

Qian Qianyi's Theory of *Shishi* during the Ming-Qing Transition

Lawrence C. H. Yim



中央研究院

中國文哲研究所

中國文哲論叢

Occasional Papers ①

Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy
Academia Sinica

**Qian Qianyi's Theory of *Shishi* during
the Ming-Qing Transition**

Lawrence C. H. Yim

嚴志雄

Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy, Academia Sinica

中國文哲論叢・第一號

**Qian Qianyi's Theory of *Shishi*
during the Ming-Qing Transition**

作	者	Lawrence C. H. Yim (嚴志雄)
發	行	中央研究院中國文哲研究所 臺北市南港區研究院路2段128號 電話：(02)27899814；(02)27883620
印	刷	者 長達印刷有限公司 臺北市西園路2段50巷4弄21號 電話：(02)23040488 (代表號)
定	價	新臺幣80元 中華民國94年7月出版

GPN 1009402154

ISBN 986-00-1732-8

中國文哲研究所·中國文哲論叢·第一號(2005年7月)

Occasional Papers, Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy, No. 1 (July 2005)

© 2005 中國文哲研究所 Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy

Qian Qianyi's Theory of *Shishi* during the Ming-Qing Transition

Abstract

This study explores Qian Qianyi's (1582-1664) vision for the poetics of Ming loyalism: *shishi*, "poet-historian" or "poetry-history." Qian's theory of *shishi* synthesizes paramount values of Chinese historiographical and poetic traditions. Although he draws heavily on ancient intellectual and literary precursors, his purpose is not to restore the values of antiquity. Qian strives, rather, to demarcate a poetic space for Ming loyalism, a space and value Qian no doubt desires to share with the Ming loyalists; and to devise, for this line of writing, a hermeneutic strategy for his contemporaries and posterity. We will expose elements of this theory in a close reading of an important essay that Qian wrote in 1656, "Hu Zhiguo shi xu" (Preface to Hu Zhiguo's Poetry), and an examination of related literary, cultural and historical contexts. Despite its brevity, this essay is of great significance, critically and polemically, in the contexts of Ming poetics and the Ming-Qing dynastic transition. More specifically, it not only reflects the general literary temperament of the Ming remnants, but it also provides a critical apparatus with which to approach the kind of poetry Qian himself labored over in his later years, which became his most celebrated.

We argue that Qian's essay can be seen as targeted at the Ming loyalists and their sympathizers, in their day and in the future. A promise to the loyalists and a guide to posterity, the message can be interpreted on three levels. First, it issues an assurance: Qian assures the Ming loyalists that posterity will remember them, through their writings, just as the Ming people remember the Song loyalists. It is meant to impress on every loyalist the urgent necessity to record. Second, there is a summons: Qian urges the Ming loyalists to write *shishi*, the most effective record of their times. Third, Qian offers a reading strategy for posterity: read between the lines to flesh out the Ming loyalists' intent as embodied in those "subtle words." For the loyalists, Qian's promise is an immortality secured by writing a particular kind of verse, in a time when the loyalists were marginalized and had no authority except in the realm of literature. The writing of "Hu Zhiguo shi xu" might be an act of self-redemption on Qian's part, too. Qian knew if he could inscribe his own name on the monument of the loyalists, posterity would form a more favorable impression of him, and save him from the disgrace he had to bear in his mortal life.

Keywords: Qian Qianyi poetics of Ming loyalism "Hu Zhiguo shi xu" *shishi*
Ming-Qing transition

錢謙益之「詩史」說與明清易鼎之際的遺民詩學

中文提要

本文探論錢謙益 (1582-1664) 於明亡以後所倡之「詩史」說，剖析此一詩歌美學體系與明遺民情境之關係。錢氏詩史說之一大特色，端在結合中國史學傳統之褒貶觀與詩學傳統之美刺觀而為明遺民詩學點撥出一種「微言」式的修辭與喻意策略。就創作言，此一語言策略容許了抒情主體在詩篇中寄託一己之情思與乎經驗，亦賦予了載體在歷史記憶、政治及社會批評上重要的使命及功能。就詮釋言，具有詩史性格的詩篇要求讀者積極挖掘詩人於字裡行間所寄寓之情志與「大義」。本文將環繞錢謙益順治十三年 (1656) 所撰〈胡致果詩序〉一文展開論述，探究詩史與中國傳統史學、經學、詩學之關係，追蹊詩史在唐代、宋代、宋元之際及明代所歷經的發展，最後聚焦於明清易鼎之際的歷史、政治情勢及明遺民詩人的創作特色與集體訴求。錢氏〈胡致果詩序〉一文篇幅雖不長，卻是探論明遺民詩學與情境的重要文獻，藉之並可進窺錢氏晚年所作詩文的企圖與成就。

本文認為，錢氏〈胡致果詩序〉的讀者對象為明朝遺民及當時後世同情於遺民的文士。明清改朝換代之際，明遺民被逼或自願處於政治權力之外，特立獨行，其抱持者，為對前朝的記憶、認同與自我的價值、信念。詩史為一「見證」及「存在」美學，遺民藉之可將當代重要歷史、政治事件及己身之遭際、感慨筆之於文，傳之於世。而史學傳統的褒貶觀及詩學傳統的美刺觀在中國文化中地位崇高，亦為此時此地的書寫行動注入了超越實際政權的強韌力量。由是觀之，「立言」一途，亦可「不朽」，歌詩一藝，不能以小技目之。詩史於此端，遂亦具有對抗政治、命運的深沉意味。政權轉移之際，形勢險危。錢氏詩史說主微言大義，無異提供一種較為隱晦的修辭策略，在語犯時忌的陰影下，詩史性的書寫或多或少發揮著一種保障的功能。錢謙益的詩史說緊扣遺民處境建立，且述說之際，儼然以遺民自居。這也許是一種建構「意欲形象」的努力。世人咸知，錢氏身事明清二朝，為「貳臣」。錢氏通過詩史論述而以遺民形象出現，或欲洗刷其「貳臣」的歷史污點？或欲賦其未遂之志？

關鍵詞：錢謙益 明遺民詩學 〈胡致果詩序〉 詩史 明清之際

Qian Qianyi's Theory of *Shishi* during the Ming-Qing Transition

Lawrence C. H. Yim

Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy, Academia Sinica

In considering the poetics of the Ming-Qing transition, one may well begin with several fundamental questions: What did the poetic vocation mean to the survivors of the foreign invasion? When a city as rich in history and culture as Yangzhou had been utterly flattened by war in a matter of days, when human lives were as fragile as the morning dew, to use a Chinese metaphor, what did it mean to be a poet? Did the dynamics of tragedy generate a new, distinctive poetics? If so, how did this new mode of lyrical expression differ from the late-Ming verse, and its obsession with individuality and strangeness, or from the Qing poetry prevailing towards the close of the seventeenth century, and its paradigm of “elegance” and “correctness” (*yazheng* 雅正)? In this study, I address these issues by discussing Qian Qianyi's 錢謙益 (1582-1664) vision for the poetics of Ming loyalism formulated after the fall of the Ming house.¹

I am much obliged to the two anonymous readers whose constructive criticism, advice, and queries improved the paper considerably. One of the reviewers in particular took time to supply me with some extremely valuable comments and suggestions that led to significant improvement of the manuscript. Naturally, any errors that may remain are entirely my own responsibility.

¹ Ming loyalist, for want of a better word, translates *Ming yimin* 明遺民 in most of its occurrences in this study. My association of Qian Qianyi with the Ming loyalists may raise some eyebrows, since he is still an *erchen* 貳臣 (“twice-serving official”) to many. Indeed, the designation of *yimin* should be reserved for the former Ming subjects—whether officials or not—who chose not to seek or accept official posts from the subjugating Qing empire. The identity of *yimin* and its antithesis can be readily established should our interest be in checking who did not or who did serve the Qing. In this sense, Qian Qianyi is not a Ming *yimin* because he served the Ming and then the Qing. Yet the idea of *yimin* concerns more than a mere political act in dynastic transition: it involves a wide variety of constituent conditions (besides political and historical ones), complex psychologies, behavioral and social performances, and textual and cultural constitutions of the self.

Qian's theory of *shishi* synthesizes paramount values of Chinese historiographical and poetic traditions.² Although he draws heavily on ancient intellectual and literary

A publicly and historically constructed identity and a scattered and textually constituted self of a certain person are at times tautologically equivalent, and at times at odds with one another. And ultimately, when we place a so-called *yimin* and a non-*yimin* side by side in the aforementioned contexts and situations, their distinction will, more often than not, begin to blur. Most importantly, if our interests lie in understanding the existential conditions of life, the literature, and the layers and contours of feeling and emotion of the writers of the Ming-Qing transition, we must go beyond what a political-ethical position would allow. I have suggested elsewhere the adoption of the notion of "Ming loyalist poetics" or "poetics of Ming loyalism" to characterize the poetry of the Ming-Qing transition that verbalizes loyalty to and memory of the Ming. It included writers from both the *yimin* and non-*yimin* camps (politically defined) to represent its particular praxis and own sense of poetic vocation. This suggestion applies to the present study as well. See my "The Poetics of Historical Memory in the Ming-Qing Transition—A Study of Qian Qianyi's (1582-1664) Later Poetry" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1998), pp. 4-10. For literary and historical representations of Qian in Qing and modern times, see Xie Zhengguang 謝正光 (Andrew Hsieh), "Tanlun Qingchu shiwen dui Qian Muzhai pingjia zhi zhuanbian" 探論清初詩文對錢牧齋評價之轉變, in his *Qingchu shiwen yu shiren jiaoyou kao* 清初詩文與士人交遊考 (Nanjing: Nanjing daxue chubanshe, 2001), pp. 60-105; Kang-i Sun Chang, "A Case of Misreading: Qian Qianyi and His Place in History," in Wilt Idema, Wai-ye Li, and Ellen Widmer, eds., *Trauma and Transcendence in Early Qing Literature* (forthcoming from Harvard University Asia Center). For discussion of the identity of *yimin*, see Lynn Struve, "Ambivalence and Action: Some Frustrated Scholars of the K'ang-hsi Period," in Jonathan Spence & John Wills, Jr., eds., *From Ming to Ch'ing: Conquest, Region, and Continuity in Seventeenth-Century China* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1979), p. 327; Jennifer Jay, *A Change in Dynasties: Loyalty in Thirteenth-Century China* (Bellingham, Washington: Western Washington University, 1991), p. 6; Xie Zhengguang, "Qingchu suo jian 'yimin lu' zhi bianzhuan yu liuchuan" 清初所見「遺民錄」之編撰與流傳, in his *Qingchu shiwen yu shiren jiaoyou kao*, pp. 1-31; He Guanbiao 何冠彪 (Ho Koon Piu), "Lun Ming yimin zhi chuchu" 論明遺民之出處, in his *Mingmo Qingchu xueshu sixiang yanjiu* 明末清初學術思想研究 (Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1991), pp. 102-5n2; Zhang Bing 張兵, "Yimin yu yiminshi zhi liubian" 遺民與遺民詩之流變, *Xibei shida xuebao* (shehui kexue ban) 西北師大學報(社會科學版) 35.4 (Jul. 1998): 7-12; Zhao Yuan 趙園, *Ming Qing zhiji shidafu yanjiu* 明清之際士大夫研究 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1999), pp. 257-79; Tobie Meyer-Fong, *Building Culture in Early Qing Yangzhou* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2003), pp. 33-34.

² It is not irrelevant to note that Qian was a serious historian, both in pursuit of professional goals and personal gratification. Throughout his long life, Qian committed himself to various historiographical projects. In 1610, Qian earned his *jinshi* degree and the Wanli emperor appointed him, then age twenty-nine, to the post of Historiographer (Shiguan 史官). (Qian's formal position

precursors, let me suggest at once, his purpose is not to restore the values of antiquity.

was Junior Compiler in the Hanlin Academy, Hanlinyuan Bianxiu 翰林院編修, with the rank of 7b.) Qian held the office for only a few months, since his father died that same year. Qian requested a leave of absence and went home for the mourning period. As it happens, partisan politics kept him from resuming his position for the next eleven years. Although he held the post for so short a time, in many of his writings Qian continues to style himself “The former Historiographer” (*jiu shiguan* 舊史官), an indication of his regard for the historian’s vocation. During the short-lived Hongguang reign (1645), Qian asked for permission to compose the Ming history, and suggested that he supervise the project at his private library, the marvelous Jiangyunlou 絳雲樓. The Hongguang emperor, however, did not grant him the honor. During his service with the Qing (1646), besides holding the position of Vice Minister of Rites, Qian was also engaged in the Ming History compilation project as Vice Supervisor. When he “retired” from the Qing court, he privately and single-handedly undertook the Ming history project. It was said that he had already drafted one hundred *juan* of the Ming history before his library caught fire in the winter of 1650. The manuscript, along with many priceless editions of Song and Yuan books, was, alas, destroyed. For a study of Qian’s book collecting and library, see Jian Xiujuan 簡秀娟, *Qian Qianyi cangshu yanjiu* 錢謙益藏書研究 (Taipei: Hanmei chubanshe, 1991). Qian was often noted by his contemporaries for his dedication and splendid ability as a historical writer. Some even suggested that Qian chose not to die for the Ming in 1645 but survived to serve the Qing because of his desire to compose the Ming history. See Wu Zuxiu’s 吳祖修 poem “Shu Muzhai shi hou” 書牧齋詩後, included in Qian Zhonglian 錢仲聯, ed., *Qingshi jishi* 清詩紀事 (Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1987), pp. 934-35, and Shen Deqian’s 沈德潛 comment on the poem, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 935; and Ling Fengxiang’s 凌鳳翔 preface to the *You xue ji* 有學集, *Sibu congkan* 四部叢刊 edition (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1979), “zhengbian” 正編, vol. 79. The high opinion of Qian’s historiographical talent has not been limited to Qian’s contemporaries: some of his works, especially those on the early Ming, are still consulted by modern historians. See Frederick Mote’s “Bibliographic Notes” for “The Rise of the Ming Dynasty, 1330-1367,” in Frederick Mote & Dennis Twitchett, eds., *The Cambridge History of China, Vol. 7, The Ming Dynasty, 1368-1644, Part I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 783-84. For studies of Qian’s historiography, see Du Weiyun 杜維運, “Qian Qianyi qi ren ji qi shixue” 錢謙益其人及其史學, in his *Qingdai shijia yu shixue* 清代史家與史學 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988), pp. 223-33; Yang Jinlong 楊晉龍 (Yang Chin-lung), “Qian Qianyi shixue yanjiu” 錢謙益史學研究 (M.A. thesis, Gaoxiong shifan xueyuan 高雄師範學院, 1989); Zhang Yonggui 張永貴 & Li Jianjun 黎建軍, “Qian Qianyi shixue sixiang pingshu” 錢謙益史學思想評述, *Shixue yuekan* 史學月刊 2000.2: 19-24; Qian Maowei 錢茂偉, *Mingdai shixue de licheng* 明代史學的歷程 (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2003), pp. 326-32; Wang Rongzu 汪榮祖 (Young-tsu Wong), “Qian Muzhai de shibi” 錢牧齋的史筆, *Zhongguo wenzhe yanjiu tongxun* 中國文哲研究通訊 (Newsletter of the Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy) 14.2 (Jun. 2004): 49-61.

Qian strives, rather, to demarcate a poetic space for Ming loyalism, a space and value Qian no doubt desires to share with the Ming loyalists; and to devise, for this line of writing, a hermeneutic strategy for his contemporaries and posterity.

We will expose elements of this theory in a close reading of Qian's important essay, "Hu Zhiguo shi xu" 胡致果詩序 (Preface to Hu Zhiguo's Poetry),³ and an examination of related literary, cultural and historical contexts. Despite its brevity, this essay is of great significance, critically and polemically, in the contexts of Ming poetics and the Ming-Qing dynastic transition. More specifically, it not only reflects the general literary temperament of the Ming remnants, but it also provides a critical apparatus with which to approach the kind of poetry Qian himself labored over in his later years, which became his most celebrated.

Although an excellent place to observe the special features of the poetics of the Ming-Qing transition, "Hu Zhiguo shi xu" is no easy read. The entire essay is saturated with historical and topical references and at the same time highly allusive and lyrical. It demands an extensive commentary.

Dating of "Hu Zhiguo shi xu"

"Hu Zhiguo shi xu" was not dated, but it was most likely composed sometime in the spring of 1656, on Qian's visit to Nanjing: In his essay, Qian mentions that he met with Hu Zhiguo in Jinling 金陵 (Nanjing). Between 1645 and 1664, his "retirement" from the Manchu court and his death, Qian stayed in Nanjing on four occasions.⁴ The

³ In Qian Zhonglian 錢仲聯, ed., *Muzhai you xue ji* 牧齋有學集 [hereafter *You xue ji*] (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1996), *juan* 18, pp. 800-1.

⁴ In preparing this study, I have consulted, among others, the following biographical sources on Qian Qianyi: Wang Zhonghan 王鍾翰, ed., *Qing shi liezhuan* 清史列傳 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987), 79:6575-78; Jin Hechong 金鶴沖, *Qian Muzhai xiansheng nianpu* 錢牧齋先生年譜 (prefaced 1941 by Qian Wenxuan 錢文選, n.p., n.d.), recently included in Qian Zhonglian 錢仲聯, ed., *Muzhai zazhu* 牧齋雜著, in *Qian Muzhai quanji* 錢牧齋全集 [hereafter *Quanji*] (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2003), pp. 930-52 (Qian Zhonglian's *Quanji* also contains some other important biographical material in pp. 930-75); Pengcheng tuishi 彭城退士, *Qian Muweng xiansheng nianpu* 錢牧翁先生年譜, appended in *Muzhai wannian jiacheng wen* 牧齋晚年家乘文 (Shanghai: Guoxue fulun she 國學扶輪社, 1911); Ge Wanli 葛萬里, *Muweng xiansheng nianpu* 牧翁先生年譜, in Lei Jin 雷瑒, comp., *Qingren shuohui er bian* 清人說薈二編 (Shanghai: Saoyeshanfang 掃葉山房, 1917), pp. 575-89, reprinted in Wang Youli 王有立, ed., *Zhonghua wenshi congshu* 中華文史叢書 (Taipei: Huawen shuju, 1969), ser. 11; Hu Wenkai 胡文楷, "Liu

first was from 1647 to 1649, when he was arrested and put on trial in Nanjing because of his implication in Ming restoration activities. In early winter 1651, in late 1655 to spring 1656, and in winter 1657, Qian came back for visits. In another undated essay, “Zengbie Hu Jingfu xu” 贈別胡靜夫序 (In Bidding Hu Jingfu Farewell), Qian says that he had written a preface to Hu’s collection of poems on his previous visit to Nanjing, and that seven years later he met with Hu again and composed another preface to Hu’s poetry, the “Zengbie” essay.⁵ The generic meaning of *zengbie* 贈別—a word that frequently occurs in the titles of poems or essays dedicated to a departing visitor—indicates a visit that Hu paid Qian and a farewell gesture on the part of Qian. Even though such a visit by Hu to Qian’s home in Changshu 常熟 is not documented, for reasons that we will give shortly, it would be wise to follow historian Chen Yinke’s 陳寅恪 (1890-1969) suggestion of dating Hu’s trip and Qian’s “Zengbie Hu Jingfu xu” to 1662.⁶

Chen’s date can be inferred from the contents and circumstances of two poems, one by Qian and another by Hu. During his visit of 1656 to Nanjing, Qian wrote a poem-series named “Bingshen chun jiuyi Qinhuai, yu Ding jia shuige, jia liangyue, linxing zuo jueju sanshi shou liubie liuti, bufu lunci” 丙申春就醫秦淮，寓丁家水閣，浹兩月，臨行作絕句三十首留別留題，不復論次。Musings on his Nanjing friends and acquaintances comprise the bulk of these thirty poems, no. 18 of which was dedicated to Hu (see Appendix B for the text).⁷ This attests to the fact that the two men

Rushi nianpu” 柳如是年譜, *Donfang zazhi* 東方雜誌 43.3: 37-47, recently included in Fan Jingzhong 范景中 & Zhou Shutian 周書田, eds., *Liu Rushi shiji* 柳如是事輯 (Hangzhou: Zhongguo meishu xueyuan chubanshe, 2002), pp. 465-500; Chen Yinke’s 陳寅恪 study of Liu Rushi and Qian Qianyi, *Liu Rushi biezhuàn* 柳如是別傳 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1980); L. Carrington Goodrich & J.C. Yang’s biographical entry “Ch’ien Ch’ien-I [Qian Qianyi],” in Arthur W. Hummel, ed., *Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing Period (1644-1912)* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1943-44), pp. 148-50. Pei Shijun’s 裴世俊 recent comprehensive biography of Qian, *Sihai zongmeng wushi nian: Qian Qianyi zhuan* 四海宗盟五十年：錢謙益傳 (Beijing: Dongfang chubanshe, 2001), is convenient to use for major events of Qian’s life and the general historical background. Cai Yingyuan’s 蔡營源 earlier book, *Qian Qianyi zhi shengping yu zhushu* 錢謙益之生平與著述 (Miaoli: Privately printed, 1976), is also useful.

⁵ *You xue ji*, juan 22, pp. 897-99.

⁶ See Chen Yinke, *Liu Rushi biezhuàn*, pp. 1087-88.

⁷ *You xue ji*, juan 6, p. 285.

met in 1656. In *Wu zhi ji* 吾炙集, a compilation of poems by contemporary poets collected by Qian mostly between 1656 and early 1660s (see below), we find three verses by Hu. The one that holds the greatest interest for us is entitled “Yushan gui ge, shang da Zongbo Muzhai fuzi” 虞山檜歌, 上大宗伯牧齋夫子 (Song of the Juniper Tree of Yushan, Presented to Master Muzhai the Grand Minister), in tribute to Qian. Portions of the poem read:

矯矯虞山檜	Towering is the juniper tree of Yushan
天挺虬龍姿	Whose robust stature resembles a coiling dragon
高柯應北辰	His tall branches reach up the North Star
清風貫四時	Pure winds chime against him all seasons
.....	
樵人礪斧曷敢近	The woodcutter's gleaming axe dares not approach him
神物抱節誰能窺	This holy creature has an integrity that few comprehend
我時翹首不得見	So many times I raised my head yet failed to gain a sight of him
再拜先生冰雪儀	Now I curtsy, once again, to his pure, awe-inspiring appearance
.....	
七年遙隔杜鵑夢	For seven long years, the dreams of the cuckoos have not crossed
二月重逢楊柳絲	In the second month, amid the tender willow branches we meet again
花霧霏微舊陵闕	Flowers in drizzle, fog light, imperial mausoleums shrouded in gloom
白頭喬木兩含悲	Two white-headed arbors suffused with melancholy ⁸

The location of the *gui* 檜 tree, the metaphor adopted by Hu for Qian, is specific—the tree is rooted in the soil of Yushan, Qian's home area. The tree's images conjured here are concrete and vivid, too, giving the impression that they came from an actual viewing, not from Hu's poetic imagination. This lends credence to the idea that Hu did make a trip to Changshu to see Qian. The poem also relates that it was in the second month of the year that he and Qian met again, after a duration of seven years. This matches the time frame of their reunion that Qian cites in the “Zengbie” essay. Both Hu's “Yushan” poem and Qian's “Zengbie” essay are likely to have been occasioned by Hu's visit to Yushan. As a meeting between the two in 1656 is attested by the

⁸ *Wu zhi ji*, 15a, in Zhou Fagao 周法高, ed., *Zuben Qian Zeng Muzhai shi zhu* 足本錢曾牧齋詩註 (Taipei: Privately printed, 1973), 5: 2797. See Appendix A for the entire text. All translations in this study are mine unless otherwise noted.

“Bingshen chun jiuyi Qinhui” poem, and there is no other mention of their having met except in the two places that we just examined, it is natural for us to assign 1662 for their reunion—between 1656 and 1662 lies a period of roughly seven years—and to assume that seven years before, in Nanjing, Qian had composed “Hu Zhiguo shi xu.”

Attributing other dates to “Hu Zhiguo shi xu” is less desirable for the following reasons. From 1647 to 1649, Qian did spend substantial time in Nanjing, but he was in detention; it does not appear to provide conditions under which he could have written “Hu Zhiguo shi xu.” Moreover, Qian begins the “Zengbie” essay with this sentence: “On my previous visit to Nanjing” (*wang yu you Jinling* 往余游金陵). The word *you* 游 implies a leisurely visit; the dreadful experience of Qian’s detention and trial would not have allowed the use of the word. One might argue that in the beginning of the trial, the circumstances were very black against Qian—as Qian complains in “He Dongpo ‘Xitai’ shiyun liu shou” 和東坡西臺詩韻六首 (Rhyming with Su Dongpo’s “At the Censorate,” Six Poems), written in 1647 about the event⁹—but after the first few months, Qian’s situation seems to have improved significantly. Qian could have written “Hu Zhiguo shi xu” in the latter part of his 1647-1649 Nanjing stay.¹⁰ Indeed, in the collection of his 1648 and 1649 poems, Qian appears to be taking part in some social and literary activities, and by 1649 he had regained enough peace of mind to pen quite a few poems and essays, and to consult materials in local libraries for a literary project he was working on. But if “Hu Zhiguo shi xu” had come from this point in time, it would then place the “Zengbie” essay in 1656. However, as Hu’s poem reveals, the reunion of the two took place in the second month of that year in Yushan. Yet, from the late winter of 1655 to the spring of 1656, Qian was away from home in Nanjing. This precludes the likelihood that Qian wrote “Hu Zhiguo shi xu” in 1649. Nor does 1651 seem likely to be the year. In around November that year Qian traveled to Nanjing to avoid the birthday fuss. After arriving in Nanjing, he very quickly retreated into a Buddhist monastery for the company of a few monk friends and for discussions

⁹ *You xue ji*, *juan* 1, pp. 8-13.

¹⁰ As I myself did, in my 1998 dissertation for Yale University, where I suggested dating “Hu Zhiguo shi xu” to 1649, and “Zengbie Hu Jingfu xu” to 1656. I must thank the anonymous reviewer of this study who urges me to reconsider the particular details contained in the literature that I am examining in this section. As he/she argues convincingly in the reader’s report, Hu Zhiguo’s visit of 1662 to Qian in Changshu should be taken as an actual event, as Chen Yinke has suggested. I am happy to correct myself.

of Buddhist doctrines. Very little interaction between Qian and members of the Nanjing literati circle is recorded for this one-month visit. The only other possible date remaining is 1657, when Qian spent the winter in Nanjing. But as there exists no record, or hint, of the two men's meeting in this particular year, and as all related materials favor 1656 more, we shall leave 1657 out.

Who was Hu Zhiguo, for whom Qian Qianyi wrote the particularly rich and nuanced essay "Hu Zhiguo shi xu," and what was Hu's motive in visiting Qian in Changshu? About Hu Zhiguo we know precious little, but he was surely not a prominent figure in the Ming-Qing transition. We know neither his dates nor, with any certainty, what he did during his life. The very limited information that we do have gives the impression that he led a reclusive, loyalist life in Nanjing after the demise of the Ming. He won some recognition from his contemporaries for his poetry, but only among fellow Ming loyalists, as no mention of him can be found outside loyalist circles. Hu's poetry is extant only in part (see Appendix A for the texts).¹¹ In Qian's "Bingshen chun jiuyi Qinhuai" poem, Hu Zhiguo is depicted as a reclusive scholar. From "Hu Zhiguo shi xu" and "Zengbie Hu Jingfu xu," Hu emerges as a serious poet. As my discussions below will show, Qian paints Hu in the colors of a Ming loyalist in "Hu Zhiguo shi xu," too. Qian's descriptions of Hu accord more or less with a brief biographical sketch of Hu in Zhuo Erkan's 卓爾堪 (1653-1712 after)¹² *Yimin shi* 遺民詩 (An Anthology of [Ming] Loyalist Poetry), in which thirteen poems by Hu were included. From Zhuo's anthology we learn that Hu's name was Qiyi 其毅, Zhiguo being his *zi*, and Hu adopted the style name Jingfu 靜夫. Hu was native to Jiangning 江寧 (Nanjing), and he wrote a collection of poetry called *Jingzhuozhai gao* 靜拙齋稿 (Writings from the Quiet and Artless Studio), which is no longer extant. Zhuo suggests that Hu was a "humble" (*qianjin* 謙謹) and "self-possessed" (*zichi* 自持) man, and that Hu's poetry shows a "limpid and calm" (*chongdan* 沖淡) quality. Among all of Hu's existing poems, almost none, in my opinion, matches the style that Qian attributes to

¹¹ They are gathered from Zhuo Erkan 卓爾堪, comp., *Yimin shi* 遺民詩, Shanghai You zheng shuju 有正書局 *Mingmo sibaizha yimin shi* 明末四百家遺民詩 1910 edition; Wang Yu 王豫, comp., *Jiangsu shizheng* 江蘇詩徵, 1820 edition; and Zhu Xuzeng 朱緒曾 et al., comps., *Guochao Jinling shizheng* 國朝金陵詩徵, 1892 edition.

¹² The precise dates of Zhuo Erkan's life were not established until very recently, when Pan Chengyu 潘承玉 published his book on Zhuo. See Pan Chengyu, *Qingchu shitan: Zhuo Erkan yu Yimin shi yanjiu* 清初詩壇：卓爾堪與《遺民詩》研究 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004), pp. 38-108.

Hu in “Hu Zhiguo shi xu.” There is, of course, the possibility that what Qian had read of Hu was very different from the poems we have of Hu’s today.

Even less is known about the reason for Hu’s visit to Yushan, but Chen Yinke has speculated about it. Chen holds that Qian had been a secret leader of the Ming revival movement in Jiangnan, coordinating activities and loyalists; and that Hu went to Changshu to update Qian with the latest information about Nanjing in the wake of Zheng Chenggong’s 鄭成功 (1624-62) defeat by the Qing forces in 1659. What particularly prompted Hu’s 1662 trip, Chen further asserts, was the recent death of the Qing Shunzhi 順治 emperor (r. 1644-61), which compelled the Ming loyalists to network and evaluate situations at hand.¹³ Chen’s theory can be supported, at least in part, by further reading of Hu’s “Yushan gui ge” poem. The poem contains this passage:

百草萎霜困鵲鳩	All the flowers fell on the frostbitten ground, paining the cuckoos
羣萌向暖復歲蕤	Those sprouts, facing the warming sun, grew into vigorous plants again
獨此潛根凍壑走	Only this tree spreads his hidden roots under the cold ravine
依然拔地蒼雲垂	Nonetheless, he thrusts up from the ground into the hanging clouds

To the initiated reader of Chinese poetry, the images of the first two lines here, of the flowers fallen in the cold and the sprouts gaining strength by embracing the warmth, have echoes of Qu Yuan’s 屈原 melancholic poem, “Li sao” 離騷 (Encountering Sorrow), where the poet uses “fragrant flowers” (*fangcao* 芳草) to symbolize men of virtue, who are forced out by sycophants in the court of the king.

¹³ Taking the major historical events of these few years into consideration, the anonymous reviewer of this study suggests that Chen’s analysis, though viable, can be further fine-tuned: as Zheng’s defeat in Nanjing had occurred in 1659 and there were no momentous happenings associated with Nanjing afterwards, one can instead contextualize Hu’s trip to Changshu with the recent capture (and later execution) of the Yongli 永曆 emperor (r. 1647-61) of the Southern Ming by Wu Sangui 吳三桂 on the Qing side, an event that was crushing to the Ming loyalists. Qian makes a clear reference to the rumors surrounding Yongli’s doom in one poem-series of 1663 in his *Toubi ji* 投筆集. In this connection, the anonymous reader of this study maintains that it is perhaps more desirable to date Hu’s visit to 1663. His/her theory deserves further exploration. Dating Hu’s “Yushan” poem and Qian’s “Zengbie” essay to either 1662 or 1663 will not affect the 1656 status of “Hu Zhiguo shi xu,” as the traditional Chinese reckoning of “years” is ordinal, allowing the give or take of one year.

This symbolism is developed by its further association with the image of a cuckoo—which appears here as the *tijue* 鷓鴣 and above as the *dujuan* 杜鵑—not in the original “Li sao” context. In the Chinese poetic tradition, the cuckoo invokes nostalgia and sadness for the lost country. This orients “Yushan gui ge” towards the particular political and historical situations of the Ming-Qing changeover and creates the impression that the Ming loyalists are unable to prevail against the ever-more-powerful Qing dynasty, and that many people are courting imperial favor and seeking ways to return to official life again. In this connection, the tree in the following two lines appears as one willing to stand even alone for his principles and belief in the face of overwhelming adversity. From the images of its roots hiding yet still spreading, and of its trunk rising sheer from the ground, one might suggest that he has earned admiration and respect from the like-minded community. Another two lines of the poem characterize him as a leader worthy of a place in the history books:

丞相黃冠指南錄	The Grand Councilor put on a yellow [Daoist] cap, [but he left behind] the book <i>Pointing the Way</i>
尙書赤舄居東期	The Imperial Secretariat wore red shoes, [and emerged with his ministership after] a long retirement on Eastern Hills

This is a couplet designed to lionize Qian. Hu Zhiguo compares Qian to Wen Tianxiang 文天祥 (1236-83) of the Southern Song dynasty in the first line, and to Xie An 謝安 (320-83) of the Eastern Jin in the second. Author of *Zhinan lu* (*Pointing the Way*), Wen was the legendary Song martyr who directed the last Song resistance to the Mongol-Yuan invasion. Wen had since become an icon of steadfast loyalty to the country and many Ming loyalists aspired to his example. Xie An saved the Eastern Jin by orchestrating the defeat of Fu Jian’s conquering army at the famous battle at Feishui. One particular detail of Xie’s life is alluded to here, that Xie was recalled to the imperial court only after a long, forced retirement. The hopeful undertone of this couplet is that, when the time comes, Qian would reemerge as a national leader, honored, for his sterling worth and faithful service, with the most prestigious official post.

Clearly, Hu Zhiguo does not look to Qian Qianyi as a mere mentor of literature. The richly nuanced symbols and metaphors and their implications in “Yushan gui ge” unambiguously suggest that Hu and Qian were bonded by the shared Ming loyalist morals, sentiments, and values, if not by their common involvement in a certain Ming

revival campaign, as Chen Yinke maintains. Hu's "Yushan gui ge" provides a window into how some Ming *yimin* perceived Qian. We thus expect that Qian would reveal certain aspects of Hu's Ming loyalist experience in "Zengbie Hu Jingfu xu" as well. But unfortunately for us, Qian's "Zengbie" essay, in contrast, only dwells on Qian and Hu's friendship and ideas of poetry. Hu appears in the essay as a serious, sensitive and passionate poet, and that is about all. To know more about Hu, we will have to turn to other places, such as "Hu Zhiguo shi xu," the main subject matter of this paper. But even there, where we are shown more of Hu's thoughts and feelings, not much information about Hu as a historical person is available.

The classical thesis on the bond between history and poetry: "praise and blame," "praise and satire," and rhetoric of "subtlety"

Qian Qianyi's "Hu Zhiguo shi xu" begins as follows:

Mencius said: "When songs were left uncollected, the *Spring and Autumn Annals* was composed." All the poems written before the *Spring and Autumn Annals* are histories of states. It was known that Confucius had edited the poems, but not that he meant to construct a history [out of them]. It was known that Confucius had composed the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, but not that he meant it as a continuation of those poems. The *Book of Odes*, the *Book of Documents*, and the *Spring and Autumn Annals* are one book in sequence, [but people] divided it and made it into three. Since the Three Ages, history concerns itself only with history, and poetry only with poetry, yet it cannot be that the significance of poetry is not drawn from history.

孟子曰：“《詩》亡然後《春秋》作。”《春秋》未作以前之詩，皆國史也。人知夫子之刪詩，不知其爲定史，人知夫子之作《春秋》，不知其爲續《詩》。《詩》也，《書》也，《春秋》也，首尾爲一書，離而三之者也。三代以降，史自史，詩自詩，而詩之義不能不本于史。¹⁴

Theorists, traditional and modern, who maintain that there is a direct link between the *Book of Odes* and the *Spring and Autumn Annals* rely on Mencius' remark:

When the sway of the kings was gone, songs were left uncollected. When songs were left

¹⁴ *You xue ji*, juan 18, p. 800.