

AN EXAMINATION OF VARIOUS WORKS
PRESENTED IN A SENIOR FLUTE RECITAL

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Justin William Thai

SUBMITTED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF

Professor Immanuel Davis, Dr. David Grayson, and Professor Jerry Luckhardt

TO THE UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA – TWIN CITIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

the Degree of Bachelor of Music &
Summa Cum Laude in Music

18 MAY 2020

© 2020
Justin William Thai
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Acknowledgements

I would like to first express my deepest gratitude to Professor Immanuel Davis, for serving as my undergraduate honors thesis advisor and as my principal undergraduate Flute Professor. Additionally, on my thesis committee, I wish thank Dr. David Grayson and Prof. Jerry Luckhardt for reviewing my thesis but also for sharing their wisdom and experiences with me during my studies. Thank you to Dietmar Friessenger (soon Dr.) and my colleagues, Gaston Gosselin, Alivia Jones, Abigail Mellado, Max Vitullo, & Felix Wimmer, for their assistance in proofreading my thesis.

Although I cannot thank everyone that has so graciously contributed to my education to this day, as much as I would like to include them all, there a few organizations and a number of individuals I am ultimately indebted to thank:

to the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; our School of Music; the University of Minnesota Bands, Orchestras, and Choirs; the University Honors Program; and the Minnesota Orchestra Student Ambassadors Program.

to Dr. Michael Kim, Director of the School of Music; Dr. Matt Bribitzer-Stull, Honors Program Director and Music Theory Professor; Dr. Laura Sindberg, Director of Music Undergraduate Education; Tim Brock and Rebecca Aylesworth, academic advisors; C.J. Longabaugh, Anabel Njoes, Jaron Paige, & Nicole Radotich, School of Music Staff.

to Conductors: Dr. Emily Threinen, Maestro Mark Russell Smith, Professor Elizabeth “Betsy” McCann, Professor Emeritus Craig Kirchoff, Carrie Backman, Dr. John Nick Smith, Dr. Cory Near, Timothy Redmond, Tom Hammond, & Peter Davies.

to Professors and Graduate Assistants: Dr. David Damschroder, Dr. Gabriella Currie, Dr. Kyung Kim, Dr. Guerino Mazzola, Dr. Rie Tanaka, Prof. Jane Giering-DeHaan, Prof. Tanya Remenikova, Prof. Norbert Nielubowski, Lukas Perry, & Alyssa Boehnlein.

to my Flute Professors and Teachers: Frau Mag. Maria Jauk, MDW; Furugh Djafar-Zadeh-Karimi, MDW; James “Jim” Walker, Julie Burkert, Sara Andon, Sandra “Sandy” Kipp-Iles, Mary Predmore, & Ann Erwin.

to the Professors and Staff at IES Abroad, Vienna: Dr. Morten Solvik, Dr. Ulrike Anton, Dr. Charlotte “Lotte” Summesberger, Prof. Carolyn Hague, Miguel Kertsman, Deirdre Brenner, Bianca Calinescu, Miyuki Schüssler, Dr. John Wilson, Martin Schwarz, Gintė Stankevičiūtė, Tobias Sigmund, Meral Kölblinger, Gavin David Lord, & Dieter Strobl

to the Wiener Staatsoper (Vienna State Opera) and my Musikarchiv colleagues, Head Librarian Dr. Katharina Hötzenecker, Mona-Lisa Kress, & Thomas Heinisch.

to the Orchesterverein der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Wien: Maestro Robert Zelzer, Jodi B., Ayako K., Thomas K., Rudolf “Rudi” M., Eberhard P., Michael P., & Xiaocheng W.

to my Grade School Music Directors: Anthony “Marty” Martone, Adam Payne, Michelle Hagen (Brown), Janine Delwarte, & Susan Treworgy-Calkins.

to my Close Friends, (in a non-exhaustive list) domestically and internationally: Karoline B., Eric B., Justus B., Antón D.-C., Agnese C., Eric E., Liam G., Gaston G., Kingsley H., “Manu” K., Leonard L., Elgin L., Vincent L., Clarie L., Abigail M., Alejandro M., Yana M., Jacob M., Jenna M., Ben P., Meghan R., Céline S., Eviatar S., Brittney S., “Jane” S., Benjamin S.-W., Audrey S., & Max V.

... and of course, to my family,

whom I never thank enough for their love and support.

Dedication

*to Professor Jerry Luckhardt, Professor Elizabeth “Betsy” McCann,
Max Vitullo, Claire E. Loritz
Liam N. Green, & Eric Elert*

for sharing their gifts with the world.

*“The meaning of life is to find your gift.
The purpose of life is to give it away.”
- Pablo Picasso*

Abstract

During the final year of undergraduate studies in music, many universities require their students to perform a senior recital in partial fulfillment of their Bachelor of Music degree. This thesis, in conjunction with the recital, is also intended for partial fulfillment for the University Honors Program distinction of *summa cum laude*. I selected three works for my flute recital: *Chant de Linos* (1944) by André Jolivet; the Sonata in E Minor for Flute and Basso Continuo (1724?, BWV 1034) by Johann Sebastian Bach; and the Concerto for Flute and Orchestra (1932–33) by Jacques Ibert.

Each work will be discussed in-depth and chronologically, exploring their composers, the historical contexts surrounding the works, as well as their compositional design. As Jolivet and Ibert are lesser known, short biographies have been provided.

Although each of these compositions have different combinations of ensemble choices, such as flute, string trio, and harp for *Chant de Linos*, only versions for flute and piano (or realized keyboard for the Bach) were to be used in performance – however, as a result of recent events in March 2020 of the novel COVID-19, all university-wide events, including recitals were canceled. In the appendices, the program that would have been performed has been provided, along with program notes for a general audience.

Table of Contents

J.S. Bach: Sonata for Flute and Basso Continuo in E Minor, BWV 1034 (1724?)	1
J. Ibert: Concerto for Flute and Orchestra, L 47 (1932–1933)	9
A. Jolivet: <i>Chant de Linos</i> for Flute and Piano (1944)	17
A Senior Recital in Vienna, Austria – CANCELED.	23
List of Works Cited.....	26
Appendix A: Proposed Program (English & Deutsch)	28
Appendix B: Program Notes for the General Audience	31

J.S. Bach: Sonata for Flute and Basso Continuo in E Minor, BWV 1034 (1724?)

Composer and keyboardist, Johann Sebastian Bach (1685–1750) was among the most influential musical figures of his time. Utilizing a wealth of styles and compositional techniques, he wrote hundreds of liturgical and secular works ranging from oratorios and cantatas to orchestral suites and studies.

Only a small handful of works is dedicated to *il flauto traverso* or *Querflöte*, the transverse flute, which is played by blowing across it, rather than the *flûte à bec*, the recorder. (For conciseness, “flute” here will refer to the transverse flute.) Among scholars, the solo pieces that are confirmed to be authored by J.S. Bach, with or without accompaniment, are comprised of the A minor partita, BWV 1013; two sonatas for flute continuo and obbligato harpsichord, BWV 1030 and 1032; and two continuo sonatas, BWV 1034 and 1035. There are two obbligato sonatas (BWV 1020 and BWV 1031) and another continuo sonata (BWV 1033), which are questionable in authorship and have likely been mistakenly attributed to J.S. Bach.¹ As this does not pertain to the continuo sonata in E minor, BWV 1034, the concerns of authenticity will not be addressed here, but rather the origins of the work.

Much of Bach’s chamber and ensemble music were once thought by many musicologists to have been composed in his Cöthen period (1717–1723). Today, it is considered that a bulk of this music was rather written during his early years in Leipzig through the end of his time serving at the Collegium Musicum (1723–early 1740s). This collection of pieces include the *Sonate für Flöte und Basso continuo, e-Moll*, BWV

¹ Robert L. Marshall, “J. S. Bach's Compositions for Solo Flute: A Reconsideration of Their Authenticity and Chronology,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 32, no. 3 (1979): pp. 463-498, <https://doi.org/10.1525/jams.1979.32.3.03a00050>, 466, 474.

1034, speculated to have been written around the year 1724.² Since the autograph of the sonata lost, it is not certain when exactly Bach composed it, although the earliest manuscript by copyist Johann Peter Kellner is presumed to have been made in 1725 or 1726, making it logical to theorize that the E Minor Flute Sonata was written shortly before the copies.³ Beginning in 1723, Bach served as a cantor at *Thomaskirche* (St. Thomas' Church) in Leipzig, largely focusing on composing music for Sunday and feast services. For this purpose, he wrote a great deal of music by the end of his time there, such as his 300 sacred cantatas. In addition to his function as Thomaskantor, he looked to become the music director at the University of Leipzig, where he frequently performed at the campus' church, Paulinerkirche.⁴

In these positions, Bach wrote 21 cantatas – 14 of which include the flute in their orchestration – between 23 July and 19 November 1724. Before and after this timeframe, the flute parts in his cantatas were quite elementary in comparison and were implemented much less frequently and more sporadically. Given the difficulty of the solos in the cantatas written during these summer and autumn months of 1724, there is a hypothesis that because a skilled and resident flutist was documented to be unavailable, it is conceivable that a capable flutist was temporarily staying in Leipzig. In a testimonial, Bach references such a flutist on 18 May 1727: a law student, Friedrich Gottlieb Wild. In this source, Bach noted Wild's accomplishments as a student of

² Johann Sebastian Bach and Barthold Kuijken, "Nachwort - Zur Entstehung," in *Sonate für Flöte und Basso continuo e-Moll*, ed. Barthold Kuijken and Siebe Henstra (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1991), p. 16-17, 16.

³ Marshall, "J. S. Bach's Compositions for Solo Flute: A Reconsideration of Their Authenticity and Chronology," 481.

⁴ Christoph Wolff and Walter Emery, "Bach, Johann Sebastian," ed. Christoph Wolff, Oxford Music Online: Grove Music Online, 2001, <https://doi-org.ezp1.lib.umn.edu/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.6002278195>.

composition as well as of the flute and harpsichord. Whether or not the work is intended for Wild is not definite, but rather likely. Theorizing that the E Minor Flute Sonata was conceived in the same five-month period as the cantatas, the sonata, would then have been composed sometime in the second half of the year 1724. To add to the plausible argument connecting these works, this flute sonata (BWV 1034) is more texturally similar to the cantata's continuo arias compared to his earlier, fuller solo sonatas with obbligato keyboard from the Cöthen period. Overall, such considerations further exclude the possibility of the composition belonging to the years before his time in Leipzig.⁵

The Sonata for Flute and Basso Continuo in E Minor is presented in four movements in an alternation of slow–fast–slow–fast, forming a *sonata da chiesa*.⁶ (For the analysis to follow, only the continuo and the flute will be taken into account, as to avoid the variety of possible realizations of the figured bass.) The first movement, *Adagio ma non tanto*, is in a simple quadruple meter in E minor and is through-composed in a simple binary form, AB, without a repeat in the middle. The piece begins with a quality of longing, using gestures of consecutive rolling thirds and sixths as well as small-scale arpeggiation. Like other works by J.S. Bach, this opening movement is built with long and drawn-out phrases that never seem to end. Parallel to grammatical rules in language, each of these lengthy sentences are still punctuated properly and never cross the line of becoming a “run-on sentence.” The music only moves through three phrases, each established by a perfect cadence. The first and second sections fit into the “A” of the binary form, while the final section takes up the entirety of “B.” The first

⁵ Marshall, “J. S. Bach's Compositions for Solo Flute: A Reconsideration of Their Authenticity and Chronology,” 482-84.

⁶ Johann Sebastian Bach, *Sonate für Flöte und Basso continuo e-Moll*, ed. Barthold Kuijken and Siebe Henstra (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1991), 2-15.

sentence establishes the tonic and stays in tonic through the first cadence until the downbeat of m. 9. The flute begins with a curious arpeggiation while underneath, the basso continuo maintains, at first, quite a smooth and simple line within this first phrase. Here, and throughout the movement, the flute presses with dissonance against the continuo during the strong beats, resolving as appoggiaturas, occasionally through suspension, increasing the harmonic energy and tension towards the few landmark cadences Bach has made available. In m. 5, under the floating voice of the flute, the continuo introduces a new figure. The continuo descends in thirds, followed by the flute in the next measure, two octaves higher, verbatim. The flute continues the gesture further three more times in a gentle descent while the basso continuo imitates below at a sixth and an octave just for the fourth gesture, bringing the phrase towards the cadence. The tonic begins the second sentence passing through to the mediant, G, on the following downbeat in m. 10, where it functions on a lower hierarchy in the minor, dominant, B minor as a VI chord. The VI, now analyzed in the subordinate tonal area of B minor, tonicizes the area in a weak imperfect cadence on the downbeat of m. 11 and further continues harmonic activity within B minor through m. 17. This time, the basso continuo, in m. 11, borrows and develops the opening flute melody, becoming a conversation partner with the flute. Again, the motif with the rising thirds recurs in m. 13 and the flute echoes the continuo thirds, taking this gesture and melding the thirds and their inversion: sixths. The final sentence never reestablishes the tonic before the end. Rather, Bach maintains the minor dominant key area while taking the thirds and sixths, rising figures, and conversation between the flute and continuo through a flurry of harmonies in a small amount of time. In m. 20, the major third is reintegrated back

into the dominant to prepare its return to the tonic, while it rises in a neighbor motion to what seems like tonic resolution in m. 21, falling back to the principal tones in the middle of m. 22. The dominant is now suspended, containing energy and propulsion to drive towards the tonic, with various moments of passing figures, and the last gently falling thirds through the penultimate measure, completing the movement on a well-awaited perfect authentic cadence.

Bach's second movement, *Allegro*, breaks the yearning of the first movement with a stately and jaunty celebration, felt in a simple duple or fast quadruple meter. For ease of discussion, the movement will be explored with a fast quadruple meter. This *Allegro* in E minor falls in place on a macro-phrasal level as a "i-III-v-V-i" progression, a form similar to that of a ritornello concerto. Each of these ritornelli, or "orchestral" tutti sections are mm. 1–15, 24–39, 48–58, and 62–70. During each of these ritornelli, the flute should match and complement the continuo, while in between each of the said ritornelli are solo sections, called *die Episode* (German, plural, *die Episoden*), where the flute should instead maintain a strong and forward presence. From the top of the movement the bass initiates, with the flute bouncing off of the first beat into the second beat. Stripping away the material on the upbeats provided to the flute, the melody is quite simple, maintaining a parallel tenth against the basso continuo in the first three measures. Typically, there are three sections contained in a single ritornello section including *der Vordersatz*, *die Fortspinnung*, and *der Epilog* (German). As in example, taking the first ritornello, mm. 1–5 contain the *der Vordersatz* (plural, *die Vordersätze*), establishing a maintaining a single key area. The phrase continues, breaking the pattern to develop further – this is *die Fortspinnung*, (plural, *die Fortspinnungen*) where the

ritornello undergoes harmonic change. In the second half of the phrase from the middle of m. 5, this decorated melody in the flute is imitated without alteration below in the continuo at an octave and a perfect fourth, functioning similarly to a real answer in the contrapuntal technique of the fugue. During this change of roles, the flute decorates and similarly parallels the bass with the inversion of a third, which is a sixth, plus the addition of an octave. The real answer falls out of the exact imitation on the final sixteenth-note in m. 9 and continues to the concluding cadence of the first ritornello – *der Epilog* (plural, *die Epiloge*). The figure of parallel tenths or parallel sixths plus an octave dominate the movement, while the sixteenth-note arpeggiation solo gestures in the flute – each of which is *die Episode* – the first of which appears in m. 16 with an anacrusis, outlining chords that ultimately form sequential patterns. Bach uses these *Episoden* with arpeggiated sequences in this context to bridge harmonic areas. The first of these sequences, mm. 16–24, hovers on the tonic until it accepts a raised third and minor seventh, propelling it into a descending-fifths sequence to land in G major. Returning to the motif of parallels, the G major tonality quickly moves into D major by m. 28 – however, this is unstable! The use of D major is merely one part of the path. Within the path, D major succumbs to the B minor, its relative minor in m. 40. Each additional measure then accepts a major third and a minor seventh or shift by a descending fifth, back and forth. It is only in m. 51 that we reach a full B dominant seventh – an entity that allows the movement to return to the original tonic to reinstate the “parallel motif” and bring the movement to a close.

The *Andante* movement follows as a contemplative aria in a simple triple meter in the relative major, G, with a meditative six measure introduction. What Bach

produces in this movement is captivating, forming a passacaglia where the figured bass is repeated multiple times. The continuo is repeated three times at the beginning, is then altered for a new harmony, but returns for two more repetitions. The music spawned in each phrase and reiteration an assortment of colors, provide effective interest. Only the internal section, mm. 20-42, opposes the major mediant's authority. Even though it begins with the harmony prepared in the introduction, the music changes, referencing the tonic minor of the complete sonata. Preceding mm. 20 and 43, another feature makes this quite aria-like – these are not found anywhere else in this sonata: entering each of the sections, the flute takes a moment of recollection, then sings a full measure cadenza-like anacrusis, like a glimpse into fantasy.

Declarative and spirited, the last movement of the sonata – also in a simple triple meter – returns the music to E minor in a simple binary structure, A:||:B functioning as “i-III-v(-V, in the first ending):||:v-V-i”. The principle motives of this final *Allegro* include articulating an “8-5-1” of a chord with a neighbor tone decorating the “8”; alternation of sixteenth-notes in one measure with a repeated pitch on eighth-notes in the next (e.g. mm. 13-18); and a falling descending motif in the flute (e.g. 30–32), using a combination of thirds to create a harmonic sequence. The movement begins with the 8-5-1 motif in the flute in the first two measures, echoed by the continuo in the next two measures while the flute serves as accompaniment for a small moment, also revisited in m. 11. In the flute in mm. 11–12, the rhythm outlines a sort of hemiola, where the rhythm disrupts the bar lines, foreshadowing additional hemiolas in mm. 37 and 83, including each of those measures' anacruses. Following this first phrase is the back and forth simultaneous conversation between the flute and basso continuo, beginning in m.

13. The flute begins with a measure of rearticulated eighth-notes and continues with a measure of sixteenth-notes, and returns to the eighth-notes, and so on. In the meantime, the continuo joins in with eighth-notes in m. 14 during the flute's sixteenth-notes, but then its chance to rise to the platform sixteenth-notes during the flute's eighth-notes, trading roles with the flute. The trade-off is broken in m. 19 as the music descends in a sequence. At m. 23, there is an exchange between the flute and continuo, with the flute being subordinate to the continuo's changing harmonic line. The flute returns to the fore and descends with the bass in a third-composite sequence in mm. 30-32, transitioning to a G major downbeat by m. 36, imitating the theme in the mediant but also, as mentioned previously, surprises the audience with a hemiola-like gesture that soon leads to either B major during the repeat, or B minor to move beyond the repeat. The second half of this final movement is quite similar in construction, motivically, moving in the macroscope from B minor to B major, to the final E minor. The first phrase is at first deceptive, but is actually a loose representation of the 8-5-1 motif in inversion, delaying the basso continuo echo until m. 49. The continuo echo, however, is not in inversion. What follows is similar to mm. 23-26 in the first half, however this time the flute takes precedence and the continuo, subordinate. After that insertion, the movement proceeds like the first half. The alternation of eighth- and sixteenth-notes in between the flute and continuo does come next, but this time the flute begins right away with the sixteenth-note figures. In mm. 65-68, the flute operates as the important voice, as the bass is simplified, if one parallels the voice from the previous half in mm. 19-22, where voices served equally. The rest of the movement is rhythmically and texturally the same, but, of course, with a cadence in E minor to finish the sonata.

J. Ibert: Concerto for Flute and Orchestra, L 47 (1932–1933)

Jacques Ibert (1890–1962) was the son to a Parisian businessman, by the same name, and a well-trained pianist, Marguerite Lartigue. At an early age, his mother trained Ibert to read music, providing his first violin lessons at age 4, and later, piano lessons. She desired very much for her son to reach musical fame; however, his father was rather displeased at this idea and preferred him to follow in his footsteps as a businessman. His father feared that even during this early age, the young Ibert should not be distracted from his Classical academic studies. Despite these wishes, he proceeded to continue his musical studies in secret, even learning to improvise waltzes and other pieces as early as age twelve. After completing secondary school, he delayed entering higher education and worked as an apprentice with his father. Meanwhile, Ibert registered for courses in solfège and harmony but was also inspired to take drama classes by Paul Mounet. It was with Mounet that he discovered a great passion in theatre but met great disdain from both of his parents and ultimately returned to music composition after consolation by the composer Manuel de Falla, a friend to the family.⁷

At age 21, Ibert proceeded to study composition and joined Arthur Honegger and Darius Milhaud at the Paris Conservatoire, colleagues with whom he would collaborate later in his career. As a result of his father's disapproval and revoking financial support, Ibert was forced find income, composing popular songs and accompanying silent films in the cinema. Although his studies were interrupted in 1914 by his required service in the First World War, Ibert entered and won the esteemed composition competition, *le Prix de Rome*, in October 1919, following the footsteps of only a select number of the

⁷ Véronique Ibert Péréal, "Biographie," Biographie, 2010, <http://www.jacquesibert.fr/ibert/Biographie.html>.

most renowned French composers. After his three-year residency at *la Villa di Medici* in Rome, Ibert composed a diverse collection of music for film and the stage, in addition to the concert and recital halls. Within his compositional output, only two works are dedicated to the solo flute: *Concerto pour flûte et orchestre*, L47 (1932–33), and *Pièce pour flûte seule*, L 60 (1936, “for flute alone”). Eighteen years after winning *le Prix*, he returns to serve as the Director of the Académie de France in Rome until 1960. In 1955, Ibert was appointed as an administrator to the combined management of the Paris Opéra and Opéra Comique. A year later, he is elected to the celebrated Académie des Beaux Arts de l’Institut de France.⁸

During early 1930s in Paris, Ibert wrote a rich variety of works, from an *opéra comique* as well as ballet and film music, a symphony and both a concerto and a concertino.⁹ The latter Concerto for flute and orchestra bears many compositional similarities in style and texture to the Concertino da Camera, L 58 (1935) for the saxophone and small orchestra, both of which today are standard works of the respective repertoires. The Concerto for flute was written for the legendary flutist and pedagogue of the Paris Conservatoire, Marcel Moyse, who premiered the work on 25 February 1934 at the Société des Concerts du Conservatoire in Paris. The orchestra was conducted by a notable flutist and colleague to Moyse, Philippe Gaubert.¹⁰

The première was well received by the Parisian public and was positively reviewed. Parisian music critic Robert Brussel, reviewer to the many great French

⁸ Alexandra Laederich, “Ibert, Jacques (François Antoine Marie),” Oxford Music Online: Grove Music Online, 2001, <https://doi-org.ezp1.lib.umn.edu/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.13675>.

⁹ Alphonse Leduc, “PDF” (Paris, May 2010), 3.

¹⁰ Steven Ledbetter, “JACQUES IBERT: Flute Concerto,” Rockford Symphony Orchestra, 2016, <https://www.rockfordsymphony.com/ibert-flute-concerto/>.

composers, wrote his high praise in the newspaper, *Le Figaro*, in the section, *Le mouvement musical* (The Musical Movement). The complete paragraphs from the newspaper regarding this first reception of Ibert's concerto have been reproduced and translated below, as this has not yet reached the worldwide community of flutists.

“Nous manquions d'un concerto moderne pour la flûte. M. Jacques Ibert vient de nous le donner. Il s'était préparé à cette tâche par la composition de pièces où l'instrument de Tulou, de Taffanel et de Gaubert jouait le rôle essentiel. Son Concerto pour flûte est ravissant. C'est Marcel Moyse qui en a été l'interprète triplement admiré pour la beauté de son, du style et le raffinement de la virtuosité. Et c'est la vieille Société des Concerts du Conservatoire, toujours vaillante et toujours magnifique, – dont je regrette que les circonstances m'empêchent de parler plus souvent, – qui nous en a fait l'heureuse surprise.

Trois parties : un allegro, un andante, un finale en forme de rondo. Plan traditionnel ; style classique ; couleur moderne. Ce mélange n'est pas un des moindres agréments de ce charmant ouvrage et l'un de ses moins piquants attraits. M. Jacques Ibert observe ici les règles de l'ancien jeu, expose, réexpose, varie, déduit, amplifie, combine, brode d'une plume sûre et sans poids, allège d'un sourire les plus doctes préceptes. Le premier mouvement a de l'élan, le deuxième du charme et de l'ardeur, mais le troisième est tous le plus réussi, plein d'entrain de verdure, avec sa double cadence où le virtuose se prodigue en traits brillants et le compositeur en spirituelles saillies. L'orchestre sonne à ravir ; M. Jacques Ibert y a très heureusement marié le timbre de la flûte à celui des autres instruments et notamment de l'alto, et M. Philippe Gaubert en a rendu avec délicatesse le fin coloris. M. Moyse a plongé ses auditeurs dans le ravissement : 'Il est doux d'écouter le roseau qui soupire.'”¹¹

“We have been missing a modern concerto for the flute. Mr. Jacques Ibert has just given it to us. He has prepared himself for this task by composing pieces in which the instrument of [Jean-Louis] Tulou, [Paul] Taffanel, and [Philippe] Gaubert played an essential role. His flute concerto is ravishing! It was performed by Marcel Moyse, who was triply admired for his beauty of sound, style, and the refinement of virtuosity. And it is the old *Société des Concerts du Conservatoire*, ever so valiant and always magnificent, of which I regret that the circumstances prevent me from speaking more often, which has given us this joyful surprise.

Three parts: an *Allegro*, an *Andante*, a finale in rondo form. Traditional scheme. Classic style. Modern color. This mixture [of components] is not of its least delightful features but one of the less striking appeals. Mr. Jacques Ibert observes here the rules of the old game: exposing, re-exposing, varying, deducing, amplifying, combing, embellishing with a reliable and weightless pen, lighting up a smile of [an individual with] the most learnt fundamentals. The first movement has momentum; the second, charm and ardor; but the third is the most successful – full of lively enthusiasm, with its double cadenza where the soloist lavishes himself in its brilliant facets and the composer in intellectual wittiness. The orchestra resonates in pleasure. Here, Mr. Jacques Ibert very joyfully marries the timbre of the flute to that of the other instruments – notably the viola – and Mr. Phillippe Gaubert has delicately implemented this with a fine coloration. Mr. Moyse has submerged his audience into delight: It is sweet to listen to the reed that sighs.”¹²

¹¹ Robert Brussel, “Œuvres Nouvelles,” *Le Figaro*, February 27, 1934, 58 edition, sec. Le mouvement musical, p. 4, <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k297616z>.

¹² Brussel, “Œuvres Nouvelles,” trans. Justin W. Thai.

The concerto is in three movements: *Allegro*, *Andante*, and *Allegro scherzando*. Each movement demands the highest sense of artistry from not only the soloist but the orchestra, too. The orchestral score consists of doubled flutes, oboes, clarinets, and bassoons; doubled horns and one trumpet; strings; and timpani (a single timpanist and two timpani). A piano reduction, which was completed in the same year of the concerto by Ibert himself, will be referenced instead here unless otherwise stated.¹³

The first movement is fiery and brilliant, characterized by precise sixteenth-note passages for the soloist and collaborator(s). This *Allegro* is primarily in a simple duple meter, with a small handful of exceptions, including complex single and simple triple meters. In terms of form structure analysis, the movement is a bit tricky. There are two main sections of the exposition, spanning mm. 1–53 and mm. 53–141. Within the first section, there is much restlessness among the soloist and the orchestra, bustling with powerful energy. The second section, on the other hand, is calm, but persistent until the music intensifies to the solo flute’s C, five ledger-lines above the staff. The development covers mm. 142–207, recalling the impetus of the previous two sections but in a rather playful character, marked by Ibert as *scherzando*. The recapitulation of the exposition, mm. 208–255, only restates the first section with alterations until m. 224, where the flute solo and collaboration are identical to material in the exposition. The movement finishes with a coda, m. 256 through the end, where the music seems to disappear into thin air but is punctuated with a final startling crash of a high E major chord against the well-established “F” root.

¹³ Jacques François Antoine Marie Ibert, *Concerto: pour flûte et orchestre* (Paris: Alphonse Leduc, 1934).

Keeping in consideration the first movement as well as the whole concerto, Ibert manages to create a landscape that is tonally unclear yet still informed, where one could call this a “Concerto in F” or “Concerto en fa” without specification to the sonority, major versus minor. Even with the four-measure introduction to the concerto, there is something interestingly “tonal” despite a first examination telling a listener otherwise. In the third measure is a minor-seventh, a C and a B-flat, functioning somewhat as an outer shell to a C dominant-seventh chord. This is supported in the following measure in the last eighth-note octave C’s in the bass moving by root-motion to F. Whether this is truly a “tonic” might not be clear; examining a repetition of the meticulous flute solo brings possible clarity with a change of atmosphere and texture. Taking mm. 5–10 from the soloist, the ensemble repeats this figure transposed down a minor-sixth at m. 15; the harmony is perhaps more explicit here. When accounting for this phrase, the cadence in m. 14 enters the transposed solo melody, while the simpler harmonic support provides a strong confirmation for which pitch may function as a tonal center, if any exists. There are various ways to identify the tonality, with the less complicated but more subjective method of listening. If an individual, who has been cultivated by Western music, can sing their idea of the “tonic,” then it exists. Indeed, the other method is tonal theory analysis, which luckily in this example, is quite comprehensible and is quite short and sweet compared to other harmonic challenges within this work. In this case, transposing the hypothesized introductory tonic down by a minor-sixth, the root is likely the pitch, A. The preceding cadence in m. 14 supports this with an arpeggiation of an E major chord in the bass, with the addition of an incidental minor 9th that descends to the octave and then to the minor seventh, completing the cadence by root-motion, despite the

leading tone resolving in a different octave. Just a couple measures later, the downbeat eighth-note, E, in the bass is harmonized with a G-sharp and another E, producing a feeling of a dominant chord in the key area of A, before proceeding to traverse through additional harmonic areas.

The middle *Andante* movement of the concerto, yearning and grieving, contrasts greatly against the outer counterparts. It is known that Ibert's father died in 1933 at the time of writing this concerto and it is possible this movement might have been his method to process the event of losing a loved one, each moment burning deeper than the last, while reaching contemplation and eventually serenity and acceptance.¹⁴ This movement is primarily in a simple triple meter with sprinklings of the simple quadruple meter. Should one accept the possibility of this entire concerto as an F centered composition, then this movement, hovering in the harmonic land of D-flat, stands as a submediant in the big picture of the work, functioning in ternary form (ABA). The first A section, mm. 1–36, is built of two unbelievably gorgeous and heart-wrenching, yet extensive phrases – similar to those mentioned in the previous section regarding the Bach E Minor Flute Sonata, BWV 1034, (see p. 3). The collaboration and the dissonance in this section heavily urge the music towards delayed climaxes and, finally, a warm cadence, with a question. Following in the B section, mm. 37–79, the careful and tender atmosphere is disrupted with a rigid, march-like theme in the collaboration. The soloist attempts to process the events, building to an expansive and heaving bawl, but retreats back to ponderous thoughts. In m. 80, section A returns, but now the melody is sung by a solo violin at an octave higher than the original, while the solo flute heeds the violin

¹⁴ Péréal, "Biographie."

and accompanies it with a tidal-wave-like stream of sixteenth-notes – pushing and pulling beneath the violin. The roles are traded back in m. 96, where the solo flute continues the melody at the raised octave with the tides continuing to support it. On a technical note, Ibert has the solo flute return to the original octave in m. 106 to avoid too high of a register, which could destroy the coloration he has so carefully orchestrated. From there, the soloist passes the melody back to its collaborator in the anacrusis to m. 110, while maintaining the original tessitura. In the last phrase, m. 113 to the end, the flute gently interjects with a coda, using a melody from section B (mm. 59 and 60), raised by a perfect fourth, into a raw and delicate flageolet D-flat.

Ibert's final movement of his flute concerto is flashy, bright, and erratic, combining and playing with the use of simple triple, simple duple and quadruple, and complex quadruple meters, heavily marked with syncopation. These main figures of syncopation are most present bookending the movement in the introduction and coda – both of which are unmistakable, with complementary dissonance, confirming F as a tonal center of sorts. This figure of syncopation, as a rhythm, permeates much of the internal workings of the movement. Fascinatingly, the form of this *Allegro scherzando* is a ternary form with additional internal ternary forms: Introduction-(ABA)-(CDC)-(ABA)-Coda. For the sake of explanation, the each of the parenthetical groupings of this ternary structure, “(ABA)” or “(CDC),” will be considered a “bubble.” Each time A appears, it generally follows the same rhythmic structure and melodic contour, where the flute is filled and built nearly exclusively with triplets. The triplets take form mostly as unidentifiable running scales, mixed in with twisting and turning intervals of thirds and octaves, requiring great embouchure flexibility and agility. Ibert brilliantly utilizes a

group of tied over notes (e.g., mm. 7–9), followed by arpeggiation and tremolos. Each time this occurs, harmonic content varies, allowing the phrase to transition into the B section or out of the internal ternary bubble and into the next section, either the first section C, or the coda. Comparing the two (ABA) bubbles, the first bubble (mm. 25–96) descends a half-step when it returns in m. 205. To connect the first (ABA) bubble to the middle sections, Ibert has brought back the rambunctious syncopation from the introduction as transitional material (mm. 97–108). It suddenly halts, as if frozen in the air. The solo flute mysteriously calls out through means of a cadenza, dancing with an improvisatory-like intent, but time suddenly clicks back on at m. 126, moving along persistently, beginning section C. The ensemble as a whole seems to be searching and wandering for something, but to no avail. The solo flute becomes agitated with confusion and dances by in a gust of sixteenth-note triplets, where it is most concentrated in section D, in mm. 162–172. These gusts rise chromatically, falling in a nearly scalar fashion – but like the scales in section A, they do not have a recognizable pattern. The soloist then holds out on a scream, a high B-flat, and falls at their pleasure in thirty-second-notes and returns to reality, to wander again, but this time, lowered a half-step. Without transition, the second (ABA) bubble commences. It is quite curious that Ibert contrasts the directions of transposition for the repetitions of the internal C's, lowering a half-step, while the outer (ABA) bubble is presented is opposite, being raised a half-step the second time – likely no mistake in this subtle change. To send off the end of the concerto, Ibert writes an extensive and dazzling second cadenza, integrating flutter tonguing and harmonics to attach the coda, which finishes much like the movement begins and concludes the concerto with a bang.

A. Jolivet: *Chant de Linos* for Flute and Piano (1944)

Born in Paris, André Jolivet (1905–1974) proved to have significant artistic talent at a young age. His mother was a pianist, while his father was a painter, taking an interest in both disciplines as well as theatre. Jolivet had piano lessons from his mother and studied the cello with Louis Feuillard, and as for painting, he worked with Georges Valmier. Young Jolivet spent his free time listening to the matinee musical theatre performances of *Comédie française*, fantasizing about taking part in the productions. At age 15, he designed a full marionette theatre, including building the set, making the puppets, and writing scripts, capturing the attention of the abbot at the chapel of Notre Dame of Clignancourt. Discovering his abilities, the abbot provided early instruction in harmony and improvisation.¹⁵

Although Jolivet was highly artistically driven, his parents forbade him from entering the arts and preferred that he would become a teacher – he obeyed at the time. After receiving his diploma and accepting a teaching position at a local Parisian school, it allowed him at the age of 23 to self-fund his music studies. It is during this time that he worked with painter Valmier, who introduced him to composer Paul Le Flem, and took Jolivet under his tutelage. Though Le Flem was a professor of counterpoint at the *Schola Cantorum*, he also introduced the twelve-tone techniques of Schönberg and the music of Edgar Varèse, a classmate of Le Flem. Before Varèse left for the United States, Jolivet became his only European pupil and was significantly influenced while

¹⁵ Janet Landreth, “André Jolivet: A Study of the Piano Works With a Discussion of His Aesthetic and Technical Principles” (dissertation, University Microfilms International, 1980), pp. 1-101, 1-2.

forming his methods of composition and musical experimentation in the realm of atonality.¹⁶

Over the years, André Jolivet explored a range of musical inspirational sources, including ritual and sacramental music from Africa and East Asia, considered today as his “magic” period. It is during this period that he wrote his first work for flute, *Cinq incantations* for solo flute (1936), focused on the cycle of life and the seasons of the harvest. He also met Olivier Messiaen and Jean-Yves Daniel-Lesur, where the three found, in 1935, “La spirale,” a chamber music society emphasizing on the avant-garde. The following year, joined by Yves Baudrier, they formed “La Jeune France,” (The Young France). They opposed Stravinsky’s movement of neo-classicism, Satie and Les Six, and others, and promoted spirituality and humanness in a time of machines. During the Second World War, Jolivet looked to leave behind atonality in place of lyricism but still maintained his fascination with the concept of the ritual, writing *Chant de Linos* (1944) to be performed with solo flute and piano. Following the war, he accepted a position as the musical director of the *Comédie française*, circling back to his childhood dreams. He served at the theatre for 14 years, near to the end of his life, having written several scores to stage plays. Outside of the world of drama, he continued to compose other works, many of which contributed further to the flute repertoire. A few pieces made during the last years of his life were a Concerto for flute and string orchestra (1949); a sonata for flute and piano (1958); and *Alla rustica* for flute and harp (1963).¹⁷

¹⁶ Landreth, “André Jolivet,” 2-3.

¹⁷ Barbara L. Kelly, “Jolivet, André,” Oxford Music Online: Grove Music Online, 2001, <https://doi-org.ezp1.lib.umn.edu/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.14433>.

Of André Jolivet's œuvre for the flute, *Chant de Linos* is perhaps the most popular in performance. The work was composed as a *pièce de concours* for the flutists at the Paris Conservatoire, where a piece serves as a final examination for those finishing their studies at the conservatoire. That year, 1944, included the famed Jean-Pierre Rampal who won *Première Prix*, or "First Prize." The following year, Jolivet wrote the second version of the work for solo flute, violin, viola, cello, and harp, and was premiered by the Pierre Jamet Quintet. This ensemble included the professor of flute at the Paris Conservatoire, Gaston Crunelle, to whom this work is dedicated.¹⁸ (N.B.: the concept of *un concours* is often directly translated to "a competition," wherein this context should instead be considered an evaluation of an individual alone, where the *Prix* serves as a diploma. The *Prix* also designates the threshold of performance, with the First Prize as the highest distinction. With that in mind, any number of First Prizes and Second Prizes were awarded, including the chance of no prizes at all.)¹⁹

Along with many other works by Jolivet, he took inspiration from folklore to write *Chant de Linos*. He wrote to the performer in the music, "Le CHANT de LINOS était, dans l'antiquité grecque, une variété de thrène : une lamentation funèbre, une complainte entrecoupée de cris et de danses."²⁰ (The Song of Linus was, in the time of Greek Antiquity, a variety of threnody – a funeral lamentation, a lament broken by cries

¹⁸ Markus Brönnimann, "André Jolivet: Sämtliche Werke Für Flöte," Naxos Classical Music - Naxos Album Reviews, February 2019, https://www.naxos.com/mainsite/blurbs_reviews.asp?item_code=8.573885&catNum=573885&file_type>About%20this%20Recording&language=German.

¹⁹ Dallas Kern Holoman, "The Paris Conservatoire in the Nineteenth Century," Oxford Handbooks Online, April 7, 2015, <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935321.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935321-e-114>.

²⁰ André Jolivet, *Chant De Linos: pour flûte et piano*, 11th ed. (Paris: Alphonse Leduc, 1946), 1.

and dances.)²¹ Coming from Greek mythology, the figure, “Linus,” or more commonly known as “Linus,” is conceived through many inconsistent stories. Between all the myths, it is consistent that Linus portrays a personification of lament, associated with sacrificial ceremony and the funeral rite. Of the myths, three are most accepted. From the myth rooted in ancient Argos, Linus is the son of Apollo and a nereid (a sea nymph), named Psamathe. She bore and raised Linus in secrecy but was found by shepherds and fed to dogs. In grief, her father learns of the child and condemns Psamathe to death for her betrayal. For his cruelty, Apollo plagues Argos, only to escape by sacrifice and singing of dirges. The tale stated in Thebes tells that Linus was born from the union of a son of Poseidon, Amphimarus, and the muse, Urania. However, two possible scenarios lead to his death, though both include his gift as a musician. Linus, in the one Theban myth, is said to have been a tutor of music to Heracles. In frustration, Linus is murdered with his own harp by Heracles. The alternative Theban myth recounts Linus’ prowess, boasting his musical talent against Apollo, where the god kills Linus in a competition. Like the Argivian perspective of the story, Linus is also mourned, offered sacrifices and laments in his honor.²²

Chant de Linos is an intricate piece, requiring a vast amount of musicianship from all performers. The version for flute and piano will be the source of analysis here.²³ Jolivet depicts this Grecian threnody from terrifying, powerful singing and gritty ceremonious dancing to haunting whispers. He incorporates imagination with his invented scales as well as standard modes, occasionally setting them to unpredictable

²¹ Jolivet, *Chant De Linos*, trans. Justin W. Thai, 1.

²² William Smith, “Linus,” *Encyclopedia Mythica* (Pantheon, May 12, 1999), <https://pantheon.org/articles/l/linus.html>.

²³ Jolivet, *Chant De Linos*, 1-19.

shifting rhythms while other times are creating hypnotic stomping. The work opens with immense power, preparing the entrance of the flute for a great cry, exclaiming in a cadenza-like figure. This occurs three times, each time louder and more forceful than the last. This introduction, mm. 1–16, is completely built from G, A-flat, B, C-sharp, D, and F, with occasional uses of C-natural in the solo flute, providing a striking color palette. Interestingly, these pitches, without the C-natural, create two major triads a tritone apart, like Stravinsky's "Petrushka chord" by chance. (This connection is a dangerous one to make, however, "La Jeune France," Jolivet's music society as mentioned previously, opposed the ideologies of Stravinsky.) Still, as the cries become calm, they barely stray from this sonority, transitioning into a slow sulky song with a meditative and repetitious accompaniment. E-flat is sprinkled through the texture, though with great care. In m. 34, the wind surges upwards into a thunderous and jazzy chant, discovering a newly invented tonal scheme. The flutist incorporates flutter tonguing, too, descending only enough to be provoked again, but returns in relaxation. The following section, like the previous slow song, is more energized, yet reserved, wandering through a collection of pitches that nearly make up an octatonic scale (pc 0,1). The song diminishes into m. 58, where the collaboration prepares the flutist's wailing, in yet another system of pitches into a chirpy, jazzy swing in m. 73. Moving around with confusion and letting out a shrill shriek, m. 81 introduces robust dance, menacingly stamping the ground, hearing sporadic yelps and cries, rising and falling. Reaching m. 126 is a different sort of dance and feels lighter, but crazed and mad. The music frolics in celebration of life, yet feels slightly tipsy, until approaching m. 175, when a sense of grounding returns. The first song from m. 17 is sung again, but, like the progression of the dances, is more

motivated. The solo flute is transposed up an octave and a third, recalling the melody with less seriousness. The stormy, turbulent cries of m. 59 are released once more into the heavens, raised a half-step. The music, impatient, is eager to chirp again and to initiate the jittery stomping, flying through and accelerating the ritual with a dizzying D Dorian to an explosive conclusion.

A Senior Recital in Vienna, Austria – CANCELED.

It was just a year ago, when I committed to studying abroad during my final year of undergraduate studies in Vienna, Austria, while also thinking about the prospects of graduate school. With both a senior recital and possible auditions as a part of the near future, I decided it would be logical to prepare repertoire suitable for both events, selecting J.S. Bach's Sonata for Flute and Basso Continuo in E Minor, BWV 1034; either W.A. Mozart's Flute Concerto in G Major (KV 313) or in D Major (KV 314/285d); Gabriel Fauré's *Fantasie* for Flute and Piano; Jacques Ibert's Concerto for Flute; André Jolivet's *Chant de Linos*; and a number of orchestral excerpts. After arriving to Vienna, I had determined that I would postpone my graduate school applications, allowing myself a gap year to digest the substantial amount of learning, experience, and pedagogy from my previous education. Delaying these plans, of course, left the mandatory senior recital still in place. In this light, I trimmed the repertoire to the three works presented here in my thesis, permitting a higher level of focus and depth of study to grow my musicianship and clean up my technique.

Unfortunately, these plans were cut short in the March of 2020, when the novel COVID-19 became a worldwide pandemic. Nearly all events and performances were canceled, while university students and many workers were asked by the government to do their work from home. This eventually canceled in-person instruction associated in my study abroad program and jeopardized recitals, including my own. Though I did not get to perform my program, I still learned a great deal about this music and myself during the process. A bulk of the repertoire was completed by March, when many of us had wondered whether the virus would diminish before the summer, but this was quickly

not the case. As I was working heavily on reworking and redeveloping my articulation, these three pieces were placed on hold as I went to work on the basics, even with the flute headjoint alone. In the future, I hope to perform this program, though in the midst of redirecting my attention to technique, the pieces were unfinished in their study, but I am looking to complete it soon after retraining my facility in articulation. (I've included a program I proposed with short program notes in the Appendices.) What is left is mostly the ends of the pieces: the second half of Movement IV from the Bach sonata, the last third of Movement III from the Ibert Concerto; and the second half of the Jolivet – all of which are mostly needing preparation to play at the appropriate tempo, and the Jolivet primarily speed as well as thoroughly rehearsing with a collaborative pianist. Still, in the process, I was able to dig deeper in a new environment with new perspectives over the months I was in Vienna.

Each of the pieces of music presented its own challenge. Bach's sonata did not demand the same technical agility as Ibert's concerto or *Chant de Linos* but required a clear concept of style and poise – one that had not yet been integrated into my flute studies. The first movement, *Adagio ma non tanto*, was perhaps the most difficult. Discovering how to emphasize the most hierarchically important gestures and individual notes had to be achieved not only through dynamics and articulation but a psychological intent to understand the phrasing. I was told by a number of faculty members, in one way or another, that “[I was not] reading the music fast enough.” Though the literal thought is simple, I came to realize that it was not so much the actual movement of the eyes and reading. Rather, the direct advice was that I should not hesitate or stop while performing – usually out of fear and nervousness – and to actively engage myself with

the next measure, the next phrase, the next section, and so on, to convey my concept of the greater structure.

The concerto by Ibert, as one would imagine, posed other obstacles. Admittedly, this music was not entirely new for me. I brought this to undergraduate auditions four years ago, concentrating on the first and second movements with the final movement untouched. Though a decent interval of time has since passed, I fought against my old and poor habits when reviving the concerto in practice. The rhythms were uneven and the articulations sounded horribly brittle, requiring practice that became frustrating and tedious. However, while combating these issues, they helped to reveal the areas still weak in my flute playing and pushing me to try new ways of learning music. It reminded me that we should take time to step back and remember the basics and to revisit fundamental techniques with an always maturing, but also constantly elastic mindset.

The final work, *Chant de Linos* by André Jolivet was the most arduous test of my flute technique. With many passages, in Jolivet's piece, the Ibert, as well as many other difficult pieces, I have always struggled with learning them and playing them consistently well. Some practice methods proposed over the years have included playing the music with uneven or altered rhythms, working in groupings, and more. While these methods certainly helped me to learn complex works, I could not execute them quite so properly every time – stained in mistakes, many of which had only happened the first time in lessons or performances. While I still struggle with this, I found ways to create new exercises out of the pieces and make practice more interesting, as the tools that got me “here” today, need to be improved to get me “there” in the future.

List of Works Cited

- Alphonse Leduc. "Jacques IBERT: Catalogue." Paris: Alphonse Leduc, May 2010.
http://www.jacquesibert.fr/ibert/Catalogue_files/Catalogue.pdf.
- Bach, Johann Sebastian, and Barthold Kuijken. "Nachwort - Zur Entstehung." Essay. In *Sonate Für Flöte Und Basso Continuo e-Moll*, edited by Barthold Kuijken and Siebe Henstra, 16–17. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1991.
- Bach, Johann Sebastian. *Sonate für Flöte und Basso continuo e-Moll*. Edited by Barthold Kuijken and Siebe Henstra. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1991.
- Brönnimann, Markus. "André Jolivet: Sämtliche Werke Für Flöte ." Naxos Classical Music - Naxos Album Reviews, February 2019.
https://www.naxos.com/mainsite/blurbs_reviews.asp?item_code=8.573885&catNum=573885&filetype>About%20this%20Recording&language=German.
- Brussel, Robert. "Œuvres Nouvelles." *Le Figaro*. February 27, 1934, 58 edition, sec. Le mouvement musical. <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k297616z>.
- Holoman, Dallas Kern. "The Paris Conservatoire in the Nineteenth Century." Oxford Handbooks Online, April 7, 2015.
<https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935321.001.001/oxfordhb-9780199935321-e-114>.
- Ibert, Jacques François Antoine Marie. *Concerto: pour flûte et orchestre*. Paris: Alphonse Leduc, 1934.
- Jolivet André. *Chant de Linos: pour flûte et piano*. 11th ed. Paris: Alphonse Leduc, 1946.
- Kelly, Barbara L. "Jolivet, André." Oxford Music Online: Grove Music Online, 2001.
<https://doi-org.ezp1.lib.umn.edu/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.14433>.
- Laederich, Alexandra. "Ibert, Jacques (François Antoine Marie)." Oxford Music Online: Grove Music Online, 2001. <https://doi-org.ezp1.lib.umn.edu/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.13675>.
- Landreth, Janet. "André Jolivet: A Study of the Piano Works with a Discussion of His Aesthetic and Technical Principles." Dissertation, University Microfilms International, 1980.
- Ledbetter, Steven. "JACQUES IBERT: Flute Concerto." Rockford Symphony Orchestra, 2016. <https://www.rockfordsymphony.com/ibert-flute-concerto/>.

- Marshall, Robert L. "J. S. Bach's Compositions for Solo Flute: A Reconsideration of Their Authenticity and Chronology." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 32, no. 3 (1979): 463–98.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/jams.1979.32.3.03a00050>.
- Péral, Véronique Ibert. "Biographie." Biographie, 2010.
<http://www.jacquesibert.fr/ibert/Biographie.html>.
- Smith, William. "Linus." Encyclopedia Mythica. Pantheon, May 12, 1999.
<https://pantheon.org/articles/l/linus.html>.
- Wolff, Christoph, and Walter Emery. "Bach, Johann Sebastian." Edited by Christoph Wolff. Oxford Music Online: Grove Music Online, 2001. <https://doi-org.ezp1.lib.umn.edu/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.6002278195>.

Appendix A: Proposed Program (English & Deutsch)

**Please see the following pages for the Proposed Program,
both in English and German.**

SENIOR RECITAL PROGRAM

Johannesgasse 7, 1010 Vienna
Palais Corbelli, Mirror Hall

Justin W. Thai, Flute
Deirdre Brenner, Piano and Harpsichord

Chant de Linos

André Jolivet
(1905–1974)

Sonate für Flöte und Basso continuo, e-Moll, BWV 1034

Johann Sebastian Bach
(1685–1750)

- I. Adagio ma non tanto
- II. Allegro
- III. Andante
- IV. Allegro

Short Intermission

Concerto pour flûte et orchestre (piano), L 47

Jacques Ibert
(1890–1926)

- I. Allegro
- II. Andante
- III. Allegro scherzando – Moderato assai

Justin William Thai a flutist from California. Mr. Thai studies at the University of Minnesota and is a study abroad student this year at the Institute for European Studies, Vienna (IES Abroad). This recital is presented in partial fulfillment for the degree of Bachelor of Music and Honors distinction, *Summa cum laude*. He is a student of Immanuel Davis at the University of Minnesota and Maria Jauk at the Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien (MDW).

*Please silence or turn off all electronic devices.
Thank you for your understanding.*

PROGRAMM

FÜR DEN ABSCHLUSS DES BACHELOR-STUDIUM

Johannesgasse 7, 1010 Wien
Palais Corbelli, Spiegelsaal

Justin W. Thai, Flöte
Deirdre Brenner, Klavier und Cembalo

Chant de Linos

André Jolivet
(1905–1974)

Sonate für Flöte und Basso continuo, e-Moll, BWV 1034

Johann Sebastian Bach
(1685–1750)

- I. Adagio ma non tanto
- II. Allegro
- III. Andante
- IV. Allegro

Kurze Pause

Concerto pour flûte et orchestre (piano), L 47

Jacques Ibert
(1890–1926)

- I. Allegro
- II. Andante
- III. Allegro scherzando – Moderato assai

Der aus Kalifornien stammende Flötist Justin William Thai studiert an der Universität Minnesota und ist in diesem Jahr Student am Institut für Europäische Studien, Wien (IES Abroad, Vienna). Das Konzert ist eine der Voraussetzungen zum Abschluss des Bakkalaureatsstudiums in Musik, sowie im Bewerb um die Auszeichnung *Summa cum laude*. Justin Thai ist Student von Professor Immanuel Davis an der Universität Minnesota, Twin Cities und von Frau Mag. Maria Jauk an der Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien (MDW).

*Bitte stellen Sie alle elektronischen Geräte lautlos oder schalten Sie sie ab.
Danke für Ihren Verständnis.*

Appendix B: Program Notes for the General Audience

**Please see the following pages for the Program Notes,
available only in English.**

CHANT DE LINOS (1944)

for flute and piano by André Jolivet (1905–1974)

Born in Paris, André Jolivet (1905–1974) proved to have significant artistic talent at a young age. His mother was a pianist, while his father was a painter, taking an interest in both disciplines as well as theatre. Jolivet had piano lessons from his mother and studied, from other teachers, the cello and painting. Young Jolivet spent his free time listening to the matinee musical theatre performances of *Comédie française*, fantasizing about taking part in the productions. At age 15, he designed a full marionette theatre, including building the set, making the puppets, and writing scripts. Although Jolivet was highly artistically driven, his parents forbade him from entering the arts and preferred that he would become a teacher – he obeyed at the time. After receiving his diploma and accepting a teaching position at a local Parisian school, it allowed him at the age of 23 to self-fund his music studies, studying with Paul Le Flem. Le Flem taught Jolivet counterpoint and harmony, also introducing the twelve-tone techniques of Schönberg and the music of Edgar Varèse, a classmate of Le Flem. Before Varèse left for the United States, Jolivet became his only European pupil and was significantly influenced while forming his methods of composition and musical experimentation in the realm of atonality.

Over the years, André Jolivet explored a range of musical inspirational sources, including ritual and sacramental music from Africa and East Asia, considered today as his “magic” period. It is during this period that he wrote his first work for flute, *Cinq incantations* for solo flute (1936), focused on the cycle of life and the seasons of the harvest. In same year, he met Olivier Messiaen, Jean-Yves Daniel-Lesur, and Yves Baudrier. The four formed the music society, “La Jeune France,” (The Young France), opposing Stravinsky’s movement of neo-classicism, Satie and Les Six, and others. Instead they promoted spirituality and humanness in a time of machines. During World War Two, Jolivet looked to leave behind atonality in place of lyricism but still maintained his fascination with the concept of the ritual, writing *Chant de Linos* (1944) to be performed with solo flute and piano. Following the war, he accepted a position as the musical director of the *Comédie française*, circling back to his childhood dreams.

Of André Jolivet’s œuvre for the flute, *Chant de Linos* is perhaps the most popular in performance. The work was composed as a *pièce de concours* for the flutists at the Paris Conservatoire, where a piece serves as a final examination for those finishing their studies at the conservatoire. That year, 1944, included the famed Jean-Pierre Rampal who won *Première Prix*, or “First Prize.” The following year, Jolivet wrote the second version of the work for solo flute, violin, viola, cello, and harp, and was premiered by the Pierre Jamet Quintet. This ensemble included the professor of flute at the Paris Conservatoire, Gaston Crunelle, to whom this work is dedicated. (N.B.: the concept of *un concours* is often directly translated to “a competition,” wherein this context should instead be considered an evaluation of an individual alone, where the *Prix* serves as a diploma. The *Prix* also designates the threshold of performance, with the First Prize as the highest distinction. With that in mind, any number of First Prizes and Second Prizes were awarded, including the chance of no prizes at all.)

Along with many other works by Jolivet, he takes inspiration from folklore to write *Chant de Linos*. He writes to the performer in the music, “Le CHANT de LINOS était, dans l’antiquité grecque, une variété de thrène : une lamentation funèbre, une complainte entrecoupée de cris et de danses.” (The Song of Linus was, in the time of Greek Antiquity, a variety of threnody – a funeral lamentation, a lament broken by cries and dances.) Coming from Greek mythology, the figure, “Linus,” or more commonly known as “Linus,” is conceived through many inconsistent stories. Between all the myths, it is consistent that Linus portrays a personification of lament, associated

with sacrificial ceremony and the funeral rite. Of the myths, three are most accepted. From the myth rooted in ancient Argos, Linus is the son of Apollo and a nereid (a sea nymph), named Psamathe. She bore and raised Linus in secrecy but was found by shepherds and fed to dogs. In grief, her father learns of the child, and condemns Psamathe to death for her betrayal. For his cruelty, Apollo plagues Argos, only to escape by sacrifice and singing of dirges. The tale stated in Thebes tells that Linus was born from the union of a son of Poseidon, Amphimarus, and the muse, Urania. However, two possible scenarios lead to his death, though both include his gift as a musician. Linus, in the one Theban myth, is said to have been a tutor of music to Heracles. In frustration, Linus is murdered with his own harp by Heracles. The alternative Theban myth recounts Linus' prowess, boasting his musical talent against Apollo, where the god kills Linus in a competition. Like the Argivian perspective of the story, Linus is also mourned, offered sacrifices and laments in his honor.

Chant de Linos is an intricate piece, requiring a vast amount of musicianship from all performers. Jolivet depicts this Grecian threnody from terrifying, powerful singing and gritty ceremonious dancing to haunting whispers. He incorporates imagination with his invented scales as well as standard modes, occasionally setting to unpredictable shifting rhythms while other times are creating hypnotic stomping. The work opens with immense power, preparing the entrance of the flute for a great cry, exclaiming in a cadenza-like figures, each time louder and more forceful than the last. The cries calm, transitioning into a slow sulky song with and a meditative accompaniment. Suddenly, the wind surges upwards into a thunderous and jazzy chant, discovering a newly invented tonal scheme, and the flutist incorporates flutter tonguing, too, descending only enough to be provoked again. Calm returns into another slow song, but more energized, yet reserved. The song diminishes into preparing the flutist's wailing, jumping into a chirpy, jazzy swing. Moving around with confusion and letting out a shrill shriek, the next section introduces robust dance, menacingly stamping the ground, hearing sporadic yelps and cries, rising and falling. Another lighter dance follows, crazed and mad. The music frolics in celebration of life, yet feels slightly tipsy, until a sense of grounding returns. The first song from beginning is sung again, but, like the progression of the dances, is more motivated and the solo flute recalls the melody with less seriousness. The stormy, turbulent cries are released once more into the heavens. The music, impatient, is eager to chirp again and to initiate the jittery stomping, flying through and accelerating the ritual with a dizzying D Dorian to an explosive conclusion.

SONATE FÜR FLÖTE UND BASSO CONTINUO, E-MOLL (1724?)

I. **Adagio ma non tanto**

II. **Allegro**

III. **Andante**

IV. **Allegro**

for flute and harpsichord, Johann Sebastian Bach (1685–1750)

Composer and keyboardist, Johann Sebastian Bach (1685–1750) was among the most influential musical figures of his time. Utilizing a wealth of styles and compositional techniques, he wrote hundreds of works, but only a small handful of works is dedicated to *il flauto traverso* or *Querflöte*, the transverse flute, which is played by blowing across it, rather than the *flûte à bec*, the recorder.

Much of Bach's chamber and ensemble music were once thought by many musicologists to have been composed in his Cöthen period (1717–1723). Today, it is considered that a bulk of this music was rather written during his early years in Leipzig through the end of his time serving at the Collegium Musicum (1723–early 1740s), including the *Sonate für Flöte und Basso continuo, e-Moll*, BWV 1034. Given the difficulty of the solos in many of the cantatas written during summer and autumn months of 1724, there is a hypothesis that because a skilled and resident flutist was documented to be unavailable, but, perhaps, a capable flutist was temporarily staying in Leipzig. Adding to the claim, the sonata is also more texturally similar to the cantata's continuo arias compared to his earlier, fuller solo sonatas with obbligato keyboard accompaniment from the Cöthen period.

The Sonata for Flute and Basso Continuo in E Minor is presented in four movements in an alternation of slow–fast–slow–fast, forming a *sonata da chiesa*. The first movement in E minor, *Adagio ma non tanto*, is through-composed in a simple binary form, AB, without a repeat in the middle. The piece begins with a quality of longing, using gestures of consecutive rolling thirds and sixths as well as small-scale arpeggiation. Like other works by J.S. Bach, this opening movement is built with long and drawn-out phrases that never seem to end. Parallel to grammatical rules in language, each of these lengthy sentences are still punctuated properly and never cross the line of becoming a “run-on sentence.” The music only moves through three phrases, each established by a perfect cadence.

Bach's second movement, *Allegro*, breaks the yearning of the first movement with a stately and jaunty celebration, felt in a simple duple or fast quadruple meter. This *Allegro* in E minor falls in place on a macro-phrasal level as a form similar to that of a ritornello concerto. This form contains ritornelli, or ensemble sections, where each alternate with *eine Episode* (German), a flute solo section.

The *Andante* movement follows as a contemplative aria in a simple triple meter in the relative major, G, with a meditative six measure introduction. What Bach produces in this movement is captivating, forming a passacaglia where the figured bass is repeated multiple times while the melody above changes and only an internal section strays from the bass. Preceding each of the large sections is another feature makes this quite aria-like, which is not found anywhere else in this sonata: entering each of the sections, the flute takes a moment of recollection, then sings a full measure cadenza-like anacrusis, like a glimpse into fantasy.

Declarative and spirited, the last movement of the sonata – also in a simple triple meter – returns the music to E minor in a simple binary structure, A: | |:B. Much of this final movement trades music back and forth between the flute and basso continuo, often as a conversation between the voices, but also moments where the flute or the basso continuo can serve as the “authority figure” in the musical texture.

CONCERTO POUR FLÛTE ET ORCHESTRE (1932–33)

I. *Allegro*

II. *Andante*

III. *Allegro scherzando – Moderato assai*

for flute and piano, Jacques Ibert (1685–1750)

Jacques Ibert (1890–1962) was the son to a Parisian businessman, by the same name, and a well-trained pianist, Marguerite Lartigue. At an early age, his mother trained Ibert to read music, providing his first violin lessons at age 4, and later, piano lessons. She desired very much for her son to reach musical fame; however, his father was rather displeased at this idea and preferred him to follow in his footsteps as a businessman. Despite these wishes, he proceeded to continue his musical studies in secret, even learning to improvise waltzes and other pieces as early as age twelve.

At age 21, Ibert proceeded to study composition at the Paris Conservatoire after consolation by a family composer friend. As a result of his father's disapproval and revoking financial support, Ibert found income composing popular songs and accompanying silent films in the cinema. Although his studies were interrupted in 1914 by his required service in the First World War, Ibert entered and won the esteemed composition competition, *le Prix de Rome*, in October 1919, following the footsteps of only a select number of the most renowned French composers. Within his compositional output, only two works are dedicated to the solo flute: *Concerto pour flûte et orchestre*, L47 (1932–33), and *Pièce pour flûte seule*, L 60 (1936, “for flute alone”).

During early 1930s in Paris, Ibert wrote a rich variety of works, from an *opéra comique* and film music, a symphony and both a concerto and a concertino. The Concerto for flute and orchestra bears many compositional similarities in style and texture to the Concertino da Camera, L 58 (1935) for the saxophone and small orchestra, both of which today are standard works of the respective repertoires. The Concerto for flute was written for the legendary flutist and pedagogue of the Paris Conservatoire, Marcel Moyse, who premiered the work on 25 February 1934 at the Société des Concerts du Conservatoire in Paris. The orchestra was conducted by a notable flutist and colleague to Moyse, Philippe Gaubert.

The concerto is in three movements: *Allegro*, *Andante*, and *Allegro scherzando*. Each movement demands the highest sense of artistry from not only the soloist but the orchestra, too. The orchestral score consists of doubled flutes, oboes, clarinets, and bassoons; doubled horns and one trumpet; strings; and timpani (a single timpanist and two timpani). A piano reduction was completed in the same year of the concerto by Ibert.

The first movement is fiery and brilliant, characterized by precise sixteenth-note passages for the soloist and collaborator(s). This *Allegro* is primarily in a simple duple meter, with a small handful of exceptions, including complex single and simple triple meters. Within the first section of the exposition, there is much restlessness among the soloist and the orchestra, bustling with powerful energy. The second section, on the other hand, is calm, but persistent until the music intensifies to the solo flute's C, five ledger-lines above the staff. The development recalls the impetus of the previous two sections but in a rather playful character, marked by Ibert as *scherzando*. The recapitulation of the exposition only restates the first section with alterations. The movement finishes with a coda and disappear into thin air... but is punctuated with a final startling crash of a high E major chord against the well-established “F” root.

The middle *Andante* movement of the concerto, yearning and grieving, contrasts greatly against the outer counterparts. It is known that Ibert's father died in 1933 at the time of writing this concerto and it is possible this movement might have been his method to process the event of losing a loved one, each moment burning deeper than the last, while reaching contemplation and

eventually serenity and acceptance. This movement is primarily in a simple triple meter with sprinklings of the simple quadruple meter, functioning in ternary form (ABA). The first A section is built of two unbelievably gorgeous and heart-wrenching, yet extensive phrases with many dissonances, heavily urging the music towards delayed climaxes and, finally, a warm cadence, with a question. Following in the B section, the careful and tender atmosphere is disrupted with a rigid, march-like theme. The soloist attempts to process the events, building to an expansive and heaving bawl, retreating back to ponderous thoughts. Soon, section A returns, but now the melody is sung by a solo violin at an octave higher than the original, while the solo flute heeds the violin and accompanies it with a tidal-wave-like stream of sixteenth-notes – pushing and pulling. The roles are returned, where the solo flute continues the melody at the raised octave with the tides continuing to support it. In the last phrase, the flute gently interjects with a coda with a warm melody from the B section, tapering into a raw and delicate harmonic D-flat.

Ibert's final movement of his flute concerto is flashy, bright, and erratic, combining and playing with the use of simple triple, simple duple and quadruple, and complex quadruple meters, heavily marked with syncopation. These main figures of syncopation are most present bookending the movement in the introduction and coda – this gesture of syncopation, as a rhythm, permeates much of the internal workings of the movement. Fascinatingly, the form of this *Allegro scherzando* is a ternary form with additional internal ternary forms: Introduction-(ABA)-(CDC)-(ABA)-Coda. The solo flute part in the earlier and later thirds of the piece is filled and built nearly exclusively with triplets, taking form mostly as unidentifiable running scales, mixed in with twisting and turning intervals of thirds and octaves, requiring great embouchure flexibility and agility. The solo flute mysteriously calls out in the transition into the first C through means of a cadenza, dancing with an improvisatory-like intent, but time suddenly clicks back on. The ensemble as a whole seems to be searching and wandering for something, but to no avail. The solo flute becomes agitated with confusion and dances by in a gust of sixteenth-note triplets, where it is most concentrated in section D. These gusts rise chromatically, falling in a nearly scalar fashion. The soloist then holds out on a scream, a high B-flat, and falls at their pleasure in thirty-second-notes and returns to reality, to wander again. Without transition, the final third of the movement commences. To send off the end of the concerto, Ibert writes an extensive and dazzling second cadenza, integrating flutter tonguing and harmonics to attach the coda, which finishes much like the movement begins and concludes the concerto with a bang.