

J648.741

L23 57

0277

长安古乐谱

CHANG' AN CLASSIC MUSIC SCORES

西安音乐学院音乐研究所编

三 秦 出 版 社

Compiled by

Research Institute of Music, Xi'an Conservatory of Music

SANQIN PUBLISHING HOUSE

长安古乐谱

主编 雷家骅

西安音乐学院音乐研究所编
三 秦 出 版 社

责任编辑:张招贤
线谱绘制:郑炳炎 张津波

三秦出版社出版发行

(西安湘子庙街12号)

陕西省新华书店经销 西安音乐学院印刷厂印刷

787×1092毫米 1/16开本

1991年5月第1版 1991年5月第1次印刷

印数:1—3000

ISBN7-80546-383-2/J·47

平装18元 精装22元

传统乐种召唤着研究工作

(代序)

黄翔鹏

我们现在面对的这个传统音乐品种与中国音乐的笙管乐体系密切相关，它在历史上至少是唐、宋至今，活跃在终南山以北，渭水以南，以古长安、今西安为其中心的关中盆地一带。所以今人或把它称做“西安鼓乐”，或把它称做“长安古乐”；但都不是历史上已有确定内涵的原有名称。

我并不赞成在名称问题上费心思进行多少争论，择一而称也可；大家各从其是也可；互相承认，叫做“并称”也可；重要的是，大家都极为重视这个传统音乐品种，这就已经是认识的一致。实在说，我们这些被它吸引而来的研究者，至今不是队伍太大而却是力量嫌小。研究的方面太少，角度过于偏狭，问题的提出也很不够，因而是不同观点、不同见解太少了。多开辟几个研究据点，多出版几种材料，哪怕略有重叠都应该是大家欢迎的。这个乐种的深厚宝藏，极难挖掘罄尽，同名、同调、同曲都会有不同谱之异，何况可资比较研究之用的别出新材料呢？

特别是音乐院校，为当地的著名乐种开辟研究阵地，就更加具有宏扬传统文化的深刻意义。

近十几年来，特别是随着民族音乐集成工作的开展，出现了传统音乐研究的春天，它必将促使我们对国际范围内的音乐民族学研究作出中国人自己的贡献。音乐民族学的研究活动历来多在原始的、社会发展过程尚在较低阶段的民族之中进行。在这门学科中提出“高文化”问题的研究，国际上也还是为时不久、缺乏经验的垦荒工作。中国的传统音乐却正是这片荒野中最典型的，亟待攻克的“高文化”课题的尖端堡垒。

中国的传统乐种研究，对这一课题说来尤其具有重要意义。但我们中国人自己，对乐种问题的探究也不过是处在尚待开发的阶段，甚至于不免要提出：“乐种”是什么？这样的问题。

大家都说，维吾尔族的木卡姆是一个古老的乐种；福建南音（或称“弦管”）是一个古老的乐种；晋北笙管乐是一个古老的乐种；苏南十番鼓是一个古老的乐种；全国性的丝竹乐（据地方而言，又称“江南丝竹”“浙江丝竹”者）是一个古老的乐种；潮州音乐是一个古老的乐种等等。“乐种”这个概念在这时似乎十分清楚，但一到理论研究和遇上实际工作的矛盾时，便又立刻糊涂起来。

长期以来有个老黄历，我们是按照形式分类来研究传统音乐的。叫做“五大类”。到

现在组织全国性民族音乐集成的工作时，还是半个世纪不变，数十年一贯制地守着这个规矩。

可惜传统乐种是在历史中形成的，不是按照人们头脑中的形式分类法而形成的，它们常常不守规矩而要越出形式分类的篱藩。

据说：剧种是戏曲的再分类；曲种是曲艺的再分类；因此“歌种”当然是民歌的再分类而“乐种”当然是器乐的再分类。

那么，兼有“指、谱、曲”的福建南音只是器乐吗？刚宣布存有白居易《望江南》乐谱的晋北笙管乐应该把它的歌曲部分交给“民歌卷”呢？还是“曲艺卷”？《望江南》既非民俗歌曲也非曲艺音乐，这便如何是好？本集中也有一定数量的唐宋词音乐，我们对这种发现又作如何看待呢？

“乐种”这个概念，和“剧种”、“曲种”不是同一层次、同一角度的概念。

剧种和曲种的“种”字是种类之种。它的内涵是戏曲和曲艺按照地方风格的原则，所作低一层次的、含普遍意义的细分。只要是戏曲或曲艺，就必定归属于全国性的，或地方的某一剧种或曲种。

乐种的“种”字，则含有特殊品种的意义。就我们会意而来言的习惯用法说来，实际上它并不专属于“五大类”的器乐部门的细分，而且不带普遍意义。并不是所有的器乐或器乐与声乐的组合都可以称之为某一“乐种”的。这就和剧种、曲种大不相同了。

再如各地的营业性的、专营红白喜事的鼓吹乐，就没有必要区别为河南鼓吹乐，山东鼓吹乐等等。它们确实也是一个“种类”的音乐，但却并不是什么“特殊品种”，完全不像笙管乐那样，在不同的地方就有很不相同的地方特色和某种浓厚的风格特点。作为一般分类意义上的音乐和作为带特殊品种涵义的乐种，其间的差别是不可以道里计的。

因此，乐种含特殊性的“种”字，与剧种、曲种带一般性的“种”字，是本质上并不相同的事物。

这个差别是在用语的习惯性使用过程中形成的，不过我们未曾对它作过科学的界定，包括《中国音乐辞典》中也无处可查而已。

附带可以提到，歌种这个词，现在恐怕是用得过滥了一些。它指“花儿”、“信天游”、“爬山调”时似乎与民歌地方风格意义上的特殊品种有关；但在又指山歌、小调、号子的一般分类意义而言时，似乎是用了一个词语来兼表不同的概念了。这样用法的不假思索，不分角度不区别层次的差别，不过只能在理论工作中制造混乱而已。

乐种的诞生，是传统音乐或我们惯称为“民族音乐”的一种“高文化”的、特有的历史现象。在以往的研究工作中，杨荫浏先生创先对“乐种”提出过进行科学界定的意见：

- 一、有两、三代以上的名师，至少是有名姓可考的师承关系。
- 二、有本乐种特有的一套曲目传世。
- 三、其表演方式，包括乐器配置，自有不同于其它乐种的组合特点。

我在研究了传统音乐的传承关系问题以后，又从社会生活问题的角度补充了第四点界说：

- 四、它在音乐生活中形成了稳定的社会集体，作为爱好者的“雅集”，以自娱为主，

具有非商业化的特点。

这是它一方面较少受民俗生活、宗教生活剧变的影响；一方面又不会因为音乐的商品化而完全趋向时好；使本乐种得以常存古传特点的重要原因。

传统乐种的研究除了它在音乐民族学方面的意义而外，久已受到注意的，是它在音乐形态方面所能提供出的有关知识与艺术经验。但即使是在这一方面，我们过去的研究也是颇为浮浅的。几乎没有一个传统乐种可以宣称：我们已对它的律、调、谱、器之间诸种联系作过全面、系统的研究，对于传统乐种与有关古乐调的历史联系问题，更是未曾见过任何重大突破的了。此外还有必须注意的有关形态学问题，例如：中国传统乐种与东方各民族传统音乐的比较研究等。像东方各族传统音乐中的“调”的实际涵义常与“曲调型”问题难解难分；而中国有些古老乐种，其实是同样存在着类似规律的。但一般的研究者对此尚处在一无所知的阶段；或虽偶有所见，却常熟视无睹，竟或不予探究；这是不一而足的。

以上这些，事实上都是我们在研究工作中的落后面的表现。

更有实际价值的，是传统乐种研究对于中国音乐史研究工作的重要意义。

中国是唯一一个能在世界上再现两千余年前成套乐器音响的国家，如果和欧洲的中世纪相比，宋以后现存有谱可考的音乐，在数量和艺术质量上也是可以骄人的。但是古希腊却有古碑保存下了当时的《酒歌》等曲；而我们在文字历史上引以自豪的秦汉、魏晋、隋唐，除个别情况外却难得找到证据确凿、毫无疑义的音乐作品。

古代音乐的宝藏，深埋在何处呢？民俗歌曲中肯定有许多“遗声”存在着，但却无根无据，不能辨认。已知的两大宝库：南北曲和古琴，都是宋、元以后成其著录的材料。因此，我们可以知道，这些历史上与各代音乐生活有过密切联系的古老乐种，其中可以留下许多历史信息作为证据的第三个宝库，它的价值何在；知道它的份量轻重如何？

本集的特点之一是注意到了这一古老乐种除了它的器乐部分而外，还有着唐宋词的歌曲艺术的蕴藏。

处理古曲钩沉问题，必须兼有科学的态度和谨慎的作法。因为明清人也可以选用唐宋词来作曲，并在有关古老乐种的传承过程中留下脚印的。终南山白道峪抄本的《婆罗门引》记作“越调”，就存在“属于唐代越调，还是明、清人所理解的越调”，这样一个问题。译谱者并不知道唐代的越调属于何宫何调；所能依托的张炎《词源》“越调”记载，其实只是明、清所知的理论。但译谱者并未故意凑合这种理论以求成为“越调”，而是谨慎地取科学态度，依原谱译成现在的调性。一方面也使我们知道，原谱就不是明清人依他们所知的越调而作伪的。正确的态度可以在研究工作廓清历史情况时，证明它真正是唐代的越调。否则，一旦出现了有意或无意的弄虚作假，反倒要弄巧成拙，毁弃了真正的古乐遗存。

同一译谱者冯亚兰同志译写余铸先生传谱的《内家娇》也是取严肃态度的。这给我们提供了一个“林钟商”调在唐、宋间发生了名实变化的例子。现在没有柳永词的同名乐曲可供比较，但可知柳永用宋初乐调的“林钟商”时，恰恰可以与唐代这个同名乐调使用着基本上相同的音列，只是更改了结音。我认为此曲原是真正的唐代林钟商，不过在宋初被人牵合宋人理论而作了所谓“结声正讹”处理而已。

即使人们并不同意上述的具体考证结果，这种例子也总可说明：传统音乐诸如此类的考据作用，正是其它史料不可代替的活材料。近年来，颇有重视古老乐种的研究工作者，愿把今存古乐种称为音乐史上的“活化石”。此中的道理，应亦在此。

我愿借此集出版的机会，祝愿各地古老乐种的研究工作，得以提高到新的学术水平，并能在音乐学的原野中展现出一片全新的天地！

1990年元旦

The Classic Specific Music* Calls for Further Research Work

(In Lieu of a Preface)

by Huang Xiangpeng

The classic specific music that appears before us is closely related to the system of Chinese *sheng-guan* music. In Chinese history, it has been active at least in the areas of Guanzhong Plain, located north of Zhongnan Mountains and south of the Wei River, with the ancient Chang'an or the present Xi'an as its centre. That is why people today call it "Xi'an drum music" or "Chang'an classic music", but both of these are not the original names the connotations of which have long been established in history.

I do not approve of spending too much time arguing out on terminology. We may choose one unified name; or each may adhere to his own choice; or on terms of mutual acknowledgement, we may assign the label "also called" to the names adopted by others; the important thing is that all of us have set store by this classic specific music and arrived at unity of cognition. In fact, the ranks of us researchers, who have been drawn to it, are not too numerous, but rather too few. The aspects being explored are too limited, the scope of research too narrow, and the problems being raised insufficient; thus, it is the different views and distinct^① opinions that appear to be too scanty. The establishment of more research units and the publication of more books and articles, even if some overlapping may occur, should be welcomed by all. It is very difficult to dig out all the rich treasure of this specific music. The same name, the same tune and the same melody may have different music scores, not to mention the new materials that may be exploited for a comparative study.

Consequently, if the music conservatories and institutes will provide research grounds for the famous specific music in the locality, it will be of great significance to the enhancement of our traditional culture.

During the past ten odd years, especially with the carrying-out of the work in the Chinese Traditional Music Collections, there has appeared a spring high-tide in the study of classic music, which will enable us to make our own contributions in the study of ethnomusicology on the international front. The study of ethnomusicology used to be conducted in the primitive nations, whose social development is still at a comparatively low level. The proposition to undertake a "high-cul-

① A musical term, equivalent to *yuezhong* (乐种) in Chinese.

tural" study in this subject is still a new move even on the international scope, and is quite an inexperienced trail-blazing work. The Chinese classic music is a typical sophisticated "high-cultural" topic in this barren field that awaits our tackling.

The study of Chinese classic specific music has an especially important bearing on this topic. But we Chinese ourselves are also still at such an initial stage in our exploration of the problem of the specific music that we even have to raise the very basic question: "what is 'specific music'?"

It has been said by all that *mukamu* of the Uygur is an ancient specific music; that *nan'yin* (the southern tune, also called string and wind music) of Fujian Province is an ancient specific music; that *sheng-guan* music of Northern Shanxi is an ancient specific music; that *shifan'gu* (a kind of percussion and wind music) of Southern Jiangsu is an ancient specific music; that the national string and woodwind music (in a specific locality, it may be called "Jiangnan *sizhu*" or "Zhejiang *sizhu*") is an ancient specific music; that Chaozhou music is an ancient specific music; etc., etc. Here it seems that the concept of "specific music" is quite clear, but one gets confused when he goes into theoretical research and comes across contradictions in practical work.

There is an old calendar (obsolete practice) that has existed for a long period of time, i. e., we have been accustomed to studying classic music according to the formal classification, the so-called "five major categories". Now, when we organize the nationwide summing-up work in the Traditional Music Collections, we still stick to this old rule, which has remained unchanged for scores of years.

To our regret, the classic specific music has been formed in the course of history, but not according to the formal classification inherent in people's mind. It very often does not abide by the rules and goes beyond the scope of formal classification.

It is said that *jūzhong* (kinds of operas) is a reclassification of traditional local operas and *qūzhong* (kinds of tunes) is a reclassification of *qūyì* (folk art forms, including ballad singing, story telling, comic dialogues, clapper talks, cross talks, etc.). By analogy, we may say *gezong* (kinds of songs) is a reclassification of folk songs and *yüezhong* is, of course, a reclassification of instrumental music.

Then, is *nan'yin* of Fujian, which includes "*zhi*" (fingering), *pu* (scores), and *qū* (tunes), just a kind of instrumental music? Should *sheng-guan* music of Northern Shanxi, which has kept the music scores of *Wangjiangnan* (Looking Towards the South of the Yangzi River) by Bai Juyi as is recently announced, assign that part of its songs to the Volume of "Folk Songs" or to the Volume of "*Qūyì*"? How shall we deal with *Wangjiangnan*, which is neither a folk song nor a kind of *qūyì*? Here in this very volume, we also have a certain amount of music in *cǐ* (a kind of Chinese poetry) of the Tang and Song Dynasties. And how shall we look upon this new discovery?

The concept of *yüezhong* is different from that of *jūzhong* and *qūzhong* in that they are not concepts on the same level or viewed from the same angle.

The Chinese character "*zhong*" in *jūzhong* and *qūzhong* means "kind". In connotation, it refers

to the general detailed classification of traditional local operas and *qūyī* on a lower level according to the principle of local style. As long as it is a traditional opera or *qūyī*, it must belong to either the nationwide or a certain local *jūzhong* or *qūzhong*.

The Chinese character "zhong" in *yüezhong* has the meaning of "a specific kind". According to the customary usage that we understand, it, in fact, does not belong to the detailed classification of the section of instrumental music of the "five major categories" and has not the general sense. Not all the instrumental music or combination of instrumental and vocal music can be called a certain "*yüezhong*". Thus, it is quite different from *jūzhong* and *qūzhong*.

Take for another example, when we talk about the drum and wind music that people employ on wedding and funeral occasions, there is no need to distinguish it into Henan *guchui* music (drum and wind music) or Shandong *guchui* music, etc. These are indeed certain kinds of music, but they are not any specific kinds like *sheng-guan* music, which will show different local features and a certain degree of strong stylistic characteristics when it appears in various localities. The term *yüezhong*, which has the connotation of a specific kind, is a far cry from such music in the sense of a general classification.

Therefore, the character "zhong" in *yüezhong*, which has the sense of particularity, is essentially distinct from that in *jūzhong* and *qūzhong*, which has the connotation of generality.

The distinction has come into being in the course of the customary use of the term. But we have not yet given it a scientific definition, and the term is not even to be found in the *Dictionary of Chinese Music*.

Incidentally, the term *gezong* is now being used too indiscriminately. When it is used to refer to such tunes as *Hua'er* (Flowers), *Xintianyou* (a kind of folk song, popular in Northern Shaanxi, Gansu and Northeastern Ningxia) and *Pushandiao* (a kind of folk song, popular in the middle and western parts of Inner Mongolia, inhabited by the Hans), it may bear some relation to the term "specific kind" in the sense of the local style of the folk song; but when it is used to refer to mountain songs, ditties and *Huozi* (a work-song sung to synchronize movements, with one person leading) in the sense of general classification, it seems that the same term is employed to express different ideas. The thoughtlessness and indiscrimination in the use of such a term cannot but cause great confusion in theoretical work.

The birth of *yüezhong* is a specific high-cultural historical phenomenon of traditional music, or, what we used to call, national music. In his former research work, Mr. Yang Yinliu first put forward his proposition of a scientific definition for the term *yüezhong*, which contained the following points:

- (1) There should be two or three generations of renowned masters, at least with identifiable names to show the master-apprentice relationship;
- (2) there should be a particular catalogue of tunes of the specific music in question that has been handed down to the present;
- (3) the way of performance, including the arrangement of musical instruments of the specific

music in question should be distinct from the features of combination of the other genres of music.

After we have studied the relationship of inheritance of Chinese classic music, we have supplemented a fourth point from the viewpoint of social life.

(4) It has formed a stable social collective in music life, as a *yaji* (gathering of the refined) of the music lovers, which aims at self-entertainment without any commercial inclination.

An important reason why the specific music in question can always retain the features of ancient inheritance is that it is, on the one hand, less influenced by the drastic changes of ethnological life and religious life, and, on the other, it is not under the sway of sheer fashion-seeking because of the commercialization of music.

Besides its significance in the field of ethnomusicology, the focus where the study of classic music has long drawn popular attention is the relevant knowledge and artistic experience that it can render in the field of music morphology. Even in this respect, our research work in the past was rather superficial. Hardly is there a single classic specific music in which we can declare that we have made a comprehensive and systematic study of the various links between its temperament, modes, scores and instruments. No important breakthrough has been made on the question of the historical relation between the classic music and the ancient modekey system concerned. Moreover, there still remain the questions concerning morphology that warrant our attention, e. g. , a comparative study of Chinese classic specific music and the traditional music of the various eastern nations, etc. The actual meaning of "*diao*" (key and mode) in the traditional music of various eastern nations is entangled with the problem of the "types of tunes"; and, in fact, similar laws also manifest themselves in some Chinese ancient specific music. But the ordinary researchers still have the least inkling of this point; perhaps, few may have come across it, but often turn a blind eye to it, or even refuse to explore the subject; this is by no means an isolated case.

The above, in fact, is a manifestation of the backward aspects in our research work.

What is of more practical value is the important bearing that the study of classic specific music has on the research work in the music history of China.

China is the country in the world where the music sound of whole sets of musical instruments may be reproduced. If compared with the Middle Ages of Europe, the Chinese classic music, that was recorded in scores after the Song Dynasty and is now extant, is a source of pride of us both in quantity and artistic quality. However, the ancient Greeks had preserved such tunes as *The Wine Song* of that time in stone tablets, while the Qin, Han, Wei, Jin, Sui and Tang Dynasties of China, of which we are proud to have a written language, can hardly find any authentic and undoubted music works, except for certain individual cases.

Then, where does the treasure of our ancient music hide? There are certain "traces" to be found in folk songs, but the proof is lacking and many are indiscernible. The two major treasures that have already been made known, the *Nanbeiqü* (Southern and Northern tunes) and the *guguin*

(a seven-stringed zither) music are both works composed after the Song and Yuan Dynasties. Thus, we may know where lies the value of the third treasure, the ancient specific music, which was once closely connected with the music life of the various dynasties in history and might leave us with much historical information as the evidence, and become aware of the important role it might play.

One of the characteristics of this volume is that it has taken note of the fact that this ancient specific music has held in store the singing art of *ci* (a kind of Chinese poetry) of the Tang and Song Dynasties, besides the musical instruments it employs.

We must have both a scientific approach and a careful attitude in dealing with the problem that our ancient music may have fallen into oblivion, as people of the Ming and Qing Dynasties might also select *ci* of the Tang and Song Dynasties to compose tunes and thus left their footmarks in the inheritance of the ancient specific music concerned. *The Notes of "Preface to the Brahmin"* in the manuscript of Baidao Valley of Zhongnan Mountains is often taken as *yüediao* (a term in Twenty-Eight "Diao" of an ancient mode-key system), then there is the problem whether it is the *yüediao* of the Tang Dynasty or that understood by people of the Ming and Qing Dynasties. People who transcribed the music score did not know to which note (of the ancient pentatonic scale) and to which key the *yüediao* of the Tang Dynasty should belong; the account of *yüediao* in the *Ci Yuan* by Zhang Yan is the only source that can be depended upon, but it is, in fact, just a theory disseminated in the Ming and Qing Dynasties. However, the transcribers did not purposely cater to this theory so that it might be called *yüediao*, but carefully took a scientific approach and transcribed it into the present form of the tune according to the original score, so that we may know that the original score is not what was forged by people of the Ming and Qing Dynasties according to their own understanding of *yüediao*. The correct approach may clarify the historical status in the research work and prove it to be the true *yüedia* of the Tang Dynasty. Otherwise, deliberate or unintentional deception and fraud may occur and, as the saying goes, by "trying to be clever only to end up with a blunder," one may ruin the true remains of ancient music.

The same transcriber, Comrade Feng Yalan, also took a serious attitude when she transcribed *Neijia jiao*, a tune whose score was handed down by Mr. Yu Zhu. This provides an example of the nominal and substantial changes of *linzhongshang* mode-key that occurred amidst the Tang and Song Dynasties. Now we do not have the tune which is of the same name as *ci* by Liu Yong, but we know when Liu Yong used *linzhongshang*, which had its own structure of the Early Song Dynasty, he actually employed the music arrangement basically similar to the same note row of the Tang Dynasty which had the same name, but he just changed the conclusive note. I think that this tune is the true *linzhongshang* of the Tang Dynasty, but it was modified to suit the theory of the contemporaries of the Song Dynasty at the early years of that dynasty in order, so to speak, "to rectify the error in the finale."

Even if one may not agree with the above-mentioned specific investigation and verification, such examples can at least show that the textual research of classic music of its like has a corpus

of living materials that the other kinds of historical data cannot substitute. In recent years, some researchers who set store by the ancient specific music would call the extant ancient specific music as the "living fossil" in music history, the reasons of which lie exactly here.

I should like to take the opportunity of the publication of this volume to congratulate the researchers of ancient specific music all over the country and wish that they may raise their study to a still new academic level and unfold a new horizon in the field of music science.

On the New Year's Day, 1990

序

刘恒之

中国历史久远，中国文化、中国音乐，也就历史久远。但我们却曾经慨叹，中国音乐史是无音乐的音乐史。因为除了琴曲，经过打谱，可以使了解到唐、宋以来及唐以前的音乐作品情况以外，传世的古乐谱极为稀少，有之，也不知如何演奏。

可喜的是，近三、四十年，由于一些考古新发现，例如湖北随县战国初期编钟的发现等，使我们能够根据实际音响，获得对中国乐律的新的认识；由于对古乐谱例如对宋·姜白石歌曲谱的翻译、对敦煌琵琶谱的研究解读等，使我们得以听读一些古代的音乐作品，这就从音乐上丰富了我国音乐史的内容。而对民间古老乐种的发掘研究，更是一种活音乐史的研究。例如长安古乐（也称西安鼓乐），从众多乐谱抄本的抄写年代看，它盛行于明、清两代而流传至今，而从谱式、谱字、曲目、乐曲结构等方面考察，其历史渊源却相当古远，可以上溯到唐、宋。对它的研究，可以看到我国传统音乐发展的一些轨迹。

从现状看，长安古乐主要是器乐演奏，从历史看，它可能是歌、舞、奏混成一体的艺术品种，它的很多曲目，原来就是有歌词（诗、词、曲），可以唱的。如见于《教坊记》（唐·崔令钦撰）的《后庭花》、《遐方怨》、《柳含烟》、《鹊踏枝》、《望月婆罗门》等，见于《九宫大成南北词宫谱》的《啄木儿》（此曲名在宋“诸宫调”中已出现），《端正好》、《倘秀才》、《粉蝶儿》、《满庭芳》、《点绛唇》、《醉太平》、《雁儿落》、《斗鹤鹑》、《秃厮儿》等，就属于这类乐曲。这些乐曲，经过长期的传承、衍变、作为长安古乐的曲目，已成为器乐曲而不是声乐曲了，而且在曲调、节奏、情趣等方面，肯定有了不少变化，甚至已面目全非；而有的乐曲，却又可能较多地保留原有的结构形态。长安古乐学社的同志们，在对长安古乐曲目作了历史性考察后，将现有一些曲目的曲调与古代的诗、词或曲词相配，发现从形式结构到声韵、情绪等，竟都十分吻合。从而证明长安古乐的一部分曲目，确是从演唱的乐曲衍变成为演奏的乐曲，也证明其历史渊源不是牵强附会的。从今乐可以约略见到古乐的情况。黄翔鹏同志说，他“坚信：古乐是理藏在今乐之中的”（《音乐研究》1990年第1期第42页），这是确实的。有了这个基本认识，我们的音乐史研究，内容就会十分广泛，而且会做得生动活泼。仅从这一点说，出版长安古乐乐曲选集，其意义就十分重大。

乐谱是研究一个乐种的基本的也是主要的资料。长安古乐的乐谱，和其他民间乐谱一样都只记出一个大概轮廓，要付诸演奏，须有艺人的再创造。在长安古乐，则是先由乐社先生“韵曲”，即将乐谱韵唱成能演奏的曲子，然后艺人们根据先生的“韵曲”进行演练。本曲集刊印的乐曲，是长安古乐学社同志们与艺师余铸先生合作的研究成果，原谱与传谱（韵唱谱）、译谱同时刊印，从中我们可以看到他们研究的足迹；同时，它又是一份研究长安古乐的可贵资料。我们期待有更多的长安古乐曲谱出版，以推动对长安古乐更广泛、深入的研究。

PREFACE

by Liu Hengzhi

China has a long history, and thus the Chinese culture and Chinese music are long in origin. However, some of us have sighed with regret, saying that the music history of China is one without music. For, except that through the scores of *qingu* we can get to know the status of music works since the Tang and Song Dynasties and that before the Tang Dynasty, there are very few ancient music scores that have been handed down. Even if we have some of these, nobody knows how to play them.

What is heartening is that in recent thirty or forty years, some new discoveries in archaeology, e. g. , the discovery of *bianzhong* (a series of bells in different sizes) of the early period of the Warring States in Suixian County of Hubei Province, etc. , have made it possible for us to have a new understanding of the Chinese music temperament based upon the actual acoustics; and the study of the ancient scores, e. g. , the transcription of the music score of *The Song of Jianghui* of the Song Dynasty and the interpretation of the *pipa* score of Dunhuang, etc. , has opened the way for us to read and listen to some of the ancient music works, thus enriching the content of the music history of our country. The exploration and study of the local ancient specific music is a study of the living music history. Take Chang'an classic music (also called Xi'an drum music) for example. Judging from the date of copying of the manuscripts of many music scores, it was prevalent during the Ming and Qing Dynasties and has been handed down to the present, and if we examine the forms of the scores, the characters used in the scores, the tunes and the musical composition, we can see that it has a rather long historical origin which may be traced back to the Tang and Song Dynasties. The study of Chang'an classic music may reveal certain traces of the development of traditional music in our country.

At the present stage, Chang'an classic music is mainly an instrumental performance, but, in history, it might be an artistic combination of songs, dances and playing of instruments. Many of its tunes are originally verses of songs (poems, *ci* and *qū*) and may be sung out. Such tunes as *Flowers in the Backyard*, *Complaints from Afar*, *Willows in the Mist*, *A Magpie Perching on the Twig*, *The Brahmin Looking at the Moon*, etc. , which are found in *Notes of the Palatial Music Office* (compiled by Cui Lingxin of the Tang Dynasty), and *The Woodpecker* (this tune already appeared in the various *gong*—the first of the five Chinese music scales—tunes of the Song Dynasty), *Uprightness Is Good*, *The Scholar Tang*, *The White Butterflies*, *A Courtyard Full of Flowers*, *Painting the Crimson Lips*, *Drunk at the Piping Times of Peace*, *Falling of the Wild Goose*, *Making the Quails Fight*, *The Bald Guys*, etc, which are found in *Gong Scores of the Northern and Southern Ci of the Nine-Gong Composite*, all belong to

such types of musical composition. As the components of Chang'an classic music, these tunes have, in the course of inheritance and development, become instrumental music rather than vocal music, and certainly showed considerable changes in tune, rhythm and temperament, and, in some respects, have even changed beyond recognition; but some of the tunes may comparatively retain much of the original structural pattern. Having made a historical investigation of the tunes of Chang'an classic music, the comrades of Chang'an Classic Music Society have matched some of the existing tunes with the poems, *ci* or *qǔ* of ancient times and found that there is a close identity in form, structure, rhyme and temperament. This proves that part of the tunes of Chang'an classic music have developed into instrumental music from vocal music and that their historical linkage is not a strained interpretation. We can infer the status of ancient music from that of today's music. As Comrade Huang Xiangpeng says, he "firmly believes that the ancient music is embedded in today's music" (see *Music Studies*, 1990, No. 1, p. 42). This is definitely true. Starting from this fundamental viewpoint, our study of the music history will have a wide coverage and show life and vigour. This point alone is enough to explain that the publication of *Selections of Chang'an Classic Music Tunes* is of great significance.

The music scores are the basic as well as main data for the study of a certain type of specific music. Like the other popular music scores, the scores of Chang'an classic music are recorded only in the broad outline. To make the actual performance, there is the need for the recreation by the artists. As for Chang'an classic music, firstly, the music master of the Society sings out the tune, i. e., to turn the music scores into vocal tunes so that they can be performed, and then the players do the rehearsals according to the master's singing. The tunes carried in this Volume are the fruits of research of the cooperation between the members of Chang'an Classic Music Society and the music master Mr. Yu Zhu. The original scores, the passing-on scores (sung-out scores) and the transcribed scores are published at the same time. From this we can see the footmarks of their research work. At the same time it is a copy of valuable material for the study of Chang'an classic music. We expect that more music scores of Chang'an classic music will be published so as to push the research work of Chang'an classic music forward in breadth and depth.

序

鲁日融

长安古乐,千百年来一直活跃于周、秦、汉、唐京畿各地,为当今国内外学者所关注。专家们认为,长安古乐是唐宋遗音之余绪,是珍贵的活的文物资料。五十年代初,音乐史学家杨荫浏先生曾先后两次到西安考察,并依据长安古乐(他称西安“鼓乐”)和五台《八大套》,对宋代姜夔的歌曲,作了译解。此后就只有李石根、何钧等少数几位同志继续这一研究,六十年代西安音乐学院也曾开始整理和学习,但都因种种原因时断时续。“文化革命”中,很多古乐谱被焚毁,古乐演奏活动也被迫停顿,长安古乐频于消亡。中国共产党的十一届三中全会后,特别是改革开放政策的深入发展,长安古乐才又得以复苏。1980年我院民族民间音乐研究室成立伊始,在当时负责教务与科研工作的梁光、雷家骅同志的敦促下,并由雷家骅同志与民研室主任冯亚兰同志负责组织和领导,把长安古乐的研究,列入了民研室的重点研究项目,以尽快地抢救这一音乐文化的宝贵遗产。这一研究课题很快得到原省高教局科研处的支持,使此项研究得以顺利开展。学校还邀请了鼓乐专家李石根同志来院作专题讲座,民研室冯亚兰、蒋咏荷同志会同民乐系热心于此项研究的元修和、焦杰、梁欣等同志多次去长安、周至、户县、蓝田深入农村古乐社,收集资料,采访艺人。先后就教于长安县何家营古乐社何生哲、何生璧,集贤古乐社蔺峰岳、王顺堂、顾景昭;东仓古社赵庚辰;西仓古乐社崔世荣;迎祥观古乐社张存柱等艺师们。学院特别聘请了古乐世家余铸先生担任导师,学习古乐歌曲,记译古乐曲谱。为了使得译谱及时成为音响,向中外学者广为介绍,以扩大其影响,争取多方面的支持。在元修和、焦杰等同志的热心组织下,由民乐系部分师生自愿组成了古乐演出小组。1985年7月在这个基础上成立了“长安古乐学社”,这就为长安古乐的整理、译谱、考证和演奏提供了有利条件。

十年来,经民研室和古乐学社全体同志的共同努力,取得了可喜的成绩。截止目前已经记译了300余首乐曲;尝试为古乐曲配了10余首唐宋同名词调;排练并向中外学者演出了古乐专场音乐会7场;译配的部分乐曲和歌曲录制了盒式磁带。这些成果深为中外专家关注和赞许。长安古乐将与译解的敦煌曲子、唐传日本《五线谱》、《琵琶谱》、《十三弦箏谱》、宋代的《白石道人歌曲》一起进入中国古代音乐史的课堂,从而填补了中国古代音乐史缺少唐、宋曲谱的空白,为弘扬祖国悠久而又丰富的音乐文化作出了重大贡献。

我院师生在经历十年对长安古乐的抢救、整理、研究与演奏的艰辛劳动之后,赢得了一个向世界人民宣扬祖国优秀传统文化的历史性的机遇——应德国“欧洲国际民俗艺术协会”的邀请,我院“长安古乐团”一行17人于1991年5月28日到6月30日,出访了瑞士、德国、法国、比利时、荷兰、西班牙等欧洲六国,参加该协会主办的“丝绸之路艺术节”,历时月余,演出18场,听众达万余人。长安古乐以其瑰丽的风姿、古朴天成的韵律、典雅庄严的气质和富有逻辑的严谨程式结构,博得世界人民的青睐。

对长安古乐的研究,这些还只是一个良好开端。传统音乐的生命力在于发展,那种保守的凝固状态,必然会阻碍它的传承与发展。面对祖国与世界传统音乐文化的格局和趋向,怎样进一步挖掘长安古乐的潜力,使之在更大范围内,更高的层次上发扬光大,我认为应从如下领域尝试:

一、把学校音研所“长安古乐学社”确立为研究、保存、传播、发展这一传统乐种的阵地;特别要