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Introduction: “Beside the plum tree, playing my flute, calling, awakening my jade lady.”

(Jiang Kui, Secret Fragrance, 1191)

When talking of lyric songs, the pieces composed during the Northern Song have always attracted praise. However, it was not until the Southern Song that the lyric song reached the apex of its refinement, and only towards the end of the Song did it reach its apex of variation. Jiang Yaozhang is the most outstanding [exponent of the genre]. What a pity that of Whitestone’s Music Bureau Songs, his [lyric oeuvre] in five fascicles, only twenty-odd pieces survive today.¹

世人言詞，必稱北宋，然詞至南宋始極其工，至宋季而始極其變。姜堯章氏為傑出。嘗手《白石樂府》五卷，今僅存二十餘簡也。

This lament for the unfortunate loss of a large proportion of Jiang Kui’s lyric oeuvre is by Zhu Yizun朱彝尊 (1629–1709), the main propagator of the lyric song (ci词) renaissance, and is an extraordinary statement, taken from the introduction to Zhu’s Cizong詞綜, a definitive anthology of the song form published in 1678 (see Table 1, no. 6). For the first time in literary history, the reputation of the lyric songs of the Southern Song (1127–1279) had been enhanced to a level superior to that of the Northern Song (960–1127). In a similar fashion to how the now-familiar phrase “Tang poetry and Song lyric songs” took centuries before acquiring currency, Zhu’s contention that lyric songs of the Southern Song were superior to those of the Northern Song was not widely acknowledged until the eighteenth century. The lyrics of delicate Southern Song vocal pieces, as exemplified by the works of Jiang Kui—also known by his courtesy name Yaozhang堯章 or his sobriquet Baishi白石 (“Whitestone”)—attracted little attention, and none of his works was included in Caotang shiyu草堂詩餘 (literally, Lyric Songs of the Thatched Cottage), the most widely circulated anthology of the ci词 genre published in the Southern Song dynasty.² Following this precedent, subsequent anthologies also failed to include pieces by Jiang, for instance Cilin wanxuan詞林萬選 (1543), compiled by the celebrated literary critic Yang Shen楊慎 (1488–1559) in the late Ming dynasty.

In the first two decades of the eighteenth century, however, Jiang’s lyric songs suddenly became popular, “bestsellers” in fact, favourites of anthology compilers, and published in numerous editions (Table 1, nos. 8–10). As Lin Shuen-fu aptly remarks: “The fact that there are more than thirty different editions of Chiang’s collected 詞 from the Ch’ing dynasty, more than there are of the collected works of any other 詞 poet, attests to the popularity and achievement of Ch’iang K’uei.”³ In other words, by the eighteenth century, the works of this Southern Song poet-musician had become essential to the canon of lyric songs.

The history of lyric songs thus emerges as a record of the vagaries of their reception by literati readers. In the mid-seventeenth century, Jiang and his Southern Song followers were still largely neglected. That they were elevated, within a few decades, from the dust of oblivion to a position of importance indicates that a dramatic shift in the process of canon selection had occurred during the eighteenth century. This book aims to shed light on the renaissance of lyric songs during this time and through to the early twentieth century; it also explores how and why this rebirth occurred, in other words, what happened to Jiang Kui’s lovely “plum blossom” when it reached the “far side of the stream.”

Table 1: Major editions of Jiang’s lyric songs from the thirteenth to the mid-eighteenth centuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pieces</th>
<th>Editor</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Size (cm)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>Baishi daoren gequ</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Jiang Kui</td>
<td>Qian Xiwu</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>Huān cixuan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Huang Sheng</td>
<td>Liu Chengpu (Fuzhou)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.6 × 12.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>Baijia ci</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Wu Ne</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16–23</td>
<td>20.5 × 14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>c. 1628</td>
<td>Song liushijia ci</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mao Jin</td>
<td>Mao Jin</td>
<td>Changshu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.6 × 14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>Ci zong</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Zhu Yizun</td>
<td>Wang Sen</td>
<td>Jiaxing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.0 × 14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Baishi xiansheng ciji</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Zhu Yizun</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.2 × 16.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Baishi cibu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Zhu Yizun</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Jiaxing</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>c. 1710</td>
<td>Baishi cichao</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Wu Huanchun</td>
<td>Yu Lan</td>
<td>Jiaxing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.2 × 12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Baishi ciji</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Chen Zhuhan</td>
<td>Zeng Shican</td>
<td>Yangzhou</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.4 × 13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>c. 1736</td>
<td>Baishi daoren gequ</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Li E, Min Hua, Wang Zao</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yangzhou</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.2 × 12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Baishi daoren gequ</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Li E, etc.</td>
<td>Lu Zhonghui</td>
<td>Yangzhou</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.5 × 11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Baishi daoren gequ</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Li E, etc.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Wuxing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.6 × 12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Baishi shici heji</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Jiang Qiuř̆</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.5 × 11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Baishi daoren gequ</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Zhang Yishu</td>
<td>Yao Peiqian</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.5 × 11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The size refers to the physical dimensions of the writing block.

** Since there is no frame surrounding the writing area in Ke Chongpu’s manuscript copy of Baishi xiansheng ciji (1685), the figures here refer to the physical size of the manuscript.

Plum Blossom on the Far Side of the Stream

Down the generations, Anxiang 暗香 (Secret Fragrance) and Shuying 疏影 (Dappled Shadows, Figure 1) have consistently been two of his most enduring and oft-quoted ci, and to these he penned explanatory introductions; thus, let us first give centre stage to the master so that he can speak to us directly in his own words:¹

In the winter of 1191, travelling through the snow, I paid a visit to [Fan] Shihu.

Staying for a month with him, he gave me paper so I could compose some sentences, requiring me to write a new song. I composed these two pieces, and Shihu, very appreciative of my efforts, had a singer practise them; as the word setting was pleasantly harmonious, he called them Secret Fragrance and Dappled Shadows.

辛亥之冬,余載雪詣石湖。止既月,授簡索句,且徵新聲,作此兩曲,石湖把玩不已,使工妓肄習之,音節諧婉,乃名之曰: 〔暗香〕 、 〔疏影〕 。

Secret Fragrance

Yesteryear, the moon’s loveliness
How many times didst shine on me
Beside the plum trees, playing my flute?
Calling, awakening my jade lady
Regardless of the clear cold to pluck blossoms with me
He Xun² is gently and gradually ageing
Having wholly forgotten his poetical pen, once fresh as the spring wind
Is simply befuddled by the scattered flowers outside the bamboo grove
Whose fragrant chill steals into the exquisite banquet hall?

The land of rivers
Is desolately lonely
Sighing, sending the blossoms on their distant road
The night-time snows still newly piled
The gemstone mead cup weeps so easily
Red calyxes answer silence to our pent-up recollections
Lingeringly remembering places where once hand in hand we tarried
A thousand trees oppress the West Lake and its cold turquoise hues
Once more, the blossom, flake by flake, let all be blown away
When shall we see one another again?

4. See Appendix 1, nos. 83 and 84.

5. Some of my translations take inspiration from Laurence Picken and Shuen-fu Lin’s, but all have been made with the intention of retaining as much of the original word order of the Chinese as possible.

6. He Xun 何遜 (480–520), a sixth-century poet well known for his verses on plum blossom, with whom Jiang Kui is closely identified.

---
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Figure 1: *Dappled Shadows*, ink rubbing of Jiang Kui’s autograph, Peking Library.

_Dappled Shadows_

On the moss, the plum blossom embroiders like jade
And small and delightful greenfinches
Nest together with it on the branches
When wandering we meet
At the hedgerow’s edge at dusk
Not uttering, the blossom simply alights on the slender bamboo
Zhaojun’ not accustomed to the sands of distant Tartary
Plum Blossom on the Far Side of the Stream

Still secretly remembered the northern and southern banks of the Yangtze River
I wonder, is it her jade waist-plaques, on a moonlit night, now returned
Changed into this flower, dark and solitary

Recalling, deep in the palace, the old tales
When my beloved was asleep
The blossom flew to the fine edges of her moth-like eyebrows
Don’t be like the spring wind
Cruelly and coquettishly careless
At the earliest opportunity, prepare for it a golden chamber
Having let a petal drift with the waves
Why still so resentful and moved to compose a tragic flute tune
If you were to wait for this moment, and seek once more its fragrance
It is only to be found depicted on a horizontal scroll by the small window

苔枝綴玉,
有翠禽小小,
枝上同宿。
客裏相逢,
籬角黃昏,
無言自倚修竹。
昭君不慣胡沙遠,
但暗憶、江南江北。
想佩環、月夜歸來,
化成此花幽獨。

猶記深宮舊事,
那人正睡裏,
飛近蛾綠。
莫似春風,
不管盈盈,
早與安排金屋。
還教一片隨波去,
又却怨、玉龍哀曲。
等恁時、重覓幽香,
已入小窗橫幅。

In evaluating these two songs, Wang Guowei 王國維 (1877–1927) was of the opinion
that although they idolized plum blossom, on closer inspection of the language employed,
not a single mention was made of it, and this “estrangement” between an object in ques-
tion and the description of it was completely unacceptable. Instead, he required a more
forthright directness, by which a poet simply expresses what he means and calls a “spade
a spade.” Wang Guowei’s criticism continues: Jiang Kui, however, uses a whole panoply
of circumlocution to avoid specific mention, leaping hither and thither, sometimes nar-
rating past events, then jumping to the present or predicting the future. For example,
consider the lines in the song Secret Fragrance: “Once more, the blossom, flake by flake,
let it be blown away, when shall we see one another again?” Is he saying here that the plum
blossom has fallen, and asking when it shall be seen again? Rotating between the past,
present, and future, and, with regard to the scene that is described, he also flits between
the riverbank and the lakeside, and then inexplicably shifts to a place where he and his
beloved plucked plum blossom. In this jumble of different places and times, he has not
actually written with clarity on the beauty of plum blossom, and what its appearance is
really like, its blooms, branches, and the tree trunk itself; instead, he allows latitude for
readers to form their own image through perception of the protagonists’ appreciation of
plum blossom, or the relationship between them and the flowers, and in this way come to
an appropriate understanding.

In fact, Wang Guowei’s biting criticism seems to have missed the point: this type of
rhetorical usage is entirely a new invention of Jiang Kui’s, different from contemporary
practice and as such more deserving of praise for its subtlety, flexibility, and ingenuity.

8. Wang Guowei, Renjian cihua 人間詞話 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1998), 9; and Adele Austin Rickett, Wang
Kuo-wei’s Jen-chien tz’u-hua: A Study in Chinese Literary Criticism (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University
Press, 1977), 28–31 and 54–58. See also Yang Chengkai 楊成凱, Renjian cihua menwai tan 人間詞話門外談 (Beijing: Haitun chubanshe,
2015), 124–46.
In a similar vein to Wang Guowei, Wu Shichang 吳世昌 (1908–1986), in his New Essays on Lyric Songs, indicates that Whitestone’s Secret Fragrance and Dappled Shadows are simply immature jokes. Although their craftsmanship is superficially strong, they have no substantive meaning. On first encounter, a degree of innovative freshness might be perceived, but on closer inspection they are simply foppish affectations, not worthy of serious consideration, and marred by the common fault of excessive personification. Whitestone employs flowers as a metaphor for a beautiful lady, going so far as to write: “[Zhaojun] still secretly remembered the northern and southern banks of the Yangtze River,” yet in what sense did Zhaojun have such feelings? And, besides, with the line “with jade plaques, returning emptily, a soul in a moonlit night” 環佩空歸月夜魂, Du Fu 杜甫 (712–770) had already fashioned this image; thus at best Whitestone is simply parroting jade plaques, returning emptily, a soul in a moonlit night”, Du Fu 杜甫 (1082–1135, r. 1100–1126) and Qinzong 钦宗 (1100–1156, r. 1126–1127), and hurt that no one of ability had taken on their role, Wu Shichang concludes: Chen Tingzhuo 陳廷焯 (1853–1892) was of the opinion that these two ci “express secret anger for the Two Emperors [i.e., Huizong 徽宗 (1082–1135, r. 1100–1126) and Qinzong 钦宗 (1100–1156, r. 1126–1127)], and hurt that no one of ability had taken on their role,” but the language is empty of passionate expression of this, and no traces of it can be discovered. It has also been said these songs are “profound and substantive in this way; loyal and honest in that way,” and so on and so forth, but this evaluation is, instead, only using self-deception as a tool to deceive others. Whitestone has simply written love poems, which have no connection whatever to contemporary events. Moreover, “profound and substantive” and “lofty and honest” simply mean that all ci whose meaning cannot be understood are good, and thus have genuine significance.

Twentieth-century critics Wang Guowei and Wu Shichang were clearly unimpressed, and if their critical appraisal had been the only voice, the renaissance of interest in the works of Whitestone would not have happened. Yet, it did, and thus a search for the wellspring of this revival must look elsewhere. The first figure in just such an alternative critical lineage was Zhang Yan 張炎 (1248–1320), a generation later than Whitestone himself, who, in his Ciyuan 詞源 (Origin of Lyric Songs), specifically praises these two poems in detail from no fewer than four distinct perspectives in four different chapters: in “On Citing the Ancients,” he gives: “with regard to the citations of ancient texts, these are not simply driven by the ancient texts themselves,” thus stressing the new vitality and meaning these citations have acquired from Whitestone’s pen; in “On Pure Intangibility,” he describes this expressive style thus: “not only does it portray a pure intangibility, but it also ascends to the heights of the elegant and visionary poetry of the ancients”; in “On the Attractiveness of Meaning,” he adds that this “pure intangibility is imbued with attractiveness of meaning”; and, finally, in “Jottings,” he concludes: “even in ancient times, there were no predecessors, and subsequently, there have been no inheritors, an expressive uniqueness has been established, and this is no less than the pinnacle of poetic achievement.”

With the thirteenth century already providing such a detailed and multilayered critical reception, the expectation must be that the renaissance of Whitestone’s works of the seventeenth century would supply yet more sophisticated scholarly refinement. A close reading of these sources, including writings of the principal propagators Zhu Yizun and Li E 厲鶚 (1692–1752), yields, however, a surprising paucity of similar analysis, and it was not until the eighteenth century that a less well-known scion of the Zhexi 浙西 Poetry School, Xu Angxiao 许昂霄 (c. 1680–1751), applied himself in this direction. His evaluation outlines three areas of Whitestone’s poetic excellence: an ability to fuse past, present, and future happenings into an explanation of present emotions; his choice of citation; and the innovative use of the connotations of these citations. By comparison with Zhang Yan's richer and more complex description, this concentration on mere craftsmanship seems to lack lustre.

In fact, for the duration of the flowering of the Zhexi Poetry School, from the start of Kangxi’s 康熙 (1654–1722, r. 1661–1722) reign to Daoguang’s 道光 (1782–1850, r. 1820–1850) accession to the imperial throne, none of its Whitestone specialists made publicly available any serious attempt at analysis of these two seminal songs. With the demise of this school, it was left to Zhang Huiyan 張惠言 (1761–1802), instigator and founder of

13. Ibid., 25. In this chapter, on p. 24, Zhang Yan regards Jiang Kui’s flowing images of “solitary clouds, their ebbs and flow, and their blemishless delicacy” as the only genre that satisfies his notions of artistic refinement (雅賞).
15. Ibid., 32.
the Changzhou 常州 Poetry School in the late eighteenth century, to move towards an explanation of the language and background surrounding them. Sadly, his work is spoilt by simple factual errors; for example, he identifies Fan Chengda 范成大 (1126–1193) as being twenty or more years younger than Jiang Kui, whereas the opposite was in fact the case; nonetheless, he does break the taboo, and touches on the crucially important content and meaning of these two *ci*. His opinions were inherited and expanded by his student Song Xiangfeng 宋翔鳳 (1776–1860), a direction subsequently absorbed into the work of other late Qing dynasty *ci* scholars Deng Tingzhen 鄧廷楨 (1776–1860), Chen Li 陳澧 (1810–1882), Chen Tingzhao, and Zheng Wenzhuo 鄭文焯 (1856–1918), making it a focus of research activity. By now, the Zhexi Poetry School had, conversely, long since passed into history and with it the first peak of interest in Whitestone's poetry. Moving into the twentieth century, the scholarly mantle was inherited by Chen Feishi 陳匪石 (1884–1959), Shen Zufen 沈祖棻 (1909–1977), and Yu Pingbo 俞平伯 (1900–1990), reaching its apotheosis with Liu Yongji 劉永濟 (1887–1966), who finally noticed the intertextuality between Whitestone's two poems and a *ci* by the former Emperor Huizong, penned after he had been seized as a hostage by the victorious Jin dynasty forces.

To the *cipai* melody *Yan'ermei* 眼兒媚 (*Beautiful Eyes*), Huizong's *ci* reads:

> Remembering the hustle and bustle of the Jade Capital in former times
> The Empire extended for ten thousand leagues in all directions
> Gemstone towers and jade pavilions
> Dawn resonated with the sounds of strings and pipes
> Evening radiated with the *sheng* and *pipa*

> The populace has left the flowered city, deserted and desolate
> Spring dreams haunt the barbarian sands
> Where is my country?
> Listening, in sufferance, to the alien Qiang flute
> Playing the coda to the piece *Falling Plum Blossom*

According to Liu Yongji's analysis, Whitestone's *Dappled Shadows* takes direct intertextual influence from this song. Whitestone's lines are:

> Zhaojun not accustomed to the sands of distant Tartary
> Still secretly remembered the northern and southern banks of the Yangtze River

These encapsulate perfectly the emotion and meaning portrayed in Huizong's *ci*. In fact, when Zhaojun, or, more correctly, Huizong himself "secretly remembered the northern and southern banks of the Yangtze River," it is as if "spring dreams haunt the barbarian sands, where is my country?" and also "remembering the hustle and bustle of the Jade Capital in former times." Whitestone gives: "Why still so resentful and moved to compose..." and so forth.

Taking this train of thought to its logical conclusion, Whitestone's *Secret Fragrance* and *Dappled Shadows* are thus not songs whose ultimate goal was to describe plum blossom, but instead an expression of a deeper political anxiety at the transition from the Northern...
to the Southern Song. In this context, consider the opening lines to the second stanza of *Secret Fragrance*: “The land of rivers is desolately lonely; sighing, sending the blossoms on their distant road, the night-time snows still newly piled.” On the surface, this citation, from the Northern and Southern dynasties, refers to a fifth-century poet named Lu Kai 陸凱, who snapped a plum branch laden with blossom to send to his friend Fan Ye 范晔 (398–445) in far-off Chang’an 長安. For Whitestone, however, the “distant road” is that along which Huizong and Qinzong had been taken as hostages, and their inaccessibility is accentuated by pointing out how “desolately lonely” the land is without them, and how difficult a journey in that direction might be, given that “the night-time snows [are] still newly piled.” The meaning of the next two lines in Whitestone’s song becomes at once more lucid, and the reader is now clear why “the gemstone mead cup weeps so easily” and “red calyxes answer silence to our pent-up recollections.” The severity of the emotion is acute, with the cup “weep[ing]” and feelings “pent up.”

In *Dappled Shadows*, Whitestone ends the first stanza with: “I wonder, is it her jade waist-plaques, on a moonlit night, now returned, changed into this flower, dark and solitary.” With Huizong suffering a desperate death in the clutches of his Jin captors, the plum blossom is now a tragic metaphor for a forlorn hope that Huizong, personified here as Zhaojun, has, in some metaphysical state, in fact returned, sadly though, now only “dark and solitary” and devoid of vitality. Wu Shichang’s dismissive criticism of these two lines as simply plagiarism of a Du Fu original now takes on a hollow ring: Du Fu may have been the first to employ this vocabulary in association with Zhaojun, but his usage remains at this level, whereas Whitestone has ingeniously expanded the image and given it a new political gloss. In fact, Wu Shichang has simply missed the point.

Whitestone admits the futility of his aspirations in the last two lines: “If you were to wait for this moment, and seek once more its fragrance, it is only to be found depicted on a horizontal scroll by the small window.” Huizong is now dead, and the Northern Song dynasty will never be revived, thus seeking once more the fragrance of former times is simply pursuing an empty dream or being deceived by a mirage: the delicate and lovely plum blossom petals are now captured for posterity only by a painting that depicts them, and will never be seen again.

From a superficial perspective, if both *Secret Fragrance* and *Dappled Shadows* were only about plum blossom, then both Wang Guoweï and Wu Shichang’s criticisms of them would hold water, as the songs are riddled with circumlocutions, flitting to and fro, without ever alighting on the subject in question. In fact, at a deeper level, these two songs are, however, not about plum blossom, and the fate of the petals is simply a metaphor for much wider political and social issues. The key to unlocking the mystery was Huizong’s *ci*, and it must have been deeply embedded in Whitestone’s psyche for him to draw on it so richly. Later generations of Jiang Kui enthusiasts, for example Zhu Yizun and Li E, in their copious writings on Whitestone and in collections of his poetry, do not at any stage touch on the true interpretation of these two songs, yet they unquestionably had access to Huizong’s *ci*, as it appears in at least three books published prior to their period of activity. Two of these are collections of ephemeral writings on the demise of the Northern Song—*Dasong Xuanhe yishi 大宋宣和遺事* (*Surviving Anecdotes from the Xuanhe Era of the Greater Song*) and *Nanjin jiwenu 楚僑記録* (*A Record of Southern Ashes*)—and appeared at the cusp of the Southern Song and Yuan dynasties.29 The third, *Huacao cuibian 花草粹編* (*Flowers and Grasses, Selected Highlights*),30 a popular compilation of lyric songs, was published in the Ming dynasty. Given that the Zhedong 浙東 School of Historiography was so proactive in preserving and disseminating historical materials, and some of its members, such as Quan Zuwang 全祖望 (1705–1755), also participated in the activities of Zhexi Poetry School, these three books were undoubtedly widely available to Zhu Yizun, Li E, and their fellows. Not only in respect of *Secret Fragrance* and *Dappled Shadows*, but also with regard to the whole of Whitestone’s oeuvre, the actual subject matter of Jiang Kui’s lyric songs seems also to have been rarely discussed. Even the Zhexi Poetry School, at the same time enthusiasts and experts on Whitestone’s *ci*, when expressing opinions in public arenas, uncritically accepted Dong Qichang’s 唐規昌 (1555–1636) duality, which divided painting into northern and southern schools, and applied it lock, 

---

29. Huizong’s *ci* as it appears in Li Liewen 李棲文, ed., *Dasong Xuanhe yishi 大宋宣和遺事* (Shanghai: Shanghai yinhuguan, 1934); and Yan Yongcheng 燕永成, ed., *Nanjin jiwenu 南僑紀聞錄* (*Nanjin Jiwenlu*), in *Quan Song biji (全宋筆記)* (di si bian) 全宋筆記 (第四編), ed. Zhu Yiran 朱宜然 (Zhengzhou: Daxiang chubanshe, 2008), vol. 4, 48.
stock, and barrel to lyric songs. A search for the underlying impetus for the revival of Whitestone's poetry in these sources is thus doomed to be stillborn, and an examination instead of the actual behaviour of the main actors in the unfolding drama ends up yielding more fruitful explanations, and is given here the full treatment it deserves.

The first chapter of this book therefore examines the first forays into the rediscovery of Jiang Kui's works made in the Kangxi era by Zhu Yizun, the chief protagonist at this stage. In order to situate Zhu Yizun in his correct position as the instigator of this process, evidence is culled from two sources: a manuscript copied in 1685 by Ke Chongpu (active 1679–1704) from Zhu Yizun's collation of Jiang Kui's poems, now held in the Peking University Library; and a copy of Zhu Yizun's "supplementary list" of Jiang Kui's lyric songs annotated by Zhang Zongwu (1705–1775), kept in the Shanghai Library. Fresh evaluation of this newly discovered primary material puts the groundbreaking 1710 and 1718 editions of the fifty-eight-《compilation of Jiang Kui's lyric songs into a completely new perspective, and conclusively demonstrates that they came into being entirely as a result of Zhu Yizun's efforts at rediscovery.

Moving into the second generation of the renaissance of Jiang Kui's works in the eighteenth century, the second chapter takes as its starting point my unearthing of an entirely unreported working manuscript, now kept in private hands (reproduced here as Facsimile 1), that was used in the preparation of the Lu edition of Jiang Kui's works in 1743, and of which Zhu Yizun was completely unaware. The Lu Zhonghui 陆鍾辉 (1697–after 1773), Wang Zao 王藻, and the Ma brothers (the salt merchants Ma Yueguan 马曰琯 [1688–1755] and Ma Yuelu 马曰璐 [1701–1761]), all members of the Yangzhou 江州 Poetry Club.

In the third chapter, a series of poems connected with the arrival of Hang Shijun 杭世骏 (1696–1773, recently dismissed by the Emperor Qianlong 乾隆, r. 1735–1796) into the Yangzhou Poetry Club is used as a vehicle for examining further the motivation and aesthetic ideals of the circle. An important backdrop here is the consolidation of Qing dynasty rule at this time, the exclusion of the scholarly elite of southern China from positions of power, and their reactions to this situation. These notions seep into their poetic creations, and also concur with their espousal of Jiang Kui as a convenient symbol of their ambitions, issues that are explored here through copious translation and exegesis of their literary creations.

Most modern studies of lyric songs omit discussion of the musical component of their performance, even though it was an essential part of their composition, and the melodies employed, collected in 《compilations, rarely survive. The working manuscript used to prepare the 1743 edition uniquely preserves, however, seventeen such melodies by Jiang Kui, and through it can be glimpsed authentic performance practice before eighteenth-century editors got their hands on the material. Particularly in respect of stanzaic division, the fourth chapter argues that members of the Yangzhou Poetry Club appear to have misunderstood relationships between text and metrical pattern. In fact, the Song dynasty vernacular process of adding words to a reservoir of pre-existing melodies became, in the eighteenth century, a highly sophisticated relating of sentences to metrical patterns and rhyme schemes, and it is this crucial evolution that underpins the whole Jiang Kui renaissance, giving it a subtlety of veiled meaning that could still survive and thrive, despite pressure from the Manchu literary inquisition.

Close focus on the lineage of the seminal 1743 and 1749 Jiang Kui editions forms the basis of the fifth chapter, and here the key players are Fu Zeng 符曾 (1688–1764) and Wang Dong 汪栋 (1710–1738). Analysis of the source for these two editions, as well as of poetry by the chief protagonists and stories of their interaction, demonstrates that the editorial practices employed for the 1749 publication (Facsimile 2) were simply an extension of those used for the 1743 text. In fact, both editions were crystallizations of processes generated by networks of friends and colleagues, all motivated by a similar array of political and social aspirations.
Based on a manuscript penned by Jiang Bingyan 江炳炎 (c. 1679–?), the next important collection of Jiang Kui's lyric songs was edited by Zhu Zumou 朱祖謀 (1857–1931) and appeared in 1913, a couple of years after the end of the Qing dynasty. Zhu Zumou claimed his publication was closer to Song dynasty original versions than those of 1743 and 1749, and mainstream critical opinion has concurred ever since; however, in the sixth chapter, my discovery of a tracing copy of the Jiang Bingyan source (Facsimile 3) clearly proves that his manuscript was a conflation of the fifty-eight-ци and 109-ци collections. Zhu Zumou's motives for this subterfuge are discussed in detail; I argue that, as a Qing dynasty loyalist, Zhu used Jiang Kui once more as a focus for discontent at dynastic change.

Thus, three facsimiles crucial to an understanding of Jiang Kui's lyric songs are presented here: a working manuscript owned by the Ma brothers used in preparing the 1743 Lu edition, a source that has never appeared in print before (Facsimile 1); a copy of the 1749 edition annotated by Bao Tingbo 鮑廷博 (1728–1814) in 1783 (Facsimile 2); and a tracing copy of Jiang Bingyan's manuscript written by Shen Yunzhai 沈韻齋 in 1914, also never before published (Facsimile 3). Also included is a New Critical Edition in Chinese of Jiang Kui's lyric oeuvre, which, unlike Xia Chengtao 夏承燾 (1900–1986) exegesis, is not grounded in Zhu Zumou's 1913 edition, but is based instead on the working manuscript and some twenty other sources, such as are cited in this book. There are two appendices: a list of Jiang Kui's lyric songs that appear in editions from the mid-thirteenth to the mid-eighteenth centuries and a summary of lyric songs misattributed to Jiang Kui during the same period.
Conclusion

“Jiang Baishi of the Southern Song, by his profound feelings and singular creativity, is able to supersede the superficiality of direct description, the wind and the dust, but does not lose the magical mellifluousness familiar since the Wei and Jin.”

(Quan Zuwang, preface to Fu Zeng’s anthology The Spring Duck Poetry Collection, c. 1753)

From the Kangxi period to 1913 in the lower Yangtze River region of southern China, a renaissance of interest in Jiang Kui was crucial to crystallizing both aesthetic and political aspirations. If interest had simply been in the rehabilitation of a neglected poet and limited to a narrow band of scholarly enthusiasm, the results would not have been the intensity of passion engendered or the plethora of publications and manuscripts that actually appeared. In fact, Jiang Kui became a supremely appropriate vessel for expressing a whole host of different viewpoints: for the Yangzhou Poetry Club, he represented political disenfranchisement and racial discrimination at the hands of the Manchu autocracy, yet, for Zhu Zumou, the same lyric songs symbolized nostalgic reminiscence for the Qing regime once it had been overthrown. The appropriateness of these *ci* was that they could be interpreted in a flexible manner, on the surface embodying an exquisite sense of refinement, yet underneath expressing a more turbulent feeling of oppression and dispossession. Yet where did this common emotion of disharmony and dissatisfaction come from?

The heart of an answer to this question comes from the behaviour of the Manchu ruling dynasty, which had not only asserted political and military control, but had also begun to extend the tentacles of its oppression into cultural spheres.1 From the Kangxi era in the mid-seventeenth century to the end of Qianlong’s reign at the close of the eighteenth century, this persecution was to become ever more cruel. Thus, the focus of intellectual activity for the educated elite of southern China realigned itself, turning away from the more philosophical concerns of Confucian ideology to become a movement whose principal interest was now philological.2 Lyric songs had, in their original state, been a more vernacular and less highbrow literary form,3 yet were now elevated to a position where, placed on the pedestal of “refinement,” they acquired almost the status of sacred texts.4

In the Kangxi period, although the scholarly elites of southern China were already under pressure, to a limited extent, they were still able to operate inside the political and social hierarchy. Zhu Yizun did, after all, in 1679, successfully sit Kangxi’s examination for the higher degree of “erudite literatus,” and subsequently occupied an official position in Beijing for a number of years. Zhu Yizun’s ancestors had held high office in the Ming dynasty, and in the years before taking the “erudite literatus” examination, he himself had been involved in efforts to oust the Qing dynasty and revive the Ming.3 Eventually appointed to office by Kangxi, his position, unsurprisingly, proved precarious, and he was finally dismissed. While employed, in self-mockery, he published a book of poetry entitled *A Record of Being a Figure of Fun* (*Tengxiao ji*),4 admitting to all and sundry that he had submitted to Qing dynasty control, though was also somehow aware of the absurdity of his role.

With the accession of the Emperor Qianlong, the screw was progressively tightened; anyone with a connection to the southern Chinese educated elite found themselves either sacked or not employed in the first place. Evidently at this point, a new literary form was needed. Its requirements were, on the one hand, to give clear, cathartic voice to latent dissatisfaction, whilst, on the other, to have an opaque means of expression that veiled the true meaning of the thoughts expressed and protected its practitioners from further persecution. Y et where did this common emotion of disharmony and dissatisfaction come from?

1. Wilt Idema, Wai-ye Li, and Ellen Widmer, eds., *Trauma and Transcendence in Early Qing Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006); Wai-ye Li, “Women as Emblems of Dynastic Fall from Late-Ming to Late-Qing,” in *Dynastic Crisis and Cultural Innovation: From the Late-Ming to the Late-Qing and Beyond*, ed. David Wang and Shang Wei (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005), 93–150; and Wai-ye Li, *Women and National Trauma in Late Imperial Chinese Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2014).


danger. The sophisticated and subtle song lyrics of Jiang Kui were thus chosen, or perhaps chose themselves. With *cipai* melodies available off the shelf to Jiang Kui, it may well have been that adding evocative words to them had not been all that difficult, but by the Qing dynasty these melodies had been lost, and song lyricists of this era had only metrical patterns and text with which to work. The adding of text to metre was now a much more complex problem, but the harder this became, from a political perspective, the safer it was, as only the most sophisticated could be involved in the process. It was against this background that Zhu Yizun used all the resources at his disposal and assembled his compilation of fifty-eight pieces. His efforts at bringing about a renaissance in lyric songs were not limited to Jiang Kui’s oeuvre alone; he also unearthed a manuscript copy of the Southern Song lyricist Zhang Yan’s *Lyric Songs of White Clouds in the Mountains* (*Shanzhong baiyun ci*), edited it, and passed it on to colleagues who published it. In the Yuan dynasty manuscript *Supplement to the Repertoires of the Music Bureau (Yuefu buti乐府補题)*, in addition to Zhang Yan, other Southern Song disciples of Jiang Kui such as Zhou Mi and Wang Yisun are also represented—Zhu Yizun had this supplement published too. Under his auspices, song lyricists in Beijing were assembled, and composed “poetic answers” to the same metres and rhythms as the lyric songs in this text, though these activities were by necessity cloaked in secrecy and took place surreptitiously.

The commanding motivation for all these efforts was to eulogize the concept of “refinement” (*ya*); in Zhi Yizun’s estimation, it was Jiang Kui who best embodied it. His view was that the most “refined” anthology of lyric songs was Zhou Mi’s compilation *Surpassingly Fine Lyric Songs* (*Caotang shiyu*), and that the popular *Lyric Songs of the Thatched Cottage* (*Caotang ci shi*) was by comparison the “crudest.” “Refinement” is, however, both an abstract and subjective concept, so what did Zhu Yizun and his followers actually mean by it? In his copy of *Lyric Songs of the Thatched Cottage*, Li E added a postscript that provides an apt and succinct definition:

> In the Yuan dynasty, *Lyric Songs of the Thatched Cottage* was published by the Phoenix Forest Publishing House, and consists of three fascicles; although it is not known who made the selection, it was the product of Southern Song loyalists of the Zhiyuan [1264–1294] and Dade [1297–1307] eras. The lyric songs therein are all plaintive laments suffused with sorrow, and never forget their occupied homeland. At the opening of the book is given that it is the work of Liu Cangchun [i.e., Liu Bingzhong, 1216–1274] and Xu Luzhai [i.e., Xu Heng, 1209–1291], which is of unparalleled significance. Their editing and selection are excellent, and not a word is vulgar or superficial. Other than Zhou Mi’s *Surpassingly Fine Lyric Songs*, there is nothing to compare with it. As far as these two books are concerned, I love them dearly, and they never leave my side, not even for a moment.

元鳳林書院《草堂詩餘》三卷，無名氏選，至元、大德間諸人所作，皆南宋遺民。詞多慷慨傷感，不忘故國，而於卷首冠以劉淵泰、許魯齋二家，亦有深意。至其采覓諸妙，無一語近於通張孝先《絕妙好詞》而外，涉於寡匹。余於此二種，心所愛玩，無時離手。

The “unparalleled significance” to which Li E refers should also be understood as “refinement,” and its identifying characteristic here is that these lyric songs “never forget their occupied homeland”; in other words, it is a kind of cultural patriotism. Not only are Liu Bingzhong and Xu Heng both represented, but so too is the renowned leader of resistance to the Mongolian Yuan dynasty invaders Wen Tianxiang 文天祥 (1236–1283), and the poem of his that is included is privileged as the third in the book. Zhu Yizun’s words are best interpreted as a public utterance by which “refinement” is limited to artistic and literary expression. In the privacy of a handwritten postscript, Li E gives here a quite different explanation to “refinement,” aligning it firmly with cultural patriotism. Taking this spirit a step further, his interest in the lyric songs of the Southern Song dynasty was much wider than simply Jiang Kui’s oeuvre—his publications also include the hundred-fascicle *Song shi jishi 宋詩紀事* (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1983) and a twenty-four-fascicle *Liao shi shiyi 遼史拾遺* (Supplement to the Liao Dynasty Official History), an eight-fascicle *Nan Song yuanchua lu 南宋院畫錄* (A Record of Works by the Southern Song Painting Academy), a seven-fascicle *Juemiao haoci jian* (An
The ultimate aim of this process was to achieve “sagehood” through creating new standards of “refinement” — this was what the Manchu court understood by both terms.

In opposition to one another, two completely different paradigms of “refinement” had thus now emerged, one in Beijing and the other in the lower Yangzze River region of southern China. No dictatorship could tolerate such insubordination, and the Manchu court had to act. During the period 1711—1755, persecution by the literary inquisition of the Qing dynasty reached its first climax. The year 1711 marks the start of this renewed activity, as in this year, leading scholar, poet, and Kangxi protégé Wang Shizhen died, whilst Zhu Yizun had passed away two years earlier, thus literary intellectuals now lacked a leadership figure. In addition, the cause célèbre Literary Inquisition case of Dai Mingshi’s works had thus now emerged, one in Beijing and the other in the lower Yangzze region.

As Manchu conquerors, the Qing dynasty authorities were extremely keen to legitimize their rule in Confucian terms. In order to do this, they had to be seen to have rigorously reorganized both literature and music. Thus, in the field of lyrical songs, in 1707, they published Lidai shiyu (Ci Poetry of Former Dynasties) in 120 fascicles, and, in 1715, Qinding ciupu (Imperial Register of Ci Prosody) in forty fascicles. With regard to music, in 1713, they printed Lüli zhengyi shili (The Origins of Pitch and Calendar), published in 1723, and in 1746, a 120-fascicle Lüli zhengyi houbian was also printed. The ultimate aim of this process was to achieve “sagehood” through creating a new standard of “refinement” — this was what the Manchu court understood by both terms.

Disrobed and dismissed from office, returning to southern China, these disaffected intellectuals made contact with colleagues already holding office there and formed themselves into a distinct political entity. After the Emperor Yongzheng’s accession to the imperial throne in 1723, the spotlight turned on Hu Qiheng in 1725, who is described in historical documents as sentenced to death by hanging because he had not implicated his superior Nian Gengyao in treasonable activities. What these sources do not indicate, however, is that a notebook by Nian Gengyao’s advisor and Hu Qiheng protégé Wang Jingqi, also a Manchu, was confiscated and kept under lock and key in the Palace for the imperial inquisition, as sentenced to death by hanging because he had not implicated his superior Nian Gengyao in treasonable activities. What these sources do not indicate, however, is that a notebook by Nian Gengyao’s advisor and Hu Qiheng protégé Wang Jingqi was confiscated and kept under lock and key in the Palace for the imperial inquisition.

The book was confiscated and kept under lock and key in the Palace for the Encouragement of Imperial Scholarship, where it languished until the Republican period, when it was rediscovered on December 6, 1927. On its front cover, the Emperor Yongzheng had written: “Obstuse, ridiculous, mad, disorganized, to such an extreme extent. I only regret that I came to see this book so belatedly. If, in the future, similar happenings occur, then poison of this sort must not be allowed to escape my net” — this “poison” had come from Hu Qiheng’s acquaintance Wang Jingqi, who had passed it on to Nian Gengyao.
When Huang Zhijun, as the chief examiner for Fujian province, was impeached and dismissed by the Emperor Yongzheng, as mentioned in Chapter 5, the emperor admonished him to “simply get on with implementing policy”; but what policy had he failed to implement? A very clear indication of what he had been expected to do is given by the behaviour of his successor to the post of chief examiner for Fujian province Dai Han 戴瀚 (jinshi degree 1723), who took up his new position in 1729. Not long afterwards, in 1730, a lowly student called Fan Shijie 范世杰, not yet successful even in the lowest rungs of the kejiu examination, penned a panegyrical essay in praise of the Emperor Yongzheng. In it, he unwisely pointed out that Yongzheng had modestly given way to his three elder brothers during the process of determining the imperial succession. Lineage and legitimacy were extremely sensitive issues, and even to mention them was just the pretext Dai Han needed in order to launch an investigation by the Literary Inquisition. Fan Shijie was quickly imprisoned, and Dai Han dispatched a confidential report to the emperor.30 Yongzheng was impressed and did not simply tick the report as “read,” but instead took the trouble to write on it in red ink:

How excellent it is that you were able so loyally to carry out my instructions and report them back to me. If only all senior officials, regardless of the situation they encountered, without hiding anything, [reported so swiftly back to me,] then those who flout the law would be completely exterminated . . . Let my words here be made known to all provincial and prefectural governors.

This was just what Yongzheng had wanted from Huang Zhijun all along: strict implementation of the Manchu policy of persecuting southern Chinese intellectuals.

When Yongzheng’s son, the Emperor Qianlong, invited Huang Zhijun to Beijing in 1738 to participate in writing The Orthodox Understanding of Pitch Standards, it is no wonder that Huang found a pretext to decline the offer. He chose instead to stay in Shanghai and edit the musical notation in The Songs of the Whitestone Daoist; this sent out a very clear message as to which type of “refinement” was closest to his heart. He was extremely assiduous in the undertaking, and, in the musical notation alone, more than 130 differences between the 1749 Zhang edition and the relevant working manuscript can be found.32 He had declined Qianlong’s invitation on health grounds, yet seems to have been sprightly enough when it came to working on something he valued.

By the end of the eighteenth century, the energies of the Literary Inquisition seem to have spent themselves, and Jiang Kui’s lyric songs, as a symbol of reaction to it, no longer had quite the same relevance. Thus, in the early nineteenth century, when a new school of lyric song writing emerged in Changzhou, Jiang Kui was no longer the focus of its attention. In 1911, however, with the demise of the Qing dynasty, the situation had reversed itself once more, and members of the intellectual elite were again presented with difficult choices as to where to place their loyalties. At this juncture, the disenfranchised and dispossessed tone of Jiang Kui’s lyric songs was found, ironically perhaps, to have most resonance with the Qing dynasty loyalists Wang Pengyun, Zhu Zumou, Zheng Wenzhuo, and Kuang Zhouyi 况周頤 (1859–1926) and their struggle to come to terms with the deposition of the imperial power that had previously employed them. Of these, Wang Pengyun and Zhu Zumou even went to the trouble of printing editions of Jiang Kui’s works.

From the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries, a genuine renaissance of Jiang Kui’s works took place, which, inside the framework of the history of Chinese literary criticism, can be counted as a truly extraordinary phenomenon. Its promulgators held all along that their starting point had been the creation of a division between Northern and Southern Schools of ci composition; they freely admitted that their paradigm for this sea change had been transplanted from art criticism. In this context, Ming dynasty scholar-official and calligrapher Dong Qichang was a crucial figure, as it was he who had first indicated that the inspiration for this division had come from Chan Buddhism, which had always been commonly regarded as being separated into two schools, a Northern and a Southern: the Northern advocated a gradual process of achieving enlightenment through

---

31. Ibid., 997.
32. That borrowed by Bao Tingbo from descendants of the Ma brothers, as discussed in Chapter 5.
lengthy spiritual exercises, whilst, by contrast, the Southern believed in the notion of sudden enlightenment, a "road to Damascus" moment, if you like.

Dong Qichang regarded the Tang dynasty painter Li Sixun 孫思錫 (651–716) and his son Li Zhaodaol 孫道拙 (675–758) as the leading lights of the Northern School, a mantle inherited by the Song dynasty masters Zhao Gan 趙幹 (active c. 960–975), Zhao Boju 趙伯駿 (1120–1182), Zhao Bosu 趙伯壽 (1124–1182), Ma Yuan 马遠 (1160–1225), and Xia Gui 夏圭 (c. 1195–1224). This school is characterized by detailed and quasi-realistic representations of a multitude of objects, crammed into a picture in rich and varied hues. Evidently art of the skilled professional, each scene is a crafted product of intense and highly-wrought complexity. Dong Qichang considered that the Southern School had been initiated by Wang Wei 王維 (699–759) of the Tang dynasty; in the Five Dynasties (907–960) and the Song dynasty, the lineage had passed to Jing Hao 剪俟 (c. 855–915), Guan Tong 关同 (c. 906–960), Dong Yuan 董源 (c. 934–c. 962), Juran 趙喦 (c. 932–?), Guo Zhongshu 郭忠恕 (?–977), Zhang Zao 張璪 (?–1093), Mi Fu 米芾 (1051–1107), and his son Mi Youren 米友仁 (1074–1153), and then to the four masters of the Yuan dynasty: Huang Gongwang 黃公望 (1269–1354), Wang Meng 王蒙 (c. 1308–1385), Ni Zan 尼釴 (1301–1374), and Wu Zhen 吳鎮 (1280–1354). Its features are the use of softer pastel shades and gentle ink washes.

In a general sense, the notion of a coalescence of practices into Northern and Southern Schools began in the Six Dynasties (220–589). Southern Song Chan Buddhism, paintings, and ci would seem to share similarities in this regard. Southern Song Chan Buddhism took complex and systematic activities such as reciting sacred texts and doing good works and simply rejected them all. Similarly, Southern Song painting advocated simplicity and “minimalism,” a few deft strokes used to achieve a rich effect, the fewer the better, a discourse of “less is more.” Concerning lyric songs, quoting the master himself, the anthology Guo Zhongshu

Jiang Kui, in his Discourse On Poetry (Shishuo 詩說), urges: "Let the implicit be valued in the usage of language, . . . so that a phrase has added flavour, and if a verse has added meaning, the finest of fine poetry is possible.”

With general parallels like these, it might be regarded as natural for the Southern ci to have reigned supreme, viewed as the peak of artistic, philosophically, and creative achievement, a primacy certainly attained by Southern Chan Buddhism and painting. This was not, however, what happened, and as the twentieth-century critic and polymath Qian Zhongshu 钱鍾書 (1910–1998) has observed with respect to the canon selection of paintings and lyric songs, diametrically opposite processes between the two can be witnessed: "implicit" in the visual arts has always attracted most acclaim, whilst subtle and veiled poetic meanings have normally been regarded as inferior to more direct types of expression.

In this context, painter and poet Wang Wei is an apposite case study: criticism has always regarded his paintings and poetry, though of different media, as belonging to the same “implicit” school, yet whilst his paintings have always been regarded as of the highest quality, his poetry, by comparison with the beloved muscularity of Li Bai 李白 (701–762) and Du Fu 杜甫, is usually considered to be of the second division.

Thus, in painting, the most precious of qualities is xu 虚 or “implicitness,” whilst in literature, it is shi 實 or “directness.” No wonder, then, that early twentieth-century scholar Wang Guowei Wang Guoqiang 李國強 criticised Jiang Kui for the ge 竣 quality of his poetry, that is, its "separateness" or "estrangement" from expressing anything directly. For many centuries, this critical consensus was maintained, but in the early modern period, a few siren voices began to express diverging viewpoints. Early amongst these was the late Ming and early Qing scholar Lu Shiyong 萬時雍 (gongsheng degree 1633), who, in his book The Mirror of Tang Dynasty Poetry (Tangshi jing 唐詩鏡), dares to criticizes Li Bai, Du Fu, Han Yu, and Bai Juyi 白居易 (772–846), whilst commending Wang Wei and Wei Yingwu 韋應物 (737–792), explicitly stating: “Mojie [i.e., Wang Wei] should not be regarded as inferior to Li Bai and Du Fu” 莫怪不宜在李杜下.35

Wang Shizhen, a leading figure in poetical and literature circles of the Kangxi era, expressed similar views. In public, he remained a steadfast supporter of the orthodoxy, praising Li Bai and Du Fu according to received wisdom and assessing Du Fu’s poetry

34. Qian Zhongshu, Qiuzhui ji 七缀集 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985), 1–32.
35. Ibid., 22.
as “the epitome of rectitude”究竟歸宿處. In private jottings, however, another story is revealed, and here he has nothing but contempt for Du Fu, as observed by the scholar Li Zhonghua李重華 (1682–1755), who had gained access to some of these writings.36 Likewise, Zhao Zhixin趙執信 (1662–1744), in his compendium of literary criticism A Record of Discussing Dragons (Tanlong lu談龍錄), the “dragons” here are in fact “poems”

Ruanweng [i.e., Wang Shizhen] absolutely detested Shaoling’s [i.e., Du Fu] poems, but most certainly would not have dared to attack them publicly, so he often quoted Northern Song poet Yang Danian’s (974–1020) disparaging assessment of Du Fu as a mere “village schoolmaster” when speaking of the subject to guests.

阮翁酷不喜少陵，特不敢顯攻之，每舉楊大年「村夫子」之目以語客。37

In fact, Wang Shizhen and Zhao Zhixi were related (the former was the latter’s wife’s uncle through marriage), which explains Zhao Zhixi’s privileged access to the more private conversations of this distinguished pedagogue.

The importance of the renaissance of lyric songs and Jiang Kui’s oeuvre in particular was not limited in scope simply to its effect on the ci genre; those participating in the movement were also well aware of the overall critical framework in which it was situated. Yangzhou Poetry Club member and historian Quan Zuwang explores these issues in an introductory essay to an anthology of poems by Fu Zeng entitled The Spring Duck Poetry Collection (Chunfu ji春鳧集). In order to increase the persuasive power of his argument, he takes for his mouthpiece the Northern Song poet Su Dongpo:

In former times, Dongpo discussed poetry, saying: "Li [Bai] and Du [Fu], with full measure of the vastness of the ocean and the sturdiness of the land, surpassing all, bestrode a hundred generations, and made the works of all other poets, ancient and modern, seem like rubbish. However, [a poetry style which] exceeds the winds and is untouched by dust has perpetuated since the Wei and Jin dynasties; since the time of Li and Du, it has declined."

昔東坡之論詩，謂：李、杜以海涵地負之量，凌跨百代，古今詩人盡廢。然而魏晉以來高風絕塵，亦自此衰。38

He then provides his own analysis of these words:

The reason for this is that the giddy heights of Li and Du’s poems cannot be reached, their magical brightness and urgent strength are sufficient to take poetry to the apex of its variation, and if inept scholars inherit his mantle, that is enough to cause poetry to lose its integrity. From the Tang dynasty onwards, poets such as Changli (i.e., Han Yu), Dongye (i.e., Meng Jiao孟郊, 751–814), Yuchuan (Lu Tong盧仝, c. 795–835), Langxian (i.e., Jia Dao賈島, 779–843), Changgu (i.e., Li He李賀, 790–816), as well as, of the Song dynasty, Dongpo (i.e., Su Shi), Shangyu (i.e., Huang Tingjian黃庭堅), Chengzhai (i.e., Yang Wanli楊萬里), Dongfu (i.e., Xiao Dezao肖德輿), and Fangweng (i.e., Lu You), the breadth of their creative achievements and stylistic traits may vary, yet they are all nonetheless offshoots of Li and Du. However, they suffer from common faults in passage after passage, verse after verse: either coarsely brutal and thinly pinched in sound; or casual, superficial, flaccid, and garulous in melody; twisted, insincere, and slyly disingenuous; there is no level to which they do not stoop.

蓋李、杜之詩不可幾，其神明魄力足以盡詩之變，而不善學者襲之，亦足以失詩之真。自是而還，昌黎、東野、玉川、閬仙、豐谷以暨宋之東坡、山谷、誠齋、東夫、放翁，其造詣之深淺，成家之大小不一，要皆李、杜之別子也。然而流弊所極，叢篇長語，或為粗礪噍殺之音，或為率易曼衍之調，不逕誼說，無所不至。39

In order to revive the situation, Quan Zuwang regards Jiang Kui as his saviour:
gentle yet eternally implicit, translucent yet strangely rich, is this not the true poet's gift?

南渡姜白石，……以其深情孤詣，拔出於風塵之表，而不失魏晉以來神韻，淡而彌永，淸而能腴，真風人之遺也。40

Jiang Kui’s canonical place is now no longer part of “the wind and the dust” of Li and Du, but instead his works pass through and beyond those of these poets, superseding their directness of expression with his own more subtle hues. The plum blossom is such a small and delicate flower, and through Jiang Kui we learn so much of its resilience: a potent voice, resonating through the centuries, an undercurrent of resistance, a focus for discontent, an implicitness of expression, and a recurring renaissance.

40. Ibid., 1253.
Although Jiang Kui’s musical notation provides an important and unique insight into the performance of lyric songs, the materials he furnishes us with are scanty, and probably acted more as a memory aid to musicians already immersed in the tradition rather than a comprehensive set of instructions on how to perform. These problems are particularly evident when dealing with aspects of rhythm, an issue that is insufficiently addressed in Jiang Kui’s notation if European music of recent centuries is taken as a benchmark, but to contemporary Song dynasty performers imbued with customary practice, he probably told them all they needed to know. Rulan Chao Pian in her transcriptions turns this into a positive quality, and does not attempt to give exact durations to different pitches, using instead a plainsong-type system that assumes flexibility.\(^1\) Thus, the recordings offered here are presented simply as plausible interpretations of how these lyric songs might have sounded, given what we know of Jiang Kui and the musical world he inhabited. Ancient Complaint, Discontentment at the Long Pavilion, and Secret Fragrance use transcriptions by Laurence Picken,\(^2\) whilst Pale Yellow Willows and Secret Fragrance were transcribed by Yang Yinliu.\(^3\) A second performance of Secret Fragrance employing a different interpretation of the same Jiang Kui notation is included here in order to draw attention to varying modern approaches taken to transcription and performance practice.

Apart from Ancient Complaint, which is a qin piece, none of the other musical scores lists which instruments might have been used to accompany the singer, but mention of candidates that could have taken on this role is given in the texts of the lyric songs themselves. Possibilities include pipa 琵琶, xiao 箫 (vertical bamboo flute), yabili 啞篳篥 (double reed pipe), and clappers. For the purposes of the recordings here, where possible, instruments have been constructed and equipped according to likely Song dynasty practice; for example, the pipa is held horizontally, whereas nowadays it is played vertically, and silk strings are used throughout, not the nylon or metal types normally employed for performance of more modern repertoire. For Discontentment at the Long Pavilion and Secret Fragrance (Picken transcriptions), pipa, xiao, and clappers accompany the singer, but only the xiao takes on this supporting role in Pale Yellow Willows and Secret Fragrance (Yang transcriptions).

The first three lyric songs were sung by Cheng Lai-chun 張麗真, and the fourth and fifth by Lau Chor-wah 刘楚华; the xiao was played by Sou Si-tai 蘇思棣, the pipa by Ho Kang-ming 何耿明, and the qin and clappers by Lau Chor-wah. Two performances were given in Hong Kong of these and other Jiang Kui songs: on October 31, 2009, at the Fragrant Sea Pavilion 香海軒, Nan Lian Garden 南蓮園池; and on April 24, 2010, at the Art Museum, Hong Kong University. The recordings listed below were made in the Hong Kong University recording studio shortly afterwards.

List of the Titles:

- **Song 1 Ancient Complaint** (transcribed by Laurence Picken)
- **Song 2 Discontentment at the Long Pavilion** (transcribed by Laurence Picken)
- **Song 3 Secret Fragrance** (transcribed by Laurence Picken)
- **Song 4 Pale Yellow Willows** (transcribed by Yang Yinliu)
- **Song 5 Secret Fragrance** (transcribed by Yang Yinliu)
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聲文之美的合浦珠還

《白石道人歌曲》在清代的重現

考察南朝詩人庾信（1555-1221）的《白石道人歌曲》，是中國詩學史和音樂史研究中的顯著一例。為學者所著，則是清代康熙八十八年（1743）陸錦輝在揚州重刊之故的事。陸錦輝在揚州重刊之故的事，陸錦輝與揚州文人張文虎、陳達甫、鄭文焯、張朝錦（John Hazeldin Levis）、唐鴻、夏承書、楊薰湖、丘錦濤、朱士信等為《白石道人歌曲》中所保存的詞調樂譜相立說，紙墨互通，其中楊氏及陸氏兩家譜著，尤空虛音創，彼之管絃。1可見，陸氏重刊為關係《白石道人歌曲》在八百年間陰陽的分水嶺，也是影響有清一代學界指歸的關鍵。

詞學史和音樂史上有如此重要的事件，其間原委我們已知之甚少，所了解的背景也僅僅局限于陸錦輝為重刊本所做的一篇短序。到了同治元年（1862年），以「擅長樂律」而名噪一時的張文虎，以陸錦輝對比乾隆四十年（1775年）後出的《白石道人歌曲》張著稱極之，撰成《校訂詞》一卷，刊入《雲間金書》。《校訂詞》批判陸錦，不僅說它「語調以意照管，每失其故」，又將先出的陸錦故意排在張著之後，說是「同時又有揚州錦輝陸錦刺本，亦云出自自頑散，大略相同。」從表面上看，張文虎送給陸錦輝一頂「揚州錦輝」的帽子，實際上是通過貶低陸錦輝來排斥陸錦，宣揚他「莊」本校之，覺總不知陸錦之善」的論調。在同治初年，人們聽到「揚州錦輝」的字眼到底能引發怎麼聯想呢？十八世紀寄居揚州的兩淮鹽商通常被稱為「鹽隊主」，試用今天的話說，就是「暴發戶」。《揚州畫舫錄》對其「饑餓壽」、「香澤門第」的畸形生活態度有生動的描述。3張文虎《校訂詞》「據其所有，改所不知」的斟酌，雖然無法完全自圓其說，但清末詞學家者，除了曾元輯說明了句「竊謂以言樂者是也，若以鶴石則似不盡然」的公道話以外，4大抵還是看不明白。但張文虎「鹽隊主」的指控，對遺民詞人敏感的神經竅發生了作用，其後吳昌偉、鄭文虎，紛紛推重張本。民國二年（1913），朱孝威據清乾隆二年（1737）江坊某家抄本《張村案》本《白石道人歌曲》，乃與陸本、張本詳加校對，編著校記，並自跋校本云：「以校二本，互為異同，且有誤與刊本同者。大抵張之失在字畫小節，尚足存舊文貴異證；陸則並卷易篇，部位次，大非編造六卷之舊。」

陸錦輝刺本《白石道人歌曲》到底是不是「鹽隊主」附庸風雅的產物？果如是，陸本問世之後，何以能夠震動詞壇？筆者校理吳詞，發現《白石道人歌曲》在揚州首次重刊實非出於陸錦輝一人之力，而是張文虎刺和以梅校馬氏依仗為核心的張江吟社精心籌劃的結果。把陸錦和《白石道人歌曲》聯繫起來是一個新發現的抄本。是本已故藏家存先生無相藏本，今歸揚江書屋（以下簡稱無相本）。范仲蓮中書曾為無相本寫過一篇之記；5陳先行先生也曾鑒定過該本的字跡和工料，認為是典型的乾隆晚期江南抄本。去夏訪書泊，承薊江書屋主人的美意，得以親見無相本原卷，發現書眉校語屢見「張始度」、「吳作云」、「梅作云」的字樣，其中樊榭就是淅西詞派領袖謝軍，玉井就是揚州閨學，
梅淵就是吳江王藻，這幾位詞人正好都是韓江雅集的成員。回憶後，我又將無相本與姚廷焯三角之校校張奕柱本對校一遍，見張氏方寸校語所據「維揚馬氏詞本」的諸字行格與無相本幾乎全同。說明在符軸納於將軍樓數百百藏的詞作本傳到揚州的時，韓江集雅成員對於此本進行了復校的校語。

這引發我進一步聯想到美國克利夫蘭美術館收藏的《九日行葉文狀語圖》卷。該圖描繪了馬氏兄弟在行樂會友雅集的情景。行樂在揚州天寧寺西園，由馬日琯、馬日璐兄弟出資購買。畫中馬氏兄弟及屬姚樹、閔玉井、王梅洲，陸鍾輝等人肖像神態各異。而雅集的時間在乾隆八年九月，就是夏曆九月九日。繪圖的時間據《維揚馬氏家藏題記》，及畫雅集之後「既達行」，也就是十月初九日，陸鍾輝序落《白石道人歌曲》在同年十月既望，也就是十月十六日。則陸氏重刻《白石道人歌曲》與此圖繪成只是差不夠一週的時間，正可以看作是重刻《白石道人歌曲》時韓江雅集的「合諧」，維揚馬的這篇《圖記》涵蓋了韓江雅集的主要成員，寫得也很生動傳神，鈪出來和大家一道欣賞。

乾隆癸酉九日，風流既既，詩酒清美，遊約同人，成集於斯。中懸佇英白描陶鈺韓清，採黃花，白鵲為供，乃以「人世難逢開口笑，菊花須著滿頭傾」分韻賦詩。6 既遼月，吳中士友葉君嘉興來，歡飲小篤，令為一卷，方君環山補題，命曰《九日行葉文狀語圖》。裝裱成，將書所作於後，為屬�鲖為記。按圖中共坐四絕句二十二，白其圖畫，爾為陸君再為陸君忙；左抱絃者，為天門唐南軒先生建中也。坐中堂者二人，右均患者，手抱環山小篤；左帶者曰，江都閔玉井珍也。一人坐張鯤 (?, ), 齊山謝山祖望也。一人坐石坐，若凝想者，遼陽張漁川四科也。樹下兩人，諸立塗者，維揚屬黿，光州、彥陽、桐鄉人，樹下有古木，諸家塗者，維揚屬鷸，光州、桐鄉人。此中六七位皆名載地方志書，其中十数位同輩有傳。從任何角度講，這個由揚州詞人和他們的揚州贊助人主導的雅集，都足以睥睨當時的江南文壇。其中在畫本上留有話語的鶚鶚，閔春、王藻都不是雅集；揚州二馬、張四科、陸鍾輝雖然是鶚鶚，但生意都沒有到「總經」的地步，速速談不上甚麼「揚州總經」。推動《白石道人歌曲》繪本問世的靈魂人物，應該還是主盟揚州詞壇的鶚鶚。謝章錫《繪棋山莊詞話》說的很妥當：「維揚、乾隆間，詞學奉鶚鶚為首領，家白石而戶梅花矣。」而之所以陸鍾輝序言《白石道人歌曲》，很可能是由於他擁有過一部書作作坊「水雲書局」，刊刻的書目，無論是自譯的《放鴨亭小稿》、自輯的《南宗篇賢詩選》，還是陸龜蒙的《笠囊叢書》、姜白石的《詩詞合集》都很精美。連收清代刻本至為嚴格的《中國版刻圖錄》也收入了他刻的幾部書。

我們看到無相本的校語，就明白張文懿對《白石道人歌曲》陸鍾輝刻本的揣摩站不著本，零刻絕不是哪個「鹽鐵子」附庸風雅的產物，而是鶚鶚主盟的揚州詞壇張揚的韓江雅集寄興吟吟，聯絡常識之外的用心之作。所以知不足齋曾在傅以張刻為底本，對校陸刻、陳刻、鶚鶚和維揚馬氏底本之
後，決定交付景刊的是陸初刻而非張初刻。

至於最後問世的《白石道人歌曲》朱孝藏刻本，底本乃清乾隆二年（1737）江炳炎抄本。朱氏校記云：「江氏手自寫校，未付剞劂，玄考之嫌，自較二刻為憂。」夏承焘氏書信服此說，所作《姜白石詞編年箋校》云：「姜詞刊本以朱氏《畬村客書》出於江炳炎手抄本者為最上，蓋據以為主。」今夏訪訪書范氏冷琉璃室，得見民國二年（1913）沈耦齋等刻書室刻江炳炎抄本，有詞一百一十九闋，校足本更多出十闋，為混入朱彝尊番五十八闋本中之屑作，甚至江炳炎同時文人所加之作。足徵江抄本為颱抄本與朱初本之合輯本。朱刻將江抄所差出之十闋概行刊列，於校記內著一詞，適足掩蓋江抄之長矣。

饒宗頤先生在《白石鴻譜新詮·後記》中結語一百年校勘家整理《白石道人歌曲》的業績時說：

「長詩歌詞樂之流，……自張文虎、鄭大鶴至於夏君，而臻其極致。惜《白石詞集》迄無古本可資尋勘，各家傳抄，時有舛讹，若胡齊雲氏以己意改字，尤足詬病；而鄭長之稿，於語言校之明，為例雖嚴，而事不盡爾，譬如《詞律》以上下平仄不著，未見其義可據也。」

饒公指出的「校勘校」「迄無古本可資尋勘」，或「以己意改字」，正是清末迄今研究《白石道人歌曲》的一大障礙。今校本的發現，向今人提供了最接近原著古本面貌的版本，必將宋詞音樂的校勘、考證和校勘引入新的境界。今即取無相本白石歌詞一百〇九闋為底本，以紫芝、吳訥、柯紹、高鈞、王鈞、江鈞、蘇續、蘇庠、黃鈞等較本十種及花潤、毛刻、《詞綜》、吳刻、陳刻、陸刻、張刻、毛刻、許刻、沈本、朱刻等各本十一種互相參校，詳加考訂，校人鄭長、鄭柱、王震、吳廷孝、陳澧、許增、鄭文焯、朱孝藏、曹元忠、吳梅、任中敏、施鷑、汪世清諸家校語，並考證柯紹、江鈞、吳刻、陳刻、蘇續等本內朱彝尊譯作作十一闋出處，寫成《白石道人歌曲新校證本》初稿八卷。校詞之業，見聞所及，永無止境。必賴學者，踵事增華。淺學如我，非敢致法前修諸子折衷辨正，蓋惟理到本原，兼載異文，以備方家摘簡，此則《新校證本》之所為作也。二〇一二年九月廿一日楊元政謹識於香港大學。

二十年來，予歷校各本，以無相本及鮑延博校語所據「維揚馬氏底本」為最近陶淵本範。而江炳炎抄本，孝藏考後無人書寫，幸賴沈耦齋抄本，乃得一線之傳。今無相本、鮑延博校張刻本、江炳炎抄江鈞本詳細校存，如魯殿靈光，景星寥落，胡可不謂之為幸？兹得藏家慨允，以此三本附於校稿之後，並印以傳。校稿付排後，得內子薦校一過，凡字謬誤，在此一並申謝。元政補記，時二〇一九年春杪。

8. 夏承焘《姜白石詞編年箋校》（上海：上海古籍出版社，1998年），第2頁。
9. 饒宗頤《白石道人歌曲新詮》，載饒宗頤、趙望云、趙志伊等編《詞話叢編》（香港：全記書局，1958年），第67頁。
白石詞版本叢錄

寫本之部（十一種）

無相本
《白石道人歌曲》六卷《詞話別集》一卷，舊抄本，半葉十行，行二十一字，黑口。載白石詞一百九闋，有旁譜，錄有方鴻、關華、王藻等人校語。【淡竹柳】、【長亭怨】、【角描】、【雲裳中序第一】各闋過片之處，尚未經清人修定，最近陶鈞輯本，本篇用作底本。原存施凝與無相庵，有施氏校語二則，范景中、楊榮和跋。楓江書屋藏。

紫芝本
《白石詞話》一卷，明紫芝漫抄《宋元名家詞》本。按：此《宋元名家詞》殘抄十四冊，收詞七十家，其中姜夔《白石詞話》與陸游《渭南詞》合裝一冊，目錄下題「螺川陳湘龍少章撰」。抄本半葉九行，行十五字，墨格，白口左右雙邊，版心下錄「紫芝漫抄」四字。載白石詞集二十二闋，無旁譜。夏承焘一九三八年得劉師寵錄校本，乃據《陳元龍白石詞話》一卷，力辨其書乃「元明人僞作」，且謂「陶鈞既出，此即真出少章手，亦無足貴」云云。按：此本是明刻善本，有毛扆、陸鈺等校，唐晏跋。孫漁、毛扆、黃丕烈、陳寶善、劉焯年、李盛鐈校藏，流傳有序。觀其內容，皆錄自錢希武刻《白石道人歌曲》卷三至六，而絕無采自《詞話別集》者。商次第，是本將白石詞名著之《暗香》、《疏影》兩闋自錢刻《詞話》卷五移至卷四，刪落卷三
【浣溪沙】六闋之中四闋，其餘各闋則採從錢刻，並無任何刪削移位。陶鈞至乾隆初年方入編，紫芝本則為明人所錄，其出處非陶鈞可考。但兩本次序相符合，紫芝本「微」字且避宋諱敬錄本，其必出自錢刻可無疑義。然紫芝本所錄並無《別集》，殆《白石道人歌曲》錢刻刻印本缺？而所缺《浣溪沙》四闋，通為此初印本則去之，並非抄手有意節略，亦極可能。要之，紫芝本與陶鈞同出白石手定之錢刻，陶鈞自錢刻後印本，紫芝本出自錢刻初印本。雖經元明人點竈，校勘價值仍較清人各本為高。夏氏以其未必出自陳元龍手訂，而捐棄不校，亦失之寡僕也。北京大學圖書館藏。

吳刻
《唐宋名賢百家詞》，吳訥輯，明藍格抄本。半葉十行，行十七字，黑口四周雙邊。載白石詞三十二闋，不出《花庵詞選》範圍，且品訂極多。紹興圖書館藏。

柯鈞
《白石道人詩集》一卷《白石先生詞集》一卷《續書譜》《詩話》等一卷，朱彝尊輯，清康熙二十四年（1685）嘉善柯崇槐校抄本。半葉十行，行二十一字，無格。封面題「姜白石全集」，原有柯崇槐子書小序，稱「其長短句則竹垞自虞山毛氏所刻宋詞《樂章集》，更旁采諸書，合得五十八首為一卷。」 錦按：是本為李盛鐈舊藏，卷中間有硃墨批校文字。檢李氏《木犀軒藏書書錄》，稱
此本為「志名氏」，而同書《江湖小集》本《白石道人詩集》條下則經稱「余
別有柯謨一校本」。今檢校中柯詳異已為木齋抽出，付工編入《紹代名士簡
墨》，而以另紙照異異抄訂柯序批評書，裝於冊首。是本載詞五十八闋，內
十一闋非白石所作。北京大學圖書館藏。

属鈔
《白石道人歌曲》六卷《詞歌別集》一卷，維揚馬氏小玲珑山館轉抄清乾隆二
年（1737）屬鈔鈔本。半葉九行，行二十字，白口。有袁克文、羅振常跋，均
定為樊榭手寫。夏承焘《記屬鈔屬手寫白石道人歌曲》云：「予意屬鈔得見樣
鈔題名時，或曾自鈔一本。當時屬鈔方主馬家，馬氏屬人過録其本，遂並錄
其跋語。袁、羅二氏乃因此遂謬為屬鈔手鈔。」載白石詞一百〇九闋，旁注音
譜剝去未錄。浙江大學圖書館藏。

王鈔
《白石道人歌曲》六卷《詞歌別集》一卷，仁和王曾祥轉抄清乾隆二年
（1737）屬鈔鈔本。半葉十行，行二十一字，無格。有魏際生、秦更年、傅增
湘題記。載白石詞一百〇九闋，無旁語，內容全同屬鈔，足徵兩本同出一源。
北京圖書館藏。《宋集珍本叢刊》景印。

江鈔
《白石道人歌曲》六卷《詞歌別集》一卷，民國二年（1913）沈韜齋氏感題樓
景華清乾隆二年（1737）江炳炎鈔本。半葉十二行，行十八字，無格。載白石
詞一百一十九闋，較足本更多出十闋。鈔按：此十闋多為混入五十八闋本中之
讚作，甚至江炳炎時文人酬唱之作。足徵江鈔實為一百〇九闋本與五十八闋
本之合編本。是本經曾大鐵、吳建錫遞藏，周書田校，沈韜齋、周書田跋，今
歸范氏淨琉璃室。

虬鏡本
《白石公詩詞合集》清乾隆九年（1744）姜虬鏡鈔本四冊。第三、四兩冊為白
石詞集，不分卷。半葉九行，行二十字，無格，黑口單魚尾。抄填詞五十四
闋，自製詞二十闋。與陶鈔相較，多出『月上海棠』一闋，『越女鏡心』兩
闋，『阮郎歸』等十三闋。至於『鏡歌』、『越九歌』、琴曲『古怨』等則
置諸第一冊詩歌卷首。其中『鏡歌』十二首，與陶鈔相較，少『帝臨郷』、
『維四葉』兩首。合計詩歌九十七闋，采自陶鈔本者九十四闋，采自竹垞輯
本者三闋。其中『 DATE』、『古怨』、『醉吟商』三首且附録旁語示意。鈔
按：『合集』第四冊末附各本序跋，有曾時鏜《白石道人詩詞合刻序》、洪陔
華《白石道人詩詞合刻序》、陸鍾輝《白石道人詩詞合刻序》，其為虬鏡鏡
據陸鍾輝鈔本及朱彝尊輯本合編，殆無疑義。惜虬鏡乃廣達洪武十年（1377）
姜福四、萬曆二十一（1593）姜福兩跋，僞託為白石暮年手定藏諸姜忠肅祠
堂者。夏承焘《姜白石晚年手定集》一文辨之甚詳。上海圖書館藏。

庫本
《白石道人歌曲》四卷《詞歌別集》一卷，清乾隆四十六年（1781）四庫館校
校文編閲《四庫全書》鈔本。半葉八行，行二十一字，朱格，白口四周雙邊。
《四庫全書總目》謂鈔自「監察御史許善箋藏本」，而雲間許氏藏本乃「從
宋麗翻刻，重為完善。」鈔按：庫本所據實為陸刻，以其字體點畫有顧宋體，
四庫館臣乃誤認『從宋麗翻刻』，並因之諸而妄事更改，最不足據。載白石詞
一百〇九闋，有旁語。臺灣商務印書館景印。

項鈔
《白石道人歌曲》三卷《词曲别集》一卷，清钞本。半叶十一行，行二十五字，无格。白口四周双边。此本卷首《白石道人歌曲》目录依次依陶砂，分为六卷。内容则依陶砂卷一、二内《韵歌》、琴曲、《越九歌》不录，卷三至卷六《词曲别集》内之词调，不钞旁谱。然略次第《别集》一卷与陶砂同，其余各则按今、慢、自度曲分成三卷，每卷内又依创作年代为排列先后。是卷自一收小令三十三卷，卷二收慢词二十卷，卷三分自度曲十三卷，《别集》收词十八卷，合共八十四卷。部松年、薛凤藻，翁斌张逊藏。书后副叶有薛凤藻题跋三则，先以是本目录末叶左下牌有「项伯子作」、「项易庵」朱文小印二方，断为「项易庵取旧名钞，」「盖易安手录」。後细玩之，乃自不疑，转谓：「卷目後有项易庵自记，故疑为手钞，以其字迹甚似耳。至卷後有「陪它人抄录」故多误字。」今人汪世清氏因钞本尝对校《词综》，而易庵诗於清顺治十五年，当不及见此《词综》问世，懷疑此本是否项氏手钞。汪按：今观陶砂末卷批有薛凤藻题记云「上海葛氏宜缘轩旧藏本」，收藏印鉴尚有「石斋」、「刘塘之印」二者，钤盖位置、印面大小亦不合法度，殆亦成问书估僣造诸印，冒充项氏、刘氏旧藏明钞宋人词集，售售上海部松年者。陈致《书端源记》曰：「松年尠於書，凡宋人词集有未刻或刻而板坏者，不惜重资以翻制钞架」，著可謂其好事矣。後翁斌张逊，翁斌张逊心存项孙，必遍版本，仅於書前副叶题赵与炤《侯书堂诗话》一者，於此不赞一词，殆已有所察觉耶？然本虽非明钞，时是乾嘉间词人据陶砂传本重为编年之本，足资考镜，故本编亦取与道校一过。汪世清《白石道人歌曲校勘表》内已标作「项钞」，本编姑依之。北京图书馆藏。

江西
《白石道人词集》三卷《白石道人词别集》一卷，民国壬戌（1922）丙寅（1926）間汪景玉钞《靜寄過南阳书家》本。半叶十行，行二十五字，无格。白石词十八卷，无旁谱。有陈三立、夏敬观、马寿题记，金曾鍾镌刻。《静寄過南阳词集》，许玉成、陆頬羌、吴湖帆藏。汪氏所作《目次》，自注有「江研南传录陶南村钞本」。汪按：汪景玉钞本，實據清光緒七年（1881）王鶚敦四印齋所刻《白石詞》。四印齋则本随乾隆八年（1743）陸錫棻刻本，宜与汪氏所纪不同。《目次》所谓「江研南传录陶南村钞本」，殆出於汪氏误记。上海图书馆藏。

剞本之部（十一种）

花庵
《中兴以来绝妙词选》十卷，黄昇辑，宋淳祐九年（1249）刘子畏刻。半叶十三行，行二十五字，白口左右双边。白石词三十四闋。北京图书馆藏。

毛刻
《宋六十名家词》九十一卷，毛晋刻，明崇祯虞山毛氏汲古阁刊。半叶八行，行十八字，白口左右双边。白石词三十四闋。上海古籍出版社藏。

词综
《词综》三十六卷，清康熙十七年（1678）朱彝尊辑，康熙三十年（1691）袁枚校刊。半叶十行，行二十一字，黑口左右双边。白石词二十三闋。中華書局版。

吴刻
《白石僧行》卷一《词钞》卷一，吳徵浒刊，清康熙武当俞兰刻。半叶十行，行二十一字，黑口左右双边。是本载词五十八闋，内十一闋非白石所作。上海
圖書館存張元濟舊藏是刻卷末有張宗憲所注康熙丁未（1707）朱彝尊集《書白石樂府後》、《白石詞補》，揞譜五十八閲本所著。

陳刻
《白石詩鈔卷》一卷《詞鈔卷》一卷《諸家評論》一卷，陳撰輯，清康熙五十七年（1718）曾時燜刻，半葉十行，行十九字，黑口左右雙邊。載白石詞五十八閲，《四庫全書存目書目》著錄。

陸刻
《白石道人歌曲》四卷《詞鈔別集》一卷，清乾隆八年（1743）江都陸鍾輝水雲樓屋刻。半葉十一行，行十九字，白口左右雙邊。載白石詞一百○九閲，有旁譜。刻成版片旋歸江春，故又有江氏隨月讀書樓印本。《四部叢刊》著錄。

張刻
《白石道人歌曲》六卷《詞鈔別集》一卷，張奕樞、周耕餘、江棟、厲鶚、陸培。黃之秀校，清乾隆十四年（1749）華亭姚培謙松桂書堂刻。半葉十一行，行十九字，黑口左右雙邊。載白石詞一百○九閲，有旁譜。版片後入華亭南塘張氏時春三味樓，故又有張應時印本。徐無聞景印跋延博手校張奕樞本。

王刻
《白石道人詞鈔》卷三《白石道人詞鈔別集》一卷，清光緒七年（1881）臨桂王鶴蓮四印齋刻《雙白詞》本。半葉十行，行二十字，黑口左右雙邊。載白石詞八十四闋，無旁譜。王氏自跋印本云：「陸氏以陶南村刻本付梓，獨稱完善，即為初堂本所從出。末declare，合刻《雙白詞集》，此即宜用陸本，而去其所《續歌》、琴曲，以志刻詞，因非與陸異也。」上海古籍出版社景印。

許刻
《白石道人歌曲》四卷《詞鈔別集》一卷，清光緒十年（1884）仁和許增刻《續園詞鈔》本。半葉十二行，行二十三字，黑口左右雙邊。載白石詞一百○九闋，有旁譜。其刻本《續言》云：「《白石道人歌曲》學勘精審，當推陸本為褎。兹據陸本重刊，閱有與別本互異者，附刊本字之下，以墨圍隔之。」

沈本
清宣統二年（1909）沈曾植以石印法縮小景印張奕樞等校乾隆十四年（1749）姚培謙刻《白石道人歌曲》初印本於安慶。夏承熹《姜白石詞編年箋校》所據張本，實即此本，汪世清撰文已詳辨之。

朱刻
《白石道人歌曲》六卷《詞鈔別集》一卷，民國二年（1913）歸安朱祖謀刻《彥村叢書》本。半葉十一行，行二十一字，黑口左右雙邊。上彥村人朱祖謀得清乾隆二年（1737）江ᖀ炎鈔本，乃與乾隆八年（1743）陸鍾輝刻本、乾隆十四年（1749）張奕樞刻本等詳加對校，撰寫校記，並自跋印本謂：「江氏手自校校，未付剞劂，袁氏之嫌，自絶二刻為臾。」夏承熹氏信服此說，所作《姜白石詞編年箋校》題記云：「彥詞刊本以朱氏《彥村叢書》出於江約炎手鈔本者為最上，兹據以为主。」書刻本謹錄白石詞一百○九闋，江鈔本所差出之十闋則概行刊錄，於自校校記內不著一詞，適足掩蓋江鈔乃合編自一百○九闋本與五十八闋本之異相矣。
白石道人歌曲卷之一

聖宋銅鼓吹曲十四首

慶元五年，青龍在己亥，番易民姜夔頴首上尚書，臣聞銅鼓者，漢樂也。殿前謂之鼓吹，軍中謂之騎吹。其曲有《朱駕》等二十二篇，由漢誦隋，承用不替，雖名數不同，而樂紀同傳，各以詠歌祖宗功德。唐亡銅鼓，有柳宗元作十二篇，亦兼彈歷。神宗受命，帝績克烈，光耀震動，而樂典未備。通政和七年，臣工以請，上詔製樂。臣更否擇，聲文同傳。中興之腐，顛覆之末，不義于樂，污穢不昭。臣今製曲辭十四首，味死以獻。臣於前緒銅鼓者，或聲威武，幼人之軍，屬人之國，以得土謫，乃矜厥典。惟我太祖，太宗，真、仁、高宗，或取或守，同臣仁術，討者弗執，執者弗殺，仁義義安，歷數純美，故臣斯文，特備倫德，其所舒和，與前作異。臣又惟宋周唐，古樂遺頌，鼓吹所錄，惟存三篇，譜文並著，因事制辭，曰《銅鼓引》，《十二時》，《六州歌頭》，皆用羽調，音節悲促。而登封岱宗，故祀天地，見廟、耕語，帝后冊寶，發引、舞榭、五禮殊醉，樂不異曲，義理未完。乞詔有司取臣之詩，協其清潤，被之脣管，俾聲暢遠，感眾人心，永念宋德，僉有紀極，海內稱幸。臣夔頴首上尚書。

銅鼓

[鍾鼓銅吹曲十四首] 曾元忠曰：按《史記》樂志：“姜夔進《大樂誦》於朝。其議作銅鼓者，以歌祖宗功德。古者祖宗有功德，必有詩歌。《七月》之陳王事也，歌於朝中，周之儀鑑，謹謹是也。漢有絃箏箏歌之曲及二十二篇，今謂之詩吹。其曲曰《戰城南》、《聖明之類》之類也。德國之時，為之《疊官序》等曲有二篇，皆亦為之《征途》等曲有二十篇，唐柳宗元亦為之作銅鼓十二篇，宋高宗、太宗功德，今朝朝廷，太宗垂千古，仁宗一成而卻契丹；仁宗海涵春育，德而虔；高宗再造大功，上倔祖宗，顧諟文之臣，追述功德之盛，作此曲詩，使知樂者協以音律，領之太常，以揚於天下。”是白石先有此議，至慶元五年始自撰銅鼓曲耳。

[政和七年，臣工以請] 吳子曰：政和七年見事《宋史》樂志及《 Propel 傳。}

[臣今製曲辭十四首] 曾元忠曰：又按《樂志》：「姜先為作《聖銅鼓歌》，宋受命曰《上帝命》，倉上黨曰《河之書》，定緯訪曰《淮海圖》，顧湖南曰《藻之波》，得軍州曰《皇輼誌》，取蜀曰《蜀山》，取廣南曰《時露》。」下江南曰《望雲山》，越銅獻國曰《大哉》。其樂曲上曰《觀樂詞》，旨河東曰《伏功篇》。聞還尋曰《帝臨瀚》，安仁治曰《維四葉》，旋中興曰《義精繚》，凡十有四篇。於今尚書省。奏書，詔進古常，皆與《白石集》合。

[與前作異] 曾元忠曰：元陸子仁《雅政雜志》引周公誚云：「姜先為《銅鼓吹曲》乃步騶尹師師《皇嘉》、《越秋歌》，乃規模鮮于子辰《九誚》，然時成編，意味高貴，頗有越秋騶師之意。」按尹洙《皇嘉》：一《天尊》，二《西師》，三《魯武》，四《憲章》，五《大雅》，六《難事》，七《帝命》，八《帝制》，九《皇清》，十《太平》。鮮于子辰《九誚》：一《九韶》，二《舜韶》，三《周公》，四《孔子》，五《庸神》，六《清神》，七《商子》，八《徵子》，九《雙慶》，並見《樂志》。據為白石《銅鼓歌》、《越秋歌》之祖。更知《白石曲》亦如其詩，杜撰，無一字無來歷也。公謹此語，見《浩然齋詩話》。持書作「然指聞條綱，意詠流遁，似或適之。」

[鼓吹所錄，惟存三篇] 曾元忠曰：按《樂志》引《雨朝志》云：「自天聖以來，帝郊社，躬耕田，至太后恭謝宗廟，悉用正宮《導引》、《六州》、《十二時》，凡三曲。」
謂四曲者，合《導引》第二曲數之。如列宗所傳四首為《導引》《六州》《十二時》合為《導引》之類，詎有其曲，買之三篇，故自石謂《鼓吹所錄，惟存三篇》也。

校記

【聖宋銘歌】銘案：陸刻、庫本、詩刻小題前有「歌曲」二字。無相、厲鴻、王鈞、江鈞、虬鈞、朱鈎、張鈎無。

【鼓吹曲】銘案：無相本作「吹曲」，江鈞、朱鈎、張鈎同。厲鴻、王鈞、陸刻、庫本、虬鈞、詩刻作「鼓吹曲」，無相本目錄作「鼓吹曲」，今據目錄改。

鮑延博校張刻曰：「聖宋銘歌」下，抄本有「銘」字。

【十四首】銘案：庫本皆同，惟虬鈞本《白石集總目》首歌府、琴操，次五言古詩而從七言古詩，五言絕句、六言絕句、七言絕句、七言律詩，再從為詩餘，分填詞、自製曲，名記首數，故此處脫「十四首」三字。

【慶元五年】銘案：庫本皆同，惟虬鈞本改「慶元五年」，今據本改。其時所在有順治三年字上書尚書九字作「臣慶當」三字。

【己亥】銘案：無相本，厲鴻、王鈞、江鈞、朱鈎、陸刻、庫本，詩刻、張鈎皆作「己亥」。

鮑延博校張刻曰：「己亥」，抄本作「己未」，常以「己未」為是。

詩增曰：按慶元五年，太監在己未。

【慶元五年】銘案：慶元五年為己未。

【番禺銘】銘案：厲鴻、江鈞、張鈎同。陸刻作「番陽」，庫本、詩刻、王鈞、朱鈎同。

【神宗受命銘】銘案：江鈞、朱鈎、陸刻、庫本、詩刻、張鈎、虬鈎同。厲鴻、王鈞作「神宗」。鮑延博校張刻云：「厲鴻『神宗』，庫本喜鴻、王鈞相符。

【通政和七年】銘案：王鈞、江鈞、陸刻、庫本、詩刻、張鈎同。獨虬鈎、王鈎「通政和七年」作「通政和七年」。

【厲有題述銘】銘案：王鈞、庫本同。厲鴻作「厲有題》」，江鈞、朱鈎、陸鈞、詩刻、張鈎、虬鈎同。

【曲辭銘】銘案：陸鈞、庫本、虬鈎、詩刻、江鈞、朱鈎、王鈎同。厲鴻作「曲辭」。張鈎刻作「曲詞」。

【十四首】銘案：庫本皆同，惟虬鈎本作「十四首」。

【黃仁宗銘】銘案：陸鈞、庫本、詩刻、江鈞、朱鈎、張鈎、虬鈎同。厲鴻「黃仁」作「黃宗」，王鈈同。

鮑延博校張刻曰：「黃仁」，抄本作「黃宗」。庫本「宗」，庫本「仁」，當風陸鈞。銘案：虀校庫本與無相本相符，鮑廷博校虀本與厲鴻、王鈞相符。

【宰相銘】銘案：庫本皆同，惟虬鈎本作「宰相」同。

【歷數鵞水銘】銘案：江鈞同。厲鴻作「歷數鵞水」，王鈞、庫本同。陸鈎刻作「歷數鵞水」，張鈎、虬鈎同。詩刻作「歷數鵞水」、「鵞水」、「歷數鵞水」。

【特贈盛德銘】銘案：厲鴻、王鈞、江鈞、朱鈎、陸鈞、詩刻、張鈎、虬鈎同。庫本作「特贈盛德」。

【耕籍銘】銘案：厲鴻、江鈞、虬鈎同。庫本作「耕籍」。陸鈈刻作「耕籍」，張鈎、詩刻、朱鈎同。

【未完銘】銘案：庫本皆同，惟鮑廷博校張刻曰：「未完」，抄本作「未完」。

【臣兼輔上書尚書銘】銘案：庫本皆同，惟虬鈎本未有「臣兼輔上書尚書」七字。

【七言】

上帝命，太祖受命也。五季亂極，人心戴宋，太祖無心而得天下也。上帝命，惟皇之。作宋祚，五王不綱。陳橋之夕，帝服自黄。維帝念民，惟民念帝。八雖千春，不曰子聖。穆祖圣，龍路孔嘉。得之非心，遐亦云易。有弟聖賢，我昨當年。十世之後，乃復其天。

【備注】

【十事之後，乃復其天】鮑延博《紳賢堂餘筆》三卷：「高宗聖孝宗於宮中，為太祖七世孫。此云『十世』，疑誤。」

【備注】

【上帝命】銘案：虬鈎本「上帝命」三字作題另列，下仿此。

【維帝念民】銘案：張鈎、厲鴻、王鈞、江鈞同。陸鈞刻作「維帝念民」，庫本、詩刻、虬鈎、朱鈎同。
河之表，破澤州也。李筠不知天命，自是勇，不能降心，以至於叛而死也。

河之表，曰上黨。彼駑駑，踞奧壤。交兵百斤，不如一仁。振汗千里，莫能脱身。帝整其旅，喟曰汝武。心飛太行，赭落戰鼓。

【李筠】吴梅中曰：昭義軍節度使李筠在，建隆元年，命石守信討平之。（《宋史》卷四八四）

【校記】

破澤州：錦案：無相本作「被澤州」，本行欄上原校：「梅涓曰：『破』作『被』」。陸刻作「破澤州」。王紹：江紹：朱刻：庫本：虬線：計刻：張刻：同。今據王梅涓校改。

以至於：錦案：虬線本「於」字多作「于」，下仿此。

駑駑：錦案：「駑駑」，庫本皆同，惟虬線本作「駑駑」。

駑駑：錦案：虞紹：王紹：江紹：陸刻：庫本：虬線：計刻：張刻：同。獨朱刻作「駑駑」。

交兵：錦案：張刻：虞紹：王紹：江紹：陸刻：庫本：虬線：計刻：朱刻：同。

百斤：錦案：庫本皆同，惟虬線本作「百斤」。

如不一仁：錦案：庫本皆同，惟虬線本作「不敵于仁」。

振汗：錦案：庫本皆同，惟虬線本作「振汗」。

吳能：錦案：庫本皆同，惟虬線本作「吳克」。

太行：錦案：庫本皆同，惟虬線本作「神駒」。

戰鼓：錦案：庫本皆同，惟虬線本作「戰鼓」。

【校記】

淮海濱，定惟揚也。李重進自謂周大臣，不屈於太祖。作鎭券以安之，猶豫鎮叛。

淮海濱，老將矣。帝心危，信在券外。汝朝弗思，與越師爭。皇威壓之，燕墨自碎。維宋佐命，維周碩臣。汝獨狐疑，用鈎厥身。

【校記】

李重進：吳梅中曰：見《宋史·周三臣傳》。

【校記】

惟揚：錦案：虞紹：王紹同。無相本本行欄上天頭剪去一條，於欄下出校：「惟」改「維」。千里，則此「千里」或出後人偽託，亦未可知。考宋代揚州與有《寶祐惟揚志》、高宗《嘉靖惟揚志》等，今無寶祐舊名，以惟揚為稱，且謂「禹貢」淮海惟揚州，寶祐志本此。鲍廷博校張刻曰：「底本無「維」字，則無相本與維揚為氏底本確比底本為早，或非無據。陸刻作「惟揚」，庫本、虬線、張刻、計刻、江紹、朱刻：同。

汝獨：錦案：庫本皆同，惟虬線本作「四獨」。
[取湖南] 吴梅曰：周行逢卒，子保权嗣。张文表叛，保权乞援於宋。及宋师至，文表已为保权所杀，遂拒宋师。宋怒，平之。（《宋史》卷四八三）

校记

[取湖南也] 韪案：眾本皆同，惟此錄本下有注：「按湖南張文表」。
[校勘] 韪案：眾本皆同，惟此錄本作「校勘」。
[巴邱] 韪案：陸刻、詩刻、江刻同。庫本作「丘」，孔刻、張刻、朱刻同。
[火德] 韪案：無相本作「火德」，張刻同。無相本本行欄上原校：「樊榭云：『火德』當作『火德』，『鎮山』謂とのこと也。」延壽博士張刻云：「此本作『火德』，『鎮山』謂とのこと也。」又云：「『火德』，妙本作『火德』，陸刻『火』。」延壽引長本樊榭校語與無相本屬校全同。陸刻確作「火德」，庫刻、江刻、朱刻、孔刻、孔刻、庫本、許刻同。今據長樊榭校改。
[百祿] 韪案：眾本皆同，惟此錄本作「百聶」。

[5]

皇威暢，得荆州也。我師救湖南，道荆州，高繼沖懼，歸其土。

皇威暢，附庸勢。諸宮三月青草發，漢家旌旗繞城堞。小臣不敢煩天成，再拜敬以荆州歸。帝得荆州不為喜，百萬愁隨漢春水。

校注

[高繼沖懼] 吴梅曰：乾德元年，慕容延邈入荊南，高繼沖降。

校記

[青草] 韪案：厲刻、王刻、江刻、朱刻同。陸刻作「春草」，庫本、孔刻、許刻同。
[校勘] 陸刻作「青草」。延壽博士張刻云：「『青草』，陸刻「春草」。」陸刻作「春草」。末句「漢春水」，

[漢春水] 韪案：眾本皆同，惟此錄本作「漢春」，亦改「漢」。

[6]

葛山遠，取蜀也。孟昶恃其國險，且結河東以拒命，兵加國除。

葛山遠，蜀主詳。謂當萬年，不亦天意。帝曰「全斌，汝征自秦。」開門不守，吏啼白雲。帝曰「光詔，汝征自陝。」瞿唐及波，助我肆伐。蜀人號呼，乞生於師。蜀因素衣，天子憐之。

校注

[取蜀] 吴梅曰：見《宋史》卷四七九，王全斌、劉光義平蜀。

校記

[瞿唐] 韪案：眾本皆同，惟張刻、王刻作「瞿塘」。

[及波] 韪案：惟相本作「及波」。無相本原校：「樊榭云『及波』當作『及波』。」

[蜀因] 韪案：眾本皆同，惟此錄本作「蜀主」。

[7]

時雨雷，取廣南也。劉鋸淫虐，我師弒其民，俘鋸以歸。

時雨雷，早火絕。聖人出，虔政滅。五領之君，盲風恆雲。毒蛇螫螫，相其不仁。南兵象陳，自謂孔武。有獻在廟，僞臣僞主。降者榮之，叛者生之。將不若是，彼死爭之。十僞之交，一用此道。天佑烈祖，仁以易暴。

校注

[取廣南] 吴梅曰：開寶四年，潘美克廣州。

[南兵象陳] 吴梅曰：李繼渥以象陳指宋。潘美以勢勢射之。象反叛，遂大敗。

校記

[五領之君] 韪案：江刻同。眾刻作「五嶺之君」，王刻、朱刻、陸刻、庫本、孔刻、
許刻、張刻同。
[許]廷校校張刻曰：底本「領」。
[許]將不若之，彼死爭之] 錄案：眾本皆同，惟張刻本脫此八字。

[8]
望鏡山，下江南也。李煜吊臣乍叛，宗初乃令，而我師未嘗戮一人也。望鏡山，眺新戰。波瀾湯湯，雲霏霏。主歌臣詠歌未已，詔書屢傳不為起。
望鏡山，眺新戰。波瀾湯湯，雲霏霏。主歌臣詠歌未已，詔書屢傳不為起。

[9]
大哉仁，越幾何獻其國也。大哉仁，越幾何獻其國也。

[10]
謳歌歸，陳洪進以漳州來獻也。謳歌歸兮海一，強國滅兮弱國入。彼無諸兮計將安出，天不震兮民不茶。捧齒貢兮沉水輸，保室家兮長嫉妒。
[11]
伐功繼，克河東也。始太祖之伐河東，誓不殺一人。又哀劉氏之不祀，故緩取之，至太宗始得其地。
伐功繼，吁以時。烈祖有逆，太宗復之。河東難微，方命再世。河東難強，
卒奪其軍。惟漢之義，保於此部。烈祖念汝，乃貸未殺。一夫殘生，帝也不
取。而今既治，河東自舉。河東既平，九有以寧。喚呼太宗，繼伐有聲。

箋注
[克河東] 梁揚曰：興國四年正月，命潘炎討太原。二月，即征。五月，平之，劉繼
元降。

校記
[念汝] 梁揚曰：屬妙、王妙、江妙、朱刻、陸刻、虬緣、許刻、張刻同。獨庫本作「念
爾」。
[乃貸] 梁揚曰：眾本皆同，惟虬緣本作「貸乃」。
[帝也] 梁揚曰：眾本皆同，惟虬緣本作「命兹」。
[既治] 梁揚曰：眾本皆同，惟虬緣本作「既治」。

[12]
帝臨墉，親征契丹於澶淵也。
帝臨墉，六師厲。胡如雲，暗九州。帝曰「吁，胡微子」。準曰「帝，母
庸虛。」徧之謝，胡宅夏。嫖弗懲，薄哉野。我謀資，我武揚。帝在茲，胡
且亡。惟虞機，激流矢。一言仆，萬胡靡。勝不戰，惟唐虞。魏斯攘，
焚穹廬。帝曰「吁，棄之遇」。粔明年，使來賀。

箋注
[親征契丹於澶淵] 梁揚曰：事見《真宗紀》。
[一言仆，萬胡靡] 梁揚曰：《寇準傳》：契丹統軍按覽中或軍床子弩而死，乃立盟。

校記
[眾本] 梁揚曰：虬緣本無此首。
[胡如雲] 梁揚曰：屬妙、王妙、江妙、朱刻、陸刻、許刻、張刻同。獨庫本作「冠如
雲」。
[胡微子] 梁揚曰：屬妙、王妙、江妙、朱刻、陸刻、許刻、張刻同。獨庫本作「冠微
子」。
[胡宅夏] 梁揚曰：屬妙、王妙、江妙、朱刻、陸刻、許刻、張刻同。獨庫本作「彼宅
夏」。
[我謀資] 梁揚曰：屬妙、王妙、江妙、朱刻、陸刻、庫本、許刻、張刻後印本同。張
刻初印本獨作「藏」。

江世清曰：沈本獨作「藏」，誤，沈、張不異之。

[胡且亡] 梁揚曰：屬妙、王妙、江妙、朱刻、陸刻、許刻、張刻同。獨庫本作「冠且
亡」。
[一言仆] 梁揚曰：屬妙、王妙、江妙、朱刻、陸刻、許刻、張刻同。獨庫本作「一人
仆」。
[萬胡靡] 梁揚曰：屬妙、王妙、江妙、朱刻、陸刻、許刻、張刻同。獨庫本作「萬人
靡」。
[焚穹廬] 梁揚曰：屬妙、王妙、江妙、朱刻、陸刻、許刻、張刻同。獨庫本作「焚穹
廬」。

[吁] 梁揚曰：眾本皆同，惟許增曰：「祠堂本作『寢』。」

[13]
維四葉，美哉治也。
維四葉，聖遂大。萬生熙，德施流。吁嗟仁兮。帝垂衣，沿為。日月出，
照玉壇。吁嗟仁兮。帝乘格，六龍僉。神示下，鐸鐸鼓。吁嗟仁兮。周八
區，者以醉。稼如海，桑如雲。吁嗟仁兮。

箋注
[維四葉] 吳梅曰：此義測安，自太祖至仁廟正二代也。
[神示下]，蜂嘗鼓 吳梅曰：宣祖二年作明堂，定大樂。

校記
[版本] 蜂案：無錄本無此段。
[曁臨治] 蜂案：王紹、江紹、朱剣、陸剣、庫本、亨剣同。獨錄本作『吳政治』。
江世清曰：屬本抄作『政』，誤。
[滿優為] 蜂案：屬書、王紹、江紹、朱剣、陸剣、庫本、許剣同。獨張刻本作『滿優為』。
[帝乘格] 蜂案：江紹、朱剣、陸剣、庫本、許剣、張剣同。屬本作『帝乘格』，王紹同。
[六龍書] 蜂案：屬書、王紹、江紹、朱剣、陸剣、庫本、許剣同。獨張刻本作『六龍書』。
鮑延博校張刻曰：『底本』同。
[神示下] 蜂案：王紹、江紹、陸剣、庫本、許剣同。張刻本作『神示下』，朱剣同。
鮑延博校張刻曰：『示』，陸剣『示』。底本『示』。

【14】
炎精復，歌中興也。
炎精復，天馬度。人漢為，狄為衆。洛水深深，漢雲陰陰，維帝傷心。帝心激發，馬蹄血，天地動色。惟哀盡劉，駕使之軀，包將之矛。皇基再建，有綺有記，施于諸孫。天順帝仁，遇符夢靈，通臻太平。

筆注
[天馬度] 吳梅曰：此蓋高宗天馬事，見《南渡錄》。
[洛水深深，漢雲陰陰，維帝傷心] 蜂錄本此首後附案語：陶南村云：『洛水深深』，中之段。『漢雲陰陰』，二聖。『維帝傷心』，乃復仇大義。『惟哀盡劉』，善為高宗回護也。

鮑延博校張刻曰：『底本』同。

[人漢為] 蜂案：屬書、王紹、江紹、朱剣、陸剣、庫本、許剣同。獨庫本作『人心和』。
[狄為衆] 蜂案：屬書、王紹、江紹、朱剣、陸剣、庫本、許剣同。獨庫本作『冠蓋集』。
[馬蹄血] 蜂案：屬書、江紹、朱剣、陸剣、庫本、許剣同。獨庫本作『馬蹄』。庫本作『大軍是故』。

鮑延博校張刻曰：『馬蹄』，抄本作『減』。底本『減』。
[盡劉] 蜂案：庫本皆同，惟錄本作『遇劉』。
[夢靈] 蜂案：江紹同。陸刻作『夢靈』，屬書、王紹、朱剣、庫本、許剣、張剣同。

鮑延博校張刻曰：『夢』，底本『夢』，殊筆校改。

琴曲
[側商調]
琴七絃，散聲具宮商角徵羽者為正弄，慢角、清商、宮調、慢宮、黃鍾是也。加變宮、變徵為散聲者曰側弄，側楚、側商、側商是也。側商之調久亡。唐人詩云：『側商調裏唱伊州』。予以此語尋之：伊州大食調，黃鍾律法之商，乃以慢角轉弦，取變宮、變徵散聲。此調甚流美也。蓋側商乃黃鍾之正，側商乃黃鍾之側，它言側者同此。然非三代之聲，乃漢燕樂爾。予既得此調，因製品弦法並古怨。

調弦法
慢角調（慢四十一弦，取二弦十一騷應。慢六一騷，取四弦十騷應。）
大弦黃鍾宮 二弦黃鍾商
三弦黃鍾角 四弦黃鍾變徵側
五弦黃鍾羽 六弦黃鍾變宮側
七弦黄锺清商

[15]

古怨
日暮四山兮，烟雾暗前浦，将维舟兮无所。追我前兮不逮，怀后来兮何处。

世事兮何常，手翻覆兮云雨。遇金谷兮花谢委尘土，悲佳人兮薄命谁为主。

豈不有春兮，终自伤兮遽暮。髮將素。

欢有穷兮恨无数，弦欲绝兮声苦。满目江山兮泪沾襟。君不见年年汾水上兮，惟秋雁飞去。

校記
【琴曲】按：无相本琴曲在《圣宋稿歌鼓吹曲》後，琴曲透上，属妙、壬妓、朱刻同。

江妙、张刻琴曲在《圣宋稿歌鼓吹曲》後，但在下一页，並不相透。陆本琴曲在《越九歌》後，妙妓、庚本、许刻亦同。

鲍廷博校张刻曰：底本透上。

【七弦】按：属妙、江妙、九妓、张刻同。壬妓作「七弦」，朱刻、张刻、底本、许刻同。

【古怨】按：属妙、江妙、江妙、九妓、张刻、庚本、九妓、许刻同，独张刻作「古

怨云」。

鲍廷博校张刻曰：底本无「云」字，陆无「云」字。

许刻曰：初堂本有「云」字。

【又有穷】按：底本皆同，惟鲍廷博校张刻云：『『有』，抄本作『又』，非。』
自製曲

[88]
秋宵吟  越調
古氐空，壘月皎。坐久西窗人悄。落蕊香，漸漏水丁丁，箭壺催曉。引涼軒，動翠葆，露腳斜飛雪衣。因蟋鳴，似欲因情償，幕帆煙草。帶眼銷磨，為日久愁多臨老。衛娘何在，宋玉歸來，兩地暗織綇。搖落江楓早，嫩菊無心，幽夢又香。但盈盈、淚灑單衣。今夕何夕復來矣。

校記
自製曲] 錢案：腐紗，王紗，江紗，朱紗，張刻同。陸本卷四詞題前有「自製曲」三字，此處不分卷，未重標「自製曲」三字，庚本，許刻同。王刻卷三詞題前有「自製曲」三字，此處不分卷，未重標「自製曲」三字，江紗同。項紗目錄作「自製曲」，卷內卷六同卷五合寫，並標作「自製曲」。此緣不分卷，卷六同卷五各類並標作「自製曲」，次序亦有更易。花轂，吳謳，毛刻，《詞綜》、柯紗，吳刻，陳刻，紫芝無此。

鄭文焯校沈本曰：「自製曲」，與「自製曲」略別如此，陸刻以意遂合之。
【秋宵吟】 錢案：庚本皆同，惟張刻作「秋宵吟」。紫縉本增詞題，作「無題」二字。

總編校張刻曰：「宵」，陸本作「宵」。
鄭文焯校沈本曰：「宵」，陸本作「宵」，是。《目錄》正作「宵」。
【坐久】 錢案：庚本皆同，惟紫芝本作「久坐」，又加乙號。
【漏水】 錢案：腐紗，王紗，江紗，陸刻，庚本，張刻，王刻，許刻，朱紗，江紗同。
花轂作「漏水」，吳謳，毛刻，柯紗，吳刻，陳刻，項紗，紫芝，此縉本同。
鮑廷博校張刻曰：「水」，陳刻「水」。成本顧評注：「作「水」。」

施評存曰：「漏」，花華本誤作「漏水」，汲古閣本，《花蓮詞選》，花華本，洪陸華本同。
【幕帆煙草】 錢案：庚本皆同，惟紫紗，王紗作「暮煙衰草」。施評存氏《校異》自云
據宋淳佑本《花蓮詞選》，考宋刻《花蓮詞選》作「幕帆煙草」，絶無譌誤。「帆」誤作「衣」，其《四庫提要》著錄《花蓮詞選》之明柵本刻本也。

鮑廷博校張刻曰：「幕帆煙草」，抄本作「幕煙衰草」。

施評存曰：「幕帆煙草」，花華本「帆」誤作「衣」，汲古閣本已改正。
【單衣】 錢案：庚本皆同，惟陳刻作「單衣」，項紗作「衣單」。

鮑廷博校張刻曰：「衣」，庚本作「衣」，成本顧評注：「作『衣』。」
謂增曰：舊抄本作「衰」。

[89]

淒淒犯

合肥巷陌皆種柳，秋風夕起騷然。予客居閲，時聞馬嘶，出城四顧，則荒煙野草，不勝淒黯，乃著此解。琴有淒淒調，假以為名。凡曲言犯者，謂以宮犯商、商犯宮之類，如道調宮上字住，雙調亦上字住，所佔字同，故道調曲中犯雙調，或於雙調曲中犯道調，其他準此。唐人樂書云：「犯有正、旁、偏、側。」宮犯宮為正，宮犯商為旁，宮犯角為偏，宮犯羽為側。」此說非也。十二宮所住字各不同，不容相犯。十二宮特可犯商、角、羽耳。予歸行都，以此曲示國工田正德，使以嘔蜚角吹之，其韻極妙。亦曰瑞鶴仙影。

綠楊巷陌秋風起，邊城一片離索。馬嘶漸遠，人歸甚處，戍樓吹角。情懷正惡，更衰草寒煙浩渺。似當時、將軍部曲，遠還塞沙漠。追念古來上，小放歌歎，晝晚行樂。故遊所在，想如今、翠篠紅落。漫步羊裙，等新雁來時繫著。怕匆匆，不肯寄與侯侯鶴。

箋注

[道調宮上字住，雙調亦上字住] 曹元忠曰：所謂道調、雙調皆用上字住者。
[所佔字同] 陳淳曰：「住字」，即沈存中所謂「殺聲」，蔡季通所謂「煞字」，張叔夏所謂「殺字」。宋人歌曲最重殺字，今日作者不知也。
[十二宮特可犯商、角、羽耳] 曹元忠曰：所謂十二宮可以犯商、角、羽者，律吕四犯有宮犯商，商犯羽，羽犯角，角歸本宮是也。
[予歸行都，以此曲示國工田正德] 曹元忠曰：按《武林舊事》乾淳教坊樂部壽寧日德壽宮有田正德，注云：「教坊大使。」又馬下樂有壽寧日正德，皆與自序合。所謂「嘔蜚角吹之」自序云：「謂家妓歌妓於孤山之西村，命國工吹篠」，未詳姓名，不能知是箋色中何人耳。
[胡梅曰：田正德，見《武林舊事》]。
[使以嘔蜚角吹之] 鄺文煒校沈本曰：陸本無「角」字，故箋注本邕註樂圖，其製法角音九孔而五音咸備。此注言「嘔蜚角吹」，蓋以其製類角，蓋似笳，當時因以此名之。
[曹元忠曰：《詞譜》音譜題云：「惟怪曲引，近，名曰小唱，須道聲字清調，以嘔蜚角合之，其音甚正」是也。據是知「淒淒犯」乃當時小唱也。
[黃梅曰：嘔蜚角今之調管。此淒譜多用此。]

[似當時、將軍部曲，遠還塞沙漠] 鄺文煒校沈本曰：紹興庚辰，全人歐盟，犯塞州，王權敗績。太師陳東別請下詔親征，以蔡義同督淮南軍，虞允元參謀軍事，尋敗敵於采石。詞中所謂「似當時、將軍部曲，遠還塞沙漠」，蓋謂其時時事也。

校記

[詞牌] 曹元忠曰：按此詞汲古閣本注云：「仙宮調犯商調」，又誤列入《夢窗乙稿》作「淒淒調」。按「調」字未詳。《詞源》有「淒淒犯」《賦重台水仙》，注云：「又名【瑞鶴仙影】」，與白石自序同，則「調」字為後人之誤。
[宮調] 張炎：無相本原無注，乃校者後補「仙宮調犯商調」。花庵詞牌下注「仙宮調犯商調」，吳詠、毛詞、柯紓、吳劍、陳劍、紫芝、陸劍、周本、王劍、許劍、汪紓同。厲紓、王紓、項紓、江紓、張紓、朱劍無此注。則本編注「韋」字，作「仙宮調犯商調」。任詠校沈本於詞牌下添注：「仙宮調犯商調」。
[詞題] 則此本詞題作「合肥紹秋」，吳詠、毛詞、柯紓、吳劍、陳劍本同。《詞綜》本無詞題。

按曹元忠云：「花庵本詞題作「合肥紹秋」，吳詠、毛詞、柯紓、吳劍、陳劍本同。《詞綜》本無詞題。」

[淒淒調] 則此本作「合肥紹秋」，吳詠、毛詞、柯紓、吳劍、陳劍本同。《詞綜》本無詞題。
[犯羽为侧] 锺案：罪本皆同，惟陸刻、庫本、王刻、江鈔衍「宮」字，作「犯羽為側宮」，均據《詩經》補。

鲍廷博校张刻曰：「失」「宮」字，陸本有。庫本亦無「宮」字。

曹元忠曰：《詩經》律吕四犯宮引姜白石云：「凡曲犯者，謂以宮犯商、商犯宮之類。如通調宮上字，變調亦上字字，所住字同，故通調宮中犯變調，或變調中犯通調。」

（《白石詞》無此八字。）他準此。唐人樂書云：「犯有正、旁、偏、側。宮犯宮為正，宮犯商為旁，宮犯角為偏，宮犯羽為側宮。」此說非也。」

汪世清曰：陸本作一「宮」字，姜石本不著。

[所住字] 锺案：罪本皆同，惟紫芝本毛扆朱筆補一「之」字，作「所住之字」，有據《詩經》補。

曹元忠曰：《詩經》律吕四犯宮引姜白石云：「十二宮住字之（《白石詞》無此字。）字各不同，不容相犯，十三宮特可以犯商、角、羽耳。」皆白石（姜白石）序語。

[各不同] 锺案：罪本皆同，惟紫芝本原作「吞不回」，毛扆朱筆校改作「各不同」。

[田正德] 锺案：罪本皆同，惟紫芝本原作「田」原作「口」，毛扆朱筆校改作「田」。

[喔嚨奏角] 锺案：尾鈔、王鈔、江鈔、陳刻、朱刻同。陸刻作「喔嚨奏」，無「角」字，毛扆、項鈔、庫本、王刻、許刻、汪鈔同。紫芝本原作「喔嘨奏」，毛扆校改「成」為「奏」。

鲍廷博校張刻曰：「陸本無「角」字，庫本有「角」字。」

施塾存曰：「使以吱嚨奏吹之」諸本同，惟江刊南本、朱刻本及子所鈔本作「使以吱嘨奏吹之」。

[瑞鶴仙影] 锺案：罪本皆同，惟紫芝本謹作「睡鶴仙影」。

[秋風起] 锺案：紫芝、陳刻、姚鈔、王鈔、江鈔、陸刻、庫本、張刻、王刻、許刻、朱刻、汪鈔同。花庵作「西風起」，吳訥、毛刻、《詞綜》、柯鈔、吳刻、項鈔、毛扆同。

施塾存曰：「秋風起」，花庵本作「西風起」，汲古閣本同。

[小軒] 锺案：罪本皆同，惟紫芝本、陳刻作「小軒」。

鲍廷博校張刻曰：「軒」，陳刻作「軒」，庫本「軒」。

[漫寫] 锺案：紫芝、姚鈔、王鈔、江鈔、陸刻、毛扆、張刻、庫本、王刻、許刻、朱刻、汪鈔同。花庵作「謹寫」，吳訥、毛刻、《詞綜》、柯鈔、吳刻、陳刻、項鈔同。

施塾存曰：「漫寫」，花庵本「漫」作「謹」，汲古閣本、洪本同。

[繁 Bols] 锺案：罪本皆同，惟無本作「繁 Bols」，無本校語：「『繁 Bols』當作『繁 Bols』，今據改。」

[帖勿勿] 锺案：罪本皆同，惟紫芝本作「帖勿勿」，毛刻作「帖勿勿」。

[摸後約] 锺案：罪本皆同，惟紫芝本作「摸後約」，毛扆於「約後」加乙號。
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翠樓吟 雙調

淳熙丙午冬，武昌安陸樓成，與劉去非諸友落之，度曲見志。余去武昌十年，故人有泊舟鸛鶴洲者，聞小姬歌此詞。問之，頗能道其事。遺吳為予言之。慶懷昔昔，且傷今之離索也。

月冷龍沙，塵清虎落，今年漢陽初賀。新翻朝部曲，聳聽幕元或歌吹。層樓高峙，看諸曲繡紅，簾幕飛翠。人姝麗，粉香吹下，夜寒風細。

此地，宜有詞仙，

撫素雲黃鶴，與君遨遊。玉梯凝望久，歎芳草凄凄千里。天涯情味，仗酒祓清愁，花消妖氣。西山外，晚來煙捲，一簾秋霧。}

注释

【淳熙丙午冬，武昌安陸樓成，與劉去非諸友落之，度曲見志】曹元忠曰：按劉過《詞綜》有【唐多令】序：「安陸樓小集，侍帷歌板之姬黃其姓者，乞詞於龍洲道人，為賦此【唐多令】。」又閩人作「劉去非、石氏鷄、周嘉仲、陳孟參、孟容。時八月五日也。」

曹元忠曰：「過龍洲【唐多令】當作安陸樓落成時相去無幾，因各集亦劉去非諸人又詞云『二十年重遊此樓』、知安陸樓即南樓，故換頭云『黃鶴斷橋頭，故人今在否』。陸游《入蜀記》所謂『南樓，在儀門之前石山上，一日黃鶴山，制度闊偉，登望尤勝也。』

吳梅：「劉去非善考。」《詞綜》【唐多令】題中亦有此名。

校記

【宮調】鐘案：罪本皆同作「雙調」，惟《詞綜》、毛扆本脫此注，花庵作「雙調」，張
【詞題】錦瑟：花謝作「武昌安遠樓成」，吳訥、毛刻、《詞綜》、柯鈺、吳刻、陳刻同。
【劉去非】錦瑟：原本皆同，惟劉鈺作「去非」。
江世清曰：屬抄脫「劉」字。
【武昌】錦瑟：原本皆同，惟紫芝本誤作「武曲」。
【小姬】錦瑟：原本皆同，惟紫芝本誤作「小姬」。
【歌此詞】錦瑟：原本皆同，惟紫芝本作「歌此詞」。
【胡部曲】錦瑟：原本皆同，惟盧本誤作「小部曲」。
【欽曲】錦瑟：原本皆同，惟盧本誤作「欽」。
【詞仙】許增曰：《歷代詩餘》作「神」，《詞譜》同。
施替存曰：《詞仙》，《歷代詩餘》作「神仙」。
【凌雲】錦瑟：鈺鈺、王鈺、張刻同。花謝作「菱菱」，呉訥、毛刻、《詞綜》、柯鈺、吴刻、陳刻、江鈺、項鈺、陸鈺、虬鈺、賈本、王刻、許刻、朱刻、江鈺同。紫芝本作「菱菱」，毛庭依花改「凌」作「菱」。
【酒破清愁】施替存曰：《酒破清愁》，升庵《詞品》作「酒破清愁」。
【花謝菱菱】錦瑟：《詞綜》、陳刻、鈺鈺、王鈺、江鈺、項鈺、陸鈺、虬鈺、賈刻、張刻、江鈺同。柯鈺原作「花謝菱菱」，朱刻改「清」作「謝」，呉刻作「花謝菱菱」，賈本、許刻、朱刻同。花謝作「花謝菱菱」，呉訥、紫芝、毛鈺同。
【詞仙】許增曰：《歷代詩餘》作「神」。
施替存曰：《花謝菱菱》，花謝作「花謝」。
【湘月】[長溝楊聲伯] 張潮曰：長溝楊姓為一時盛族。有楊後、楊方、楊簡，皆師事朱文公，此聲伯特未能詳其名。
【詞題】【長溝楊聲伯】張潮曰：[念奴嬌]，大石調牌也。大石調與雙調中隔一高大石調，故云「隔調」。
【校記】[湘月] 錦瑟：花謝作「高指調」，小注「又名湘月」，柯鈺朱筆後又點去，是改作「湘月」。
【詞題】錦瑟：鈺鈺、王鈺、江鈺、朱刻、張刻、項鈺、紫芝同，共有二百三十八字。陸鈺同「即念奴嬌之高指調也」句中「之」字，共二百三十七字，賈本、王刻、許刻、江鈺、虬鈺同。花謝、呉刻、《詞綜》、柯鈺、吳刻、陳刻詞題皆有刪改。花謝無題，詞下注：「雙調，即念奴嬌之高指調也」。呉刻、《詞綜》同花謝，惟「雙」作「雙」。陳刻不注調名，詞題撰寫已有差謬，如「重午」誤作「甲午」、「趙景魯、趙景」誤為「趙景、趙曾」。作「甲午七月既望，與楊聲伯、趙景、趙曾，約和甫、楊甫、時は甫、楊甫，大舟渡湘」二十七字。柯鈺同陳刻，後又朱筆改「渡」為「浮」，詞題前小注「雙調」誤名，後又朱筆添注：「即念奴嬌之高指調也」。呉刻同柯鈺，亦作「大舟浮湘」，並改「趙景、趙曾」為「趙曾曾」，詞題前並刻調名：「雙調，即念奴嬌之高指調也。」
校記

[錦霞] 題畫：無相本、鵺紗、玉紗、江紗、陸劍、許劍、張劍、朱劍有朝希武院，紫芝、項紗、虬線、庫本、玉劍、汪紗無錦霞。

[壬戌] 題畫：無相、鵺紗、玉紗、江紗、陸劍、許劍、張劍、朱劍劍作「壬戌」。乾成與《白石道人歌詞序》云：「嘉泰壬戌，刻於雲間之東巖」，今據九疇改。

銅版銅板鍛劍，本亦無「壬戌」，今據織改銅版銅板，改嘉泰無「壬戌」也。

許劍增曰：按宋崇宗崇泰元年春日，至乙丑改元開禧，「壬戌」當作「壬戌」之誤。以嘉泰元「壬戌」也。

陳勉《有別齋詞序》曰：庚戌之秋，沈子培提學以書劍妾白石詞見遺，其後題「嘉泰壬戌」、「辰」當為「戌」。

鄭文焯校沈本曰：「辰」為「戌」之誤，陸本同。白石詩卷有塗錄之年，壬戌秋客雲間，《題華亭銀友形園》於言孫一書。壬戌，蓋即希武也。蓋亦書紗本有道人廿世孫風

錄書略云：「自嘉泰開刻於東巖，後公又刻之，錄本藏於家，五六百年，世無知者。」是此本刻於道人生前，又經其手重刻，是則能徵以寄託契後生者，蓋可貴已。按銅版銅板刻於道人垂靈之碧，今又不知幾年矣。」所云「己卯」、「庚辰」，屬

嘉定二十二、三年，至紹定二年「己丑」，又曆九年，道人猶在。據《年譜》所記，隆興

元年書尚幼，至是年蓋將七十已。其生平遷也不可略略而考見之。

吳梅校張劍曰：是「戌」字，寧宗崇泰二年也。

秦更年校王紗本曰：按宋崇宗崇泰元年春日，至乙丑改元開禧，「壬戌」當作「壬戌」之誤，後織銅版銅版尤足證也。

慶元會要

慶元三年丁巳四月，鰓州布衣姜康老上書論雅樂事，並進《大樂議》一卷、《琴瑟考古圖》一卷，詔付奉常。有司以其用工破精，留書以備採摘。

校記

[慶元會要] 題畫：無相、鵺紗、玉紗、江紗、項紗有此條。項紗《慶元會要》在《別集》趙善之後，「詔付」云「下今在起一行」，銅版銅板鍛張劍猶揚馬氏本插錄此條全文，並云本此條「在後半頁」，退與無相、江紗兩本同。而本此條字體又大於正文，無相本正寫十三字，江紗正寫十四字，當係陶瓷格式。又江紗上半題「大樂議」一「又」字，為無相、鵺紗、玉紗、項紗所無。陸劍、庫本、王劍、許劍、張劍、紫芝、虬線、朱劍、汪紗俱無此條。

[丁巳] 題畫：鵺紗、江紗、項紗同，惟王紗作「丁巳」，後於「畢」旁又書「巳」字。

[大樂議] 題畫：鵺紗、江紗、項紗同，惟王紗作「大樂議」。

[用工破精] 題畫：鵺紗、江紗、項紗同，惟王紗作「用心破精」。
白石歌詞別集

[92] 趙郎中誥告迎侍大夫人，將來都下，予喜為作此曲寄小重山令。

[93] 念奴嬌

[94] 卜算子
吏部梅花八詠，雙次韻。
江左梅花人，夢繞青云路。因向东风夜吹雪，心事更将寄。憶別庾郎時，又過林逋處。萬古西湖寂寞春，惆悵誰能賦。

【詠】
吴梅言：此和曾無遗三詩者，其《烟湖秋集》亦有和作可证。
【注】
【引】
【校記】

[8詠] 韵案：本本皆同，惟汪紹作「八詠」。

[95]
月上海雲沈，頓去吳波迥。行過西泠有一枝，竹暗人家靜。又見水沈亭，舉目悲風景。花下撫琴把一杯，緩飲春風影。
西泠橋在孤山之西，水沈亭在孤山之北，亭廢。

【注】
【校記】

【西泠橋在孤山之西】曾元忠曰：按《武林舊事·》孤山路下云：「西泠橋又名西林橋，又名西泠橋，又名西村。」故第六闋自注云：「西村在孤山後，梅皆阜陵時所種。」

[亭廢] 韵案：本本皆同，惟朱刻、於鈐本【卜算子·】按語引作「今廢」。

【詠】
薛幹折斜芳，玉蕊松低覆。日暮冥冥一見來，略比年時瘦。淒觀酒初醒，竹閣吟絃就。猶恨幽香作詩憐，小遲春心遠。淒觀在孤山之麗，南北梅最奇。竹閣在淒觀西，今廢。

【注】
【校記】

【涼觀】 曾元忠曰：按《武林舊事·》御園下有「涼觀」，孤山路下云：「孤山舊有栢堂、竹閣、四照閣、棲霞閣、林士盧，今皆不存。」
吴梅：「涼觀」，見《四祠閣見錄》：「孤山涼堂為西湖奇絕處。」

【竹閣】 吴梅：《臨安志》：「白公竹閣在廣化寺後。」

【詠】
【詞牌】 韵案：陸剱、庫本、王刻、許刻、汪紹於此闋前拖「又」字以代調名。又，【卜算子·】八言，虬線本「薛幹」，「家在」二首，題作「梅花」，所附按語云：「按《別集》載此闋有八闋，反覆未詳，其佳旨不出此，今亦不敢增補。然如『御園接湖波，松下春風細。雲錄篋畫玉芙蓉，別有仙風味。』（注：『聚景官梅，皆植之高松之下，花薰歲久，聚畫園。』）『綠萼更稀枝，多少梅花意。惆悵西村，頻過長人賞。』（注：『綠萼，橫枝皆梅別種，凡二十餘種。西郊在孤山後，梅皆阜陵時所種。』）『又見水沈亭，舉目悲風景。花下撫琴把一杯，緩飲春風影。』（注：『水沈亭在孤山之北，今廢。』）『路出古昌塢，錦被香夢故。折得青紅界賞花，詩句人間說。』（注：『趙之昌源古梅妙天下。』）數軼，可入梅花詩格也。又，有公於《題梅絶句》，注：『題里，題王之里，諸在山陰西南二十餘里，地產梅多妙天下。予得一枝，古意特甚，為作七言。』《舊圃姿姿探梅詩，詩軍遂鹿未歸》。」

【詠】 韵案：張刻、靳鈔同。虞鈔、王鈔、江鈔、陸剱、虬線、庫本、王刻、許刻、朱刻、汪紹作「薛幹」。

【校記】

【幹】【幹】 韻案：本本皆同，惟鮑廷校張刻同。「幹」，陸剱「幹」。
家在马城西，曾赋梅雪诗。梅雪相兼不入花，月影玲珑藏。
前度带愁看，一钩和愁折。若使道仙及见之，定自成愁绝。
马城在都城西北。梅屏甚见珍爱。

注释

【马城】曾元忠曰：按《咸淳临安志》山川门：「东西马城在余杭门外，土细宜花卉，
园人工于栽接，都城之花皆取焉。或云『马』当为『城』，盖钱王国城，故白石谓之『马
城』。」
吴梅曰：马城即马塍，在余杭门外。
【梅屏】吴梅曰：《北渡集》有《梅屏赋》。
【词牌】作：「陆词、陆帧、康本、王刻、许刻、江钞於此皆同标「又」字以代词名，
别本无之。
【马城西】作：「马城西」，康本皆同，惟陆帧标「又」字。
【曾赋】作：「曾赋」，康本皆同，惟许刻标「今赋」，是许刻认术而改江钞，且未出校。
【诗义】清曰：陆本独作「今」。
【一钩】作：「一钩」，康本同，惟许刻标「江钞」，未出校。
陆词、陆帧、康本、王刻、许刻、江钞标「又」字。
【吴廷栋校】校曰：「钩」，抄本作「钩」，成本「钩」。
郑文烨校沈本曰：「钩」，当从「日」旁，康本是。
郑文烨校陈本校曰：「钩」，或谓如「钩」，「一钩」之名异一字之谓。 「钩」、「钩」正俗字。
【诗义】清曰：陆本独作「钩」，误。
【一钩】作：「一钩」，江钞本、康本同，而未得旧钞标「一钩」。
【和愁折】作：「和愁折」，康本皆同，惟陆帧标「和愁折」，而善刻标「和愁折」，今即据。
【吴廷栋校】校曰：「钩」，成本「钩」。
【郑文烨校沈本曰：「钩」，校作「折」，康本是。
【别之】作：「别之」，康本皆同，惟陆帧标「别」字。
【定自】作：「定自」，康本皆同，惟陆帧标「定」字。
【马城】校曰：康本皆同，惟陆帧标「马城」。
【梅屏】校曰：康本皆同，惟陆帧标「其」字，作「其梅屏」。

98]
摘蕊照香飞，倚树疑冰落。下竺桥边送立时，香已漂流却。空逐晚烟平，
古寺春寒急。老子寿花第一番，常恐吴儿觉。
下竺寺前砌石上风景最妙。

注释

【下竺寺】曾元忠曰：按《武林旧事》上天竺寺有「下竺灵山教寺」。
吴梅曰：《临安志》：「下竺灵山教寺在钱塘县西。」
【词牌】作：「陆词、康本、王刻、许刻、江钞於此同标「又」字以代词名，别本无之。
【空远】作：「空远」，康本同，惟许刻标「空远」。
【下竺寺前砌石上风景最妙】作：「陆词、康本、王刻、江钞、朱刻、张刻、项钞同，陆刻、
康本、王刻、许刻、江钞标「甚妙」，作「甚妙」。朱刻独标注。
【吴廷栋校】校曰：「下竺寺」，陆刻标「甚」。
【诗义】清曰：陆本独作「甚」。

99]
绿萝更折枝，多少梅花种。惆怅西村一树春，开过无人赏。细草藉金舆，
岁岁寄花香。枝上鸟一两声，犹似宫中唱。
绿萝，折枝皆梅别种，凡二十许名。西郊在孤山后，梅皆草际时
所种。

注释
[小草籍全集，歲寒長吟者] 曹元忠曰：按杜甫《玉谿寄詩》云：「當時詩全，故物獨石馬。愛來未草草，浩歌泪盈把。」白石詩詩本此。
[阜陵] 吳梅曰：孝宗葬阜陵。
[校記]
【詞牌】騷家：陸賈、庫本、王刻、許刻、江鈔於此闕前樓「又」字以代詠名，別本無之。
【聞過】騷家：廖鈔、項鈔、陸賈、張刻、庫本、王刻、許刻、江鈔、毛繡本[卜算子]按語內引文同。江鈔作「聞過」，朱刻作「聞過」，王鈔作「聞過」，又改「聞過」。

[100]
象筆帶香題，龍笛吟春嘆。柳柳綽無暇愁，花管人別離，路出古昌源，石渡霜霖清。折得青纓碧蘇花，持向人間說。
越之昌源，古梅妙天下。

【校記】
【詞牌】騷家：陸賈、庫本、王刻、許刻、江鈔於此闕前樓「又」字以代詠名，別本無之。
【花管人別離】騷家：眾本皆同。
施遞曰：「花管人別離」，別本同目，然「花管」不辭，疑當作「不管」。
【折得】騷家：眾本皆同，惟張刻初印本、沈本作「折得」。
鄭文焯校沈本曰：「折」當作「折」，陸本是。
汪世清曰：沈、張本同作「折」，誤。

[101]
 Yazhou接湖波，松下春風細。雲綠蓴苔初萬枝，別有仙風味。長信昨來，憶共東皇醉。此樹娑婆一惘然，苔蘇生春意。

【校記】
【詞牌】騷家：陸賈、庫本、王刻、許刻、江鈔於此闕前樓「又」字以代詠名，別本無之。
【蓴苔】騷家：項鈔、張刻同。蓴苔、王鈔、江鈔、陸賈、庫本、王刻、許刻、朱刻、江鈔作「蓴苔」。
鲍廷博校張刻曰：「蓴苔」，陸賈「菜苔」。
鄭文焯校沈本曰：「菜」當作「菜」，陸本是。
【娑婆】騷家：陸賈、庫本同。蓴苔、王鈔、江鈔、項鈔、張刻、王刻、許刻、朱刻，江鈕皆作「娑婆」。
汪世清曰：陸本獨作「娑婆」，誤。葉文龍本作「婆娑」。
施遞存曰：「此樹婆娑」，陸本、鮑本、姜本「婆娑」均作「娑婆」，予所得舊鈔本亦作
洞仙歌

黄木香赠辛稼轩

花中著識，壓架玲瓏雪。乍見幽叢間琅葉。恨春風將了，染額人歸，留得箇箇裝香帶月。驚兒鼻似酒，我愛幽芳，還比醺醺又嬌絕。自種古松根，待看黃龍，亂飛上蒼禽五鬣。更老仙添與筆端春，敢誚起桃花，問誰優劣。

【校注】
自種古松根，待看黃龍，亂飛上蒼禽五鬣。曾元忠曰：「五鬣」，松也。《羣芳錄》前集云：「凡松葉皆雙股，故世以為松鈍。獨松松每根三葉，而高麗所産每根乃五鬣焉，今所謂華山松是也。」然則白石詩意，盡誤黃木香為古松耳。按華山産五鬣松，《五代史·鄭遵穆傳》云：「言華山有五鬣松，臥於地上，千歲化為藥，能去三尸，因徙居華陰，欲求之。」

【校記】
【版本】曾元忠曰：洞仙歌。《黃木香贈辛稼軒》，汲古閣謬列入《夢魘甲集》，且曰「玲瓏」作「瑅瑸」，「乍見幽叢」作「可見瑅瑸」，「待看黃龍」作「待黃龍」，蓋文通字賸皆是，汲古閣本不足信如此。
【詞詠】銘案：版本皆同，惟屬鈐此行箔去，用黃筆補入「黃木香贈辛稼軒」。
【庚寅】銘案：版本皆同，惟屬鈐本「庚」作「貫」。
【乍見】銘案：版本皆同，惟張刻、項鈐作「可見」。
鲍廷博校銘案：「可」，陸刻「乍」，底本「乍」。
【幽叢】銘案：版本皆同，惟屬鈐作「幽叢」，項鈐作「幽叢」。
鲍廷博校銘案：「幽叢」，陸刻「幽叢」，底本「幽叢」。
【筆端】銘案：版本皆同，惟無版作「筆端」。無版校校語：「『筆端』當作『與』。」今從無版校校語校改。
【桃花】銘案：版本皆同，惟屬鈐作「金桃」。

【校記】
【落花】銘案：版本皆同，惟銘作「偶然」。
鲍廷博校銘案：「偶然」，抄版作「偶然」，陸刻「偶然」，底本「偶然」。
施鶴存曰：「偶然」，諸本皆同，惟銘作「偶然」，底本有校注云：「『偶然』，一一作『偶然』。」

【校記】
【落花】銘案：版本皆同，惟銘作「偶然」。
鲍廷博校銘案：「偶然」，抄版作「偶然」，陸刻「偶然」，底本「偶然」。
施鶴存曰：「偶然」，諸本皆同，惟銘作「偶然」，底本有校注云：「『偶然』，一作『偶然』。」
[104]

永遇樂
次韻辛克清先生。
我與先生，風期已久，人間無此。不學楊郎，南山種豆，十一微微利。雲霄之上，諸公衮衮，乃作道邊苦李。五千言老來受用，骨骸造物兒戲。東山記載，同來膏任，歲月幾何難計。抑老悲極，松高對阮，未鮮為鄰地。長干白下，青樓朱閣，往往夢中徘徊。卻不如蓬蒿放滿，老夫未醉。

箋注
[辛克清] 吳梅曰：克清，見前〈探春慢〉詞。
[松高對阮] 鄭文焯校沈本曰：『松高對阮』，老杜詩「松高擬對阮生論。」近世詞家，務為雅緻，未節淺陋，以爲侍賓中別有取字一格。元明以降，益用胸臆臆斷，文不雅制。
觀於清異，白石諸家，無一字無来历，盡從唐人詩句剪裁而出，使讀者但驚嘆其清妙而已。

校記
[詞牌] 箋案：虬繡本詞牌作「次韻克清」。
[韻律] 箋案：原本皆同，惟虬繡本作「道旁」。
[造物] 箋案：原本皆同，惟鮑廷博校張刻曰：『『物』，抄本作「化」。』
[窩草放滿] 箋案：原本皆同，惟江隠、張刻「窩」作「繚」。
鮑廷博校張刻曰：『繚』，陸雲「窩」，底本「窩」。

[105]

括蒼煙雨樓，石湖居士所造也，風景似越之蓬萊閣，而山勢環繞遠勝高秀過之。觀居士題顔，且歌其所作「虞美人」，愛亦作一解。閣在表立蒼龍背，三面煙雨樓。東遙絃上小蓬萊，不見此樓煙雨而未應回。而今指點來時路，却是在遺處。老仙鶴駕幾時歸，未必山川城郭是耶非。

箋注
[括蒼煙雨樓] 石湖居士所造也] 吳梅曰：《麗水縣志》：『處州舊州治在小括蒼山烽火樓為郡守楊嘉言建，延至大書榜。』

校記
[詞牌] 箋案：無抄本無詞牌名，屬鈔，王鈊，江鈊，虬繡同。鈔本、陸刻、張刻、庫本、王刻、許刻、朱刻、江鈊加詞牌名「虞美人」一行。
鮑廷博校張刻曰：『舊本無此行。』
[峯陽] 箋案：原本皆同，惟張鈔作「師陽」。
鮑廷博校張刻曰：『舊本「師」。』
[題顔] 箋案：原本皆同，惟鮑廷博校張刻曰：『『顏』，一本作「額」。』
[且歌其所作「虞美人」] 箋案：原本皆同，惟張鈔作「且歌其所作」。
鮑廷博校張刻曰：陸刻有「虞美人」三字，底本同。

校勘：明鈔本（鈔本：施氏校語「明」當作「舊」，即無本本。）不標詞名「虞美人」，陸本加題，張刻則於所序中削去「虞美人」三字，遂使序文不完整。
[愛亦作一解] 箋案：原本皆同，惟虬繡本無「愛」字。
[煙雨樓] 箋案：江鈊，朱刻，鈔本，張刻初印本、沈本同。屬鈔，王鈊，陸刻，虬繡，張刻後印本，庫本，王刻，許刻，江鈊「煙」皆作「繚」。
鄭文焯校沈本曰：『煙』，陸本作『繚』，非是。
江世清曰：沈、張本不同之十三。

校勘：『『舊』，陸本，姜本，鮑本，四印齋本『舊』誤作『繚』。
[繚上] 箋案：原本皆同，惟張刻初印本、沈本作『繚』。
鄭文焯校沈本曰：作『繚』，誤。
江世清曰：沈本獨作『繚』，誤。沈、張本不同之十二。

[106]

稼軒北固樓詞永遇樂韻。
雲隔迷樓，苔封紙鶴，人向何處。數騎秋煙，一筆寒沙，千古空來去。史君心在，蒼翠無垠，苦被北門留住。有尊中酒殞可飲，大旗畫繡熊虎。 前
身諸葛，來遊此地，數勸便謝三顧。樓外冥冥，江皋隂隂，認得征西路。中原生聚，神京耆老，南望長淮金鼓。問當時依依種御，至今在否？

校記
【釋義北樓詞永遇樂韻】餘案：虞紹、王紹、江紹司，題前皆無詞牌名。其餘各本加詞牌名「永遇樂」，而詞韻各不相同：陸筆作「北固樓次稼軒韻」，虬緣、庫本、王刻、許刊、江紹司。張刻作「次韻稼軒北固樓」。朱筆作「次稼軒北固樓詞韻」。鮑延博校張刻於詞名「永遇樂」一行出校云：「底本無此行」，於詞韻一行出校云：「陸筆作『北固樓次稼軒韻』，底本此篆之作『稼軒北固樓詞永遇樂韻』。」

周南曰：陸本作「北固樓次稼軒韻」。

許增曰：祠堂本（1樓）作「亭」。

鄭文焯校沈本曰：祠堂本「樓」作「亭」，陸本作「次稼軒韻」，以後二解列之，則此本當是舊題。

汪世清曰：吳熙本作「次稼軒北固亭」。

施塾存曰：長沙本此作「稼軒北固樓詞永遇樂韻」。諸本皆以「永遇樂」標題，陸本、鮑本下云：「北固樓次稼軒韻」。江本、朱刻本則作：「次稼軒北固樓詞韻」。姜本改作「次稼軒北固亭」，蓋稼軒原題作「京口北固亭懷古」也。

【雲陽】餘案：陸刻、虬緣、庫本、王刻、許刊、江紹司。虞紹、王紹、江紹、張刻、江紹作「雲陽」。

【狼石】餘案：江紹、項紹、張刻同。虞紹、王紹、陸刻、虬緣、庫本、王刻、許刊、朱刻、江紹作「狼石」。

江世清曰：吳熙本亦作「狼」。

施塾存曰：「狼石」，姜本及予所得舊抄本作「狼石」，諸本均作「狼石」。

【史君】餘案：虞紹、王紹、江紹同。項紹、陸刻、虬緣、張刻、庫本、王刻、許刊、朱刻、江紹作「史君」。

鮑延博校張刻曰：底本「史」。

施塾存曰：「史君」，夏校云：「虞紹作『史君』，誤。」予所得舊抄本亦作「史君」。

【書老】餘案：原本皆同，惟虬緣本作「書齋」。

【長淮】餘案：原本皆同，惟張刻作「長淮」。

鮑延博校張刻曰：「長淮」，抄本作「長淮」，陸刻「長」，底本「長」。

施塾存曰：「長淮」，姜本有校注云：「『長』，亦作『清』。」

[107]

水調歌頭

東西望水嘉作。

日落臺山背，沙漲子潮回。平生夢不到，一葉渺西來。欲訊桑田成海，人世了無知者，魚鳥兩相怪。天外五里香，子晝只空臺。倚闊幹，二三子，總仙才。節節遠遊章句，雲氣入吾杯。不問王郎五馬，願憶席生雙屐，處處長青苔。東望赤城近，吾興亦悠哉。

校記
【東西望水嘉作】吳梅曰：「胡在龍公山，嘉祐三年知州楚建中重修之。」
【不問王郎五馬】吳梅曰：「義之曾守水嘉。」
【願憶席生雙屐】吳梅曰：「靈均亦為水嘉太守。」

【詞牌】餘案：原本皆同，惟虬緣本題作「水嘉東西望」。

【顏紅弄輪】餘案：原本皆同，惟庫本作「遊不依」。

【顏紅弄輪】餘案：原本皆同，惟虬緣本作「輪」。

【顏紅弄輪】餘案：原本皆同，惟虬緣本作「輪」。

【顏紅弄輪】餘案：原本皆同，惟虬緣本作「輪」。

【顏紅弄輪】餘案：原本皆同，惟虬緣本作「輪」。

【顏紅弄輪】餘案：原本皆同，惟虬緣本作「輪」。

【顏紅弄輪】餘案：原本皆同，惟虬緣本作「輪」。
Plum Blossom on the Far Side of the Stream

[108]

Ming Wen

次顏稼軒

云曰歸鈞，阪晝天曳曳，終反衡廬。揚州十年一夢，俛仰差殊。泰碑越殿，悔舊遊作計全殊。分付與高懷老尹，管弦錦竹亭無。知公愛山入剡，若南尋李白，問訊何如。年年風飛度上，愁亦闕予。臨軒領客，向月邊、攜酒攤櫂。今但借秋風一編，公歌我亦能書。

註釋

【次顏稼軒】曾元忠曰：白石與稼軒雅故，集中故多次顏之作。作元大德庚信本《稼軒長短句》考之，如《永遠樓》《北田楠次顏稼軒觀》，稼軒《京口北固亭懷古》；《漢宮春》《次顏稼軒》，稼軒《會稽秋風亭觀雨》；又《次顏稼軒蓬萊閣》《韋轅作《會稽秋風亭觀雨》；雲夢上閣《次顏稼軒會稽秋風亭》省「會稽」二字。自下村寫本故《會稽秋風亭》五字，改會中「秦碑越殿」及「南尋李白」等語不得其解，而下閣《蓬萊閣》亦不知何地，宜於《次顏稼軒》下燭《稼軒長短句》補「會稽秋風亭」五字方合。《秋風亭》者，稼軒耕《湖州詩序云：稼軒詩軒作《秋風亭》，以長短句寄余者。」

校記

【愁亦闕予】鍾案：案本皆同，惟此諸本作「予」作「余」。

【秋風一楓】鍾案：案本皆同，惟案本作「秋風一陣」，江呂脫「一陣」二字。

【公歌我亦能書】鍾案：案本皆同，惟江呂脫「公歌」二字。

[109]

又

次顔稼軒蓬萊閣

一顧類吳，夢粟人不見，煙香重湖。當時事若對奕，此亦天乎。大夫仙去，笑人間，千古須臾。有倦客扁舟夜泛，猶疑水鳥相呼。秦山對樓自綠，怕越王故壘，時下劉蘇。只今侍閨一笑，然則非筆。小棗解呂，倩松風、為我吹之。更坐侍千巖月落，城頭鶴語蛙。

箋注

【蓬萊閣】吴梅曾：酒在會稽。

校記

【詞題】鍾案：案本皆同，惟此諸本作「蓬萊閣次顏稼軒」。

【非典】鍾案：作「稼軒。」

【解倡】鍾案：作「稼軒」案本皆同，惟此諸本作「解倡」。

【樂府校釋】鍾案：作「稼軒」案本皆同，惟此諸本作「解倡」。

【妙口】鍾案：作「稼軒」案本皆同，惟此諸本作「解倡」。

【妙口】鍾案：作「稼軒」案本皆同，惟此諸本作「解倡」。

【妙口】鍾案：作「稼軒」案本皆同，惟此諸本作「解倡」。

【妙口】鍾案：作「稼軒」案本皆同，惟此諸本作「解倡」。

歌由持文人餘事耳，或者少詮音律。白石留心學古，有志雅樂，如《會要》所載，未常所錄，卷中所錄，未亦盡見也，聲文之美，論具此編。嘉泰壬戌，刻於雲間之東慶。其家轉從自隨韓者的五十載。諸家詳細，復歸嘉禾邦賀二十載，今豈可考。因筆之以識歲月，端午日勝坡趙與當書。

校記

【標題】鍾案：此趙與當書無相本、作「稼軒。」

【標題】鍾案：此趙與當書無相本、作「稼軒。」
版心題「白石道人歌詞序」，後印本撤去此跋，易以張奕校序。徳緒、江鯉、張刻初印本俱無此跋。鮑廷博校張刻譔陸本錄文，全同無相本，並於欄上注明趙書在底本「另頁」。

【嘉泰】録案：眾本皆同，惟無相本「泰」作「鉅」，又改為「泰」。又，無相本「此編」、「嘉泰」間空一格，屬鈔、王鈔、江鈔同。項鈔、朱刻、陸刻、庫本、王刻、許刻、張刻初印本均無空格。

【壬戌】録案：王鈔、張刻、庫本、許刻、朱刻同。屬鈔、江鈔、陸刻、王刻、江鈔誤作「壬戌」。項鈔作「壬戌錢希文氏」。

【雲間】録案：眾本皆同，惟朱刻、許刻作「雲間」。

【淳祐】録案：眾本皆同，惟朱刻「淳」缺末筆，殆避清譌。

至正十年，歳在庚寅正月望日，如萊君居仲本於錢唐之用拙幽居既畢，因以識其後云。天台陶宗儀九成
此書俾它人抄錄，故多有誤字。今將善本勘董，方可人意。後十一年庚子夏四月也。
第五卷暗香詞第四句「不管清寒與攀摘」，他本作「攀折」，誤也。辛丑校正再記

校記

【明藏】録案：張本無相、江鈔兩本均寫在越與 REPORT 後，但不達寫，趙書在上半頁，陶藏在下半頁。項鈔趙與 REPORT 在上半頁，陶藏亦在下半頁，但中夾《慶元會要》。王鈔、陸刻、庫本、王刻、許刻、朱刻均接越與 REPORT 後達寫。屬鈔屬藏接越書後，陶藏前；王鈔屬藏在越書、陶藏後。徳緒、江鈔、張刻俱無此跋。

【如萊君居仲本】録案：眾本皆同，惟庫本作「如萊君居仲本」，王鈔作「如」，旁注「疑譌」。

【錢唐】録案：眾本皆同，惟王鈔作「錢塘」。

【元成】録案：眾本皆同，惟項鈔作「南明氏」。

【它人】録案：屬鈔、江鈔、項鈔同。王鈔、陸刻、庫本、王刻、許刻、朱刻作「他本」。

【誤字】録案：眾本皆同，惟庫本作「誤字」。

【今將】録案：眾本皆同，惟屬鈔、王鈔、江鈔、項鈔作「今得」。

【勘正】録案：眾本皆同，惟屬鈔作「勘正」。

【第五卷暗香詞第四句「不管清寒與攀摘」，他本作「攀折」，誤也。辛丑校正再記】録案：惟無相本有陶宗儀辛丑第三跋，別本皆無。夏錄脫「也」字。
Facsimile 1
The Shanghai MS

This facsimile is of a working manuscript used by Li E, the Ma brothers, and their circle in the Yangzhou Poetry Club for preparing the Lu edition of Jiang Kui for publication in 1743. Its pages are 27.6 cm in height and 17.5 cm in width. Onto each of these is printed a writing block measuring 18.2 cm × 12.8 cm, inside of which are vertical lines, such that ten columns of text can be written. When these columns are filled completely, they usually contain twenty-one characters. Explanatory notes are occasionally inserted into the main text; here, two characters are penned next to each other in the space where one character would otherwise have been written.

The handwriting is neat and clear, typical of the mid-Qing dynasty, and devoid of any particularly personal characteristics, suggesting that the manuscript was probably professionally copied (by someone called here Scribe A). A majority of the editorial notes has been added in the space above the writing block, though some are inserted into the text itself, whilst only one is added below the writing block. Up until folio 39, a few of these notes are by the copyist himself, but most belong to a much more untidy hand (called here Scribe B). Often, the name of the person who has provided the opinion is also included, and four people are mentioned: Fanxie (i.e., Li E), Meipan (i.e., Wang Zao), Yujing (i.e., Min Hua), and Qianli 千里 (Gu Guangqi 顧廣圻, 1766–1835). From folio 40 until the last folio 54, all the annotations are by Scribe B, and no one is named.

The function of this manuscript as a working copy is reinforced from a number of angles. In the opening thirty-nine folios, ten annotations are named here as coming from Fanxie, of which three are penned by Scribe A and seven by Scribe B. There are also three annotations each from Wang Zao and Min Hua, all by Scribe B. These features strongly suggest that Li E was present not only at the stage when the manuscript was copied, but also later when it was submitted for editorial examination, which is when Wang Zao and Min Hua made their contributions. There are seventeen unnamed annotations, of which the vast majority is by Scribe B. In two places, notes by Scribe A seem to indicate discrepancies with an exemplar manuscript, called here the “original manuscript,” which is likely to have been the Tao MS. All this indicates that the owner of the working manuscript (Facsimile 1) was in close contact with Li E, Wang Zao, and Min Hua, and also had ready access to the Tao MS via its owner, crucial factors in helping us date the working manuscript to prior to the publication of the Lu edition in 1743, and that also suggest Yangzhou as the likely place where it was written. Assuming this analysis to be correct, the annotations from folio 40 onwards probably still come from the same circle of people, but the names of who in particular provided them are no longer recorded.

Gu Guangqi is indicated as the source of only a single annotation, this note being entirely anomalous as it is the only one that appears in the space under the writing block; it is found on folio 5v, under the third column of text. Its presence at the bottom of the page is strange to start off with, as the margin here is much narrower than at the top of the page. Although difficult to perceive clearly from the facsimile, my examination of the original manuscript indicates that a vertical, oblong-shaped slip of paper has been cut from the margin above the text at this point; presumably there was text on this slip
of paper, which is why it was cut out. Gu Guangqi belongs to a later generation than
the Yangzhou Poetry Club, and was regarded as the foremost editor of historic books in
China of his time, so it is difficult to imagine he would have done this. In fact, judging
from the handwriting alone, this note is undoubtedly not in Gu Guangqi’s own hand, but
neither is it in those of Scribes A or B. The most reasonable explanation for its presence
is that originally there was an annotation at this point at the top of the page written by
either Scribe A or B that has been cut out and then added in the bottom margin, with Gu
Guangqi’s name added to give it a spurious authenticity, simply to increase the value of the
manuscript when sold: any document that Gu Guangqi had perused and annotated would
certainly have attracted a higher price.

On the version of the 1749 Zhang Yishu edition annotated by Bao Tingbo, included
here as Facsimile 2, Bao Tingbo indicates in 1783 that his notes were added in consulta-
tion with a manuscript he had acquired from the Ma family in Yangzhou. Close compari-
sion of his apparatus critici with the working manuscript reproduced here as Facsimile 1
confirms that, if not the long-lost “Ma brothers’ master copy” itself, the Shanghai MS
can at least be regarded as a bona fide copy of it. This must surely be further evidence
that reinforces the presumed provenance of the Shanghai MS as immediately prior to the
publication of the Lu edition in 1743, indicating that it was penned in Yangzhou.

In Chapter 4, comparison between the Shanghai MS and all the early modern edi-
tions of Songs of the Whitestone Daoist, such as the Lu edition, the Zhang edition, and the
Zhu edition, revealed discrepancies in the stanzaic divisions of four of Jiang’s seventeen
songs for which he provided notation. Through musical analysis, I demonstrate there
that the opening line of the second stanza in all the early modern editions may have been
intentionally placed at the end of the first stanza in the working manuscript in order
to remind the singer of the jindou form, in which the cadential notes of the first stanza
immediately repeat at the beginning of the second. Therefore, these “unusual” stanzaic
divisions are not mistakes, but indications of conventional performance practice in the
Southern Song dynasty as dictated by musical factors. This comparison further underpins
my observation that the working manuscript predates publication of the Lu edition.

In the early twentieth century, the Shanghai MS came into the possession of the
novelist Shi Zhecun (1905–2003). His seals can be found on it at the start of the table of
contents (folio 1r) and at the opening of the first fascicle (folio 4r); respectively, these read:
“an Animitta Cottage collected book” 無相庵藏本; and “in the book collection of Shi
Zhecun, herewith stamped” 施蟄存藏書記. On his death in 2003, the Shanghai MS was
passed on to the Maple River Reading Room 楓江書屋, whose owner, Howard C. Yang,
in 2006, invited Fan Jingzhong 范景中 to write an essay about the manuscript, penned in
red onto the last three previously empty folios. In 2011, Howard C. Yang invited callig-
rapher Bai Qianshen 白謙慎 to copy another essay, this time composed by himself, onto
new binding pages at the end of the volume. Also present are two slips of paper containing
annotations by Shi Zhecun, one previously found stuck on folio 29v and the other stuck
on the last of the binding pages inserted before the back cover; both are here moved to the
end of the facsimile reproduction, but before Fan Jingzhong’s essay.

1. Wang Zhongmin 王重民, Lenglu wensou 冷廬文藪 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe,
1992), vol. 1, 103–16.
This is a copy of the 1749 Zhang Yishu edition that has been annotated by Bao Tingbo in red, yellow, and black ink. If the imprints of the 1749 Zhang edition are divided into three stages, early, middle, and late, then this imprint belongs to the middle stage. Early stage imprints of the 1749 edition do not contain Zhang Yishu’s preface; instead is found a postscript written by Zhao Yuyin 趙與訔 (1213–1265) that originally appeared in a 1251 imprint of the 1202 edition, which details how the woodblocks found their way into the possession of Zhao Lingwei 趙令威, a member of the imperial family. Zhao Yuyin’s postscript was copied into the Tao MS. The early imprint of the 1749 Zhang edition was published as a photolithographic facsimile by Shen Zengzhi 沈曾植 (1850–1922) in 1910.

Variations between early and middle imprints of the 1749 edition not only pertain to the absence or presence of postscripts and prefaces, but also extend into the texts of the lyric songs themselves. Recent scholar Wang Shiqing 汪世清 (1916–2003) has researched the Zhang 1749 source that Xia Chengtao used, and found it to be Shen Zengzhi’s facsimile.¹

Compared with early stage impressions, middle stage imprints exhibit three changes: editorial alterations to the texts of the lyric songs themselves; Zhao Yuyin’s postscript has been removed; and a preface by Zhang Yishu is inserted instead. In 1820, the plates for Zhang’s edition were sold to Zhang Yingshi 張應時 of Shanghai, a wealthy individual who collected printing plates.² Zhang Yingshi also issued the Zhang edition with his own preface; this publication is the “late” imprint of the edition. The preface was written in the summer of 1820, and includes this passage:

Few copies of this edition survive, but one is in the Peking Library—it is nothing less than a “pirated” reissue of the “middle” imprint edition, but with Zhang Yingshi and his son Zhang Hong’s names added to the first page of each fascicle of the text. Viewing this book, it is certainly true to say that the printing plates had worn in the meantime, especially at the corners. Zhang Yingshi’s preface is also reproduced here, at the end of Facsimile 2.

From the beginning to the end of Facsimile 2, there are annotations in three colours, red, yellow, and black, as well as circular punctuation marks inserted into the text. All of these indicate that detailed editing has been applied to the text. From the perspective of handwriting, two types are evident: most consists of a rather untidy hand, probably belonging to someone of advanced age; the remainder is much neater, clearer, and squarer

2. From 1805 to 1825, Zhang Yingshi published a book series comprising seventy-two volumes under the title Shu sanwei lou congshu 書三味樓叢書 (Books of the Three Flavours Mansion).
in style, likely of someone younger. Often, notes in the second type are corrected and annotated by handwriting in the first, as if both a pupil and master have been at work. Neither type, though, is furnished with a name indicating who the scribe might have been. In the first hand, at the end of the first fascicle, in black, one line is written:

癸卯十一月廿二日，從維揚馬氏得底本校。

At the end of the third fascicle, in black, two lines are written:

癸卯十一月廿四日，半山舟中，底本校第二、三卷。辰刻。

At the end of the fourth fascicle, in red, two lines are written:

癸卯十二月初三日，泊舟原上，底本校于燭下。

At the end of the fifth fascicle, in red, one line is written:

癸卯十二月十二日，舟次烏青，底本校。

At the end of the supplementary fascicle, in red, one line is written:

癸卯十二月十五日，清曉臨平道中，校訖。

On binding pages inserted at the end of the text a line is written, which reads: “In Daguan, belonging to the Tang family, at their Pleasing Orchid Reading Hall, a rare book, annotated by hand by Bao Luyin [Tingbo]” 大關唐氏怡蘭堂收藏秘笈鮑淥飲手校本.

Tang Hongxue 唐鴻學 had originally come from Daguan in the province of Yunnan, and was a celebrated Sichuan book collector who died during the Second World War. Much of his book collection was taken to Britain for safekeeping, but he gave this particular volume, in 1930, to Cui Zhixiong 崔之雄 (1897–1981), who added a frontispiece and in August 1982 wrote a long postscript to it; he then contacted the Sichuan People’s Publishing House, with whom an agreement was reached to publish it, though it did not finally appear until 1987. The book passed into the hands of the publishers and, after Xu Wuwen’s death, his son Xu Li 楚立 contacted them, and searched in their library and archives for it, but could not find it—its whereabouts are now unknown.

Bao Tingbo was a conscientious annotator of books, and his comments appear on many volumes held in libraries today. Notwithstanding Tang Hongxue’s note that the annotator of this volume was Bao Tingbo, close comparison between the comments
written here and other examples of his handwriting elsewhere (Figure 22) confirms beyond question that the older, more untidy scribe was in fact Bao Tingbo.\textsuperscript{12} In a copy of Ciyuan,\textsuperscript{13} the same duet between older and younger scribes can again be observed, which strongly indicates that the younger was a permanent assistant of some sort. With regard to this latter book, its two postscripts are by Bao Tingbo himself, and he dates them to 1811–1812.\textsuperscript{14}

Bao Tingbo, courtesy name Yiwen 以文, sobriquet Luyin 淬饮, was originally from She county in the province of Anhui, but his main sphere of activity was the province of Zhejiang. Book collection, editing, and publishing were his lifelong activities, and when it came to passing books on to include in Qianlong’s The Emperor’s Four Treasures, Bao Tingbo provided more than 600 specimens. In addition, he was responsible for publishing a book series entitled Zhibuzu zhai congshu 知不足齋叢書 (From the Studio of One Who Knows His Deficiencies), which comprises 207 different volumes.\textsuperscript{15} It was at the age of fifty-six in 1783 that he made his annotations to the Zhang edition; the places that he mentions in these notes (Banshan, Yuanshang, and Linping) are all situated on the route from Hangzhou (where he lived) to Tongxiang 桐鄉 (where he owned land). His assiduousness is indicated not only by the use he made of spare moments whilst on the journey, often at unusual times of the day and night, to complete his work, but also by the quantity of annotations in all: a total of some 215 to the text alone. Two were penned on separate slips of paper, included here at the end of the facsimile, followed immediately by two notes written by Tang Hongxue. With regard to the seventeen Jiang Kui lyric songs that survive in musical notation, he made seventy-one corrections to these, and also six amendments to the qin tablature Ancient Complaint. Even though the total number of annotations nears 300, he does not at any point bring these together into a theoretical framework in order to give an overall perspective to his work. In this context, significantly, after 1796, when he came to publish his own Songs of the Whitestone Daoist, it was to the 1743 Lu edition that he finally turned, reproducing it character for character in pristine accuracy. Surely, this is evidence enough of where, in his final years, his loyalty lay. In addition, Bao Tingbo has here also provided us with crucial evidence helping identify the Shanghai MS as the important primary source that Lu used to prepare his edition in Yangzhou.

---

\textsuperscript{12} Further samples of Bao Tingbo’s handwriting can be found in Ji Qiuhua 束秋華, ed., Zhibuzu zhai xubai ti ji ji lu 知不足齋跋字記錄 (Beijing: Guojia tushuguan chubanshe, 2010).

\textsuperscript{13} Bao Tingbo’s copy of Ciyuan in the rare book section of the Shanghai Library (call number: 787519).

\textsuperscript{14} Further bibliographical information on the book can found in Pan Jingzheng 潘景星, Zhuyan lou shuba 著硯樓書跋 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006), 336.

\textsuperscript{15} Bao Tingbo, ed., Zhibuzu zhai congshu 知不足齋叢書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990), 10 vols.
This facsimile reproduces a tracing copy made by Shen Yunzhai in late 1913 of a manuscript written by Jiang Bingyan in 1737. Originally, the written section of the volume occupied a total of fifty-five folios; each page was 22.4 cm × 17.8 cm in size. As white pages have been inserted between the written pages that jut out at the top and bottom, when these are taken into account, the overall height becomes 27.8 cm. A traditional string-bound volume, the front and back covers are of “tiger-skin” paper, which has a characteristic mottled appearance. On the front cover, the title *Songs of the Whitestone Daoist* appears in a larger handwritten script, underneath which and smaller in size are the words “Ganfeng Mansion, a handwritten copy” 感峰樓鈔本, Ganfeng Mansion being Shen Yunzhai's residence. On the fifty-fifth folio is a note written by Shen Yunzhai: “In the guichou year, the eleventh month [November 28, 1913–December 26, 1913], this tracing copy was made by borrowing Old Man of Qiangcun's [i.e., Zhu Zumou's] manuscript, as is noted here by Yunzhai” 癸丑冬月，假彊邨老人藏本景鈔，韻齋誌. Important confirmation that the exemplar of this tracing copy was in Jiang Bingyan's hand and that also, in passing, affirms Shen Yunzhai's skill as a copyist can be found in a copy of Song dynasty Zhou Mi's *Juemiao haoci* (Surpassingly Fine Lyric Songs), held by the Palace Museum in Taipei (Figure 23). This book is annotated by Jiang Bingyan himself and signed by him, all in the same handwriting as that so perfectly reproduced by Shen Yunzhai in his tracing copy of *The Songs of the Whitestone Daoist* (Facsimile 3).

Shen Yunzhai's seals are to be found on folios 1r, 2r, 4r, and 53v. These translate as “Shen” 沈; “long live Yunzhai” 韻齋長壽; “happy to read all the time” 且喜六時常見書; “a handwritten copy by Shen Yunzhai” 沈韻齋手寫本; “treasured in the Ten Thousand Volumes Mansion of the Shen family of Wuxing” 吳興沈氏萬卷樓珍藏; and “Zong Studio” 宗庵. In the Republican period, Shen Yunzhai's books found their way into the possession of an engineer called Cao Datie 曹大鐵 (1916–2009), who lived in Changshu; his seals are found on folios 1r, 2r, 3v, 53v, and 55r. These translate as “Water Chestnut Flower Studio” 菱華館; “Cao Datie, his accession stamp” 大鐵父 (these last two are found on both folios 3v and 53v); “Cao Ding of Wu Prefecture” 吳郡曹鼎 (a different and larger stamp); and “books collected by the Cao family of Yushan” 虞山曹氏收藏圖書. After the Cultural Revolution, many of Cao Datie's books, including this one, were sold to Wu Jian'gang 吳建鋼. Wu Jian'gang's seals are found on folios 2r and 55r, and translate as “viewed by Jian'gang” 建鋼過眼; “Spring Breeze Cottage” 春風廬; and “collected by Wu Jian'gang” 吳建鋼藏. In 2007, the volume was sold at a Shanghai Jiatai Auction (December 12, 2007, lot 1207) to art historian and book collector Fan Jingzhong and his wife, Zhou Xiaoying 周小英, whose seals are to be found on folios 53r and 55v; these read “handwritten by Shutian of Hangzhou” 古杭書田手寫; “Vaidūryanirbhāsā shrine” 淨琉璃室; and “Fan Jingzhong and Zhou Xiaoying, husband and wife, their stamp” 范景中周小英夫婦印.

Once they had purchased the manuscript, Fan Jingzhong and Zhou Xiaoying used a copy of the Zhu Zumou edition to make a meticulous comparison between it and their
newly acquired possession, and Zhou Xiaoying has detailed the variations in red ink on
the manuscript. Sometime between 1922 and 1932, salt-levy official Wang Jingyu 汪景玉
copied the works of ten different Song dynasty song lyricists, including Jiang Kui; his
index of this endeavour gives the Jiang Bingyan manuscript as the source he used for Jiang
Kui.1 Using Wang Jingyu's copy, Fan Jingzhong and Zhou Xiaoying have made further
comparisons with their manuscript and written a second, fresh set of annotations on it in
red ink. On the binding page at the front of the volume are three notes by Zhou Xiaoying
concerning Jiang Bingyan and Shen Yunzhai. In addition, on folios 53v and 55v, Zhou
Xiaoying has penned four different postscripts of different lengths; the third of these,
probably written in 2011, reads:

Having gone through a process of editorial comparison, it can only be lamented
that the Jiang [Bingyan] manuscript has now become three different versions, and
the Tao MS original that was in the collection of Lou Yan is now, more than ever,
"yesteryear, the moon's loneliness."

校罷掩卷，不禁慨其江鈔已成三影，樓鈔祖本更是「舊時月色」矣。

If Wang Jingyu had in fact copied directly from Jiang Bingyan, then a level of dis-
crepancies such as to warrant Zhou Xiaoying's assessment would seem unlikely. My close
comparison with an array of possible alternatives Wang Jingyu might have employed
instead has revealed that his source was an 1888 publication by Wang Pengyun entitled
Whitestone Lyric Songs.2 With this book as his original, Wang Jingyu now proves himself
to be a highly skilled craftsman whose copying is absolutely faithful. Wang Pengyun's
edition does not take Jiang Bingyan's handwritten copy as its source either, but is grounded
instead in the 1743 Lu edition (though some of the contents are omitted); thus, discrep-
ancies between Wang Jingyu's copy and the Jiang Bingyan manuscript should not be at all
surprising.

1. Wang Jingyu, ed., Jingji lu liang Song shijia ci 靜寄廬兩宋十家詞, a manuscript kept
in Shanghai Library (call number: 577189).

Poems Translated

Lyric songs

*Anxiang* 暗香 (舊時月色), by Jiang Kui, 2–3
*Shuying* 疏影 (壽枝緩玉), by Jiang Kui, 3–4
*Yanierma* 眼兒媚 (玉京曾憶), by Emperor Huizong, 6
*Yangzhou man* 揚州慢 (淮左名都), by Jiang Kui, 34–35
*Guyan* 古怨 (日暮四山), by Jiang Kui, 36–37
*Danhuangliu* 淡黃柳 (空城曉角), by Jiang Kui, 43
*Xijiangyue* 西江月 (筆染滄江), by Jiang Bingyan, 70
*Jinliu* 卷雪曲 (手挾前朝), by Zhu Zumou, 73–74

Other poetry

“Xinqiu yuhou xiaoji Nanzhai fenyong Changli Qiuhuai shiyun song Hang Shijun huanshan Jinpu
Hang Shijun fende di si shou” 新秋雨後小集南齋分用昌黎《秋懷》詩韻送杭世駿還山堇浦
杭世駿分得第四首, by Hang Shijun, 31–32
“Fuweng Hu Qiheng fende di qi shou” 復翁胡期恒分得第七首, by Hu Qiheng, 29–30
“Xiegu Ma Yueguan fende di ba shou” 嵰谷馬曰琯分得第八首, by Ma Yueguan, 31
“Qiao xiaolian Ji mingjing Yi shangshe Yuanchen zhaoyin Zongzhao yuan” 喬孝廉汲明經億上舍
元臣招飲縱櫂園, by Hang Shijun, 32
“Dongri fusong Fanxie Hang Jinpu fu dake rudu” 冬日賦送樊榭杭堇浦赴大科入都, by Min Hua,
32–33
“Ti Yangzhou Chanzhi si” 題揚州禪智寺, by Du Mu, 35
“Zengbie” 赠别 (娉娉裊裊十三餘), by Du Mu, 35
“Qianhuaui” 遣懷, by Du Mu, 35
“Ji Yangzhou Han Chuo panqian” 寄揚州韓綽判官, by Du Mu, 35
“Bingzhong he Fuzhai zhongcheng naliang zayong” 病中和復齋中丞納涼雜詠, by Cheng Mengxiong, 37
“Ti Meiian suoji Guangling changhe lu hou” 題梅沜所輯《廣陵倡和錄》後, by Min Hua, 37–38
“Jiang Baishi shici quanji kecheng ji xiao Baishi ti luozhi” 《姜白石詩詞全集》刻成卽效白石體
落之, by Quan Zuwang, 38
“Nansi heke Jiang Baishi shici cheng fuyi zhizhi” 南圻合刻《姜白石詩詞》成賦以識之, by Min
Hua, 38–40
“De Fujun Yaelin shua jida si shou” 得符君藥林書寄答四首, by Wang Dong, 64–65
“Duanyan ge” 断硯歌, by Fu Zeng, 63–64
“Xiehuai” 寄懷, by Fu Zeng, 64
“Ti Fu Yaelin Zhuli kanshu tu” 題符藥林竹里勘書圖, by Li E, 66
“Ci Dongbi yun song Fanxie” 次東壁韻送樊榭, by Fu Zeng, 66
“Baoba hou xijian Pinghu Zhangda Jinfu” 報罷後戲柬平湖張大今涪, by Yao Peiqian, 68
Anxiang 暗香

Bai Juyi 白居易 (772–846)
Bai Qianshen 白謙慎
Baichuan 百川, see Tang Hongxue
Baishi 白石, see Jiang Kui
"Baishi cibu" 白石詞補
Baishi cichao 白石詞抄
Baishi ciji 白石詞集
"Baishi daoren gequ" 白石道人歌曲
Ban Gu 班固 (32–92)
"Banben Kao" 版本考
Banshan 半山
Bao Tingbo 鮑廷博 (1728–1814)
Bao Yiyun 鮑倚雲 (1708–1778)
Baoying 寶應
Bingzhou 并州
Boxue hongci 博學鴻詞
Cangchun 藏春, see Liu Bingzhong
Cao Bingzeng 曹炳曾 (1660–1733)
Cao Datie 曹大鐵 (1916–2009)
Cao Ding 曹鼎, see Cao Datie
Cao Yuanzhong 曹元忠 (1865–1923)
Cao Zu 曹組 (jinshi degree 1121)
Caochuang 草窗, see Zhou Mi
Caotang shiyu 草堂詩餘
Chang'an 長安
Changgu 蝉谷, see Li He
Changli 常黎, see Han Yu
Changshu 常熟
Changtingyuán 長亭怨
Changzhou 常州
Chaonan 鼎南, see Cao Bingzeng
Chen Fangke 陳方恪 (1891–1966)
Chen Feishi 陳匪石 (1884–1959)
Chen Li 陳淵 (1810–1882)
Chen Tingzhao 陳廷焯 (1853–1892)
Chen Weisong 陳維崧 (1625–1682)
Chen Yuanlong 陳元龍 (1652–1736)
Chen Zengshou 陳曾紱 (1878–1949)
Chen Zhang 陳章 (1696–1757)
Chen Zhensun 陳振孫 (active 1211–1249)
Chen Zhuan 陳煥 (1686–1758)
Cheng Lai-chun 陳麗真
Cheng Mengxing 程夢星 (1678–1747)
Chenghuai lu 澄懷錄
Chengzhi 诚齋, see Yang Wanli
Chongyang 重陽
Chuci jiezhu 楚辭節注
Chunfeng lu 春風樓
Chunfu ji 春風集
Chunxi 淳熙 (1174–1189)
Chunxiang 蘅香, see Yao Peijian
Cilin wanxuan 詞林萬選
Cilü 詞律
Cipai 詞牌
Cipu 詞譜
Ciyuan 詞源
Cizong 詞綜
Cui Zhixiong 崔之雄 (1897–1981)
Dade 大德 (1297–1307)
Daguan 大關
Dasong Xuanhe yishi 大宋宣和遺事
Dai Han 戴瀚 (jinshi degree 1723)
Dai Mingshi 戴名世 (1653–1713)
Danghu 單湖
Danhuangliu 淡黃柳
Danlü 淡慮, see Wang Dong
Dong Qichang 鴻漁 (1555–1636)
Dong Yuan 東坡, see Su Shi
Dongye 東野, see Meng Jiao
douxiu 斗宿
Du Fu 杜甫 (712–770)
Du Mu 杜牧 (803–852)
Du Wenlan 杜文瀾 (1815–1881)
Du Zhao 杜詔 (1666–1736)
Dushu tang xizheng suibi 读书堂西征隨筆
Nanjin 年羹堯 (1679–1726)
Nanshan see Nancun see
Meifu
Nalan Xingde 纳蘭性德 (1655–1685)
Mushanxi 摩詰 (1893–?)
Miao Sengbao
Mi Youren
Meng Jiao 梦窗 (751–814)
Maofeng 毛晉 (1640–1713)
Lülu 馬曰璐 (1688–1755)
Ma Yuan 马元 (1160–1225)
Ma Duanlin 马端臨 (1254–1323)
Ma Yueguan 马曰观 (1688–1766)
Ma Tao 马涛 (1701–1761)
Manjianghong 满江紅
Mao Jin 毛金 (1599–1659)
Mao Qiling 毛奇龄 (1623–1716)
Miao Yi 毛一 (1640–1701)
Meifeng zhenyi manlu 齐獻真隱漫錄
Meifeng 真隱
Meipan 曲律, see Wang Zao
Meiyuan 梅圂
Meng Jiao 梅郊 (751–814)
Mengchung 梅曾, see Wu Wenyung
Mi Fu 米芾 (1051–1107)
Mi Youren 米友仁 (1074–1153)
Miao Sengbao 諤僧保 (1893–?)
Min Hua 閔華 (1697–after 1773)
Mojie 曲説, see Wang Wei
Mushanxi 愚山溪

Naideweng 耐得翁
Nalan Xingde 納蘭性德 (1655–1685)
Nan Lian yuanchi 南亀園池
Nan Song yuanyu lu 南宋院畫錄
Nan Song zashi shi 南宋雅事詩
Nancun 南村, see Tao Zongyi
Nanjian ju 南簡鈔
Nanqi 南圻, see Lu Zhonghui
Naoshan ji 奈山集
Nian Zan 汝詹 (1301–1374)
Nian Chengyao 年羹尧 (1679–1726)
Chinese Terms 399

Shi Dazu 史達祖 (1163–c. 1220)
Shi Hao 史浩 (1106–1194)
Shi Zhecun 施蟄存 (1905–2003)
Shi'e r dongtian meihua ce 十二洞天梅花册
Shi lin guangji 事林廣記
Shishuo 詩説
Shismu tu 序餘圖譜
Shouning tang 壽寧堂
"Shu Baishi yuefu hou" 書白石樂府後
Shu sanwei lou conghu 書三味樓叢書
Shuli 黍離
Shuli jingyun 數理精蘊
Shutian 書田, see Zhou Xiaoying
Shuyang 叔暘, see Huang Sheng
Shuying 疏影
Song Xiangfeng 宋翔鳳 (1776–1860)
Songgui dushu tang 松桂讀書堂, see Yao Peiqian
Songjiang 松江
Songling 松陵
Sou Si-tai 蘇思棣
Su Shi 蘇軾 (1037–1101)
Su Shishe zhi 宋詩紀事
Su Wan 窮子川
Wan Shu 萬樹 (1630–1688)
Wansong 華松, see Zhou Quan
Wang Dong 汪棟 (1710–1738)
Wang Guowei 王國維 (1877–1927)
Wang Jingqi 汪景祺 (1672–1726)
Wang Meng 王蒙 (c. 1308–1385)
Wang Shizhen 王士禛 (1634–1711)
Wang babies, see Bao Yiyun
Weisheng 猛省, see Bao Yiyun
Wen Tianxiang 文天祥 (1236–1283)
Wen Tingyun 湯庶 Kıbrıs (812–879)
Wenhui tu shuhua hebi 文惠圖書畫合璧
Wenyuan shumu 文淵閣書目
Wu Changshou 吳昌綬 (1847–1927)
Wu Mingyou 吳明義 (1820–1903)
Wu Zhen 吳鎮 (1280–1354)
Wang Wei 王維 (699–759)
Wang Zengxiang 王曾祥 (1699–1756)
Wang Zhaojun 王昭君 (c. 51–15 BCE)
Wen Xi 顔世敏 (737–792)
Weicang 懷蒼, see Zhou Quan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Chinese Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yang Wanli 杨万里</td>
<td>(1127–1206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangzhou 杨州</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Peiqian 姚培谦</td>
<td>(1693–1766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaochun Baixue 阳春白雪</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangzhou man 杨州慢</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin Yuan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ye Fanglin 葉芳林</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yilin tang 意林堂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiwen 以文</td>
<td>see Bao Tingbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yongzheng 雍正, Emperor (Qing, r. 1820–1850)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You Mao 尤袤</td>
<td>(1125–1194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youlu 幼魯</td>
<td>see Fu Zeng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Ji 余集</td>
<td>(1738–1823)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Lan 俞蘭</td>
<td>(early 18th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Xin 庾信</td>
<td>(513–581)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuchuan 玉川</td>
<td>see Lu Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yujing 玉井</td>
<td>see Min Hua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiwang 玉王</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuanchengshuang 愿成双</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuanshang 原上</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yue 越</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuefu genju 楽府経曲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuefu zhimi 楽府指迷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuexiadi 月下笛</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zaju 雜劇</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeng Shican 曾時陳</td>
<td>(active 1718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhai Zhangyun 施張雲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang Hong 張鴻</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang Jinfu 张今涪</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang Zaihua 張載華</td>
<td>(active 1718–?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang Zao 張藻</td>
<td>(?–1093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang Zaogong 張藻功</td>
<td>(active 1711)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang Zongai 張宗載</td>
<td>(1705–1775)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao Boju 趙伯駒</td>
<td>(1120–1182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao Bosu 趙伯蘇</td>
<td>(1124–1182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao Gan 趙幹</td>
<td>(active c. 960–975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao Lingwei 趙令威</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao Wuniu 趙五牛</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao Yifu 趙以夫</td>
<td>(1189–1256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao Yiqing 趙一清</td>
<td>(1709–1764)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao Yu 趙昱</td>
<td>(1689–1747)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao Yuyin 趙與壬</td>
<td>(1213–1265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao Zhiying 趙致興</td>
<td>(1662–1744)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhedong 浙東</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhezhiling 柘枝令</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhuchang 柘枝令歌頌</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhezhiling 柘枝令</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhuchenzhao 柘枝令</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhujing 知足齋叢書</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zheng Wenzhuo 鄭文焯</td>
<td>(1856–1918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhibuzu 知不足齋</td>
<td>see Zhu Yizun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhongxing cixuan 中興詞選</td>
<td>see Zhongxing juemiao cixuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhongxing juemiao cixuan 中興絕妙詞選</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou Bangyan 周邦彥</td>
<td>(1056–1121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou Gengyu 周耕術</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou Ji 周濟</td>
<td>(1781–1839)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou Wenju 周無覺</td>
<td>(1232–1298)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou Quan 周全</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhu Yizun 朱彝尊</td>
<td>(1629–1709)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhu Zumou 朱祖謀</td>
<td>(1857–1931)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhucha 竹垞</td>
<td>see Zhu Yizun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhucha xingji shumu 竹垞行笈書目</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhushi kanshu tu 竹里勘書圖</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhushan 竹山</td>
<td>see Jiang Jie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhuo Renyue 卓人月</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhuochun ci 周末春</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zou Zhimo 鄒祗謨</td>
<td>(1627–1670)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Anthology of Sixty Lyricists (Mao Jin), 14
Anthology of Yangzhou Poems in “Question” and “Answer Format”, 37

Bai Juyi 白居易, 81
Baijia ci 百家词 (Wu Ne), 2 table 1
“Baishi cibu” 白石词补 (“Supplementary List”; Zhu Yizun), 2 table 1, 15, 40
Baishi cichao 白石词抄 (Wu Huanchun; Jixiang edition), 2 table 1, 12–13, 14, 40
Baishi ciji 白石词集 (Chen Zhan; Yangzhou edition); and Jiang Bingyan’s manuscript, 72–73; and Jixiang edition, 13; and Zhu Yizun, 14, 40; and Zhu Zumou edition, 72; compared to other editions, 59; Li E’s marginal comments in, 18, 21; publication details, 2 table 1
Baishi daoren gequ 白石道人歌曲, See Songs of the Whitestone Daoist

Baishi daoren gequ 白石道人歌曲 (Jiang Kui; 1202), 2 table 1, 42, 45, 50, 52, 55, 57
Baishi daoren gequ 白石道人歌曲 (Li E), 2 table 1
Baishi daoren gequ 白石道人歌曲 (Li E, Min Hua, Wang Zao), 2 table 1
Baishi daoren gequ 白石道人歌曲 (Lu edition; 1743); and revival of interest in Jiang Kui, 8; as a collective effort, 23, 24, 26, 68; as a response to Manchu policies, 38; compared with 1749 Zhang edition, 59–60, 69; Pale Yellow Willows and Discontentment at the Long Pavilion, 44 fig. 9; publication details, 2 table 1; sources and manuscripts used for, 9, 18–20, 59

Baishi daoren gequ 白石道人歌曲 (Zhang Yishu; 1749); as a collective effort, 26, 67–68; Bao Tingbo’s annotations on, 9, 21; compared with Lu edition, 59–60; Huang Zhijun’s role in, 67–68, 80; publication details, 2 table 1; role in canonizing Southern Song ci, 19, 20; role of Fu Zeng and Wang Dong in, 8, 61–63

Baishi daoren gequ 白石道人歌曲 (Zhu Zumou; 1913), 9, 19, 69–73, 74
Baishi shici heji 白石诗词合集 (Jiang Qilü), 2 table 1
Baishi xiansheng ciji 白石先生词集 (Zhu Yizun), 2 table 1
Ban Gu 班固 (Mengjian 孟坚), 14
“Banben Kao” 版本考 (“A Critical Examination of the Editions”; Xia Chengtao), 12
Bao Tingbo 鮑廷博, 9, 21, 59, 80n32
Bao Yiyun 鮑倚雲 (Weisheng 武生), 71, 73

Book of Songs, 34, 65

Book of the Later Han Dynasty, 38
Cao Bingzeng 曹炳曾 (Chaonan 朝南), 16
Cao Yuanzhong 曹元忠, 76
Cao Zu 曹組, 15
Caotang shiyu 朝堂詩餘 (Lyric Songs of the Thatched Cottage), 1, 78
chach dances, 51
Chan Buddhism, 18, 80–81
Changtingyuan 長亭怨 (Discontentment at the Long Pavilion); and Zhu Zumou’s jinliu, 74–75; date of composition, 55; images of, 44 fig. 9, 45 fig. 10, 49 fig. 12; musical structure, 42, 47–49, 51, 57 table 2
Changzhou 常州 Poetry School, 6, 41, 80
chanling 極令 suites, 52, 56
Chen Fangke 陳方恪 (Yantong 元通), 69, 71
Chen Feishi 陳匪石, 6
Chen Li 陳立, 6
Chen Shuliang 陳書良, 69, 71
Chen Tingzhuo 陳廷焯, 5, 6
Chen Weisong 陳維崧, 40
Chen Yuanlong 陳元龍, 67
Chen Yunting 陳雲亭 (Xiuwu 舛武), 18
Chen Zengshou 陳曾壽, 76
Chen Zhang 陳章, 25, 26, 27, 28
Chen Zhensun 陳振孫, 11n7
Chen Zhuan 陳振, 13, 40
Cheng Mengxing 陳夢星, 24, 25 fig. 5, 26, 28, 31, 37, 79
Chenguai bu 沉桂佩, 18
Chuci jiezhu 楚辭辭注 (Songs of the South, Abridged Annotations; Yao Peijian), 68
Chunfu ji 春風集 (Spring Duck Poetry Collection; Fu Zeng), 82
ci 词: and notion of refinement, 78; and Qing literary inquisition, 79; canon of, 10, 15, 40–41; compared to Chan Buddhism, 18, 80–81; compared to painting, 7–8, 16, 67, 80, 81; musical settings, 8, 12, 42–58; Northern Song vs. Southern Song, 1, 11; subgenre ling, 11, 51. See also Songs of the Whitestone Daoist; Southern Song dynasty ci
Cilin wanxuan 词林万选 (Yang Shen), 1
Cilü 白石道人歌曲 (Li E), 2 table 1
Cipai 词牌 melodies: and vernacular zhuàn tunes, 55, 56; collections of, 8; Dianjiangzhen, 11, 13, 14; Faqu Xianxianyin, 56–57; in the Shiyou tupe, 45; Jinliu, 73; Jueshao, 72; loss of, 78; Manjiangzhang, 12, 13, 15; Quxiaoyin, 11; Yanérmei, 6.
Li Zongwan 劉宗斡, 63
Liao shi shiyi 追史餘逸 (Supplement to the Liao Dynasty Official History), 78
Lidai shuyu 历代詩餘 (Ci Poetry of Former Dynasties), 49–50, 79
Lin Bu 林逋 (Jingfu 僧復), 13, 15
Lin Shuen-fu, 1, 73
Ling Tingkan 凌廷堪, 17–18
Liu Bingzhong 劉秉忠 (Cangchun 藏春), 78
Liu Guo 劉過 (Longzhou 劉潁), 18
Liu Ji 劉基, 45
Liu Kezhuan 劉克莊 (Houcun 後村), 17
Liu Yong 劉永, 70
Liu Yongji 劉永吉, 6
Liu Zongyuan 劉宗元, 33
Lixiang kaoceng 曆象考成 (Calendrical and Astronomic Hypotheses and Proof), 79
Long Yusheng 龍榆生, 59, 60
Lou Cai 倪采, 57
Lou Yan 倪雁 (Jingsi 敬思); and revival of interest in Jiang Kui, 23; and Tao MS, 19, 20, 60, 61, 69; narrow social circle, 67; poem composed with Zhou Wansong, 72
Lu Kai 陸凱, 7
Lu Pei 陸培 (Tianpu 天浦), 62, 67
Lu Shiyong 陸時雍, 61
Lu Tong 龍仝 (Yuchuan 玉川), 82
Lu You 陸游 (Fangweng 方翁), 18, 82
Lu Zhonghui 陸鍾徽 / 陸鍾徽 (Nanqi 南圻); and Hang Shijun, 28; depiction in Ninth-Day Literary Gathering, 25 fig. 5, 26; preface to edition, 19; role in the 1743 edition of Jiang Kui’s works, 8, 23, 24, 38, 39, 40. See also Baishi daoren gequ 白石道人歌曲 (Lu edition; 1743)
Lu Zuzuo 楊祖皋 (Pujiang 菩江), 18
Lüli zhengyi 律呂正義 (Orthodox Understanding of Pitch Standards), 79
Lüli zhengyi houbian 律呂正義後編 (Orthodox Understanding of Pitch Standards), 67, 79, 80
Luo Zhenchang 羅振常, 20
Ma Duanlin 馬端臨, 11, 14, 19
Ma Yuan 馬遠, 81
Ma Yuequan 馬曰琯 (Xiegu 澱谷); and Hang Shijun, 28; and the Lu edition, 8, 9, 20, 40, 59; biographical details, 23, 24; depicted in Ninth-Day Literary Gathering, 25 fig. 5; poetry, 30 fig. 8, 31; private library, 21, 26; request for performance of Guyuan, 26
Ma Yuelu 馬曰璐; and the Lu edition, 8, 9, 20, 40, 59; biographical details, 23, 24; depicted in Ninth-Day Literary Gathering, 25 fig. 5, 26; private library, 21
manuscripts: Hangzhou MS, 20–21, 40; Peking MS, 21, 40; PKU MS, 13–14, 40. See also Shanghai MS; Tao MS
Mao Jin 毛晋, 12, 14
Mao Qiling 毛奇齡, 33
Mao Yi 毛扆, 57
Mao feng zhenyi manlu 道教真隠漫録 (Daoist Hermit of the Mao Peak), 51
Meiyuan 梅苑, 15
Meng liao 盧載 (Dongye 東野), 82
Mi Fu 米芾, 81
Mi Youren 李友仁, 81
Miao Sengbao 聶僧保, 20
Min Hua 閔華 (Yujing 工井); and Hang Shijun, 28, 32–33; and Ninth-Day Literary Gathering, 24–25; and revival of interest in Jiang Kui, 8; and Shanghai MS, 21, 23; misunderstanding of musical structure, 55; poetry, 37–40
Ming dynasty: anthologies of lyric song, 1, 7, 41, 57; civil service examinations during, 33; fall of, 10; loyalists of, 38; Zhu Yizun’s ancestors during, 77
Mote, Frederick W., 26, 27
Naideweng 奈得翁, 55
Nalan Xingde 納蘭性德, 40
Nan Song yuannhua lu 南宋院畫錄 (A Record of Works by the Southern Song Dynasty Painting Academy), 78
Nan Song zashi shi 南宋雜詩什 (A Southern Song Poetic Miscellany), 65, 79
Nanjin juwenlu 南陵紀聞錄 (A Record of Southern Ashes), 7
Nanshan ji 南山集 (Collectsed Works of the Southern Mountain), 79
National Palace Museum, Taipei, 53 fig. 16
New Essays on Lyric Songs (Wu Shichang), 5
Ni Zan 倪瓚, 81
Nian Gengyao 年羹瑤, 30, 32n29, 79
Ningzong 宁宗, Emperor, 10. See also Song dynasty
Ninth-Day Literary Gathering at the Garden of Temporary Retreat (jiuxiān wényáng yú 六月行榻文謳圖), 24–27
Northern Song dynasty: demise, 6–7, 65; lyric songs, 1, 11, 36, 40, 41. See also Song dynasty; Southern Song dynasty
Official History of the Jin Dynasty, 38n51
opera, 67
Ouyang Xiu 欧陽修, 40n61
Owen, Stephen, 34n35
painting, 7–8, 17, 67, 80, 81
Pale Yellow Willows. See Danhuangliu 淡黃柳 (Pale Yellow Willows)
Peking Library, 21, 53 fig. 16, 71
Peking University Library, 8, 13
Pian, Rulan Chao, 51n26, 52
Picken, Laurence E., 51n26
“Postscript,” 14–15, 40
Pushatuo ji 蒲草亭集 (Zhu Yizun), 14, 15
Puyi 溥儀, Emperor, 73. See also Qing dynasty
Qian Qianyi 欣謙益, 57
Qian Xiwu 欣希武, 42
Qian Zeng 欣曾, 57
Qian Zhongshu 欣鐘書, 81
Qianlong 乾隆, Emperor, 8, 27–28, 37, 67, 68, 80. See also Qing dynasty
Qiao Ji 姜紀, 32
Qiao Lai 姜萊, 32
Qiao Yi 姜怡, 32
Qin Gengnian 泰根年, 21n23
Qin Guan 欽觀, 40, 70
Qiding cipu 欽定詞譜 (Imperial Register of Lyric Song), 47, 49, 79
Qing dynasty: and Han Chinese literati, 8, 11, 26–33, 37–38, 65, 77–80; ascension of, 10; demise, 73, 77, 80; “erudite literates” examinations, 11, 14, 26, 32–33, 63; literary inquisition, 8, 79–80; revitalization of lyric songs during, 19; standard script of, 21
Qinzong 欽宗, Emperor, 5, 7. See also Song dynasty
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Qiu huai 秋懷 (Emotions of Autumn), 28
Quan Zuwan 金翅塑造:_and Hang Shijun, 28; and Ninth-Day Literary Gathering, 24, 25, 29; and Zhuxi Poetry School, 7; interest in Ming dynasty loyalists, 38; on Fu Zeng’s poetry, 65; on Jiang Kui’s importance, 82–83; on Li E’s change of mind on career, 66
Qiüa 曲偉, 51n24

Round amongst the All-round Circle (Yuanliyuan 圓裏圓), 52–55
Shanghai Library, 8, 14, 62
Shanghai MS: and the Lu edition, 40; description, 21–23; marginalia, 24, 26; musical notation in, 42, 50, 52; stanzaic division in, 44–45, 48, 56. See also manuscripts; Tao MS
Shanzhong baiyun ci 山中白云詞 (White Cloud Ci from amidst the Mountains; Zhang Yan), 41, 78
Shen Yanmou 沈燕謀, 20
Shen Yifa 沈義父, 55–56
Shen Yunzhi 沈鴻 Goa, 9, 71–72
Shen Zufen 沈祖棻, 6
Shi Dazu 史達祖, 18, 40
Shi Hao 史浩, 51
Shi Zecun 張子存, 21
Shier dongtian meihuacé 十二洞天梅花冊 (Plum Blossom of Twelve Worlds), 75–76
Shilin guangji 事林廣記 (Extensive Records of Various Things), 50, 51n24, 52, 53, 56, 63, 67, 68, 79
Shisuo 詩說 (Discourse on Poetry; Jiang Kui), 81
Shiyu tupu 詩餘圖譜 (Xie Tianrui), 45
“Shu Baisi yuefu hou” 書白石樂府後 (“Postscript”; Zhu Yizun), 14–15, 40
Shuli jingyun 數理精諵 (Finer Definitions in Higher Mathematics), 79
Six Dynasties, 81
Song dynasty: civil service examinations during, 33; Jin encroachment on, 10, 34, 35; painting, 81; the practice of ci during, 42, 43n6. See also Northern Song dynasty; Southern Song dynasty
Song lushi jia ci 宋六十家詞 (Mao Jìn), 2 table, 1, 12, 13, 17
Song shishi 宋詩紀事 (Background Compendium of Song Dynasty Poems), 78
Song Xiangfeng 湘飄風, 6
Songs of the Whitestone Daoist: Anxiang (Secret Fragrance), 2–8; critical reception and analysis, 4–8, 12, 40–41; Dunhuang liu (Pale Yellow Willows), 42–44, 45–47, 48, 51, 55, 57 table 2; Faqiu Xianxianyin (Music Presented to a Celestial Being), 56–57, 58 fig. 19; Guyuan (Ancient Complaint), 26, 36–37; Jueshao (A Shao in the Jue Mode), 42, 50, 51, 55, 57 table 2; ling pieces, 11; major editions, 2 table; Meifu (Winsome Eyebrows), 56, 57 table 2, 58; Mudanxi, 14, 15; musical notation, 26, 37, 42, 50–52; musical settings, 11, 12, 27, 39–40, 42–58; Nishang zhongyu diyi (Rainbow-Skirt: Middle Prelude, First Section), 42, 50, 52, 55, 57 table 2; plum blossom motif, 76; Shuying (Dappled Shadows), 2–8; Yangzhouman (“Man” Poem of Yangzhou), 34–35, 37, 65; Yuexiaidi (Plume under the Moon), 56, 57 table 2, 58. See also Changtingyuan 長亭怨 (Discontentment at the Long Pavilion); Dunhuangliu 淡黃柳 (Pale Yellow Willows)
Southern Song dynasty, 6–7, 10, 55, 56. See also Northern Song dynasty; Song dynasty
Southern Song dynasty ci: adjudged superiority, 1, 41, 81; appeal for Qing dynasty literati, 23, 65, 67; Jiang Kui as supreme exemplar of, 36; musical form, 52, 55, 56; themes and techniques, 10–11, 73. See also ci詞
Su Shi 蘇軾 (Dongpo 東坡), 36, 38, 40, 66, 82
Sui dynasty, 35
“Supplementary List” (“Baishi cibu”; Zhi Yizun), 2 table, 1, 15, 40
Surpassingly Fine Lyric Songs (Zhou Mi). See jufemiao haoci (Surpassingly Fine Lyric Songs)
Tang dynasty, 11, 33, 35–36, 40, 41, 56, 81
Tang Jianzhong 唐建中, 24, 25 fig. 4, 26, 28, 79
Tangshi jing 唐詩鏡 (Mirror of Tang Dynasty Poetry; Lu Shiyou), 81
Tanlong lu 論龍鳳 (A Record of Discussing Drakes), 82
Tao MS: and ci canon, 40; and Fu Zeng, 61, 67, 69–70, 71; and Jiang Bingyan, 69, 72; and Li E, 61, 71; and Min Hua, 24; and Shanghai MS, 21; and the Lu edition, 18–20, 25, 59, 60–61; and Wang Zao, 26; and Zhang Yishu, 61–62, 67; as copy of 1202 edition, 45; musical notation in, 42; rediscovery of, 18, 37, 39. See also manuscripts
Tao Zongyi 陶宗儀 (Nancun 南曲), 16, 18, 19, 38, 42
Tengxiao ji 腾笑集 (A Record of Being a Figure of Fun; Zhu Yizun), 14, 77
Tupu 圖谱, 45
Veritable Records of the Qing Dynasty, 28
Wan Shu 萬樹, 44–49, 55
Wang Dong 汪林 (Danlú 淡濁), 8, 61–65, 67
Wang Guowei 王國維, 4–5, 7, 81
Wang Jingqi 汪景基, 79
Wang Long 汪長, 63
Wang Meng 汪蒙, 81
Wang Pengyun 汪潯遠, 59, 80
Wang Shiqing 汪世清, 21n23
Wang Shizhen 王士禛 (Ruanweng 濟弱), 79, 81–82
Wang Wan 汪琬, 33
Wang Wei 王維 (Mojie 摩節), 81
Wang Xi 王熙, 62
Wang Yisun 王沂孫 (Shengyu 聖俞), 18, 58, 78
Wang Yitong 王一通, 75, 76
Wang Yushu 汪興書, 25 fig. 3, 26
Wang Zao 王藻 (Meipan 梅艷): and Hang Shijun, 28; and revival of interest in Jiang Kui, 8; and Shanghai MS, 23; compilation of Anthology of Yangzhou Poems, 37–38; depicted in Ninth-Day Literary Gathering, 24, 25 fig. 5, 26; misunderstanding of musical structure, 55
Wang Zengxiang 王曾祥, 21, 26
Wang Zhaojun 王昭君, 3n7, 7
Wei dynasty, 82
Wei Yingwu 惠應物, 81
Wen Tianxiang 文天祥, 78
Wen Tingyun 吳醜, 40
Wenhui 文會 (文會圖書畫合璧 (Depictions of a Literary Gathering), 27
Western Han dynasty, 3n7, 34n35
Willing to Become a Pair (Yuanchenghuang 順成皇后), 52, 53 fig. 16, 54–55
Wu Changshou 吳昌綬, 5, 7
Wu Chunhuan 吳春華 (Gaian 高安), 12, 13, 40
Wu Shichang 吳世昌, 5, 7