



拉威尔钢琴作品集

Maurice Ravel

镜子

Miroirs

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

上海市教委第四期教育高地建设项目

拉威尔钢琴作品集

镜 子

Miroirs

for

Solo Piano

秦展文 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

图书在版编目 (C I P) 数据

拉威尔钢琴作品集——镜子/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 978-7-80751-624-8

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

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2010) 第 073776 号

© Copyright 1995 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——镜子

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: 8.5 乐谱: 68 面

2010 年 5 月第 1 版 2010 年 5 月第 1 次印刷

印数: 1-4,000 册

ISBN 978-7-80751-624-8/J · 572

定价: 28.00 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,会发现非常大的不同。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³,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校样已不存在,除了在杜朗档案馆中保存着一套《库普兰之墓》初校样,上面有杜朗出版公司编辑要求第二次校样的标记(我很高兴罗伊·霍华特给我提供了这份材料的副本)。这套校样中没有拉威尔的亲笔标注。除了《库普兰之墓》中的《前奏曲》和《弗尔兰纳舞曲》有一些复杂倚音的脚注(对此拉威尔似乎改变了主意)以外,第一版中可以找到所有的编辑注解。

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》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·米尼温的卷帘钢琴录音(《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 13062-43);雅克·弗浮里尔(1972年,ADES 7041-4);弗拉多·佩勒穆泰(1961年,VOX VBX 410 1-34;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))。

(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。她女儿马耶特·康斯坦丁夫人告诉我她曾经保存着妈妈接受拉威尔指导时的原始笔记,但是自从借给一位研究员后就再也没有归还。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卷帘钢琴录音;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)

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:由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⁵

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⁶

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. Vma. 2967.

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

3. 重新发行的 SONY MH2K 63316.

4. 重新发行的 VOX CDX2 5507.

5. 佩勒穆泰的录音(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)。

6. 两个页码分别指法国和英国版本。

镜 子

前 言

1905年夏所谓的“拉威尔事件”是本世纪前十年巴黎音乐生活中的轰动事件之一。已创作了《水之嬉戏》、声乐套曲《舍赫拉查德》以及《弦乐四重奏》的拉威尔在最后一次竞选“罗马大奖”时,却在预选阶段就惨遭淘汰,在报刊及其他各界引起了一片哗然。

回顾整个事件,与其说是拉威尔遭到淘汰令人奇怪(他提交给评委会的部分和声显然是在故意挑衅),还不如说是他参赛这一行为本身就让人不解。拉威尔并未真正身处于学术派氛围中,而是与一群自称“捣蛋帮”的朋友在一起(“捣蛋帮”的名称并非源自北美印第安的阿帕切族,而是

“appassionato[热情的]”一词的词根)。对他们而言,让当权派头疼是其众多有趣目标之一。尽管《小奏鸣曲》仍然在可接受的条理范围内(虽然拉威尔之后声明说这部作品与《镜子》部分相似),但《镜子》却刻意追求奇特和创新。拉威尔将这五首曲子分别题献给五位“捣蛋帮”同伴的举动也证明了这绝非偶然。正如马赛尔·马纳所言:“拉威尔在这时候开始成熟,目标明晰、始终如一且锐意进取,尽管从表面上看他为了脱离乌合之众而故意采取了冷淡态度。”¹然而该作品在技法方面并未脱节:“《小奏鸣曲》的古典主义线条在《镜子》中有着不同的应用方式:隐晦不明显,含蓄不明晰。”²

对拉威尔追求变化的证明来自他的朋友兼传记作者罗兰-曼纽尔：

“某晚，当瑞卡多·维涅什演奏了《来自草稿本》这一德彪西鲜为人知的作品以献给该著名作曲家后，他带着满脑子刚听到的话来到西弗里街：德彪西对他说，他梦想着一种音乐，一种曲式非常自由以至于听起来像是即兴创作的音乐，整部作品似乎是刚从草稿本上扯下来的。拉威尔出席了这次聚会。他出人意料地赞成这一想法，并承认说他正在创作的音乐正是以类似的原则为基础。‘我应该感到高兴’，他说，‘因为我在创作能把自己从《水之嬉戏》中解放出来的作品’。”¹³

他当时脑海中构思的可能是《悲伤的鸟儿》。

关于标题《镜子》的含义多年来一直争论不休，因为拉威尔本人并未就该问题表态，仅仅说道：“钢琴套曲《镜子》标志着我和声语汇发展中的重大变革。这种变革令当时那些欣赏我这一风格的作曲家也感到了苦恼。”¹⁴ 不过美国学者阿尔比·奥然斯坦的最新研究发掘了之前未曾公开的补充声明，拉威尔在其中说道：

“写于1905年的五首钢琴作品以《镜子》为标题，这让评论家认为这部作品集属于印象派作品。如果是通过类比来理解该标题，那么我并不完全否认这一点，更何况这种类比并无充分论据，因为印象主义在绘画外的其他领域似乎没有什么准确的含义。不管怎样，‘镜子’一词不应使人理所当然认为我主张艺术主观论。莎士比亚的一行诗表达了我完全相反的立场：眼睛不能瞧见它自己，必须通过反射，借助外物（《尤利乌斯·凯撒》第一幕第二场）。”¹⁵

整部作品必定是完成于1905年的深秋，因为瑞卡多·维涅什在日记的圣诞节篇中写道，拜访拉威尔时发现他正在修改校样。就在两星期后的1906年1月6日，维涅什在埃拉尔音乐厅首演了这部作品。从遗留的材料来看，其接受状况较为复杂。《音乐杂志》认为它为相对冷淡的晚会音乐注入了温暖活力¹⁶，而《音乐邮报》的卡米尔·莫克莱尔则认为拉威尔“创造了迷人且虚幻的奇迹，让我们接受了原本归入音乐美学经典错误之列的拟态和声”。他唯一担心的是演奏该作品所需要的精湛技巧，这让他想到了“日本杂技演员的虚妄魅力”。¹⁷ 从长期职业生涯的一开始就抵制拉威尔的批评家皮埃尔·拉罗因其音乐与德彪西的相似而感到愤怒，认为拉威尔的作品与德彪西的作品有“血缘关系”。¹⁸ 拉威尔对该指责非常不满。若干年后，乔治·让-奥布里回想起了“瑞卡多·维涅什首演莫里斯·拉威尔的《镜子》时得到的嘘声”¹⁹（他第一次在音乐会上见到拉威尔）。另一方面，维涅什自己在日记中写道：尽管没有完全理解这部作品，但他获得了“奇怪的成功”，并加演了《丑角的晨歌》。²⁰

第一首《夜间飞蛾》题献给诗人莱昂-保罗·法尔格，其灵感来自他的诗句“谷仓里的夜间飞蛾笨拙地飞，从一处高地飞到另一处”。法尔格像飞蛾一样，拉威尔本人在某种程度

上也是夜行动物，两人在30年代初经常长时间漫步于巴黎街头。将“夜间飞蛾”作为这整部在和声上格外引人注目的作品的第一首标题似乎并不怎么合适，但评论家兼“捣蛋帮”成员埃米尔·维耶尔莫兹记得，法尔格最漫不经心的评论也会对他们产生影响²¹，他似乎在很大程度上引导着整个群体的美学走向。就织体上的所有创新而言，拉威尔的《夜间飞蛾》同《水之嬉戏》一样试图摆脱传统的束缚，这应归功于李斯特（弗拉基米尔·扬科列维奇建议以《森林的细语》为例）。²² 《夜间飞蛾》也延用了《小奏鸣曲》中《小步舞曲》的调式，首尾段为降D大调，中间段最初以F音为中心。演奏时，佩勒穆泰认为作曲家想强调突然的渐强（特别是第23、26和106、109小节），从而与环绕织体形成对比。这里也可以引用维涅什的话：在弹拉威尔作品中的渐强标记时，钢琴演奏者总是过早开始渐强。²³ 最后，亨利埃塔·福雷就中间段说道：“当我把写满了表情记号的中间段弹给他听以后，他焦虑且略微恼怒地对我说：‘继续，继续，别弹得那么催人泪下！’”²⁴

拉威尔在他的《自传素描》中称，《悲伤的鸟儿》是“这部作品集中最早写的一首，也是体现我观点的最典型代表……它使人想起炎炎夏日，鸟儿在昏暗闷热的森林中迷路的情景”²⁵。维耶尔莫兹则更具体地说拉威尔的想法来自法国枫丹白露的森林：

“他和朋友们在一起。一天清晨，他听到了画眉的啼鸣，深深地陶醉于其中的典雅和忧郁的阿拉伯花式。他只不过是把这一曲调准确记录了下来，没有改动一个音符，一首清澈且富有诗意的作品由此诞生。它使得法国版《齐格弗里德》中《森林鸟》的怀旧呼声在精神上得到了升华。”²⁶

无论维涅什对借喻瓦格纳风格的作品有什么想法，从他仅有的叙述记录来看，他对这首曲目的看法似乎截然不同，认为它“相当日本化”。²⁷ 不管怎样，他的日记告诉我们拉威尔在1904年10月11日的晚上演奏了这首曲子给他及其他“捣蛋帮”成员听，而他是唯一表示喜欢的人。²⁸ 另一位“捣蛋帮”成员卡沃科雷西之后回忆说：

“那时，这首曲子是唯一一首让我们一度感到迷惑的曲子。他把《悲伤的鸟儿》弹了一遍又一遍，但我们还是无法理解他追求的是什么。他看到我们对这首花费他大量心血的作品反应冷淡而感到相当尴尬。索德斯幽默地用生动的文字描述了拉威尔‘推销’这首曲子的情景：两只可怜的小鸟站在他伸出的手指上，可没有人理睬它们。”²⁹

据罗兰-曼纽尔称，“捣蛋帮”的反应远不止困惑，“他们一直对《悲伤的鸟儿》的‘诚实性’意见不一”³⁰。

拉威尔向亨利埃塔·福雷强调了区分两个织体层次的重要性：“上方是带阿拉伯花式快速音型的吱吱鸟叫，下方则是阴暗且令人窒息的沉默森林，踏板用得很多但换踩次数少。”³¹ 至于最后一页的开头处，他说：“ad libitum[随意处理]并不像部分演奏者所想的那样表示一整段都可随意发挥。

为了让他们继续循规蹈矩地演奏,我写的是 *presque ad libitum* [几乎随意]……”²² 拉威尔令人啼笑皆非的幽默感也体现在他给维涅什的题献上。他说:“将一首完全非‘钢琴式’的作品题赠给一位钢琴家是很有趣的。”²³

《海上扁舟》是献给画家保罗·索德斯的。索德斯也是一位才华洋溢的业余钢琴家,他有着视奏现代音乐作品的独特天赋。²⁴ 拉威尔于1905年3月完成了这首曲子。维涅什在他11月2日的日记中写道:晚饭前,拉威尔和德拉奇在我这里留下了《海上扁舟》的谱子。晚上他们都回来了,和我一起寻找手稿中的错误。²⁵ 手稿上的日期,经马塞尔·马纳证实²⁶,表明该曲的诞生与拉威尔1905年夏乘坐艾米号游艇的航行无关,与德彪西同时期的作品《大海》更是毫无关联。《大海》直到10月15日才上演,而拉威尔不可能私下看过德彪西的乐谱,因为这两位作曲家1905年时仅仅是泛泛之交。与这首曲子更为相关的是拉威尔之前说的自《水之嬉戏》中解放的想法。要做到这一点可以简单地再写一部摆脱早期作品常规束缚的关于水的作品,或者创作的时候至少让人留下些许这样的印象。拉威尔要求佩勒穆泰确保开头不要过于匆忙或太快,他不希望这首作品成为一首技巧练习曲²⁷。对于亨利埃塔·福雷,拉威尔则要求“不要落入单调的俗套,我听许多演奏者都那样弹,这会让听众感到枯燥。你必须有所不同”²⁸。可能正是出于对多样化的追求促使拉威尔在1906年末将这首曲子谱成了管弦乐。这一新版本首演于1907年2月3日,大部分听众都无法接受,拉威尔本人也是如此。拉威尔对这次的进一步探索深感不甘,然而该版本在1950年他逝世后出版,并从此经常上演及录音。

如果说拉威尔把“非钢琴式”的《悲伤的鸟儿》题赠给技巧精湛的维涅什是出自恶趣味的话,他同样也可能把技巧要求极高的《丑角的晨歌》题赠给不会弹琴的卡沃科雷西。拉威尔源自母亲的巴斯克血统(据说她一口优雅的西班牙语),以及西班牙风格在法国音乐中的流行(至少从比才的《卡门》开始),毋庸置疑为这首曲子的创作提供了足够的灵感。不过也有些许可能拉威尔是受到了夏布里埃的《西班牙》(1905年2月5日,他和维涅什一起坐在米西安和爱德华兹夫妇的包厢里²⁹)以及他最后一部钢琴作品《布雷幻想曲》的影响。

马塞尔·马纳还指出了其文学出处,即贝尔特朗《夜之幽灵》中的“小夜曲”(一位小姐在其阳台上受到一名失败求婚者的追求)。³⁰ 不过可以在一封至今仍未出版的信中找到最有力的书面证据。这份信的日期为1907年9月14日,由拉威尔寄给斯坦威家族企业的费迪南德·辛齐希。称其为“先生,我亲爱的同事”,拉威尔写道:

“我理解你翻译标题‘*Alborada del gracioso*’时的难处。这正是为何我决定不要翻译。事实上西班牙喜剧中的‘*gracioso*’是一个相当特殊的角色,据我所知,在其他任何戏剧传统中都没有。然而在我们的法国戏剧中有它的同义词:博马舍(Beaumarchais)笔下的费加罗,只不过费加罗比他的西班牙‘前辈’更泰然自若,更贴心可靠。我认为最简单的办法就是把标题粗略地翻译成‘*Morning Song of a Clown*’(《丑

角的晨歌》)’。这样就足以表现这首曲目的诙谐风格了。”³¹

对于该曲的西班牙风格究竟是安达卢西亚式的还是卡斯蒂利亚式的存在争议。由于亨利埃塔·福雷没有西班牙血统,所以 he 可以忽略那些论点并表示是两种风格的综合。³² 与此同时,有充分证据表明首尾段(其弗里几亚调式无疑是安达卢西亚式的)确实采用了谢吉第亚舞曲的风格,而中间段的结构则较为自由。拉威尔放弃使用谢吉第亚舞曲传统的3/8拍拍号而选择了增加小节的长度,这就解释了为何节拍显得不规则(6/8拍和9/8拍)。这首曲目还被称作是德彪西《前奏曲》第一集中《终止的小夜曲》的先驱。³³ 如马塞尔·马纳所说,这首曲目让我们想起了“作曲家是多么喜欢挑战忍耐程度的极限”。³⁴ 另一方面,不应粗浅地看待作品表面的即兴效果。据伯内特·詹姆斯称,拉威尔“曾为莫里斯·德拉奇演示‘晨歌’以证明其结构像巴赫的赋格那样严谨”。³⁵

钢琴家长期以来一直对这一曲目敬谢不敏,尤其是要求他们在现代钢琴上演奏时,因为现代钢琴的触键据说比拉威尔和维涅什演奏时喜用的埃拉尔德钢琴沉重。但是福雷带来了佳音:拉威尔认为重复音的弹奏没有滑音那么重要,“滑音不时打断重复音,地位更高”。不过速度必须保持不变。³⁶ 拉威尔向佩勒穆泰强调说,琶音和弦必须弹得“非常紧凑,像在吉 he 上拨弦那样”。³⁷

拉威尔在1918年把《丑角的晨歌》改编成了管弦乐。当时,他仍为其母亲的逝世而悲恸欲绝,难以进行创作。乐队版本于1919年5月17日进行了首演。1930年,拉威尔认可将第一部分(或如他所说的“到人们贸然鼓掌的地方为止”)作为舞蹈的配乐使用。³⁸ 这一管弦乐版本于1926年进行了第一次录音,由奥托·克勒姆佩雷尔指挥,柏林国立歌剧院管弦乐团演奏……然而无论是哪个版本,这首作品对每个钢琴演奏者而言都值得一听。

套曲的最后一首《幽谷钟声》题赠给了拉威尔的朋友兼学生莫里斯·德拉奇。罗伯特·卡扎德絮说,拉威尔曾告诉他灵感是源自巴黎正午时分的钟声。在拉威尔作品的时间轴上,它位于1895—1897年双钢琴组曲《内心的风景》中的“钟声环绕”乐章和1906年开始创作的歌剧《淹没的钟声》(未完成)之间。它的创作时间也比德彪西在《林间钟声》(1907年10月完成的《意象集》第二册曲目)里首次明确尝试将钟声作为主要装饰素材的使用早了两年。

最后,佩勒穆泰强调开头的三次钟声应分别有各自的特色。³⁹ 对此,亨利埃塔·福雷用更为技术化的语言解释说:

“拉威尔毫不留情地指责了我的演奏,认为音色沉重且无变化。开头处,他试着让我把右手十六分音符的双音弹出钟楼的效果,而左手穿插的关键八度钟声则要弹得稳一些,从而使两手的音响有区别。这一整段都应保持 *pianissimo* [非常轻地]。拉威尔不可思议地能够在听上去弹得有力度的情况下做到这一点。

左手关键八度的以渐变为特征,这就意味着不能借用手腕的力量,否则会超过乐谱要求的力度。另一方面,中间段

热情、平静等丰富感情的流露要求音响有深度且按 *legato* [连奏] 弹奏。连奏要求手紧贴琴键并借用手臂的重量,在钢琴旁坐得低一点可完美达到这一效果。”⁴⁰

编者按

方括号内大多是编辑临时添加的记号:临时记号、休止符、力度记号、运音记号、*main droitel/main gauche* [左右手记号]、指法(在有必要补全拉威尔和弦上的少量记号时)、*ottava* [八度]/*loco* [按谱发声] 和 *simile* [相同记号]、速度和踏板记号。无论是否在圆括号内,保留了手稿 A (或 M 中的《海上扁舟》) 和第一版 E 中可能对演奏有所帮助的临时变音记号。《悲伤的鸟儿》中的指法取自拉威尔修正过的第一版修正版 (CE),《丑角的晨歌》中的指法则取自手稿 A 和修正版 CE。在《夜间飞蛾》第 6 小节中,左手大拇指的使用在手稿 A 和第一版 E 中都有标记。

踏板记号来自手稿 A、M 和第一版 E。编辑《丑角的晨歌》时,参照相应乐段添加了部分踏板记号。

为了与平行乐段保持一致,添加或修改了分句标记和弧线。这些变动,连同添加的 *laisser vibrer* [让继续振动] 连线、琶音记号、跳音及顿音断奏记号(《丑角的晨歌》除外,因为其中平行乐段的断奏记号多得难以记录)在内,在乐谱中都未作区分,但会在评注部分详述。所有不合理的节奏组在本书中按原样标记。

罗杰·尼克尔斯
1995 年
(秦展文译)

注释:

1. M. 马纳:《莫里斯·拉威尔》,(1986 年,巴黎),第 174 页。
2. 伯内特·詹姆斯:《拉威尔》,(1987 年,伦敦),第 45–46 页。
3. 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 65–67 页。
4. “自传素描”,《音乐杂志》(1938 年 12 月刊),第 20 页。
5. 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 35 页 n17。

6. 参见注 1,第 186 页。
7. 出处同上,第 187 页。
8. 参见注 3,第 79–80 页。
9. 乔治·让-奥布里:《今天的法国音乐》,(1919 年,伦敦),第 214–215 页。
10. “瑞卡多·维涅什未发表的日记”,N. 古比施编,《法国国际音乐杂志》,(1980 年 6 月),第 205 页。
11. 埃米尔·维耶尔莫兹:“莫里斯·拉威尔的作品”,《朋友心目中的拉威尔》,(1939 年,巴黎),第 32 页。
12. V. 扬科列维奇:《拉威尔》,(1956 年,巴黎),第 33 页。
13. *PerS* (HJM), 法文版,第 22 页;英文版,第 19 页。
14. *FauS*, 第 72 页。
15. 参见注 4。
16. 参见注 11,第 34 页。
17. H. 茹尔当-莫安琪:《拉威尔与我们》,(1945 年,日内瓦),第 215 页。
18. 参见注 10,第 203 页。
19. M.D. 卡沃科雷西:《音乐家画廊》,(1933 年,伦敦),第 66 页。
20. 参见注 3,第 67 页。
21. *FauS*, 第 71–72 页。
22. 出处同上,第 74 页。
23. 参见注 19,第 66 页。
24. T. 克林索:“拉威尔时代”,见注 11,第 128 页。
25. 参见注 10,第 204 页。
26. 参见注 1,第 743 页。
27. *PerS* (HJM), 法文版,第 25 页;英文版,第 22 页。
28. *FauS*, 第 72 页。
29. 参见注 10,第 203 页。
30. 参见注 1,第 183 页, n40。
31. 我非常感谢阿尔比·奥然斯坦博士同意翻译、发表这封信(原件目前由他收藏)。
32. *FauS*, 第 74 页。
33. C. le 伯德斯:“西班牙的拉威尔风格”,《莫里斯·拉威尔的笔记本 2》,(1986 年,巴黎),第 44–45 页。
34. 参见注 1,第 595 页。
35. 参见注 2,第 46 页。
36. *FauS*, 第 75–76 页。
37. *PerS* (HJM), 法文版,第 28 页;英文版,第 24 页。
38. “1930 年 8 月 1 日致罗伯特·卡扎德絮的信”,《莫里斯·拉威尔的笔记本 1》,(1985 年,巴黎),第 135 页。
39. *PerS* (HJM), 法文版,第 30 页;英文版,第 27 页。
40. *FauS*, 第 77–80 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, apart from a set of first proofs of *Le tombeau de Couperin* in the Durand archives, marked up by the Durand editor with a request for second proofs (I am grateful to Roy Howat for providing me with a copy of this material). This set contains no autograph markings. All the editorial annotations found their way into the first edition except for the form of some of the multiple appoggiaturas in 'Prélude' and 'Forlane', over which Ravel would seem to have changed his mind.

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 gibet' 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 13062-4³); Jacques Février (1972, ADES 7041-4); Vlado Perlemuter (1961, VOX VBX 410 1-3⁴; 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)).

(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 de France, 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

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 Perlemuter³
- PerS(HJM): souvenirs from Perlemuter in *Ravel d'après Ravel*, in conversation with Hélène Jourdan-Morhange⁶
- PerS(conv): souvenirs from Perlemuter in conversation with the present Editor
- FauS: souvenirs from Faure in *Mon maître Maurice Ravel*

¹ Vma. 2967

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

³ Reissued SONY MH2K 63316

⁴ Reissued VOX CDX2 5507

⁵ The designation PerR without a number indicates that Perlemuter's two recordings coincide over the point in question

⁶ Dual page numbers refer to the French and English editions respectively

MIROIRS

Preface

One of the more exciting moments in Parisian musical life during the first decade of this century was the so-called *affaire Ravel* which broke out in the summer of 1905. In the course of his final attempt to win the Prix de Rome, Ravel, who already had *Jeux d'eau*, the song cycle *Shéhérazade* and the String Quartet to his name, was disqualified after the preliminary round, provoking lively turmoil in the newspapers and elsewhere.

In retrospect it is not so much Ravel's disqualification that seems curious (some of the harmonies he submitted to the judging panel were plainly designed to infuriate) as his involvement in the first place. His true milieu was not academe, but the group of friends who called themselves "Les Apaches" (deriving not from the Red Indian tribe but from the same root as *appassionato*), for whom upsetting the Establishment was one entertaining objective among many. Whereas the *Sonatine* (whose composition, despite Ravel's later testimony, overlapped with that of *Miroirs*) belonged still to an accepted order of things, much of *Miroirs* deliberately courts strangeness and novelty, and the dedication of each of the five pieces to a fellow Apache proves that this was no accident. As Marcel Marnat says, "at this point begins a maturity that is lucid, consistent

and deliberately aggressive, despite its still somewhat precious surface reflecting the distant stance Ravel uses to isolate himself from the mob".¹ And yet there is no abrupt break on the technical front: "the linear classicism of the *Sonatine* is in *Miroirs* applied to different ends: it is underlying rather than predominant, implicit more than explicit".²

Evidence of Ravel's desire for change comes from his friend and biographer Roland-Manuel:

"One evening, when Ricardo Viñes had been to present his interpretation of *D'un cahier d'esquisses* to the celebrated composer [Debussy] of this little-known piece, he arrived at the rue de Civry full of what he had heard: Debussy had declared to him that he was dreaming of a kind of music whose form was so free that it would sound improvised, of works which would seem to have been torn out of a sketchbook. Ravel was present at the gathering. Quite unexpectedly he approved of the idea, and confessed that the music he was working on was based on similar principles. 'I shall be glad', he said, 'to produce something to set me free from *Jeux d'eau*.'"³

It seems probable that the piece he had in mind was 'Oiseaux tristes'.

Some discussion has ensued over the years about the meaning of the title *Miroirs*, since Ravel himself did not seem to have pronounced on the subject, confining himself to the observation that “the *Miroirs* form a collection of pieces for piano which mark a change in my harmonic development pronounced enough to have upset those musicians who, till then, had had the least trouble appreciating my style”.⁴ But more recent researches by the American scholar Arbie Orenstein have unearthed a previously unpublished addendum to this statement, in which Ravel says:

“The title *Miroirs*, five piano pieces composed in 1905, has authorised my critics to consider this collection as being among those works which belong to the Impressionist movement. I do not contradict this at all, if one understands the term by analogy. A rather fleeting analogy, what’s more, since Impressionism does not seem to have any precise meaning outside the domain of painting. In any case, the word ‘mirror’ should not lead one to assume that I want to affirm a subjectivist theory of art. A sentence by Shakespeare helped me to formulate a completely opposite position: ‘...the eye sees not itself But by reflection, by some other things’” (*Julius Caesar*, Act I, Scene 2).⁵

The whole set must have been completed by the late autumn of 1905, because Ricardo Viñes’s diary entry for Christmas Eve notes that he called on Ravel and found him correcting the proofs. Viñes gave the first performance in the Salle Erard just under a fortnight later, on 6 January 1906. We are left with mixed evidence of the work’s reception. The *Revue musicale* thought it brought warmth into an otherwise cold evening’s music,⁶ while Camille Mauclair in *Le courrier musical* considered that Ravel had “accomplished the charming and paradoxical miracle of getting us to accept that kind of imitative harmony which we had relegated to the ranks of ancient errors in musical aesthetics”; his only concern was over the virtuosity needed to play the work, which reminded him of “the fallacious charm of Japanese jugglers”.⁷ The critic Pierre Lalo, at the start of a long career of anti-Ravelian pamphleteering, was irritated by the resemblance of Ravel’s music to Debussy’s, a charge which did not please Ravel the more for being traced by Lalo to “a natural affinity”.⁸ Some years later Georges Jean-Aubry, who met Ravel for the first time at that concert, recalled “the hisses that greeted Viñes when he interpreted, for the first time, Maurice Ravel’s *Miroirs*”.⁹ On the other hand, Viñes himself wrote in his diary that, despite not knowing the work thoroughly, he had a “succès monstre” and that ‘*Alborada del gracioso*’ was encored.¹⁰

The first piece, ‘Noctuelles’ (Nocturnal Moths), is dedicated to the poet Léon-Paul Fargue and was inspired by his lines “*Les noctuelles des bangars partent, d’un vol gauche, Cravater d’autres poutres*” (The nocturnal moths in their barns launch themselves clumsily into the air, going from one perch to another). Fargue was, like the moths and to some extent Ravel himself, a nocturnal animal, and the two men were still going for long night rambles together through Paris in the early 1930s. Perhaps not too much should be made of the positioning of ‘Noctuelles’ at the head of the set, where it certainly makes a harmonically arresting impact; but the critic and fellow-Apache Émile Vuillermoz remembered that Fargue’s “most casual remarks had an authority about them”¹¹ and it seems likely that he was to a large degree responsible for guiding the group’s aesthetic progress. For all the newness of its textures, ‘Noctuelles’, like *Jeux d’eau* from which Ravel was trying to escape, owes much to Liszt – Vladimir Jankélévitch has suggested *Waldeesrauschen* as one possible model.¹² It also follows the tonal pattern of the ‘Menuet’ from the *Sonatine*, with outer sections in D♭ major enclosing a central one initially centred on the note F. In the matter of performance, Perlemuter says that the composer wanted the sudden crescendos (especially at bars 23, 26; 106, 109) brought out in contrast with the surrounding texture; and it may be as well to recall here Viñes’ remark that pianists in general begin Ravel’s crescendos too early.¹³

Finally, with regard to the central section, Henriette Faure recalled that “when I played him this passage with its frequent *expressif* markings, he said to me in anxious and slightly irritated tones, ‘Keep going, keep going, and don’t be lachrimose!’”¹⁴

Ravel states in his ‘Autobiographical Sketch’ that ‘*Oiseaux tristes*’ was “the earliest of these pieces to be written, and the most typical of all to my way of thinking... It evokes birds lost in the oppressiveness of a very dark forest during the hottest hours of summer”.¹⁵ Vuillermoz says more specifically that the idea for the piece came to Ravel in the forest of Fontainebleau:

“He was staying with friends and one morning he heard a blackbird whistling a tune, and was enchanted by its elegant, melancholy arabesque. He had merely to transcribe this tune accurately, without changing a note, to produce the limpid, poetic piece which spiritualises the nostalgic call of this French brother of the Forest Bird in *Siegfried*.”¹⁶

Whatever Viñes may have thought of this Wagnerian reference, his own view of the piece would seem to have been rather different, to judge by his only recorded description of it as being “*très japonisante*”.¹⁷ At all events his diary tells us that Ravel played it to him and the other Apaches on the evening of 11 October 1904 and that he was the only person who liked it.¹⁸ Another Apache, M. D. Calvocoressi, later recalled:

“Only once, in those early days, did a work of his bewilder us for a time. It was ‘*Oiseaux tristes*’, which he played to us again and again without our being able to understand what he was after. He was rather disconcerted to find us indifferent to a piece in which he had put so much of himself. Sordes summed up the humour of the situation by drawing a verbal picture of Ravel hawking about, on his extended finger, two forlorn little birds with whom nobody would have anything to do.”¹⁹

According to Roland-Manuel, the Apaches’s response went beyond bewilderment and “for a long time they were divided over the ‘sincerity’ of ‘*Oiseaux tristes*’”.²⁰

To Henriette Faure, Ravel emphasised the importance of distinguishing two levels in the texture: “the bird calls on a high, rather strident level, with rapid arabesques, and by contrast, the sombre, stifling atmosphere of the forest on a lower level, rather heavy and muted, with a lot of pedal but not much movement”.²¹ Talking about the beginning of the last page, he said, “*ad libitum* does not, as some pianists think, mean all over the place – and to keep them on the straight and narrow, I’ve written *presque ad libitum*...”,²² and his ironic sense of humour was in evidence too over the dedication to Viñes. “It was fun”, he said, “to inscribe to a pianist a piece that was not in the least ‘pianistic’”.²³

‘*Une barque sur l’océan*’ is dedicated to the painter Paul Sordes, who was also a capable amateur pianist with a particular gift for sight-reading modern scores.²⁴ Ravel finished it in March 1905 and Viñes notes in his diary that on 2 November “before dinner, Ravel came with Delage to leave me ‘*Une barque sur l’océan*’ and they both came back in the evening to join me in looking for mistakes in the manuscript”.²⁵ The dating on the manuscript, attested by Marcel Marnat,²⁶ shows that Ravel’s cruise on the yacht *Aimée* during the summer of 1905 had nothing to do with the genesis of the piece, any more than did Debussy’s simultaneous work on *La mer*, which was not performed until 15 October – and Ravel could not have seen Debussy’s score in private because by 1905 the two composers were not on speaking terms. More relevant is Ravel’s remark quoted above about wanting to set himself free of *Jeux d’eau*. One way of achieving this was simply to write a water piece that escaped the earlier work’s formal constraints, or at least gave the impression of doing so.

Ravel asked Perlemuter to make sure that the opening was not hustled or too fast – he did not want the piece to become an exercise in virtuosity²⁷ – while to Henriette Faure he stressed that the piece

should not “sink into formulaic uniformity as I’ve heard it do with some pianists, making it boring for the listener. You must diversify it”.²⁸ It may have been this urge towards diversification that prompted Ravel to orchestrate the piece at the end of 1906. This version, first performed on 3 February 1907, was not well received by most of the audience, nor by Ravel himself. He never reconciled himself to its disinterment, although it was published in 1950 after his death, and has since been played and recorded many times.

If Ravel got a perverse pleasure out of dedicating the ‘unpianistic’ ‘Oiseaux tristes’ to the virtuosic Viñes, he may also have done so by dedicating to the non-pianist M. D. Calvocoressi the technically daunting ‘Alborada del gracioso’. Ravel’s Basque ancestry on his mother’s side (she spoke beautiful Spanish, apparently) and the popularity of Spanish idioms in French music at least since Bizet’s *Carmen* may be thought inspiration enough for this piece without looking further. But it is at least possible that Ravel was also influenced by Chabrier’s *España* (he and Viñes heard it together on 5 February 1905, sitting in Misia Edwards’s box²⁹) and by his last piano piece, *Bourrée fantasque*.

Marcel Marnat also suggests a literary source, the ‘Sérénade’ from Bertrand’s *Gaspard de la nuit*, which figures a lady on her balcony wooed by a distinctly unsuccessful suitor.³⁰ But the most solid literary evidence is to be found in a hitherto unpublished letter, dated 14 September 1907, from Ravel to Ferdinand Sinzig of Steinway and Sons in New York. Addressing him as “*Monsieur et cher collègue*” he says:

“I understand your bafflement over how to translate the title ‘Alborada del gracioso’. That is precisely why I decided not to translate it. The fact is that the *gracioso* of Spanish comedy is a rather special character and one which, so far as I know, is not found in any other theatrical tradition. We do have an equivalent, though, in the French theatre: Beaumarchais’s *Figaro*. But he’s more philosophical, less well-meaning than his Spanish ancestor. The simplest thing, I think, is to follow the title with the rough translation ‘Morning Song of the Clown’ (‘Aubade du bouffon’). That will be enough to explain the humoristic style of this piece.”³¹

There has been some polite argument over whether the Spanishness is specifically Andalusian or Castilian. Henriette Faure, as a non-Spaniard, may have been right to discount these claims and say that it is a mixture of both.³² At the same time, convincing evidence has been produced that the outer sections, whose Phrygian modality is undeniably Andalusian, are really in the style of a *seguidilla*, enclosing a central *copla*, and that Ravel’s decision to abandon the traditional 3/8 time signature of the *seguidilla* in favour of longer bar lengths explains why these are irregular (6/8 and 9/8). The piece also has strong claims to be a forerunner of Debussy’s ‘La sérénade interrompue’ from his first book of *Préludes*.³³ As Marnat says, the piece reminds us “how much the composer liked to go right up to the limits of what is tolerable”.³⁴ On the other hand, the effect of improvisation should not be taken at face value. According to Burnett James, Ravel “once demonstrated to Maurice Delage that the structure of the ‘Alborada’ was as strict as that of a Bach fugue”.³⁵

The piece has long been regarded with terror by pianists, especially as they have to perform it on modern pianos with a heavier touch than, say, the Érards which both Ravel and Viñes liked to play. But Faure relays good news in that Ravel regarded the execution of the repeated notes as less important than that of the glissandi, “which by interrupting the repeated notes reduce them to a secondary role”. The tempo must however be implacable.³⁶ To Perlemuter the composer emphasised that the arpeggiated chords must be “very taut, like plucked notes on a guitar.”

Ravel orchestrated ‘Alborada’ in 1918, at a time when he was still distraught at the death of his mother and found composing difficult. This version was first performed in Paris on 17 May 1919.

In 1930, Ravel sanctioned the use, as an accompaniment to dancing, of just the first section – or as he put it, “as far as the place where people applaud prematurely”.³⁸ The first recording of this orchestration had already been made in 1926, by the Berlin State Opera Orchestra under Otto Klemperer... But in whatever version one hears it, it is obviously required listening for any pianist.

The last piece of the set, ‘La vallée des cloches’, is dedicated to Ravel’s friend and pupil Maurice Delage. Robert Casadesu said that Ravel told him it was inspired by the sound of the bells at midday in Paris. In Ravel’s development it stands between the movement ‘Entre cloches’ from his suite for two pianos *Sites auriculaires* of 1895–7 and the opera *La cloche engloutie*, which he began in 1906 but never finished. It also predates by some two years Debussy’s first specific attempt to use bell sounds as more than a secondary ornament, in ‘Cloches à travers les feuilles’ from his second book of *Images*, completed in October 1907.

Finally, Perlemuter’s insistence that each of the three bells at the start should have its own character³⁹ is taken up by Henriette Faure in more technical terms:

“Ravel was merciless about my playing of this piece, which he condemned as being heavy and unvaried in timbre. At the opening, he tried to get me to play the carillon of double notes in semiquavers in the right hand, and the more settled sound of the high octave bells which punctuate them in the left, on two very distinct levels. And the whole thing had to remain within a *pianissimo* which he could, in some mysterious way, produce without it sounding feeble.

The insinuating character of the high left hand octaves means that one must not use the wrist, which would only over-ink the sketch. The great, calm, lyrical outpouring [of the central section], on the other hand, requires a profound sonority and a *legato* which comes from a hand closely wedded to the keys, and from a weight of arm that one gets ideally from sitting rather low at the keyboard.”⁴⁰

Editorial Practice

Square brackets have been applied to the majority of editorial additions: accidentals, rests, dynamics, articulation, *main droit/main gauche* indications, fingering (where completion of Ravel’s minimal indications for chords is necessary), *ottava/loco* and *simile* markings, tempo and pedal indications. Precautionary accidentals from A (or M – ‘Une barque sur l’océan’) and E, with or without round brackets, have, where considered helpful, been retained. The fingerings in ‘Oiseaux tristes’ are all taken from Ravel’s corrected copy of the first edition (CE) and in ‘Alborada del gracioso’ from A and CE. The use of the left-hand thumb in bar 6 of ‘Noctuelles’ is notated in both A and E.

The pedal indications are those of A, M and E. Some editorial pedalling has been added in ‘Alborada del gracioso’ by analogy with corresponding passages.

Phrase marks and slurs have been added or amended so as to conform with parallel passages. These changes, together with any additional *laissez vibrer* ties, arpeggiations, and staccato dots/wedges (except in ‘Alborada del gracioso’ where the additional staccato markings for parallel passages are too numerous to record), are not distinguished in the music text, but are detailed in the Critical Commentary. All irrational rhythmic groupings are here indicated as such.

Roger Nichols
1995

¹ M. Marnat: *Maurice Ravel*, (Paris, 1986), 174

² B. James: *Ravel*, (London, 1987), 45–6

³ Roland-Manuel: *A la gloire de Ravel*, (Paris, 1938; Eng. trans., C. Jolly, London, 1947, R/1972), 65–7

⁴ ‘Esquisse autobiographique’, *La Revue Musicale*, (Dec 1938), 20

- ⁵ M. Ravel: *Lettres, écrits, entretiens*, ed. A. Orenstein, (Paris, 1989; Eng. trans. A. Orenstein, New York, 1990), 35 n17
- ⁶ *see* (1), 186
- ⁷ *ibid.* 187
- ⁸ *see* (3), 79-80
- ⁹ G. Jean-Aubry: *French Music of Today*, (London, 1919), 214-5
- ¹⁰ 'Le journal inédit de Ricardo Viñes', ed. N. Gubisch, *Revue Internationale de Musique Française*, (June 1980), 205
- ¹¹ E. Vuillermoz: 'L'oeuvre de Maurice Ravel', *Maurice Ravel par quelquesuns de ses familiers*, (Paris, 1939), 32
- ¹² V. Jankélévitch: *Ravel*, (Paris, 1956), 33
- ¹³ PerS(HJM) 22/19
- ¹⁴ FauS 72
- ¹⁵ *see* (4)
- ¹⁶ *see* (11), 34
- ¹⁷ H. Jourdan-Morhange: *Ravel et nous*, (Geneva, 1945), 215
- ¹⁸ *see* (10), 203
- ¹⁹ M. D. Calvocoressi: *Musicians Gallery*, (London, 1933), 66
- ²⁰ *see* (3), 67
- ²¹ FauS 71-2
- ²² *ibid.* 74
- ²³ *see* (19), 66
- ²⁴ T. Klingsor: 'L'époque Ravel', *see* (11), 128
- ²⁵ *see* (10), 204
- ²⁶ *see* (1), 743
- ²⁷ PerS(HJM) 25/22
- ²⁸ FauS 72
- ²⁹ *see* (10), 203
- ³⁰ *see* (1), 183 n40
- ³¹ I am grateful to Dr Arbie Orenstein for permission to publish this translation of the letter now in his collection
- ³² FauS 74
- ³³ C. le Borda: 'L'Espagne ravélienne', *Cahiers Maurice Ravel 2*, (Paris, 1986), 44-5
- ³⁴ *see* (1), 595
- ³⁵ *see* (2), 46
- ³⁶ FauS 75-6
- ³⁷ PerS(HJM) 28/24
- ³⁸ Letter of 1 August 1930 to Robert Casadesus, *Cahiers Maurice Ravel 1*, (Paris, 1985), 135
- ³⁹ PerS(HJM) 30/27
- ⁴⁰ FauS 77-80

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·····	v
原始资料缩写表·····	vi

镜 子

前言·····	vi
编者按·····	ix
I：夜间飞蛾·····	1
II：悲伤的鸟儿·····	10
III：海上扁舟·····	14
IV：丑角的晨歌·····	31
V：幽谷钟声·····	43
评注·····	48

CONTENTS

Ravel's Piano Music - A New Edition

Editorial Method and Sources·····	X
Table of Source abbreviations·····	xi

Miroirs

Preface·····	xi
Editorial Practice·····	xiii
I: Noctuelles·····	1
II: Oiseaux tristes·····	10
III: Une barque sur l'océan·····	14
IV: Alborada del gracioso·····	31
V: La vallée des cloches·····	43
Critical Commentary·····	48

Miroirs 镜子

I: Noctuelles I : 夜间飞蛾

à Léon Paul Fargue

献给莱昂-保罗·法尔格

莫里斯·拉威尔
Maurice Ravel
(1875-1937)

♩ = 128 environ
Très léger

The musical score is written for piano and bass. It begins with a tempo marking of approximately 128 beats per minute and a character of 'Très léger'. The key signature has three flats (B-flat major). The score is divided into four systems. The first system (measures 1-4) is marked *pp*. The second system (measures 5-8) includes a *mf* section and a *pp* section. The third system (measures 9-12) is marked *p*. The fourth system (measures 13-16) includes a *pp* section and a *ppp* section. The score features various musical notations including triplets, slurs, and dynamic markings.

10 *pp* *pp* *f*

13 *mp* *p* *p*

16 *p cresc.* *mf dim.*

18 *p* *pp*

20 *ppp* *p* *expressif*

The musical score consists of five systems of piano music, each with a treble and bass staff. The key signature is three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat). Measure numbers 10, 13, 16, 18, and 20 are indicated at the start of their respective systems. Dynamics include *pp* (pianissimo), *f* (forte), *mp* (mezzo-piano), *p* (piano), *ppp* (pianississimo), *cresc.* (crescendo), and *dim.* (diminuendo). Articulation includes accents (>) and slurs. Fingerings are indicated by numbers 3, 5, and 8. An *expressif* marking is present above the final system. The score ends with a repeat sign in measure 19.