelius using the 1926 parts as a starting place. Several instruments did not require rescoring since they are still standard in the modern wind band. Some families of instruments were renamed to fit within the context of the modern terminology. The brass family of instruments required the most attention, substituting modern instrument equivalents to replace the saxhorns that are not common in modern wind bands. The editorial details for each family of instruments follow.

**Woodwinds**

Many of the woodwind instruments required no adjustments. Examples include the flutes, oboes, English horn, alto saxophones, tenor saxophones, baritone saxophones, and bassoons. It should be noted that there are two independent tenor saxophone and baritone saxophone parts throughout all the movements. Although the parts are primarily doubled, it is recommended that all parts be played when possible to achieve the desired saxophone family timbre. Bass saxophone was present in the second, third, and fourth movements of the 1926 edition, though it is listed *ad libitum* in the second and third movements and all notes are doubled throughout the entire Symphony. The bass saxophone part was kept in the score of the current edition. The piccolo was transposed from D-flat to C in all movements to accommodate the more common modern piccolo pitched in C.

The clarinet family was written for a large section as the Garde Républicaine Band employed twenty-three players at the time of the premiere (four E-flat clarinets, seventeen B-
flat clarinets, and two bass clarinets). Although it is recommended to have multiple players on each clarinet part (particularly the B-flat parts), in order to match the sonority likely envisioned by the composer, all parts can be covered with a minimum of two, and in many cases, one player per part if fewer players are available. The E-flat clarinet parts remained the same, with the divisi parts unchanged. A total of forty-six measures in all of the movements contain divisi E-flat clarinet parts and they are all doubled in appropriate octaves within other instrumental voices. The B-flat clarinet parts remain primarily intact from the 1926 publication. Some divisi clarinet moments were extracted and added to clarinet parts that were not playing at that time (an example is the first movement, mm. 175-176, where clarinet 1 notes were added to the clarinet 2 parts since they contained rests during the same passage). A clarinet 4 part was added in the fourth movement to cover the additional clarinet part added in the fourth movement of the 1926 edition. Due to the divisi passages in the clarinet writing, suggestions have been made in the parts and score for which note to eliminate if only one player is available per part. Figure 5 shows an example of this as found in the clarinet 2 part of the first movement (mm. 111-112).

Figure 5. Paul Fauchet, *Symphonie pour Musique d'Harmonie*, Movement 1 "Ouverture," mm. 111-112, performance edition. Editorial note added in clarinet 2/3 part (and also in the full score) indicating note preference if only one player is available. © COPYRIGHT 1926, 1933 (Copyrights Renewed) WB MUSIC CORP. Reproduced by permission of Alfred Publishing Co., Inc.
As stated earlier, the 1926 edition listed alto clarinet and bass clarinet as optional instruments that were printed on the same page as the alto saxophone and tenor saxophone parts respectively. For this edition, the alto clarinet part was omitted. Bass clarinet parts were created for each of the movements and marked *ad libitum*. This part was created to accommodate modern ensembles where the bass clarinet is commonplace. Additionally, this part primarily doubles the bassoon 2 part to enhance the low reed section and to allow for performance of the edition with only one bassoon. This makes it the edition accessible for ensembles with only one bassoon and one bass clarinet. In a few instances, the new bass clarinet part doubled the baritone sax part instead of the bassoon part, where the notes were below the range of the bass clarinet. Bassoon 1 cues were created in the bass clarinet part during some solo passages, particularly in the second and third movement. Some of these cues were already present in other voices, often in the cornet or flugelhorn parts, so these cues offer the opportunity for a reed voice to play important bassoon solos at the conductor’s discretion if that instrument is not available in the ensemble.

Brass, Double Bass, and Percussion

The philosophy of scoring the brass, and particularly the saxhorn family, for the modern wind band served a vital role for this edition. Minimal changes were made in the brass family and those that were made attempted to remain as true as possible to the original orchestration.

The brass section of this edition includes: two cornets, two trumpets, two flugelhorns, four horns, four trombones, two euphoniums, and two tubas. The cornet, trumpet, and trombone parts remain virtually unchanged from the original edition. The C trumpet parts in
movements two, three, and four were transposed to B-flat to allow younger ensembles the opportunity to perform the work, though C trumpet parts are available for performance as well. The trumpet part of the first movement was already written for B-flat trumpet. The divisi passages in the trumpet 2 part, particularly in the fourth movement, are marked as optional since they are doubled in the cornet part. These parts were left in the edition to replicate the conical versus cylindrical nature of the two instruments. The tenor-clef portions of the trombone parts were replaced with bass clef where the ledger lines were not extreme and the parts could still be easily read in bass clef. There is a single instance in the fourth movement where a trombone 3 note (m. 301) was respelled enharmonically to properly show its role as the seventh in a dominant seventh chord.

Although each movement provided individual challenges, the saxhorn family was rescored primarily using the following substitutions: flugelhorns now play the bugle parts with no changes to the parts. Alto horn parts were rescored in newly created F horn 3 and 4 parts. Baryton and B-flat Basse parts were rescored for two euphoniums. The E-flat and B-flat contrebasse parts were replaced by two tuba parts.

The bugle substitution was perhaps the easiest within the family, since the modern flugelhorn is the successor of the keyed bugle and primarily differs from the bugle in that it has valves instead of tone holes opened by keys. Adam Carse notes in his text on musical wind instruments that, “the conical bore of the bugle is fairly well preserved in the flugelhorn, because the air-passage enters the valve-system only a few inches from the mouthpiece, leaving the greater part of the tube to expand steadily without interruption.”57

57 Adam Carse, Musical Wind Instruments (Mineola, NY 1939), 293.
For the alto horn re-scoring, all duplicate pitches were consolidated and no notes were removed. In movement two there were several solos in the alto horn 1 parts that were moved to the F horn 1 part to allow for the principal player in the section to perform the solos. There were two instances in the third movement (mm. 48-54, mm. 87-96) where alto horn notes had to be redistributed or, in one case, omitted (mm. 116-117) due to the lack of available voices, but these notes were all doubled in other voices throughout the ensemble. Due to the thick scoring, it was the editor’s decision that the sonority would not be affected enough to constitute maintaining the pitches in those specific voices.

The Baryton Sib and Basses Sib parts were scored as two euphonium parts. Duplicated notes were removed and, in some cases, the Basse Sib notes were scored in the newly created tuba 1 part. This was primarily due to the fact that the notes were more appropriate in the range of a modern tuba than in the low range of the euphonium. The range of the Basse Bb saxhorn was quite wide and the wider bore of the instrument helped it, “to serve both as a bass and as a full-toned tenor soloist.”\(^5\) In the second movement, the harmonic notes of the Barytone Bb part were moved to trombone 3 and 4 (mm. 33-35, mm. 53-60) in order to keep the euphonium a part of the melodic line in the saxhorn family during those passages.

Two tuba parts were created using the E-flat and B-flat contrebasse parts. The E-flat contrebasse part was scored as tuba 1 and is primarily the higher voice, while the B-flat contrebasse part was scored as tuba 2, primarily serving as the lower voice. As noted earlier, several notes for the tuba 1 part were also rescored from the Basse Bb part.

A double bass part was created for each movement. The first and third movements of the 1926 edition had individually printed double bass parts, although the third movement is listed *ad libitum*. The double bass part for the second movement was extracted and consolidated from the Bb contrebasse part, which is listed with both instruments at the top of the page. No original part was found for the fourth movement so one was created using the Bb contrebasse part. All percussion parts remain unchanged from the original publication.

Figure 6 details the final instrumentation of the new edition. The instrumentation through the first three movements is identical for the wind parts. The English horn part is printed separately for the second movement because it is more extensive in that movement. The fourth movement contains a slightly larger instrumentation, including the previously mentioned additional clarinet 4 and E-flat bugle parts.
Table 6. Instrumentation by movement of the 2015 edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement 1</th>
<th>Movement 2</th>
<th>Movement 3</th>
<th>Movement 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piccolo in C</td>
<td>Piccolo in C</td>
<td>Piccolo in C</td>
<td>Piccolo in C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flute 1/2</td>
<td>Flute 1/2</td>
<td>Flute 1/2</td>
<td>Flute 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe 1/2</td>
<td>Oboe 1/2</td>
<td>Oboe 1/2</td>
<td>Oboe 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Horn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphonium 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet 1</td>
<td>Clarinet 1</td>
<td>Clarinet 1</td>
<td>Clarinet 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet 2</td>
<td>Clarinet 2</td>
<td>Clarinet 2</td>
<td>Clarinet 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet 3</td>
<td>Clarinet 3</td>
<td>Clarinet 3</td>
<td>Clarinet 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoon 1/2</td>
<td>Bassoon 1/2</td>
<td>Bassoon 1/2</td>
<td>Bassoon 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornet 1/2</td>
<td>Cornet 1/2</td>
<td>Cornet 1/2</td>
<td>Cornet 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet 1/2</td>
<td>Trumpet 1/2</td>
<td>Trumpet 1/2</td>
<td>Trumpet 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn 1</td>
<td>Horn 1</td>
<td>Horn 1</td>
<td>Horn 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn 2</td>
<td>Horn 2</td>
<td>Horn 2</td>
<td>Horn 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn 3</td>
<td>Horn 3</td>
<td>Horn 3</td>
<td>Horn 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombone 1</td>
<td>Trombone 1</td>
<td>Trombone 1</td>
<td>Trombone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombone 2</td>
<td>Trombone 2</td>
<td>Trombone 2</td>
<td>Trombone 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombone 3</td>
<td>Trombone 3</td>
<td>Trombone 3</td>
<td>Trombone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombone 4</td>
<td>Trombone 4</td>
<td>Trombone 4</td>
<td>Trombone 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphonium 1</td>
<td>Euphonium 1</td>
<td>Euphonium 1</td>
<td>Euphonium 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphonium 2</td>
<td>Euphonium 2</td>
<td>Euphonium 2</td>
<td>Euphonium 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuba 1/2</td>
<td>Tuba 1/2</td>
<td>Tuba 1/2</td>
<td>Tuba 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Bass</td>
<td>Double Bass</td>
<td>Double Bass</td>
<td>Double Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td>Timpani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cymbals/Triangle/Bass Drum</td>
<td>Cymbals/Bass Drum</td>
<td>Cymbals/Bass Drum</td>
<td>Cymbals/Triangle/Bass Drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snare Drum/Triangle</td>
<td>Snare Drum</td>
<td>Snare Drum</td>
<td>Snare Drum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the cross-cues from the 1926 edition remain the same to provide insight to the composer’s scoring principles and preferred secondary options. Additionally, the terminology remains in French from the original edition. Below is a list with translations of the common terminology found throughout the work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossary of Terms</th>
<th>Definitions taken from A to Z of Musical Terms by Christine Ammer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>avec chaleur</strong></td>
<td>With warmth, fervently (also, chaleureux)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cédez</strong></td>
<td>Slow down and become softer. Also, céder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cuivre, en</strong></td>
<td>Of metal (mutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cuivrez</strong></td>
<td>Produce a forced, brassy tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dehors, en</strong></td>
<td>Emphasized, standing out, accented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>détaché</strong></td>
<td>Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>divisés</strong></td>
<td>Divisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>doux léger</strong></td>
<td>Smooth, light, quick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>expressif</strong></td>
<td>With expression, with feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gracieux</strong></td>
<td>Graceful, elegant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>léger</strong></td>
<td>Light, quick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>les autres</strong></td>
<td>Others (as opposed to soloists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>meme mouvt</strong></td>
<td>Same Tempo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>moins fort</strong></td>
<td>Less loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus lent</strong></td>
<td>More Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pressez (Presser)</strong></td>
<td>Hurrying, quite fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seul</strong></td>
<td>Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solennel</strong></td>
<td>Solemn, sedate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sans bouchès</strong></td>
<td>With stopping (in horns, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sans ouverts</strong></td>
<td>Open, unstopped. Full-toned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>soutenu</strong></td>
<td>Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tranquille</strong></td>
<td>Quiet, peaceful, soft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>très décidé</strong></td>
<td>Very firm, resolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>très doux</strong></td>
<td>Very soft, gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>très large</strong></td>
<td>Very broad, full, fairly slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>très soutenu</strong></td>
<td>Very sustained, held</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The editorial process for this edition included clarifying a number discrepancies that were apparent once all parts were input to create the full score. All parts were entered into *Sibelius* exactly as they appeared on the printed parts, including potential errors, creating a full score as reference. Once the score was complete, an extremely large amount of discrepancies were apparent. These discrepancies were likely due to a number of reasons, including the cumbersome nature of engraving procedures in early music publishing. Since no autograph or full score exists of the 1926 publication, the primary source used to correct these discrepancies was the 1926 condensed score. Common areas where errors were found included: dynamics,
articulations, and note lengths. Examples of some of these editorial decisions are outlined in the following section.

Dynamics

Several passages required clarification of dynamic indications. Primary discrepancies occurred when a dynamic was present on a single line of unison passages but not on other parts. Figure 7 represents typical dynamic ambiguities found throughout the work. The unison line between the clarinet, alto saxophone, and tenor saxophone contains a crescendo in the second bar of the phrase within all five voices, although the placement of the dynamic differs for each voice. Additionally, the alto saxophone shows a decrescendo in the same measure, while no other voice indicates the same gesture. The final decrescendo of the phrase is missing in the clarinet 1 part and also there is no entrance dynamic indicated for clarinet 1. Only two of the voices contain the cantabile espressivo marking that begins the phrase. Using the condensed score as a primary source, as well as consolidating the unison line to the most common dynamic markings, the new edition clarifies the phrase shape for all of the parts.
Articulation

The largest number of corrections had to be made in regard to articulation. Each movement contained numerous discrepancies between the parts, often in different voices within unison parts. The passage shown in figure 9 represents typical articulation ambiguities present throughout the work. The slur line over the final three eighth notes of the bar of each part does not appear in the condensed score and appears to contradict the accents present over the same notes. Additionally, it is unclear where to rearticulate the final three notes in the last bar, since three of the parts contain a slur through all of beats three and four, while two of the other parts indicate a re-articulation on the second half of beat three. The condensed score presents clarification, indicating the latter, rearticulating the phrase on the second half of beat three.
Finally, the unconventional use of the phrase and slur lines at the start of the third bar does not conform to notational standards in which the phrase mark should continue over the first tied note of beat two into beat three. This discrepancy is consistent throughout the entire Symphony. These errors are corrected in the new edition, creating a consistent articulation that is clear to the performers and conductor and also based on the 1926 condensed score. Dynamic discrepancies are also present in the figure 9 excerpt and have been corrected, again using the condensed score as the primary resource.

Figure 9. Paul Fauchet, *Symphonie pour Musique d’Harmonie*, Movement 1 “Ouverture,” mm. 21-23, 1926 publication (left) and performance edition (right). Articulation discrepancies found between clarinets and saxophones in 1926 edition (left) and editorial changes made in performance edition (right). © COPYRIGHT 1926, 1933 (Copyrights Renewed) WB MUSIC CORP. Reproduced by permission of Alfred Publishing Co., Inc.

Note length discrepancies were also common throughout the score and parts. There were several instances where unison passages contained different length and articulation markings such as *staccato* versus *marcato* even within the same family of instruments. Also,
some passages contained a different note length value entirely, such as one instrument written with a single quarter note, while another instrument in the same passage contained an eighth note followed by eighth rest.

Figure 10 displays both of these discrepancies, which were common throughout the score. In all of these cases, the editor first consulted the 1926 condensed score, then, if no uniform articulation was easily identifiable, the edit was chosen based on the majority of the published parts, while also taking similar passages throughout the movement and Symphony into consideration, including repeated material and stylistic consistencies in the publication.

Figure 10. Paul Fauchet, *Symphonie pour Musique d’Harmonie*, Movement 4 “Finale,” mm. 79-82, 1926 publication (left) and performance edition (right). Articulation and note length discrepancies found between bassoon 1 and 2 in 1926 edition (left) and editorial changes made in performance edition (right). © COPYRIGHT 1926, 1933 (Copyrights Renewed) WB MUSIC CORP. Reproduced by permission of Alfred Publishing Co., Inc.

The editor considered several options to indicate editorial intervention in these passages such as parenthesized or presented with typographical differentiation. Unfortunately, as noted by James Grier in *Grove Online*, there is no uniform system for making these distinctions and “any system of that kind would disrupt the visual flow of the music and distract the performer and conductor.”

While successful methods of editorial intervention exist, it was

---

the editor’s decision to forego indications due to the extraordinarily large amount of ambiguities along with the lack of a definitive autograph.

Another questionable notational marking within the work is the *tremolo* above the clarinet, and eventually the flutes, at the start of the first movement (mm. 1-4, mm. 7-10, and mm. 291-302). Unfortunately, no second pitch is designated for the players to perform the tremolo. The marking is possibly meant to indicate a string tremolo since string tremolos only utilize a single pitch with the alternation of the bow. This figure was likely indicated to create tension at the start of the work prior to the solo horn entrance. While at this time the editor could not come to a definitive decision on the execution of the notation, it possibly comes from the tradition of orchestral transcription during the early twentieth century in band music. Fauchet was conceivably mimicking what he would have done in orchestral writing traditions. Performance practice for the tremolo on a flute or clarinet could likely indicate players should *flutter tongue* the passage, though the effect is unfortunately not the same in the wind instruments as with bowed strings, particularly when incorporated with a smaller clarinet section as would possibly be the case with this new edition. An alternative could be to have a mallet percussion instrument play the tremolo below the wind instruments, reinforcing the tone and creating somewhat of a similar effect to the bowed strings. The current edition retains the tremolo marking in the score and parts, leaving it to the discretion of the performers and conductor to choose how to interpret it.

Other instances occur throughout the score and parts supporting the idea that Fauchet used markings influenced by typical string notation. The *low brass parts* have several *pizzicato*
markings and even the saxophones and clarinets contain *pizzicato* markings where the effect of the music would be meant to mimic a *pizzicato* string instrument (see movement 3, mm. 132-133).
CHAPTER 6

PERFORMANCE EDITION OF PAUL FAUCHET’S SYMPHONY IN B-FLAT
FOR MODERN AMERICAN WIND BAND

This chapter contains the full score of the performance edition to Paul Fauchet’s Symphony in B-flat for modern wind band. The edition is a culmination of the editorial decisions outlined in the previous chapters, including re-orchestration and removal of ambiguities from pitch, rhythm, dynamic, articulation, and phrase discrepancies. The final product is a score that is accessible to a multitude of modern wind bands while striving to remain true to the composer’s original orchestration and musical intent. Permission was granted by Alfred Music to reprint and arrange the music for this study.

The lack of an autograph manuscript, along with the large number of errors found in the 1926 publication, necessitated an editorial process that best represented the editor’s critical engagement with the subject of the edition and its sources. While the score does not remain true to the composer’s original intent because of the removal of the saxhorns, it makes the work far more accessible to a larger audience of performers and listeners.

Conclusion

Source materials for Paul Fauchet’s Symphony have almost entirely been lost and, as noted by Editions Alphonse Leduc, the archived copies of the score and materials were destroyed. Continued research for contemporary writings on the Symphony’s premiere are necessary to further the research on the origin of this original work for wind band. Pierre Dupont’s unfound article, published in volume 37 of Musique et Concours (1933), potentially offers the opportunity for another level of research on the work.
While this is not the first symphony composed for band, it is certainly one the first twentieth-century symphonies for band. It is the editor’s hope that the research and work for this project will help to shine new light on the Symphony while encouraging a new generation of wind conductors to program this outstanding composition.

This performance edition reproduced with permission from Alfred Publishing.
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