

11-10-2011

Graduate Flute Recital

Lidayne Reyes

Florida International University, lreye014@fiu.edu

DOI: 10.25148/etd.FI11120804

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Reyes, Lidayne, "Graduate Flute Recital" (2011). *FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 544.
<http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd/544>

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the University Graduate School at FIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of FIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcc@fiu.edu.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Miami, Florida

GRADUATE FLUTE RECITAL

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF MUSIC

by

Lidayne Reyes

2011

To: Dean Brian Schriener
College of Architecture and the Arts

This thesis, written by Lidayne Reyes, and entitled Graduate Flute Recital, having been approved in respect to style and intellectual content, is referred to you for judgment.

We have read this thesis and recommend that it be approved.

Joel Galand

Robert B. Dundas

Catherine Anne Rand

Elissa Lakofsky, Major Professor

Date of Defense: November 10, 2011

The thesis of Lidayne Reyes is approved.

Dean Brian Schriener
College of Architecture and the Arts

Dean Lakshmi N. Reddi
University Graduate School

Florida International University, 2011

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate my Master's Thesis to my grandmother Cecilia Suárez. Her presence in my life was instrumental in my personal and professional growth. She will always be with me. I also want to recognize my parents for their guidance, unconditional support, and enduring belief in me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all of my wonderful flute professors that have helped throughout my career. I particularly appreciate the contributions of Gustavo Alonso, Vivian Jiménez, Floraimed Fernández, and Elissa Lakofsky. I will always be grateful for their support and that of my committee members, Dr. Catherine Ann Rand, Dr. Joel Galand and Mr. Robert B. Dundas.

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS
GRADUATE FLUTE RECITAL

by

Lidayne Reyes

Florida International University, 2011

Miami, Florida

Professor Elissa Lakofsky, Major Professor

These extended program notes place the repertoire of my Master's recital in historical context and analyze the structure. The works discussed are Johann Sebastian Bach's Sonata in E Minor for Flute and Continuo, BWV 1034; Paul Taffanel's Andante Pastoral et Scherzettino for Flute and Piano; Sergei Prokofiev's Sonata for Flute and Piano, op. 94; Aaron Copland's Duo for Flute and Piano; and Olivier Messiaen's *Le Merle Noir* (The Blackbird). I provide an individual essay for each piece, and the entries are chronologically organized according to the composition's dates.

This document aims to give the reader an overview of these works and assist in the understanding of the pieces' most significant characteristics. This analysis was useful to me in preparing my graduate recital. It is my intention to elicit from the reader a similar appreciation of this repertoire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. JOHANN SEBASTIAN BACH: SONATA IN E MINOR FOR FLUTE AND CONTINUO, BWV 1034.....	1
II. PAUL TAFFANEL: ANDANTE PASTORAL ET SCHERZETTINO FOR FLUTE AND PIANO.....	6
III. SERGEI PROKOFIEV: SONATA 2 IN D MAJOR FOR FLUTE AND PIANO, OP 94.....	9
IV. OLIVER MESSIAEN: LE MERLE NOIR FOR FLUTE AND PIANO.....	13
V. AARON COPELAND: DUO FOR FLUTE AND PIANO.....	16
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	19

JOHANN SEBASTIAN BACH: SONATA IN E MINOR FOR FLUTE AND CONTINUO, BWV 1034

The traverse flute emerged in the mid-to-late Baroque period, gradually replacing the recorder as the preferred instrument of composers and interpreters. Quantz in Germany and Hotteterre in France contributed to the technical development of this instrument. Composers such as Telemann, Blavet, and Leclair started writing music for the traverse flute. Johann Sebastian Bach, who made it a point to excel in most of the standard genres of his day, composed several sonatas for traverse flute and continuo.

Bach's flute sonatas are musicologically problematic. To this day, the authorship of the Sonata BWV 1020 remains uncertain; it is also attributed to the composer's son Carl Phillip Emanuel (Wolff 2011). Bach's authorship of the E-Minor Sonata, BWV 1034, is more settled, but its date of composition is not, with historians divided between the Köthen and the Leipzig periods as possible time frames for the creation of this significant work.

The time Bach spent in Köthen (1717–1723) was his most productive with respect to the creation of instrumental music. He held the positions of “Ducal Kapellmeister of Anhalt-Köthen” and “Director of Court Chamber Music.” This was the only extended period during which Bach had no obligations to compose sacred music; for the first time, he was able to focus on composing chamber music, which at the time referred to all instrumental ensemble and solo music without genre distinction. The Two and Three-Part Inventions, the French Suites, the first book of the *Well-Tempered Clavier*, the Sonatas and Partitas for Solo Violin, and the Brandenburg Concertos were all written during his Köthen years. The Sonata BWV 1034 could very well have been among these works.

Prince Leopold, himself an accomplished musician, received Bach’s music enthusiastically; the composer enjoyed an almost “warm” interaction with his employer and considerable artistic freedom (Vogt 1988, 43).

During the Leipzig period (1723–1750), the composer’s duties were concentrated almost exclusively on the creation and performance of sacred music for Lutheran services. He was Cantor of the Thomasschule at St. Thomas Church and Director of Music in the principal churches of the town. Some musicologists speculate that the E-Minor Sonata could date from late 1724, when, during a four-month period, Bach composed cantatas with particularly challenging flute parts, owing to the presence in town of a flute virtuoso (Moroney, 1991).

The E-Minor Sonata for Flute and Continuo follows the structure of the Italian *sonata da chiesa* (church sonata): four movements in a slow–fast–slow–fast alternation. The first movement, *Adagio ma non tanto*, starts with an ascending bass line that moves more slowly than main theme exposed by the soloist. Much of the movement is built up of one-bar units that are imitated between bass line and flute (e.g., mm. 7–8). The movement as a whole, though it lacks a double bar and repeat signs, is structured as a simple binary form:

	PART I			 PART II	
	Theme	Modulating repetition		Varied	
transposition of mm. 11–17					
	m. 1	9	17	 17	21
24–30					
	i	i [PAC]	→ v [PAC]	 v → i	

Measures 17–30 constitute a variant of mm. 1–17. At first, the connection between the two parts is mainly motivic, with the sequential flute part based on developmental permutations of the sixteenth-note figuration in Part I. Gradually, the correspondence between Parts I and II becomes stronger; mm. 19–20 paraphrase mm. 9–10 and mm. 24 to the end transpose mm. 11–17 at the lower fifth, with some variation.

The second movement exemplifies a recurrent feature of Bach’s style, namely his incorporation of concerto procedures in other genres. Measures 1–15 form a tonally closed complex that Bach builds like a concerto ritornello:¹

Vordersatz (mm. 1–9)—Fortspinnung (mm. 10–14)—Epilog (mm. 14–15)

The theme is treated fugally, as in the ritornello of Bach’s Double Concerto for Two Violins, with a real answer transposed to the dominant minor.

Not only is the opening thematic complex ritornello-like in itself, but it also returns, as in a concerto movement, to punctuate the crucial cadential arrivals that end the modulatory, soloistic episodes. Thus, after an episode (mm. 16–23) that modulates from tonic to relative major and features typical concerto-like solo figuration in the flute, mm. 24–32 restate mm. 1–9, now moving from G Major to D major. The final ritornello, back in the tonic (mm. 55–70) is expanded with an interpolated passage (mm. 59–64) and an expanded cadence (mm. 68–70). Although this movement does depart from concerto form in one significant way—normally there would have been another ritornello

¹ The segmentation of Bach’s typical concerto ritornello into three functional components—an initial thematic idea (the *Vorderstaz*), followed by a sequential “spinning-out” (the *Fortspinnung*) leading to a cadential suffix (the *Epilog*)—was first proposed by Wilhelm Fischer (1915) in a highly influential article. “Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Wiener klassischen Stils,” *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 3 (1915): 24–84. For the relevance of the *Fortspinnungstypus* to Bach’s work in general, see Dreyfus 1985. .

overlapping with the perfect authentic cadence in the dominant minor at m. 39—the internal construction of mm. 1–15, the pattern of its recurrences, and the sequential, soloistic figuration at places like mm. 16–23 and 40–47 (very much in the vein of solo episode) all point to the concerto influence.

Both third (Andante) and fourth (Allegro) movements illustrate Bach's treatment of dynamics. The Andante is in the typical piano gradation of the slow movements of the time. The Allegro appears particularly well marked in comparison with the more usual Baroque custom of providing few or no dynamic markings. Eighteenth-century manuscripts of the sonata stemming from Bach's circle clearly show three dynamics levels: *f*, *p* and *pp*. Following the tradition, the final movement of the sonata starts and ends *f* (see Vogt 1988, 64, for more detailed analysis of Bach's treatment of dynamics in chamber music).

The third movement begins in the manner of a passacaglia: a harmonically open-ended bass line is stated three times, first alone (mm. 1–6) and then with two different solo phrases superimposed (mm. 7–12, 13–18), with m. 19 providing tonic closure for the entire opening complex. Measures 20–31 and mm. 32–42 present expanded and modulatory variants of the bass pattern, the first moving from tonic to submediant, and the second from submediant to mediant. The bass line in its original form returns twice to conclude the movement (mm. 43–48, mm. 49–55), with the soloist executing further variations.

The finale exhibits the same form as the opening movement, but this time with the binary design made explicit by the double bar and repeat sign. Once again, Part I

modulates to the minor dominant. Part II again parallels the thematic events of Part I, at first with developmental techniques but eventually through fairly literal transposition. Thus, Part II opens with a loose melodic inversion of the main motive (compare mm. 43 and 46 with m. 1). Measures 49–52 sequentially expand mm. 3–4. After a pedal point progression that continues to prolong the minor dominant (mm.53–56), Bach modulates back to E-minor in a passage largely based on the modulatory portion of Part I (compare mm. 57–62 to mm. 13–18). Finally, mm. 69–88 restate mm. 23–42 at the lower fifth, either literally or with variation.

The E-Minor Sonata (BWV 1034) for flute and continuo by Johann Sebastian Bach is considered standard repertoire for flute. The composer's handling of the instrument's characteristics is outstanding. Giving an accurate performance of this piece, demands technical and expressive maturity of the players.

**PAUL TAFFANEL: ANDANTE PASTORAL ET SCHERZETTINO FOR FLUTE
AND PIANO**

As professor of flute at the Conservatoire de Paris, Paul Taffanel had the opportunity of commissioning new pieces not only for flute, but for all the wind and brass instruments on the occasion of the institution's annual *concours* (competitions). He thereby helped create an enduring solo repertoire for them. The flute *concours* of the Conservatoire of Paris was not only the most important annual event for the flutists of the institution, but also served as a platform to present new music. Composers such as Gabriel Faure, Cecile Chaminade, Joachim Andersen, Alphonse Duvernoy, and Louis Ganne were all commissioned to create the contest piece. The Andante Pastoral et Scherzettino was composed by Paul Taffanel himself as the competition piece for the 1906 flute *concours*. It was his final work.

Taffanel, one of the most remarkable flutists of all time, was responsible for revitalizing his instrument's repertoire. During the nineteenth century, flute music consisted mainly of virtuosic show pieces, in particular *Fantaisies* for flute and piano based on themes from popular operas. Although himself the composer of five such *Fantaisies* (for more information regarding Taffanel's *Fantaisies* see Blakeman 2005, 54), Taffanel developed a different concept of flute playing. Considered the founder of the French Flute School, he encouraged the recovery of early music for the flute as well as the creation of new works.

Dedicated to his student Philippe Gaubert, the Andante Pastoral et Scherzettino, like the majority of *morceaux de concours*, falls—as the title implies—into two sections, slow and fast, that showcase the player's musical and technical skills. The slow section is

itself subdivided into a Prelude followed by the Andante Pastoral itself. The slow section alternates compound triple meters (6/8, 9/8, and 12/8). Since the seventeenth-century, moderate compound meter had been one of the distinguishing features of the pastoral topos in music, as had flute scoring, since the flute was supposed to have descended from the syrinx, or pan pipes, of ancient Arcady. Debussy's *Syrinx* and the *Prelude to the Afternoon of a Faun* are two celebrated examples of the continued influence that the topos exerted on French composers around 1900. Taffanel's work, though compositionally more conservative than Debussy's, falls squarely in the same tradition.

Taffanel's ideas of flute playing, which place lyricism and expressivity, are well reflected in this piece. In the Prelude and Pastorale, the sense of freedom given by the fluid meter, the articulation, and the dynamic markings enhance the inflections of a melody that is designed to evoke a singing voice. The Pastorale exhibits a large-scale ternary design. The outer sections, in G minor, reflect the melancholic *nostos* with which the pastorale topic is so often imbued. The middle section, *poco più mosso*, provides some contrast with a slightly faster tempo, a richer texture, and a move away from G minor by means of a descending melodic sequence that tonicizes in turn Bb minor, G# minor, and F# major before returning to G minor. Although Taffanel's harmonic language is conservative for 1906, incursions of the pentatonic (e.g., the flute melody in mm. 29–35) and whole-tone collections (e.g., the altered dominant chords at mm. 20 and 39) gesture towards musical impressionism.

Like the Andante Pastoral, the Scherzettino starts with a piano introduction that anticipates the mood of the flute part to come. It is in this section that the flute teacher

and virtuoso in Taffanel come to the fore. Though challenging, the musical material and its articulation are designed to negotiate the technical shortcomings of the instrument easily. The character and the D-major tonality provide a light and optimistic contrast to the Pastorale. The middle section of the Scherzzettino, *poco meno mosso*, recalls the slow section somewhat, but this time with more passion than melancholy.

I perform Louis Moyse's edition of the Andante Pastoral et Scherzzettino. Moyse was himself a student of Taffanel's successor and dedicatee, Philippe Gaubert. Moyse surely had firsthand information of how to perform this piece idiomatically and how best to convey Taffanel's stylistic preferences.

SERGEI PROKOFIEV: SONATA NO. 2 IN D MINOR FOR FLUTE AND PIANO,
OP.94

During World War II, Prokofiev was evacuated from Moscow to avoid the potential dangers of the German invasion in the summer of 1941. After leaving Moscow, he lived in several cities while composing some of his best works. Many of these compositions, like the music for the movie *Alexander Nevsky*, were particularly inspirational to the Soviet people during the tragic years of the war. In addition, he wrote pieces such as the Classical Symphony, the Scythian Suite, *Peter and the Wolf*, *Lieutenant Kije*, the suites from *Romeo and Juliet*, and the Sixth Sonata, all of which increased interest in his music abroad, particularly in England and the United States (for more detailed references about this period in Prokofiev's life see Nestyev, 1960, 345).

In June 1943, Prokofiev, having been invited by the Kirov Theater of Leningrad to finish his ballet *Cinderella*, moved to Molotov from Alma-Ata. Here, immersed in the mildness of the northern summer and in the beauty of the Urals, he completed his Flute Sonata. Considered to be the most bucolic of his wartime compositions, this work was inspired by the French school of flute, which Prokofiev admired (Nestyev, 1960, 350).

The Sonata for Flute and Piano was premiered by Nikolai Kharkovsky on flute and Sviatoslav Richter on piano, in Moscow, December 7, 1943. One year later, Prokofiev transposed the flute part for violin upon the request and with the assistance of violinist David Oistrakh, who premiered this adaptation on June 17, 1944.

Unifying contemporary musical devices with classical instrumental style and form, Prokofiev was able to exploit all the resources of the instrument and achieve a neoclassical clarity supported by an interesting contemporary harmony.

About this Flute Sonata, the composer wrote: “it has turned out to be quite bulky, with four movements and about forty pages” (cited in Nestyev, 1960, 352). This work is unquestionably long; however, Prokofiev not only managed himself to make it fresh to the listener’s ears, but also to the flutist’s lips.

The first movement of the Flute Sonata exhibits classical sonata form. A particularly lyrical principal theme (mm. 1–8) and a second theme in the dominant that is closer to Prokofiev’s dancelike style (mm. 21–40) are linked by a modulatory transition (mm. 9–20). A brief closing section (mm. 38–41) articulates the end of the exposition. The development begins with a theme, still prolonging the dominant, that is more rhythmically active than those heard so far, then moves through two developmental rotations of the exposition material. The recapitulation restates the exposition in classical fashion, with second theme transposed down a fifth. At the very end of the movement the main theme appears in the high register in Bb major to finally finish in D minor.

The second movement is a Scherzo that contrasts with the lyrical style of the first movement. The fast tempo and the accentuated rhythm increase the sense of energy and gracefulness. Written in triple time, this theme disorients the listener at times by using accents to create a cross 2/4 meter. A second theme appears, in a clear 3/4 time with an exuberant triumphant mood. Then, the first theme returns again followed by a slow third

theme that brings back the temperament of the first movement. The movement ends with running eighth notes passage after the second appearance of the magnificent second theme.

The third movement is a lyrical Andante that brings back the spirit of simplicity present in the first movement. The flute starts alone and later the piano enters playing a secondary role when not taking turns with the melody. The middle section is full of triplets in the flute section which serves as counterpoint to the main theme, now played in the piano.

The last movement, Allegro con Brio, evokes the spirit of eighteenth-century classicism with its sonata-rondo design, its ornamentation, and its precise rhythm. The Prokofievan humor is also present in this movement, giving it an optimistic spirit after the lyricism and the playfulness of the previous three movements.

The analytical challenge posed by Prokofiev's style is to account for the non-diatonic and apparently non-functional aspects of the harmonic language. At the level of the large-scale sonata form, the piece is clearly tonal, but already at the level of individual phrases, function tonality is attenuated. In the first movement, the initial four-bar phrase leads from tonic to subdominant (D major to G major). The next phrase begins by literally transposing the first phrase down a whole step, beginning on C major, but then suddenly, and seemingly arbitrarily, veers back to D major. Thus, the eight-bar principal theme avoids any clear enunciation of the tonic/dominant relation. The second theme is more conventional in this regard, since its four four-bar phrases exhibit the following larger-scale pattern:

OLIVER MESSIAEN: LE MERLE NOIR FOR FLUTE AND PIANO

Oliver Messiaen was not only captivated by nature but also able to make it his source of inspiration for much of his work. About this topic, he stated: “There are a thousand ways of probing the future... I only wish that they would not forget that music is a part of time, a fraction of time, as is our own life, and that Nature, ever beautiful, ever great, ever new, Nature, an inextinguishable treasure-house of sounds and colors, forms and rhythms, the unequalled model for total development and perpetual variation, that Nature is the supreme resource” (Dingle 2007, 137).

Using Nature as a source of inspiration, Messiaen became particularly sensitive to birdsongs. Other composers such as Rameau, Liszt, Mahler, Wagner, and Beethoven, attempted to transcribe birdsongs into music but the results were stylized babblings and trills. Apparently, during the time he spent in Verdun as a stationed soldier at the beginning of World War II, Messiaen became particularly attentive to birdsongs and started incorporating them into his compositions. *La Nativité* and the *Quartet for the end of Time* are examples of such works; these first attempts contained mere references to specific types of birdsongs he wanted to imitate in the pieces (Dingle 2007, 137–139).

During the 1940’s, he continued using birdsongs in compositions like *Turangalila* and the organ works *Messe de la Pentecôte* and *Livre d’orgue*. However, the first of Messiaen’s compositions based exclusively in the song of a specific bird was *Le Merle Noir*.

Oliver Messiaen composed *Le Merle Noir* (The Blackbird) as the competition piece for the flute *concours* of the Conservatoire de Paris in 1951. This one-movement

piece for flute and piano integrates serialism (a technique widely used by the composer in previous works) with the songs of the blackbird.

It is hard to imagine a more appropriate instrument to emulate a bird than the flute. The piece starts with a vigorous flute solo preceded by a brief and *pp* piano whisper. *Un peu vif, avec fantaisie* is the indication of Messiaen for the solo flute passage beginning at m. 3, where dynamics and articulation perfectly play together in the pursuit of color and movement; it is not difficult to imagine a bird singing while suddenly flying from branch to branch.

Following this quasi cadenza, there appears a new section impregnated with a meditative mood. *Presque lent, tendre* seems like a single long line initiated by the piano that later interlaces both instruments. Chamber work is essential to achieve connection and continuity in this fragment.

The next section, *Un peu vif*, revives the black bird material; here, the flute once more exploits resources such as flutter tone, accents, and dynamic contrasts to emulate the song of the bird. A varied repetition of the *Presque lent, tendre* passage includes harmonic fingerings in the service of dynamic contrast. In conclusion, like in a final fight for predominance (or perhaps an imaginary persecution), flute and piano finish the piece in a frantic *Vif*.

After composing *Le Merle Noir*, Messiaen started studying the science of ornithology with the well-known specialist in the area Jacques Delamain (for more details see Dingle 2007, 140). This collaboration facilitated the use of birdsong as a permanent

element in Messiaen's music. *Le Merle Noir* is definitely a key work in the flute repertoire; it is not only technically challenging, but also attempts to capture the language of nature.

AARON COPLAND: DUO FOR FLUTE AND PIANO

William Kincaid (1895–1967) was the first flutist of the Philadelphia Orchestra for 39 years and taught at the Curtis Institute of Music of this city. After his death in 1967, some of his former students, organized by John Solum, commissioned a piece by Copland in the memory of their teacher, and the result was Duo for Flute and Piano. Before preparing the final score, the composer asked for the collaboration of Solum and Elaine Shaffer, who was also a Kincaid student. It was Shaffer, along with the pianist Hephzibah Menuhin, who premiered this work in Philadelphia, on October the 3rd, 1971 (Copland 1989, 376–377).

This piece was, as Copland said himself, his first extensive work for flute. It is in three movements, descriptively titled “Flowing,” Poetic, somewhat mournful,” and “Lively with bounce.” About this work, the composer stated: “My Duo is a lyrical piece, in a somewhat pastoral style. Almost by definition it would have to be a lyrical piece, for what can you do with a flute in an extended form that would not emphasize its songful nature? Lyricism seems to be built into the flute” (Copland 1989, 376).

Contrasted with some of Copland’s previous works, Duo is a tonal work. This surprised many contemporaries but resulted from “the fact that he was composing for Kincaid students not for future generations, and the used material was from earlier sketches” (Copland 1989, 376). It was Copland’s idea that only future generations could enjoy his “previous severe language” (Copland 1989, 376).

The first movement begins with a flute solo in recitative style. This section is particularly challenging since short phrases of three or four notes must be connected in a

long musical idea that features modal elements. Breathing and phrasing control are essential to negotiating this section. Special care should be given to intonation since frequent changes of register occur in this introduction.

The piano enters accompanying the flute in a much slower passage. Later, the initial tempo is recovered, leading to a much faster part where both instruments share thematic material in a new key. The line is now longer and more elaborated and the texture is more complex. A new change of key signature and mode, aids in emphasizing the more vigorous character of a new short passage, after which the initial mood is restored. The movement finishes in two energetic eight notes with the indication of *sforzando*.

The second movement is defined by Copland as closer to his own temperament with “harmonic and melodic language more akin to my later works, with the principal idea in the flute projecting a whole-tone sound similar to the opening of the *Piano Quartet*” (Copland 1989, 376). Starting with a bell- like introduction on the piano part, this movement is certainly sorrowful. The use of the flute’s low register in some passages assists in achieving the warmer tone the composer seeks. The bell motif of the piano introduction is present throughout the movement. At Solum’s suggestion, the author added some harmonic fingering to facilitate the production of the “thin tone” so difficult to achieve in the instrument (Copland 1989, 375–376).

Finally, the last movement is “lively, with a triadic theme in a free form” (Copland 1989, 376). Like the other two movements, the final movement of this work is

in ABA form. Energetic and precise, the flute and the piano share thematic material that highly contrasts with the rest of the work.

About the Duo Copland stated: “Being aware that many of the flutists who were responsible for commissioning the piece would want to play it, I tried to make it grateful for the performer, but no amateur could handle the Duo; it requires a good player” (Copland 1989, 375). In addition, Michael Steinberg of the Boston Globe declared about this piece: “Hearing Duo was also an occasion for gratefully remembering how extraordinarily evenly high Copland’s standard of achievement has been. He has composed at greater and lesser levels of musical density, but he has never written inattentively nor, for that matter, without huge signs saying ‘only by Aaron Copland.’ The Duo is a lightweight work by a masterful craftsman. It is going to give pleasure to flutists and their audiences for a long time” (Copland 1989, 377).

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Berger, Arthur. 1971. *Aaron Copland*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Blakeman, Edward. 2005. *Taffanel Genius of the Flute*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Butterworth, Neil. 1986. *The Music of Aaron Copland*. New York: Toccata Press.
- Copland, Aaron. 1989. *Copland Since 1943*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Dingle, Christopher. 2007. *The Life of Messiaen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dreyfus, Laurence. 1985. "J.S. Bach's Concerto Ritornellos and the Question of Invention," *Musical Quarterly* 71/3, 327–58.
- Fischer, Wilhelm. 1915. "Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Wiener klassischen Stils," *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 3: 24–84.
- Simeone, Nigel. 1998. *Oliver Messiaen Catalogue of Works*. Tutzing: Verlegt Bei Hans Schneider.
- Terry, Charles Sanford. 1933. *Bach*. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Vogt, Hans. 1988. *Johann Sebastian Bach's Chamber Music*. Oregon: Amadeus Press.
- Williams, Peter. 2004. *The Life of Bach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolff, Christoph. 2011. "Johann Sebastian Bach," *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians On-line*.
http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article_works/grove/music/40023pg10?source=omo_gmo&q=johann+sebastian+bach&article_section=all&search=article&pos=1&start=1 (accessed 11 October 2011).