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吾甚悔好事者或取馬欲讀而藏之不可得也予
學所謂格物者格此物也今君晚而窮理其昭明賞
通偽然是非得喪之表母亦自其少時區別果木
有得於格物之功歴昔孔門學記之訓有曰多識於
鳥獸草木之名陳君於是書也受其悔
寶祐元年癸丑中秋安陽老圃韓境序

全芳備祖序
Berkeley, California, March 21, 1927.

Translation of Chang Yüan-chi's letter to Mr. Swingle.

"My American friend, Dr. Swingle, is an expert in agricultural studies. He is very fond of searching for Chinese works on botany. Knowing that in the collection of the Han Fên Lou Library there is a work entitled Chüan fang pei tsu 全方備祖, written by a man of the Sung dynasty, he asked me to have a copy of it made for him. I just bought an old copy of the Chien chi 錢集 or First part which had been very carefully compared but I regret that I do not know the name of the person. Then I selected from the Han Fên Lou collection the Hou chi 後集 or Supplementary part; had it copied and the whole very carefully collated in order to avoid errors.

The characters in black ink, alongside the lines, are corrections made by the copyist from time to time and denote wrongly transcribed characters. Upon discovering any wrong character in the edition from the Han Fên Lou Library, the copyist or proofreader wrote the correct character in red ink beside the erroneous character. In cases of doubt he looked up in special works by various authors and consulted the Chinese Imperial Encyclopedia in order to verify these doubtful points. If there was anything to be corrected he wrote a marginal note in the upper space; and if there were any deviations from the original work which could not be decided as right or wrong he added the character 疑 (doubtful) to distinguish these from the other instances.

Although I cannot say that it is without error still this copy may be called a comparatively good one.
Chang Yuan-chi’s letter.

The text was copied by Hu Shao-i and Fang Hu-fen of Shanghai; and the texts were compared by Chuang Hsi of Peng-hsien (a district in Sung-kiang Prefecture, Kiangsu) and Hu Wên-k’ai of K’un-shan (in Su-chou Prefecture, Kiangsu).

Signed; Chang Yuan-chi and dated December 1925.
皮膜形色一有赖陈紫则以为中品若大厚皮尖

刺肌理黄色附核而赤食之有查食已而涩虽无

跡味亦自下等矣第一篇福州种植最多延施原

野洪塘水西尤其盛处一家之有至于万株城中

翠叶鲜妍蔽映数里之间蝗若星火非名画之可

传而精思之可及也观览之胜无以为比初著花

间商人计探佐之以立券若弓后寡商知不计

美恶悉为红盐去声水陆浮转以入京师外至北

戎西夏其东南舟行新罗日本琉球大食之属

而不厌好利以酬之故商人贩关

而乡人饮益
疑乎

伊醇淑之无算非精言之可悉闻者嘆而悚忯
者訝而驚化心患可以蠲忘口爽可以忘疾且欲
神于醞露何比数于甘釀援蒲薑以見擬亦古人
之深失若乃华軒归開嘉賓四会當時煖客或
順懌而斯果在焉莫不心侈而體泰信洞盤之仙
液實玳瑁之緝緳有終食于累百愈益氣而理内
故无厌于所甘虽不贫而必受沉美誉而取浮
甘瓜而自退豈一座之所荣冠四时而为最大其
贵可以薦宗廟珍可以羞王公亭十里子不致门
耳之独难收因门之不巧每被销于凡口罕获知
所遇孰能辨于其中哉

事實袒

龍眼

所思蜀都赋此竹桑绵桑怀临崖旁提龍目侧生
枝云虽观上国之光而被侧生之誙杜老亦云侧
荔枝有绿叶之善萎结朱实之离离张九龄赋荔枝

龙

雜著
紅消白瘦香猶在想見當年十八娘 苏子由
白蓮近結三千女丹荔猶招十八娘周文忠
水晶透帳輕含液絳殼離色未變香調侍制
甘露落為難子大曉風凍作水晶團誠齋
臨水酸漱新雨後出塘背向曉西風
西川紅錦無此色南海綠羅猶帶酸
側生海畔遠難將風月尤能變色漿劉後村
五言古詩
南州積炎德嘉樹凌冬綠薰風海上來丹荔逾夏
煌煌煌綿繡林亭亭翡翠屋鶴頭溫霜天酒瑩
寒玉流聲感中華採掇如不足開元史馬死漢墳
五里促君王玉食問此薦知不辱迨今糟粕餘猶
宰喚吟限荒服將非名實雄百果為羞縮區區化
天馬來首觀耀華白幽遐托地幸滯游我欲咎真
工意詫爾存衆族劉賓父
龍眼與荔枝異出同父祖端如柑與橘未易相可
否異哉西海瀟琪樹羅玄圃曇霧侶桃李一似流
膏乳坐疑星殞空又似珠還浦因經未嘗說玉食
遠莫數獨使皺皮生黃色映道楓葉莽非汝辱幸
五言八句

丞相祠堂下将軍大樹旁炎雲駒火實瑞露酌天

桜桃真小子龍眼是凡姿撒繫為下輩枇杷客作

五言絶句

兇陳從易

七言古詩

七言古詩

爾齊驪龍脫紅絃玉露團謫居深不負沉醉亦何

十里一疇飛塵漸五里一塹火催顏頜浮海風枝露

枕藉如是荔枝龍眼來飛車跨山鹧橫海風枝露

葉新採宮中美人一破顧驚塵澆血流千載永

肉無人舉觴酬白游我願天公憐赤子莫生尤物

為瘡瘍雨順風調百穀登民不飢寒為上瑞君不

見武夷溪邊粟粒芽前丁後蕉相鬚爭新舊莖

冬出意年年聞品充官茶吾君所之豈此物致養

口體何陋耶洛陽相君忠孝家可憐亦進姚黃花