



拉威尔钢琴作品集

Maurice Ravel

悼念公主的帕凡舞曲

Pavane pour une
Infante défunte

for

Solo Piano

罗杰·尼克尔斯 编订

by

Roger Nichols

伦敦彼得斯音乐出版社提供版权

图书在版编目 (C I P) 数据

拉威尔钢琴作品集——悼念公主的帕凡舞曲/罗杰·尼克尔斯编订.

——上海: 上海音乐出版社, 2010. 5

英国彼得斯出版社原版引进

ISBN 978-7-80751-627-9

I. ①拉… II. ①罗… III. ①钢琴-舞曲-法国-
选集 IV. ①J657. 41

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2010) 第 073781 号

© Copyright 1992 by Hinrichsen Edition, Peters Edition Limited, London
Chinese Translation Copyright © 2010 by Shanghai Music Publishing House

书名: 拉威尔钢琴作品集——悼念公主的帕凡舞曲

编订: 罗杰·尼克尔斯

出 品 人: 费维耀

责任编辑: 陶 天

封面设计: 陆震伟

印务总监: 李霄云

上海音乐出版社出版、发行

地址: 上海市绍兴路 74 号 邮编: 200020

上海文艺出版(集团)有限公司: www.shwenyi.com

上海音乐出版社网址: www.smph.cn

上海音乐出版社论坛: BBS.smph.cn

上海音乐出版社电子信箱: editor_book@smph.cn

印刷: 上海市印刷十厂有限公司

开本: 640×978 1/8 印张: 2 乐谱: 16 面

2010 年 5 月第 1 版 2010 年 5 月第 1 次印刷

印数: 1-4,000 册

ISBN 978-7-80751-627-9/J · 575

定价: 15.00 元

读者服务热线: (021)64315066 印装质量热线: (021)64310542

反盗版热线: (021)64734302 (021)64375066-241

序

拉威尔是和德彪西齐名的法国印象派代表人物,以写钢琴作品为主。他的作品不多,但是经常将钢琴作品同时改编成管弦乐作品。因此,他的不少作品都存在钢琴和管弦乐两种版本。

这个由英国人罗杰·尼克尔斯(Roger Nicholes)编订的《拉威尔钢琴作品集》的最大特点是:它的依据是法国著名钢琴家弗拉多·佩勒穆泰(Vlado Perlemuter, 1904-2002)的亲身经验和体会。佩勒穆泰曾跟拉威尔学过他的全部钢琴作品,因此可以说他所掌握的是来自拉威尔的第一手资料和讯息,而这些资料和讯息有许多是和已经出版的乐谱有出入的。这些差别有的也许是拉威尔在乐谱出版后改变了想法,或者是已出版乐谱本身的错误;也有一些可以理解为拉威尔本人提供的另一种可能性。

前者如《夜之幽灵》(*Gaspard of the Night*)中的第一首《水妖》(*Ondine*)的右手织体。如果我们对照这个 Peters 版和原来的法国 Durand 版,会发现有很大的不同。原来法国 Durand 版中右手各种不同的织体变化,在现在这个 Peters 版中变成从头至尾的统一织体。

后者如《库普兰之墓》(*Le tombeau de Couperin*)中的第五首《小步舞曲》(*Menuet*)的中段第 33—48 小节,它的和弦进行的主题,在 Durand 版中是由右手和左手每小节交替演奏的,而在这个 Peters 版中,主题全部由右手演奏,而左手用交叉的技术演奏另一个伴奏声部。因此,从两种不同版本谱面的视觉安排上也可以立即发现它们的不同之处。

因此,这个 Peters 版不是一个一般意义上的原始版(Urtext)。我把它称作一个实用版(Practical Edition)。它是从演奏的角度出发的一个实用版。它的实用性大于学术性。

李名强

2008年5月14日于香港

拉威尔钢琴作品集——一个全新的版本

编辑方法和资料来源

毋庸置疑,手握一部音乐杰作的手稿是令人激动的;和拉威尔很多作品一样,这部作品的手稿本身就是件艺术品,它使你在激动之余还会产生对美的感悟。但同样不可否认,作曲家也是平凡人,无论他们的手稿多么赏心悦目和激动人心,还是会出现错误。因此在是否使用手稿的问题上应当保持一定的理性。

对舞台作品来说,来自时间、空间、金钱的压力和个性的原因经常导致其变形,纵然作曲家对此不满意,但如果演出即将开始也只能接受,于是它们就进入了乐谱印刷本。但对钢琴作品来说,作曲家在准备出版时的压力就轻很多(它们通常来自出版商对于保持一贯出版风格的愿望),因此出版时对手稿的变动更大程度上代表了作曲家自己的决定。因为错误在出版过程中一定会有所增减,而且从音乐和常识上看,手稿有时确实可以用来提供重要证据。但是在和同时代很多作曲家的交流过程中,我强烈地意识到,倘若未来的编辑抛开作曲家精心准备的乐谱印刷本,转而为了所谓的真实解读,不加考虑地使用原始手稿,他们真的会生气。

就拉威尔的钢琴作品来看,上述对手稿的批评观点就愈发显得合乎情理,法国国家图书馆音乐部保存的一套拉威尔自己的印刷本可作证明,它不仅收录了拉威尔钢琴独奏曲第一版'中的大部分乐曲,而且有拉威尔的亲笔修改。根据其中的内容判断,它可能制作于1911年至1913年之间。其中遗漏的作品是《奇异小夜曲》、《听的风景》、《鹅妈妈》、《前奏曲》、《……的风格》、《库普兰之墓》和《卷首画》。拉威尔亲笔修改的《鹅妈妈》、《卷首画》、《……的风格》的印刷本在此图书馆中分开存放¹,而拉威尔自己的《库普兰之墓》印刷本(上面有他标注的指法和一处修改)陈列于蒙福尔·阿莫里的拉威尔博物馆。《奇异小夜曲》和《听的风景》的手稿极为重要,因为它们未能在拉威尔生前出版。《卷首画》的手稿也意义重大,因为它们无法在拉威尔自己的印刷本中找到。不幸的是,《前奏曲》手稿和作曲家自己的印刷本都已不复存在。

拉威尔钢琴作品第一版的所有校样都已不存在了。

主要来源

我把所有能找到的拉威尔自己的修正版作为乐谱主要来源;并对修正版(CE)、第一版(E)和手稿(A)间的差异做了详尽注释。弗拉多·佩勒穆泰拥有的那套修正版是另外一个主要来源(他于1927年和拉威尔共同研究了其几乎所有的钢琴作品)(PerCE)。其中有拉威尔的一些重要补充和修改(主要针对《夜之幽灵》)。还有拉威尔口授佩勒穆泰所做的补充和修改;这部分没被作为主要证据。罗伯特·卡扎德絮的印刷本现属于他的遗孀,不过卡扎德絮的夫人明确告诉我里面没有作曲家的亲笔标注。另外,雅克·弗浮里尔的侄女和学生艾伯克·罗森菲尔德夫人肯定她叔叔的印刷本中除了指法

以外没有标注。

次要来源

本书的次要来源可以归纳为以下四类:

(a) 卢西恩·卡班的修正版(GarCE)。卡班曾在杜朗出版公司工作,是作曲家的好朋友。虽然这些修改的准确情况很难断定,不过从两人的关系推断至少有一些修改得到了拉威尔的口授。它们现存于加州贝克斯菲尔德大学图书馆。卡班还将《高贵而伤感的圆舞曲》和《库普兰之墓》改编成钢琴二重奏(GarT)。它们由杜朗公司出版。

(b) 拉威尔对他钢琴作品所做的乐队改编谱(RO)。按最初创作的时间顺序排列(括号中是乐队改编谱的年份),它们是:《古风小步舞曲》(1929年)、《听的风景》中的《哈巴涅拉》(1908年)、《悼念公主的帕凡舞曲》(1910年)、《镜子》中的《海上扁舟》和《丑角的晨歌》(1906和1923年)、《鹅妈妈》(1911年)、《高贵而伤感的圆舞曲》(1912年)、《库普兰之墓》中的《前奏曲》、《弗尔兰纳舞曲》、《小步舞曲》、《里戈东舞曲》(1919年)。

(c) 录音

(i) 拉威尔1913年为韦尔特·米尼温的钢琴卷帘录音(《小奏鸣曲》,第一、二乐章,C2887;《高贵而伤感的圆舞曲》,C2888),1922年为艺术二重奏公司的录音(《悼念公主的帕凡舞曲》,084;《镜子》中的《悲伤的鸟儿》,082)。据说在第二次时拉威尔还录制了《夜之幽灵》的《绞刑架》以及《库普兰之墓》中的《托卡塔》,不过其实它们是由罗伯特·卡扎德絮所录。至今无法确定他们中哪个在1929年为艺术二重奏公司(72750)录制了《镜子》中的《幽谷钟声》,但我几乎可以肯定是拉威尔录制的。所有这些录音已多次翻录成密纹唱片(LP),但翻录时卷帘钢琴设备不幸未能始终保持良好状况。

(ii) 三位钢琴家的唱片录音,他们都受益于作曲家的具体指导:罗伯特·卡扎德絮(1955年,CBS 13062—4);雅克·弗浮里尔(1972年,ADES 7041—4);弗拉多·佩勒穆泰(1961年,VOX VBX 410 1—3;1977年,NIMBUS 2101—3,重新发行的CDNI 5005, 5011)(CasR, FevR, PerRI 和 PerRII)。米歇尔·梅耶虽然和拉威尔相识(他们一起举办过双钢琴私人(非公开)圆舞曲音乐会,演出没有给迪亚吉列夫留下什么印象),却从未一起研究过拉威尔的钢琴曲,这是他的女儿玛丽·伯廷告诉我的。因此,我没有引用EMI再版梅耶夫人的拉威尔录音。

(d) 拉威尔指导他钢琴作品时的回忆录

(i) 来自弗拉多·佩勒穆泰与伊莲·茹尔当-莫安琪的谈话,出版在《拉威尔谈自己》(洛桑,1953年)和F. 丹拿翻译的英译本《拉威尔谈自己》(纽约/伦敦,1988年2月/1991年)。(PerS(HJM)).

注释:

1. Vma. 2967

2. 分别是 Vma. 3157(7) 和 Fol. Vm12.2701(2)A

(ii) 来自弗拉多·佩勒穆泰与本版编辑的谈话。(PerS(conv))。

(iii) 来自《我的老师莫里斯·拉威尔》(巴黎, 1978年)中亨利埃塔·福雷的回忆录(FauS)。米勒·福雷(政治家埃德加·福雷的姐姐)曾由拉威尔指导准备其钢琴作品独奏音乐会(这很有可能是拉威尔钢琴作品的首次独奏音乐会),于1923年1月12日(正如她书中所述并非是1月18日)在巴黎香榭丽舍剧院上演,当时她18岁。其他回忆录在所出现位置都有完整说明。

我在有助于理解已有文本或主要来源无法完全解释文本中的问题时会使用次要来源。

鸣 谢

我要衷心地感谢他们对我的帮助:感谢盖比·卡扎德絮向我提供关于他丈夫罗伯特的情况;感谢米歇尔·诺伊瑞博士告诉我《小奏鸣曲》的手稿现存处并帮助我拿到副本;感谢贝克斯菲尔德加州州立大学的参考咨询馆员詹姆斯·赛格斯塔寄给我卢西恩·卡班的修正版;感谢让·图泽莱、丹尼斯·霍尔以及雷克斯·罗森允许我在状况良好的设备上欣赏拉威尔的艺术二重奏公司钢琴卷帘录音;感谢纽约皮尔庞特·摩根图书馆音乐手稿和书籍部馆长J.瑞戈比·特纳博士将《水之嬉戏》和《镜子》中的《夜间飞蛾》和《悲伤的鸟儿》的手稿副本寄给我。同时我还要感谢两位演奏家:感谢罗伊·霍华特建议我把学术和实践相结合,感谢弗拉多·佩勒穆泰与我谈论拉威尔上课的情况并让我研究他拥有的修正版;最后,我要感谢法国国家图书馆音乐部的全体员工以及玛格丽特·考博、格温德林·莫克、让-米歇尔·内克图、阿比·奥恩斯坦博士、史蒂芬·罗艾博士等人的大力支持与帮助,同时还要特别感谢伦敦彼得斯出版社的格拉汉姆·海特(此次拉威尔计划的主创人员),他以敏锐的眼光和深厚的音乐功底获得了(如同德彪西称呼安德烈·卡普利特那样)“错误埋葬者”的称号。

罗杰·尼克尔斯

1991年

(陈涵卿译)

悼念公主的帕凡舞曲

前 言

1899年5月27日,24岁的拉威尔首次以指挥家的身份上演了他为乐队而作的序曲《舍赫拉查德》。评论家皮埃尔·拉罗写道:“拉威尔还是一个音乐学院的学生,他在同学和老师间倍受青睐。”接着就开始相当详细地指出这部作品在结构上的缺点。¹这首序曲确实不能算是一部成功的作品。直至8年之后,拉威尔才另有一部纯乐队的作品问世,那就是他根据自己的钢琴作品《镜子》中《海上扁舟》的改编曲。

拉威尔早年获得的成功来自于一些小型音乐会,第一首即是《悼念公主的帕凡舞曲》。此作完成之时正值《舍赫拉查德》首演期间。作为福雷作曲班上的宠儿,拉威尔常常应邀

原始资料缩写表

A:手稿

E:第一版

CE:拉威尔修订过的第一版的修正版

PerCE:佩勒穆泰拥有的拉威尔补充及订正的修正版

GarCE:带有卡班添加和修改的修正版

GarT:卡班改写的钢琴二重奏

RO:拉威尔的乐队改编谱

RR:拉威尔的钢琴卷帘录音

CasR:卡扎德絮的录音

FevR:弗浮里尔的录音

PerRI and PerRII:佩勒穆泰的录音¹

PerS(HJM):来自《拉威尔谈自己》中弗拉多·佩勒穆泰与伊莲·茹尔当-莫安琪谈话的回忆录²

PerS(conv):来自佩勒穆泰与本版编辑谈话的回忆录

FauS:来自《我的老师莫里斯·拉威尔》中福雷的回忆录

注释:

1. 不加数字记号的 PerR 表明佩勒穆泰的两次录音在该问题上一致。
2. 两个页码分别指法国和英国版本。

参加一些当时对音乐界最有影响的女主人举行的音乐沙龙,其中一位即是爱德蒙德·德·波利尼亚克公爵夫人。在《舍赫拉查德》首演失败之后,拉威尔很可能抱着由公爵夫人对《悼念公主的帕凡舞曲》的成功助一臂之力的希望,把这首刚完成的作品献给了她。事实上,几乎不需要这位贵妇人的支持,《悼念公主的帕凡舞曲》就开始盛行于各个沙龙之中了。1902年4月5日,拉威尔的朋友瑞卡多·维涅什在国家协会的第一次公开演奏,只不过是正式标明了这首早已受欢迎的作品的成功地位。

虽然这位公爵夫人显然很乐意接受拉威尔的音乐奉献,

可是她从来就没有认为这是一部很有分量的作品。²成熟后的拉威尔同意她的看法。13年以后,拉威尔重申这部作品的乐队演出后写道:“时隔多年,我已看不到这部作品的优点了,可是我很清楚地看到其缺点:过度地受夏布里埃的影响,曲式亦极其平庸。”³马赛尔·马纳说,拉威尔承认这首曲子模仿了夏布里埃《风景小品》中的《牧歌》。⁴

但是,拉威尔的情况往往不如看上去的那么简单。首先,1910年,他不厌其烦地把这首钢琴曲改编成管弦乐曲,由亨利·伍德担任指挥,1911年2月27日第一次在曼彻斯特的“绅士音乐会”上演出;其次,直到1930年代初,他仍然经常以钢琴独奏形式公开表演;再次,据罗兰-曼纽尔证实,当他人想把这首舞曲搬上舞台时,拉威尔避之不及,⁵可他自己却在1923年为喜歌剧演员索尼娅·帕费洛把这首曲子编入一部取名为《公主肖像》的芭蕾舞剧,不过该剧从未上演过。⁶

找到一种正确的风格来演奏这首曲子也并非容易。据玛格丽特·隆说,拉威尔“常说演奏者不应使这首曲子成为一出戏剧”。他对亨利埃塔·福雷说:“人人都熟悉这曲调,可是天知道,在把伴奏部分放到第二位的同时,又必须强调其略为机械性的一面。”⁸可是要把这种客观冷静的处理和乐谱第一小节上方“非常柔和但有丰满的音响”的标记统一起来真是不容易。

而这首曲子最难对付的是速度问题。这里又一次出现了自相矛盾的情况。查尔斯·奥尔蒙特在一次由他母亲组织的社交晚会上演奏了这首曲子。拉威尔对他浇了一盆冷水:“听着,亲爱的孩子,下回记住,我是为一位死去的公主写了一首‘帕凡舞曲’,而不是为一位公主写了一首死气沉沉的‘帕凡舞曲’。”⁹可是1932年,当埃米尔·维耶尔莫兹观摩了拉威尔指挥的一场他本人的作品音乐会后,这样写道:“他的‘帕凡舞曲’慢得无法形容。”¹⁰同年,法国的哥伦比亚公司艺术指导约翰·贝拉尔在拉威尔在场的情况下,录制了“帕凡舞曲”的乐队版。据他50年后的回忆,拉威尔一开始决定的速度会使此曲在6至7分钟之间结束,远远超过了七十八转唱片一面所容的极限。当乐队重新试录时,他把拉威尔带到一家酒吧间去了。回来后,拉威尔同意了4分32秒的录音,还说,“太完美了”¹¹。

最后,还有一个不可解释的速度标记的差别:♩=80出现在第一版(E)和拉威尔修改过的校正版(CE)上,而♩=54出现在伊斯契格修改过的重印版本(ECR)和所有拉威尔的乐队改编谱(RO)以及某些钢琴原版的晚期版本中,其中包括朔特(Schott)的版本(ED 1788)。鉴于上述这些难以判断的情况,再加上拉威尔本人在钢琴卷帘(RR)中的基本录音速度为ca. ♩=69(如果按照拉威尔签字的指示操作用穿孔纸带控制琴键的自动钢琴,此曲全长4分52秒),演奏者似乎可以从♩=54到80的速度范围中自由选择,尽管在实际演奏中任何快于♩=72的速度都显得过于匆忙。另一个值得注意的是拉威尔的三个钢琴学生弹奏得相对较慢:卡扎德絮的录音(CasR)取♩=58,演奏时间为5分32秒;弗浮里尔用的是♩=52(FevR),全长6分18秒;佩勒穆泰的两次录音(PerRI)和(PerRII)均为♩=58,演奏时间分别为5分18秒和5分14秒。

根据以上所述,而且在没有手稿的情况下,很难给予任何明确的指导。对于这首似乎是18世纪的曲子,比较安全甚至可以说比较适当的方法是由演奏者的品味来选择速度。

编者按

大部分由编者加入的临时记号,休止符、速度记号, *simile* [相同记号]、力度记号、*main droite/main gauche* [左右手记号],都用方括号标示。第26小节保留了在第一版(E)中用圆括号注明的有助于预防性的还原记号。

踏板记号来自第一版(E),拉威尔的修正版(CE)和伊斯契格的修正版(ECR)。三个版本在这方面是一致的。我没有列上拉威尔本人在自动钢琴卷帘(RR)中的踏板用法,在这个问题上我倾向于选择拉威尔的指令,而不按他实际的弹法。持续音踏板的用法显然不仅限于所标之处,放掉与否由演奏者决定。

下列编者的改动未在乐谱中注出,在《评注》中也没有详叙:

添加或修改的分句标记是为了与类似乐句保持一致。以此类推,在互相对称的段落中,断奏、重音和保持音(*tenuto*)记号也相应地添加或取消。第一版(E)、拉威尔的修正版(CE)和伊斯契格的修正版(ECR)都包括一些把同音连线 and 乐句弧线混淆不清的错误,纠正这些错误杜绝了这种模棱两可的情况。所有不合逻辑的节奏组合也都依原样——指明了。

罗杰·尼克尔斯

1992年

(杨韵林译)

注释:

1. 《时报》(1899年6月13日)。
2. M. 德·科萨特:《爱之食粮》(1978年,伦敦),第64页。
3. 《音乐杂志》*S.I.M.* (1912年2月15日),第62页。
4. M. 马纳:《莫里斯·拉威尔》(1986年,巴黎),第95页。
5. 罗兰-曼纽尔:《辉煌的拉威尔》(1938年,巴黎;英译版,C. 乔莱,1947年,伦敦,1972年再版),第45页。
6. 参见拉威尔1923年9月8日写给他的编辑雅克·杜兰德的信。莫里斯·拉威尔:《信件,文章,访谈录》,A. 奥然斯坦编,(1989年,巴黎;英译版,A. 奥然斯坦,1990年,纽约),第219页。
7. M. 隆:《与拉威尔在钢琴旁》,(1971年,巴黎;英译版:O. 西尼尔-埃利斯,1973年),第120页。
8. *FauS*,第95页。
9. 《音乐杂志》,(1938年12月刊),第209页。
10. 《基督教科学箴言报》,(1932年2月13日)。
11. 让-米歇尔·内克图:《J. 贝拉德访谈录》;文字见注6,第411-412页。

RAVEL'S PIANO MUSIC – A NEW EDITION

Editorial Method and Sources

There is no denying the excitement of holding in one's hand the autograph manuscript of a musical masterpiece; and where the autograph is itself a work of art, as many of Ravel's are, then aesthetic considerations also come into play to compound the excitement. But there is equally no denying that composers are, like all mortals, fallible, and that however beautiful and exciting an autograph is, it may nonetheless contain mistakes. The apparently laudable desire to go back to what the composer originally wrote needs therefore to be tempered with a certain amount of common sense.

With stage works, it is true, pressures of time, space, money and personalities often lead to deformations which the composer does not in any sense welcome but has to accept if the performance is to go ahead, and which may then find their way into the printed score. But in the case of piano works, the pressures on the composer in preparing an edition are much slighter, exerted for the most part by the printer in his desire for conformity with house style, so that changes introduced between manuscript and edition have a somewhat greater chance of representing decisions freely taken by the composer. Certainly, in the process of publication mistakes may be introduced as well as rectified and, when musicality and common sense indicate that this may have happened, the autograph can indeed sometimes provide vital evidence. But in the course of conversations with a number of composers of our own time, I am given overwhelmingly to understand that they would actually be angry if future editors ignored their carefully prepared printed scores and went back automatically to their original autographs for a so-called true reading.

In the case of Ravel's piano music, such a critical view of autograph evidence is more than ever justified, since the Music Department of the Bibliothèque Nationale holds a bound volume containing Ravel's own printed copies, with autograph corrections, of the bulk of the first editions of his solo piano music.¹ To judge from the contents, the volume would appear to have been made up between 1911 and 1913. The works missing from this collection are *Sérénade grotesque*, *Sites auriculaires*, *Ma Mère l'Oye*, *Prélude, A la manière de...*, *Le tombeau de Couperin* and *Frontispice*. Printed copies with autograph corrections of *Ma Mère l'Oye* and *A la manière de...* are held separately in the same institution,² while Ravel's own printed copy of *Le tombeau de Couperin*, with autograph fingerings and one autograph correction, is on display in the Musée Ravel at Monfort l'Amaury. For *Sérénade grotesque* and *Sites auriculaires* the autographs may be said to assume paramount importance since these pieces were not published in the composer's lifetime. The autograph of *Frontispice* is also significant because Ravel's own printed copy has not been found. Unfortunately, for *Prélude* neither the autograph nor the composer's printed copy is extant.

No proofs are known to survive of the first editions of any of Ravel's piano works.

Primary Sources

Where Ravel's own corrected edition is available, I have taken it as my main primary source; discrepancies between this corrected edition (CE), the first printed edition (E) and the autograph (A) are duly noted. A further primary source is the set of printed editions belonging to Vlado Perlemuter, who studied almost all Ravel's piano works with the composer in 1927 (PerCE). These copies carry some valuable additions and corrections in Ravel's own hand,

mainly for *Gaspard de la nuit*. They also carry additions and corrections dictated by Ravel, but in Perlemuter's hand; these have not been treated as primary evidence. The copies belonging to Robert Casadesus are now in the possession of his widow, but Mme Casadesus has been kind enough to assure me that they contain no markings in the composer's hand. Likewise, Jacques Février's niece and pupil Mme Aboulker-Rosenfeld has assured me that her uncle's copies contain no markings beyond his fingerings.

Secondary Sources

The secondary sources fall into four groups:

(a) Printed copies with corrections by Lucien Garban (GarCE). Garban worked for the Durand publishing house and was a close friend of the composer. The exact status of these corrections is impossible to determine but, given the links between the two men, it is feasible that at least some of the changes were dictated by Ravel. These copies are now in the library of Bakersfield College, California. Garban also made piano duet transcriptions of *Valses nobles et sentimentales* and *Le tombeau de Couperin* (GarT). These are published by Durand.

(b) Ravel's own orchestrations of a number of his piano pieces (RO). In chronological order of original composition (dates of orchestration in brackets), these are: *Menuet antique* (1929), 'Habanera' from *Sites auriculaires* (1908), *Pavane pour une Infante défunte* (1910), 'Une barque sur l'océan' and 'Alborada del gracioso' from *Miroirs* (1906 and 1923), *Ma Mère l'Oye* (1911), *Valses nobles et sentimentales* (1912), 'Prélude', 'Forlane', 'Menuet' and 'Rigaudon' from *Le tombeau de Couperin* (1919).

(c) Recordings

(i) Piano rolls made by Ravel (RR) in 1913 for Welte-Mignon (*Sonatine*, movements I and II, C2887; *Valses nobles et sentimentales*, C2888), and in 1922 for Duo-Art (*Pavane pour une Infante défunte*, 084; 'Oiseaux tristes' from *Miroirs*, 082). It was claimed that at this second session Ravel also recorded 'Le giber' from *Gaspard de la nuit* and the 'Toccata' from *Le tombeau de Couperin*, but these were in fact recorded by Robert Casadesus. It remains uncertain which of the two recorded 'La vallée des cloches' from *Miroirs* in 1929 for Duo-Art (72750), though I am almost certain it was Ravel. All these recordings have been transferred a number of times to LP, but unfortunately the piano roll equipment has not always been properly regulated.

(ii) Recordings made on disc by three pianists, all of whom had the benefit of the composer's detailed advice: Robert Casadesus (1955, CBS 13062-4); Jacques Février (1972, ADES 7041-4); Vlado Perlemuter (1961, VOX VBX 410 1-3; 1977, NIMBUS 2101-3, reissued CD NI 5005, 5011) (CasR, FévR, PerRI and PerRII). Marcelle Meyer, although known to Ravel (together they gave the private two-piano performance of *La valse* which failed to impress Diaghilev), never studied his piano music with him, as her daughter, Marie Bertin, was good enough to inform me. I have therefore taken no account of Mme Meyer's Ravel recordings reissued by EMI on the Référence label.

(d) Souvenirs of Ravel as a coach of his piano music

(i) from Vlado Perlemuter in his interviews with Hélène Jourdan-Morhange, published as *Ravel d'après Ravel* (Lausanne, 1953) and in an English translation by F. Tanner as *Ravel according to Ravel* (New York/London, 1988; 2/1991) (PerS(HJM)).

¹ Vma. 2967

² Vma. 3157(7) and Fol. Vm12. 2701(2)A respectively

(ii) from Vlado Perlemuter in conversation with the Editor of the present edition (PerS(conv)).

(iii) from Henriette Faure in *Mon maître Maurice Ravel* (Paris, 1978) (FauS). Mlle Faure, the sister of the politician Edgar Faure, was coached by Ravel for her recital of his music – in all probability the first ever all-Ravel piano recital – which she gave at the Théâtre des Champs-Élysées on 12 January 1923 (not 18 January, as she states in her book), when she was eighteen. Other souvenirs are fully identified *in situ*.

The secondary sources are considered when they shed further light on an established text, or when problems in the text are not fully elucidated by the primary sources.

Acknowledgments

I should like to express my gratitude to the following for their assistance: to Gaby Casadesus for information about her husband Robert; to Dr Michel Noiray, who told me about the autograph of *Sonatine* and helped me to obtain a copy; to James Segesta, reference librarian of California State College, Bakersfield, for sending me copies of Lucien Garban's corrected scores; to Jean Touzelet for allowing me to hear Ravel's Duo-Art piano rolls on a machine in superb order; and to Dr J. Rigbie Turner, Curator of Music Manuscripts and Books in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, for sending me copies of the autographs of *Jeux d'eau*, and of 'Noctuelles' and 'Oiseaux tristes' from *Miroirs*. I am grateful also to two performers: to Roy Howat for advice that has blended the scholarly with the practical; and to Vlado Perlemuter for talking to me about his lessons with Ravel and for allowing me to study his copies of the music. Finally, my thanks go to the staff of the Music Department of the Bibliothèque Nationale, and to Margaret Cobb, Gwendolyn Mok, Jean-Michel Nectoux, Dr Arbie Orenstein, and Dr Stephen Roe for numerous kindnesses; and especially to Graham Hayter of Peters Edition Ltd, London, who has been the mainstay of this Ravel enterprise since its inception, and whose keen eye and musical expertise have made him (as Debussy said of André Caplet) 'the graveyard of errors'.

Roger Nichols
1991

PAVANE POUR UNE INFANTE DEFUNTE

Preface

On 27 May 1899, at the age of twenty-four, Ravel made his first appearance as a conductor, in the first performance of his overture *Schéhérazade*. 'M. Maurice Ravel is still a student at the Conservatoire; his colleagues and teachers are loud in their claims for him', wrote the critic Pierre Lalo, before pointing out the work's structural faults in some detail.¹ Indeed, the piece was not a success, and it was to be another eight years before Ravel again brought a purely orchestral work before the public, with his arrangement of 'Une barque sur l'océan' from *Miroirs*.

His successes in those early years were all gained in more intimate surroundings, the first of them with the *Pavane pour une Infante défunte* (Pavane for a dead Infanta) which he had just finished at the time of the *Schéhérazade* performance. As a

Table of Source abbreviations

A: autograph

E: first edition

CE: Ravel's corrected copy of the first edition

PerCE: Perlemuter's printed copy with Ravel's additions and corrections

GarCE: printed copies with Garban's additions and corrections

GarT: Garban's piano duet transcriptions

RO: Ravel's orchestral transcriptions

RR: Ravel's recordings on piano roll

CasR: recordings by Casadesus

FévR: recordings by Février

PerRI and PerRII: recordings by Perlemuter¹

PerS(HJM): souvenirs from Perlemuter in *Ravel d'après Ravel*, in conversation with Hélène Jourdan-Morhange²

PerS(conv): souvenirs from Perlemuter in conversation with the present Editor

FauS: souvenirs from Faure in *Mon maître Maurice Ravel*

¹ The designation PerR without a number indicates that Perlemuter's two recordings coincide over the point in question

² Dual page numbers refer to the French and English editions respectively

favoured student in Fauré's composition class at the Conservatoire, Ravel found himself invited to the salons of some of the most influential musical hostesses of the day, including that of the Princess Edmond de Polignac, and it seems probable that in the wake of the failure of his overture he took the opportunity of dedicating this piano piece to her, in the hope that her patronage might lend wings to its passage. In the event, her support was hardly needed. The *Pavane* became the rage of the salons and its first public performance, by Ravel's friend Ricardo Viñes at the Société Nationale on 5 April 1902, was no more than an official stamp on a success long since assured.

Although the Princess was apparently pleased by the dedication, she never felt the *Pavane* was a work of much

substance,² and the mature Ravel came to agree with her. Reviewing a performance of his orchestral version thirteen years later, he wrote, 'I can no longer see the work's virtues at this distance in time. But I'm afraid I see its faults all too clearly: the overpowerful influence of Chabrier and the impoverished form.'³ According to Marcel Marnat, Ravel admitted that the piece was modelled on the 'Idylle' from Chabrier's *Pièces pittoresques*.⁴

But, as often with Ravel, the matter is not as simple as it seems. For one thing, in 1910 he took the trouble to make an orchestral version of it, first performed by Henry Wood at one of his Gentlemen's Concerts in Manchester on 27 February 1911; and for another, he regularly performed the piano version in public until the early 1930s. Furthermore, although we have it on Roland-Manuel's authority that Ravel distanced himself from the attempts of others to give the work choreographic form,⁵ Ravel himself incorporated it in a ballet (never performed) called *Le portrait de l'Infante*, which he put together in 1923 for Sonia Pavlov of the Opéra-Comique.⁶

Finding a correct performing style for the piece is no less problematic. Ravel, according to Marguerite Long, 'used to say that one mustn't turn it into a drama',⁷ and to Henriette Faure he said, 'Everyone's familiar with the tune, Heaven knows, but at the same time as making the accompaniment secondary, you must insist on its slightly mechanical aspect.'⁸ It is difficult, though, to reconcile this objective approach with the marking over the opening bars '*Assez doux, mais d'une sonorité large*' (Rather gentle, but with a full sound).

But the most intractable problem this piece presents is that of tempo. Once again there are inconsistencies. Charles Oulmont, having played the *Pavane* at one of his mother's soirées, was dismayed to be told by the composer, 'Listen, dear boy, remember next time that I wrote a Pavane for a dead princess, and not a dead Pavane for a princess.'⁹ But Emile Vuillermoz, reviewing Ravel's conducting of a concert of his own music in 1932 could write, 'His *Pavane* was unutterably slow.'¹⁰ In that same year, Jean Bérard, then the artistic director of Columbia in France, made a recording of the orchestral version of the *Pavane* at which Ravel was present and, as he recalled fifty years later, the composer initially set a tempo at which the piece would have lasted between 6 and 7 minutes – far too long for a single side of a 78. While the orchestra tried again, he took Ravel out to a bistro and on their return Ravel gave his approval ('C'est parfait') to a recording lasting 4'32".¹¹

There is, finally, an unexplained discrepancy between the metronome marking $\text{♩} = 80$, printed in the first edition (E) and unchanged in Ravel's corrected edition (CE), and the marking $\text{♩} = 54$, found in the Eschig corrected reprint (ECR), in all editions of Ravel's orchestral transcription (RO) and in some later editions of the piano original, including the one published by Schott (ED 1788). Given the uncertainties noted above, and the fact that Ravel's recording on piano roll (RR) takes a basic tempo of ca. $\text{♩} = 69$ (with an overall duration, if the pianola is operated according to the composer's signed instructions, of 4'52"), the pianist would seem to be free to choose within the range $\text{♩} = 54\text{--}80$, even if, in practice, any speed above ca. $\text{♩} = 72$ is in danger of sounding rushed. We may note also the relatively slow performances of three of Ravel's pianist pupils, Casadesu, Février and Perlemuter: CasR ($\text{♩} = 58$) lasts 5'32", FevR ($\text{♩} = 52$) 6'18", PerRI and PerRII ($\text{♩} = 58$) last 5'18" and 5'14" respectively.

In the circumstances, and in the absence of the autograph, it is hard to see that any firm guidance can be given. It is perhaps safer – and indeed, in this quasi-eighteenth-century piece, more appropriate – to leave the matter to the performer's taste.

Editorial Practice

Square brackets have been applied to the majority of editorial additions: accidentals, rests, tempo and *simile* markings, dynamics and *main droite/main gauche* indications. One precautionary accidental from E (bar 26) has been retained in round brackets.

The pedalling in this edition follows that of E, CE and ECR, which are consistent with each other. I have made no attempt to indicate the pedalling of RR, preferring in this instance to observe what Ravel says rather than what he does. But clearly use of the sustaining pedal is not confined to the passages marked. Release of the pedal is left to the player's discretion.

The following editorial amendments have been made without their being distinguished in the music text or detailed in the Critical Commentary:

Phrase marks have been added or amended so as to conform with parallel passages. Similarly, by analogy with corresponding passages, staccato dots, accents and tenuto markings have been added or deleted. Sources E, CE and ECR contain some misplacements of ties which would cause them to be misinterpreted as slurs; their correct positioning eradicates this ambiguity. All irrational rhythmic groupings are here indicated as such.

Roger Nichols
1992

¹ *Le temps* (13 June 1899)

² M. de Cossart: *The Food of Love* (London, 1978), 64

³ *Revue Musicale de la S.I.M.* (15 Feb 1912), 62

⁴ M. Marnat: *Maurice Ravel* (Paris, 1986), 95

⁵ Roland-Manuel: *A la gloire de Ravel* (Paris, 1938; Eng. trans. C. Jolly, London, 1947, R/1972), 45

⁶ See Ravel's letter of 8 September 1923 to his editor Jacques Durand, printed in M. Ravel: *Lettres, écrits, entretiens*, ed. A. Orenstein (Paris, 1989; Eng. trans. A. Orenstein, New York, 1990), 219

⁷ M. Long: *Au piano avec Maurice Ravel* (Paris, 1971; Eng. trans. O. Senior-Ellis, 1973), 120

⁸ FauS 95

⁹ *La revue Musicale* (Dec 1938), 209

¹⁰ *Christian Science Monitor* (13 Feb 1932)

¹¹ J. Bérard interviewed by Jean-Michel Nectoux; for text see (6), 411–12

目 录

拉威尔钢琴作品集——一个全新的版本

编辑方法和资料来源	iv
原始资料缩写表	v

悼念公主的帕凡舞曲

前言	v
编者按	vi
曲谱	2
评注	7

CONTENTS

Ravel's Piano Music – A New Edition

Editorial Method and Sources	vii
Table of Source abbreviations	viii

Pavane pour une Infante défunte

Preface	viii
Editorial Practice	ix
First music page	2
Critical Commentary	7

上海市教委第四期教育高地建设项目

拉威尔钢琴作品集

Maurice Ravel

悼念公主的帕凡舞曲

Pavane pour une
Infante defunte

for

Solo Piano

杨韵琳 陈涵卿 译

罗杰·尼克尔斯 编订

by

Roger Nichols

伦敦彼得斯音乐出版社提供版权
上海音乐出版社出版

悼念公主的帕凡舞曲

献给E.德·波利尼亚克公爵夫人

Pavane pour une Infante défunte

à Madame la Princesse E. de Polignac

莫里斯·拉威尔

Maurice Ravel

(1875-1937)

♩ = 54-80

Assez doux, mais d'une sonorité large

The musical score is written for piano and consists of 14 measures. It is in G major (one sharp) and 3/4 time. The tempo is marked 'Assez doux, mais d'une sonorité large' with a metronome marking of ♩ = 54-80. The score is divided into four systems of two staves each. The first system (measures 1-3) starts with a piano (p) dynamic and includes a [sim.] marking. The second system (measures 4-6) ends with a mezzo-forte (mf) dynamic and the instruction 'Cédez'. The third system (measures 7-9) includes the instruction 'En mesure' and a [m.g.] marking. The fourth system (measures 10-14) includes the instructions 'Un peu retenu', 'En élargissant', and '1er Mouvt'. The dynamics range from piano (p) to mezzo-forte (mf) and piano (p) again at the end.

très lointain

13

pp *m.g.* *m.g.* [*m.g.*]

14 15

très soutenu

16

[*m.g.*] *mf*

17 18

19

ppp [*m.g.*] [*m.g.*]

20 21

22

[*m.g.*] *pp* [*m.g.*]

23 24

Un peu plus lent

25

mf *f*

26 27

Reprenez le mouvement

28

[sim.]

[sim.]

31

Cédez

mf

34

rapide

p

37

Un peu retenu

pp

ff

1er Mouvt

subitement très doux et très lié

[pp]

41

3

pp

44

Measures 44-46 of a piano piece. The music is in G major (one sharp) and 4/4 time. Measure 44 features a treble staff with a melodic line of eighth and sixteenth notes, and a bass staff with a steady eighth-note accompaniment. Measure 45 continues the melodic development with some chromaticism. Measure 46 has a more complex texture with triplets and a crescendo leading to a fortissimo (ff) dynamic.

47

Très grave

Measures 47-50. Measure 47 begins with a fortissimo (ff) dynamic. The tempo or mood is indicated as 'Très grave' (Very slow). Measure 48 shows a piano (p) dynamic. Measure 49 is marked piano-piano (pp). Measure 50 concludes the system with a half note in the bass staff.

51

Measures 51-53. Measure 51 features a triplet of eighth notes in the treble. Measure 52 continues with similar rhythmic patterns. Measure 53 ends with a piano-piano (pp) dynamic marking.

54

Measures 54-56. Measure 54 has a treble staff with a melodic line and a bass staff with a steady accompaniment. Measure 55 features a triplet in the treble. Measure 56 has a fortissimo (ff) dynamic.

57

Tres grave
Très grave

Measures 57-59. Measure 57 begins with a fortissimo (ff) dynamic. The tempo or mood is indicated as 'Tres grave' and 'Très grave' (Very slow). Measure 58 is marked piano (p). Measure 59 concludes the system with a half note in the bass staff.

1er Mouvt
marquez le chant

60

[pp] [sim.]

Reo. [sim.]

62

64

Cédez [mp]

Reprenez le mouvement

66

pp [7]

Reo.

En élargissant beaucoup

69

[Un peu retenu] m.g. [m.d.] m.g. ff

Reo. Reo. [a] Reo.

评 注

CRITICAL COMMENTARY

Sources: Autograph untraceable

E – first edition by Demets, undated, but published in 1900 (E.623D)

ECR – corrected reprint of E published by Eschig, bearing printed autograph statement: "Seule édition française corrigée par l'auteur et conforme au manuscrit original Maurice Ravel". Date of these corrections unknown, but numerous errors and inconsistencies still remaining

CE, RO, RR – see 'Editorial Method and Sources', p. 3

Tempo indication – see Preface

Bars 1–6. E, CE: LH, tenuto markings and staccato dots only on first two quavers of bar 2 and three quavers of bar 3. Extended editorially. ECR plainly inconsistent

Bar 6. E, CE, ECR: "Cédez" and *mf* on quaver 7. Repositioned editorially at quaver 6 by analogy with bar 33

Bar 10. E, CE, ECR: "Un peu retenu" begins on quaver 4. Repositioned editorially at quaver 5 by analogy with bar 37

Bar 15. CE: RH beats 2 and 3, tie inserted; missing in E, ECR

Bars 17, 24. CE, ECR: RH quaver 8, ♯ added to *c*"; missing in E

Bar 25. E, CE, ECR: *mf* on beat 2. Repositioned editorially at beat 1 by analogy with bar 18, and with RO in both bars

Bar 26. E, CE, ECR: *f* on beat 4. Repositioned editorially at beat 3 following RO

Bar 32. E, CE, ECR: RH quaver 3, rest below *f*♯. Downward stem added to *f*♯ and quaver rest deleted editorially by analogy with bar 31

E, CE, ECR: LH beats 2 and 4, arpeggiation removed editorially

Bar 33. E, CE: RH quaver 5, accented and with upward stem; accent and downward stem in ECR. In RO, clarinet 1 and violins 2 make clear that this chord is merely continuation of supporting harmony. Accent removed editorially and downward stem taken from ECR

Bars 34, 66. E, CE, ECR: LH beat 4, first grace-note a crotchet. Altered to quaver editorially

Bars 38, 70. E, CE, ECR: RH beat 3, *f*♯ quaver, joined to quavers of beat 2. Altered to crotchet editorially following horn 1 in RO

Bar 39. RR: Ravel emphasises suddenness of transition here and at bar 49. E, CE, ECR: "*subitement très doux et très lié*" begins on beat 4. Repositioned at quaver 8 editorially

Bar 41. CE, ECR: RH quaver 2, ♭ added to *b*"; missing in E

Bars 41–42, 51–52. E, CE, ECR: LH ties to *g* missing

Bar 44. CE: RH quaver 2, ♭ added to *f*"; missing in E, ECR

Bar 45. CE: RH quaver 8, ♭ added to *b*; missing in E, ECR

Bar 46. E, CE, ECR: beat 2, *f*. Altered to *sf* editorially by analogy with bars 47, 56, 57

Bars 47, 57. RR: quaver 1, more than a suspicion of a spread to this slightly awkward chord, especially in 57

Bars 47–49, 57–59. E, CE, ECR: the descending pairs of notes are not uniformly marked. In RO, each quaver is accented and slurred on to the succeeding crotchet, with downbows in the strings reinforcing the diminuendo pattern for each phrase.

RO also marks an overall diminuendo from quaver 3 of bar 47 to the cadence in bar 49 (and similarly in bars 57–59); E, CE, ECR have overall diminuendo only in bars 47–48 and overall phrase mark only in bars 57–58; the latter is absent from RO

Bars 48–49. E, CE, ECR: "Très grave" begins on beat 3 of bar 48.

Repositioned editorially at beat 4 by analogy with bars 58–59

Bars 49–50. E, CE, ECR: RH, no crescendo over rising part of phrase. Added editorially by analogy with bars 39–40, 43–44

Bar 50. CE, ECR: LH, treble clef added before beat 3; missing in E.

E, CE, ECR: *pp* on beat 1. Repositioned editorially at bar 49, quaver 4 by analogy with bar 43 and with RO

Bar 51. CE: RH quaver 2, ♭ added to *b*"; missing in E, ECR

Bars 51–52. See note to bars 41–42

Bars 51, 55. E, CE, ECR: RH beat 2, quaver rest above *f*"♯ and *b*' respectively. Repositioned at quaver 4 editorially

Bars 53–55. E, CE, ECR: no crescendo or diminuendo. Added editorially by analogy with bars 43–45

Bar 54. E, CE, ECR: *p* on quaver 1. Altered editorially to *pp* by analogy with bars 43, 50, and repositioned editorially at bar 53, quaver 8

E, CE, ECR: semiquaver beam on quintuplet. Demi-semiquaver beam added editorially

E, CE, ECR: LH quaver 8, quaver rest. Rest deleted editorially, and bracketed *g*' supplied (played by RH thumb) following line of clarinet 2 in RO

Bar 55. CE: RH quaver 2, *a*'♯ of E (ECR) deleted (to conform with bar 45)

E, CE, ECR: RH quaver 3, *g*" crotchet. Altered editorially to quaver, as in bar 51

CE: RH quaver 8, ♭ added to *b*; missing in E, ECR

Bar 57. See note to bar 47

E, CE: LH quaver 8, *f* crotchet. Altered to quaver, as in ECR

Bars 57, 58. E, CE: RH, quaver rests missing from 57 quaver 7 and 58 quaver 3; augmentation dots added to preceding crotchets in ECR. Rests added editorially by analogy with bars 47, 48

Bars 57–59. See note on bars 47–49

Bar 58. CE, ECR: LH quaver 1, ♯ added to *f*; missing in E

Bar 66. See note to bar 34

Bar 67. E, CE, ECR: LH quaver 8, discrepancy between this bar and bar 35. No editorial decision taken

Bar 70. E, CE, ECR: *f* is printed nearer to quaver 2 than to quaver 1. RO and RR clearly mark change of dynamics and texture from quaver 2

See note to bar 38

E, CE, ECR: beat 4, "*Ped.*" on the beat. Repositioned editorially under grace-notes

Bar 72. RR: Ravel plays final chord more quietly than preceding two. This is a compromise between E (CE, ECR) and RO, which places climax on quaver 3 of bar 70, followed by a diminuendo and a *perdendosi* on final string chord

Roger Nichols
1992