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Abstract

Of the many Chinese who sought refuge in Japan during the middle of the seventeenth century, Zhu Shunshui 朱舜水 (1600-1682) is perhaps one of the most talked about. He fled China in 1645. In 1659, giving up all hopes on the restoration of the fallen Ming dynasty 明朝 (1368-1644) after fifteen-year’s unfruitful efforts, Shunshui decided to sojourn in Japan and sworn not to return until the Manchu 滿族 regime is driven out of China. During his stay in Japan, the prominent Mito 水戶 domain lord Tokugawa Mitsukuni 徳川光圀 (1628-1701) hired him as his teacher. Mitsukuni is the founding father of the Mitogaku 水戸学, one of the most important schools of thought in Edo period (1603-1867). This school aimed to reconstruct the historiography of Japan by Chinese Neo-Confucianism principles so as to promulgate indigenous Shinto beliefs and absolute loyalty to the emperor. The close relationship between Shunshui and Mitsukuni, and the involvement of Shunshui’s students in projects initiated by Mitsukuni, including the compilation of the Dai Nihon Shi 大日本史 (The History of the Great Japan, 1906), make some scholars believe that Shunshui has dominant influence on Japan’s Neo-Confucian thoughts, if not all Edo thoughts, as well as far-fetching inspiration on Meiji Ishin 明治維新 (the Meiji Restoration, 1868). But the flow of information among brains and its effect on recipient is too dynamic to be measured. Cultural influence over time is even more difficult to trace. By investigating Shunshui’s relationship with different people and his involvement in various events in Japan during his life time, this paper aims to clarify whether the general beliefs on his influence are plausible. In case when the findings are negative, the paper will look into the causes and suggest where Shunshui’s should be.
Lay Summary

During the middle of the seventeenth century, a Chinese intellectual named Zhu Shunshui (1600-1682), after failing to help expel the invading foreign tribal enemy, decided to spend his life in Japan until the enemy is driven out of China. Accidentally, he was known to powerful people in the Japanese government and was eventually hired to be the teacher of a well respected regional lord called Tokugawa Mitsukuni. Mitsukuni was the founder of an important school of thought in Japan, the teaching of which was said to have inspired people two centuries after. Since Zhu was not only Mitsukuni’s teacher but was also one to many famous Japanese scholars, he is therefore considered to have lingering influence on Japan. By walking through Shunshui’s life, this paper tries to clarify the impact he has on others, as well as those influence on and via him during his life time in Japan.
Preface

This thesis is an original, unpublished, independent work by the author, Wai Keung Steven Yeung.
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1 Introduction

During the latter half of the seventeenth century, Japan was the common shelter for Chinese who wanted to escape the rule of the Qing regime (1644-1912). Many of these Chinese brought skills and technologies that left the archipelago with legacies of different sorts. Chen Yuanyun 陳元贇 (J. Chin Genpin, 1587-1671) is one of them. He had left Japan not just his medicine knowledge, calligraphy, and poetries, but also a style of pottery called genpin yaki 元贇焼 (Genpin-ware), which is still famous in Nagoya today, as well as a school of jujutsu 柔術 (a Japanese martial art) called kitō-ryū 起倒流. Linji 臨濟 Chan 禪 (J. Zen) Buddhist monk Yinyuan Longqi 隱元隆琦 (J. Ingen Ryūki, 1592-1673) is another celebrated Chinese immigrant. Ingen founded a school of Zen Buddhism named Ōbaku sect 黃檗宗. He is also the forefather of senchadō 煎茶道 (Sencha tea ceremony). There are many other more. But among them, Zhu Zhiyu 朱之瑜 (better known as Zhu Shunshui 朱舜水; J. Shu Shunsui, 1600-1682)\(^1\) is perhaps one of the most exalted for his influence on Japan. The ovation of Shunshui’s influence on Japan probably started by Count Gotō Shinpei 後藤新平 (後藤新平伯爵, 1857-1929). He lauded Zhu Shunshui in 1912 thus:

As for the Summoned Lord\(^2\) Zhu Zhiyu of the latter Ming dynasty, he was the most valuable and the most precious tribute\(^3\) our neighbouring country\(^4\) has offered…. As his

---

\(^1\) For consistency, Chinese pinyin will be used for the name of Zhu Shunshui throughout this paper, except in book or article titles, and in quote.


\(^3\) The word choice here is worth noting.

\(^4\) That is China.
hope for restoring the Ming court failed, he insinuated his loyalty to Ming and the resentment smouldered within himself in a piece of complimentary remark on Nankō5. [In this remark, Zhu] illuminated the cardinal principles of right and wrong, elucidated the Way of the [Sage] Kings, [and thus] let the sun and the moon of the Eastern Sea dazzle eternally. Was he not an ideal of a virtuous person? Since Zhiyu [refused to take Qing ruler as his emperor, just as Lu Lian] considered it not righteous to respect Qin as sovereign, and held tight to the principles [identicite to those as] Lu Lian’s6, he resolutely ventured into the Eastern Sea and came [to Japan]. He was recognized and patronized by Gikō [Tokugawa Mitsukuni 徳川光圀 (1628-1701; in office 1661-1690)]7 and became as imperishable as the stele of Minatogawa8. Furthermore, the spirit of his immaculate loyalty in revering the king, exuberant and encompassing, subtly germinated for almost two hundred years and finally developed into loyalists’ campaign of guarding the Emperor9 [at the end of Tokugawa period]. It further advanced into [the movement of] oseifuoku10 [that abolished the shōgun and return the ruling power to the Emperor as was

---

5 Nankō 楠公 (the revered Mr. Kusunoki) refers to Kusunoki Masashige 楠正成 or 楠木正成 (1294-1336). The “complimentary remark” refers to the eulogy Shunshui wrote for Masashige. More detailed discussion on both Masashige and the eulogy can be found later in this paper. The use of kō 公 is similar to gong in Chinese with the same character, which is a term of respect close to “sir”, or simply “mister” in English. See Endymion Wilkinson, Chinese History – A New Manual, second revised printing (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Asian Center, 2012): 137, for a more detailed discussion.

6 Shinpei is comparing Shunshui to Lu Lian 魯連 (305-245 BCE) here. Lu Lian, also known as Lu Zhonglian 魯仲連, was a lobbyist and strategist from the State of Qi 齊國 during the Warring States Period 戰國時代 (403-221BCE) of China. He once had a famous debate with Xin Yuanyan 辛垣衍 (?-?) from the State of Wei 魏國 in the State of Zhao 趙國, during which he was recorded saying “That Qin [King]…[if we let him assault us unscrupulously without inhibition and consummate his ambition of ruling all under heavens, then [I] Lian would have no choice but to plunge myself into the Eastern Sea and die. How could I tolerate myself to be his subject?]” 彼秦者…彼則肆然而為帝，過而遂正於天下，則連有赴東海而死矣。吾不忍為之民也! Anonymous, Zhanguo ce 戰國策 [The Strategies of the Warring States], ed. Liu Xiang 劉向 (77 BCE-6 CE), annotated GaoYou 高誘 (3rd century), photocopy of Qing re-carved of Southern Song woodblock printing version (Hong Kong: Yiwen 藝文, 1974), 398. See also “Lu zhonglian zhao yang liezhuang 魯仲連鄭陽列傳 [the Biographies of Lu Zhonglian and Zhou Yang]”, in Shiki kaichū kōshō 史記會注考證 [Collection and criticisms of commentaries on the Book of History], ed. Takigawa Kametarō 瀧川巌太郎, vols. 10, juan 83 (Tokyo: Tōhō bunka gakuin, Tōkyō kenkyūjo 東京研究所, 1934, Rpnt., Hong Kong: Yiwen Yinshuguan, year unknown), 5-6.

7 Gikō 義公 is the title posthumously granted to the eminent Mito 水戸 lord Tokugawa Mitsukuni.

8 The stele refers to nankōbōhi 楠公墓碑 (the Monument of Nankō) erected in front of the tomb of Masashige inside minatogawa jinja 湊川神社 (the Minatogawa Shrine) in Kobe, Japan, with the eulogy written by Shunshui engraved at its back.

9 Kin’ō 勤王 (guarding the emperor) was a political slogan campaigned by loyalists at the end of Tokugawa period (1603-1868). Its meaning is to militarily support and protect the emperor.

10 Ōseifuoko 王政復古 literally means reverting the imperial rule to ancient model. During the mid-nineteenth century Japan, it was a joint regional movement forcing the shōgun to return the rule to the emperor which marked the dawn of the Meiji Restoration.
in ancient time] and finally facilitated the great achievement of the Reform, leading to the impressive growth of our nation’s prosperity in recent days. What we received from Zhiyu is surely extensive. 若明季徵君朱之瑜, 隣邦所貢之至琛又至寶也。… 從明室恢復之志不成，而以滿身忠愨之氣，寓之一篇楠公之題贊。燭大義，闡王道，使東海之日月有光于千載，豈不賢乎! 之瑜既義不帝秦，堅守魯連之志，遂來蹈東海，得義公之知遇，乃為與湊川之碑不朽千古之人。況于其純忠尊王之精神，滂渙鬱屈，潛默醞釀，可二百年。而遂發為志士勤王之倡議，一轉王政復古，乃至翼成維新之大業，以致國運今日之蔚興。我之所得于之瑜也固大矣。 If a Japanese high-status statesman praises Shunshui to such an extent, it is not surprising to see more from Shunshui’s own fellow countrymen. Liang Qichao 梁啓超 (1873-1929) is one of them. In his Zhongguo jin sanbai nian xueshushi 中國近三百年學術史 [Academic history of China in the recent three hundred years], 1924, Liang comments that:

Shunshui, with his utmost candid and outstanding character, his utmost down to earth and yet erudite scholarship, and his utmost cordial and affable affection, left the entire population of Japan an unsurpassable influence for [cultural] advancement. The biggest impetus that turned all Japanese completely into Confucian nationals during the two hundred years of the Tokugawa [regime] was really from Shunshui. In his subsequent compilation of [a book called] “the History of the Great Japan”, Tokugawa Mitsukuni specifically propagates the principle of “Revering the Emperor and Exalting

11 Ishin 維新 is short for meiji ishin 明治維新 (Meiji Restoration). Ishin was a movement happened in the latter half of the nineteenth century which led to the modernized Japan as a world power.


All translation in this paper are mine unless otherwise stipulated.

13 Liang Qichao, Zhong guo jin sanbai nian xue shu shi 中國近三百年學術史 [The Academic History of China in the Recent Three Hundred Years] (Shanghai: Shanghai Sanlian, 2006). There are many editions and reprints since it was first published in 1924. The page numbers cited here are from Sanlian reprint edition.

14 The phrase ganhua 感化 literally means conversion or reform brought about through emotional appeal.

15 Dai nihon shi 大日本史 (The History of the Great Japan) was the major vehicle Mitsukuni used to propagate his ideology of legitimacy and revering the emperor. According to the chronological biography of Mitsukuni, he already had this idea since he was eighteen in 1645. The Dai nihon shi compilation project formally started at 1657 when Mitsukuni was thirty. However, it was not completed until 1906. The book is in jizhuan ti 紀傳體 (J. kidentai 紀傳体, basic annals-biography form) which comprises a total of 397 scrolls in 226 volumes.
Fifty years ago, Tokugawa Yoshinobu [德川慶喜 1837-1913; in office 1867-1868] returned the governing power to the [Japanese] emperor. [The emperor] abolished the han system and installed a prefectural one [instead]. The credits of achieving the Meiji Restoration should [thus] mostly go to this book of Mitsukuni’s. And since Mitsukuni’s knowledge was all from Shunshui, Shunshui was therefore not only the benefactor of the Tokugawa regime, but was also the most powerful mentor for guiding Japan in reforming to prosperity. Shunshui以極光明俊偉的人格，極平實淹貫的學問，極肫摯和藹的感情，給日本全國人以莫大的感化。德川二百年，日本整個變成儒教的國民，最大的動力實在舜水。所以舜水不特是德川朝的恩人，也是日

Copious researches on Zhu Shunshui’s influence on Japan come out since, largely following the tone set by Gotô and Liang, covering a wide spectrum from cultural landscape to gardening landscape, even the habit of enjoying *ramen* (Ch. *lamian*, noodle). Such extolments can be generalized into one sentence: “Zhu Shunshui is an erudite Confucian scholar and a Ming loyalist who has great influence on Japan upto the twentieth century”. Nevertheless,
when combing through his collections and other relevant materials, one cannot hold one’s hesitation on such assertion. I deem it appropriate here to explore the scholarship in Shunshui studies.

1.1 Bibliography and Reviews on the History of Shunshui Studies

There are two major compilations of bibliography on the studies of Zhu Shunshui written in Chinese: one by Lu Yuxin (呂玉新) and the other by Xu Xingqing (徐興慶). Lu’s bibliography contains 408 works which was compiled by expanding Xu’s list of 165 entries created in 1992 when the latter worked in Kyushu Japan. Xu’s list includes 529 works that are available up to June 2004. There is no similar work in Western Languages, but Klaus Kracht’s *Japanese Thought in the Tokugawa Era – a Bibliography of Western-Language Materials* does includes some works on Shunshui studies under Chu Chih-yü, Chu Shun-shui or Shu Shunsui.

A review of the history of Shunshui studies would help us discern some issues in the studies of Zhu Shunshui. Lin Junhong, Qian Ming (錢明), Zhuang Kaimin (莊凱雯), Zhao Jianmin (趙健民)

---


24 Lu, “Youguan Zhu Shunshui yanjiu wenxian mulu”, 22. This is an earlier version of Xu’s *Zhu Shunshui yanjiu cankao wenxian* (朱舜水研究參考文獻) [Reference literature for the study on Zhu Shunshui] which includes literature from 1684 to 1991 in Japan and China, including Taiwan. (Lin Junhong 林俊宏, *Zhu Shunshui zai Riben de huodong ji qi gongxian* (朱舜水在日本的活動及其貢獻), (Taiwan: Showwe Information, 2006), 5). This bibliography list was subsequently revised to includes materials up to 2004 and is attached to ZSJBY as annex III as referred to in note 23 above.

25 ZSJBY, xiv.

趙建民 and Xu Xingqing have all provided reviews on the history of Zhu Shunhui studies in their books. Though their reviews may vary in details, all agree that Japan was the first to compile and print Shunshui materials into collections. Without such preservation works, the studies on Zhu Shunshui would have been impossible. Then there was a silence for over a hundred years until 1798 when the chief editor of Dai Nihon Shi, Aoyama Nobuyuki 青山延于 (1776-1843), wrote an article to celebrate Zhu Shunshui’s loyalty. Nagoya Tokimas 名越時正 (1915-2005) has remarked that Aoyama was trying to use Shunshui to promulgate the idea of Sonnō jōi 尊王攘夷 (Revering the emperor and expelling the barbarian) as Japan was threatened by foreign power at the time.

Between 1890 and 1930, especially after China was defeated in the First Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895), a lot of Chinese flocked to Japan to either learn new knowledges or to plan their political intrigues to overthrow the Qing government. The newly discovered Shunshui as a staunch remnant became an anti-Qing icon. Zhou Zuoren 周作人 (1885-1967) had noted that by the end of Qing, Zhongyuan yangjiu shulüe 中原陽九述略 (A brief account of the central plain’s

---


28 Four of the ten versions of Shunshui’s collections were compiled within thirty years after Shunshui’s death. For a detailed discussion of the different versions of Shunshui’s collection, please see Xu, Zhu Shunshui yu dongya wenhua, 4-8.

calamity) (ZSJ, 1-13) and *Annan gongyi jishi* 安南供役紀事 (Chronological records of laboring in Annam) (ZSJ, 14-34) were taken out from Shunshui’s collection and printed together as a revolution propaganda material.  

Liang Qichao alleged Shunshui’s *Zhongyuan yangjiu shulüe* had greatly inspired and motivated revolutionists at the end of Qing. (ZSJ, 696)

On the other hand, after they defeated Russia and China in various battles, Japan became more and more brazen in their territorial ambition in Asia. The mentality was shared by scholars such as Inaba Kunzan 稲葉君山 (1876-1940), a student of Naitō Konan 内藤湖南 (1866-1934). Inaba is an important figure in the history of Shunshui studies. The collection he compiled in 1912 can be said to have ignited the enthusiasm on Shunshui’s studies in the past century. But he is considered both nationalistic, and militaristic. Another important scholar Ishihara Michihiro 石原道博 (1910-2010) whose famous *Shu Shunsui* 朱舜水 [Zhu Shunshui] published in 1961, is a must read in the studies of Zhu Shunshui. He was a soldier directly participated in the Second Sino-Japanese War and had been captured and imprisoned in Siberia as a prisoner of war.

During the post World War II decades, Japan was busy recovering while China was still troubled by civil war and the political turmoils. There were only a handful of articles on Shunshui study in Japan during this period and a complete halt in Mainland China. The situation was different in Taiwan. Shunshui became an agent to promote the relationship between the

---


Chiang’s government and Japan. Thus, there were not only academic articles on Shunshui studies, but also mentions in newspaper.\textsuperscript{34}

In 1972, China and Japan normalized their relationship. China officially reopened to the world six years later. From 1980 onward, Shunshui became a bonding agent between China and Japan. Conferences on Shunshui were held regularly and Shunshui studies finally gains a seat among East Asian studies.\textsuperscript{35}

From the overview above, it seems Shunshui studies has been closely affected by geopolitical developments in East Asia. Robert Chard is reasonable after all to question whether the Shunshui we perceive from his collections today is really the Shunshui in history.\textsuperscript{36}

In Japan, the focuses of Shunshui study are mostly on factual investigation on Shunshui’s life, activities, his works and his relationship with Japan,\textsuperscript{37} since they have the convenience of accessing a lot of primary sources scatteredly archived in Japan. In recent years, there is an increase in studies on Shunshui role in the cultural interaction between the two.

In China, until the middle of the twentieth century, Zhu Shunshui was not as popular a Ming Qing period subject for scholars. First, Zhu was not considered the first-rate scholar of his time comparing to Gu Yanwu 顧炎武 (1613-1682), Huang Zongxi or Wang Fuzhi 王夫之 (1619-1692).\textsuperscript{38} The lack of sufficient extant and available resources for reconstructing Zhu

\textsuperscript{34} Zhuang, \textit{Zhu Shunshui xueshu sixiang}, 58-9.


\textsuperscript{37} Lin, \textit{Zhu Shunshui zai Riben}, 7-9.

\textsuperscript{38} Zhao, “Zhu Shunshui yanjiu”, 149.
Shunshui’s thought is also a major obstacle. As a result, the focus of Shunshui studies in China tends to be more on his thought via investigating his collections.

### 1.2 An Overview of Existing Literature in the Studies of Shunshui’s Influence

*Mito Gikō no hishi Shu Shunsui* 水戸義公の賓師朱舜水 [Tokugawa Mitsukuni’s teacher Zhu Shunshui] by Kokubu Shutoku 国府種徳 (1873-1950) was one the earliest attempts that touched on Shunshui’s influence briefly. However, there is no evidence provided to support his claim of Zhu Shunshui’s “great influence” on revering the emperor (17), his efforts in strengthening Confucianism, (26-7) and his contributions in rendering thoughts on how to run a benevolent government (33).

In his *Zhongguo jin sanbainian xueshushi*, Liang Qichao gave a third of chapter seven to introduce Shunshui. (75-8) Besides the extolment quoted above, he concluded that Shunshui’s scholarship was between those of Gu Yanwu and Yan Yuan 顏元 (1635-1704).

Guo Yuan 郭垣 (1910-2002) was the first Chinese scholar to systematically analysis Shunshui’s philosophy in his *Zhu Shunshui* 朱舜水. He categorized Shunshui’s practical philosophy into *cuncheng* 存誠 [to preserve sincerity], *jujing* 居敬 [to dwell in respect], *dunli* 敦禮 [to steadfastly practise rite], *wenxue* 問學 [to pursue knowledge], and *shixing* 實行 [to wholeheartedly practise knowledge acquired]. Guo also described Zhu Shunshui’s thoughts on statecraft, on technical know hows and on literature. (36-51) In a short chapter on Shunshui’s

---


40 The article is in *Shu Shunsui kinen kai* 朱舜水記念會 ed. *Shu Shunsui* 朱舜水 [Zhu Shunshui] (Tokyo: Shu Shunsui kinen kai, 1912), 17-33.

influence (52-54), Guo explaind Zhu’s efforts in explicating Zhuzi xue 朱子学 (J. Shushigaku) and in inspiring Mitogaku 水戸学. Guo’s analysis is well structured but I agree with Lin Junhong that it is not in-depth and extensive enough. (Lin, 12)

Ishihara Michihiro 石原道博 (1910-2010)’s Shu Shunsui 朱舜水 is a frequently mentioned work in the field of Zhu Shunshui studies. He divided Shunshui’s life into different stages for critical analysis. In the second part, Ishihara commented, among other subjects, Shunshui’s scholarship, which was an expansion of Guo’s analysis⁴². The disciples Ishihara mentioned were also identical to those in Guo’s book. In any case, scholars commonly acknowledge that Ishihara’s book covers, in Japanese, comprehensively on Zhu Shunshui.

In a chapter in his The Development of Neo-Confucian Thought⁴³, Zhang Junmai (a.k.a. Carsun Chang) 張君勱 (1887-1969) labeled Zhu as a Ming “martyr” (203) when he introduced Shunshui, and considered Shunshui as a philosopher hostiled to Wang Yangming 王陽明 (1472-1529) (203, 205) and bent toward the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi (207). The core part of this chapter which introduces Shunshui’s thought can be regarded as an English version of Guo’s book. He ended the chapter by praising Shunshui for laying “the spiritual foundation for modern Japan” without leaving any convincing textual support. (215)

Wang Jinxiang 王進祥 offered in 1976 a more comprehensive and creative biography on Zhu Shunshui titled Zhu Shunshui pingzhuan 朱舜水評傳 [A Critical Biography on Zhu

---

⁴² The first edition of Guo’s Zhu Shunshui was published in 1937 while Ishihara’s book was in 1961.

Shunsui. The book introduces Shunshui in four parts: the first contains topicalized accounts on Shunshui’s life; the second is an up till then most comprehensive introduction on Shunshui’s friends and students; in the third part, Wang presented Zhu’s thought in four categories, namely practical philosophy, education, politics, and the inspiration of the Mitogaku; part four is a brief version of Zhu’s chronological biography. The topics he listed in the first part can each be a standalone field for studying Shunshui.

Julia Ching’s article “Chu Shun-shui, 1600-82 – A Chinese Confucian Scholar in Tokugawa Japan” is probably the most detailed account on Zhu Shunshui life in English. Her account on Shunshui’s life in Annam (present-day Vietnam) between 1654 and 1658 is particularly useful. (194-5) Although she raised questions on some of the contradictions she noticed, she praised Shunshui in this essay that he was “the one who contributed most to Japanese education and intellectual history”. (177) Her more in-depth investigation on Shunshui’s thought was in her other paper titled “The Practical Learning of Chu Shun-shui” as a chapter in Principle and Practicality, Essays in Neo-Confucianism and Practical Learning. This book chapter is an expansion of her earlier article and dedicates more in introducing Shunshui’s scholarships, his relationships with the Donglin group in China, and influence on Japan in various aspects. Ching’s analysis is solid and inspirational.

---


In 1980, historian Qian Mu 錢穆 (1895-1990) had also commented on Zhu Shunshui. In the essay, Qian grouped Shunshui with Gu Yanwu and Lu Shiyi 陸世儀 (1611-1672) as in Qian’s opinion they all belong to the Confucius-Mencius tradition and they all respect Cheng-Zhu. Their emphasis on practicality and li were common with the general appeal from contemporary literati at large. The difference among these three is sectorial rather than doctrinal. (18) Qian also stated that Shunshui brought new life to the Japanese culture but qualified that the statement was made according to Japanese scholars’ research. He also remarked that Shunshui could be considered a Japanese historic figure because he had not had much connection with his motherland. (12)

Li Suping 李甦平 wrote Zhu Shunshui 朱舜水 in 1993 and Zhu Zhiyu pingzhuan 朱之瑜評傳 [A critical biography of Zhu Zhiyu] in 1998. The two books are almost identical in contents, but the latter was a better construct and an all rounded work. She introduced Shunshui’s advocacies on philosophy, governance, statecraft, historiography, and education. She also investigated in this book Shunshui’s influence on practical learning in China as well as in Japan, on Seianguku 省庵學, on Mitogaku, and on Jinsaigaku 仁斎學. Li also discusses

---


50 Seianguku refers to the teachings of Andō Seian 安東省庵 (1622-1701), who is Shunshui’s first student in Japan.

51 Jinsaigaku refers to the teachings of Japan’s influential Kogigaku 古義學 master Itō Jinsai 伊藤 仁斎 (1627-1705).
briefly on Shunshui’s role in the founding of the Changzhou School of Thought 常州學派 in China, in the development of different schools of thought in modern Japan, and in the Chinese revolution in early twentieth century. The ways she categorized Shunshui’s thought for investigation is inspiring, but, as many scholars have already pointed out, she obviously needed stronger evidence to substantiate her claims.

Many scholars have also similarly devoted a whole book providing a general coverage on Zhu Shunshui. Lin Junhong 林俊宏 was positive about Shunshui’s influence in Japan in his Zhu Shunshui zai Riben de huodong ji qi gongxian. He dedicated over a fifth of his book covering Shunshui’s life, focusing realistically on Shunshui’s activities in Japan, as the title of his book indicates. In a cautious and controlled manner, he investigated Shunshui’s relationship with over twenty-seven Japanese, various Japanese schools of thought and Japanese cultural and academic development. Researchers may also find his many tables useful.

Comparatively, Qian Ming 錢明 had a narrower scope. His discussions in Shengguo binshi centred almost solely on Shunshui, without too many digressions on other aspects. While there is no doubt Qian was also by and large positive about Zhu Shunshui’s influence, his various critical remarks caution readers about the co-existence contradictory information about Shunshui.

In the field of Zhu Shunshui studies, Xu Xingqing 徐興慶 is an important scholar sufficiently by his ZSJBY alone. ZSJBY includes a lot of Shunshui’s and his contacts writings Xu digged from different archieve in Japan. However, it is those which are complied in ZSJ that are more important. By comparing the textual different, we can discern the editorial criteria.
Although there are minor textual errors\(^\text{52}\), ZSJBY is an indispensable source in the research of Zhu Shunshui. In *Zhu Shunshui yu dongya wenhua chuanbo de shijie*\(^\text{53}\), Xu creatively explored different aspects in Zhu Shunshui studies by connecting Shunshui with other contemporary scholars.

Zhuang, Kaiwen 莊凱雯’s *Zhu Shunshui xueshu xiangji qi dui riben jianghu shidai wenhua zhi yingxiang* was her PhD dissertation. The book seemed too ambitious to cover too wide a spectrum in the expense of a focussed discussion. Despite of the confusing focus, the book does contain useful materials for the studies of Shunshui.

Lu Yuxin 呂玉新’s PhD dissertation “Confucius, Zhu Shunshui, and the origins of Japanese state building in the Tokugawa era: 1650-1700”\(^\text{54}\) not only studied Zhu Shunshui’s possible connections with the Tokugawa state building and its ruling legitimacy as the title indicates, but also investigated Shunshui’s role in anti-Buddhism, ancient learning, historiography, ideology, education etc. However, the dissertation requires more solid and direct evidences to support his arguments.

---

\(^{52}\) For example, in no. 15. Zhu Shunshui’s letter to Andō Seian (75), the character *shi* 時 (see note 1 on same page) Xu add to the sentence is arguable. The character *kou* 口 would be a better fit to form the set phrase *youyou zhi kou* 悠悠之口; also, there are a lot missing pages, paragraph and words in the *Shunsui pokudan* 舜水墨談 (Ch. *Shunshui motan*) [the ink talks with Shunshui], 222-240.

\(^{53}\) Xu Xingqing, *Zhu Shunshui yu dongya wenhua chuanbo de shijie* 朱舜水與東亞文化傳播的世界 [Zhu Shunshui and the world of East Asian culture transmission] (Taipei: Guoli Taiwan daxue chuban she, 2008).

A study on Zhu Shunshui’s teaching in Japan] by Tan Qixun 覃啟勛 had a good direction. However, frequent misinterpretation of the text in classical Chinese as well as too many conjectures weakened his conclusion.

I would not go on discussing articles on Shunshui’s influence one by one. Nonetheless, I would like to point out that essays by Han Dongyu 韓東育 and Robert Chard are worth noticing for their critical views on Zhu Shunshui. Han’s “Zhu Shunshui zai ri huodong xinkao” investigated Shunshui’s relationship with the change in the kai 華夷 (the civilized and the barbarians) concept, with kogaku 古学 (ancient learning) in Japan, with the compilation of the Dai Nihon Shi. “Zhu Shunshui zai ri huodong zaikao” was a sequel to the previous one which continued to examine why Shunshui could stay, why he rejected Itō Jinsai 伊藤仁斎 (1627-1705) and Shunshui’s way of handling emotion (qinggan 情感). These two articles shed light in the research on Shunshui’s influence. Chard’s “Zhu Shunshui’s Plans for the Confucian Ancestral Shrines (Zhongmiao 宗廟) in Kaga Domain” studies Shunshui’s conceptual world and

---


his relationship with Kaga 加賀 domain daimyo Maeda Tsunanori 前田綱紀 and his “Patterns of Confucian Cultural Transmission as Reflected in the Self-Perception of Zhu Shunshui in Japan” analysed the difference on how Shunshui perceived himself and how Japanese saw him. Chard’s casting doubt on the reliability of Shunshui’s writings and his allegation that it was due to Shunshui’s self-promoting that led to his employment by Mitsukuni are certainly eye-opening. Japanese scholar Hikita Keiyū 訡田啓佑 has a solid study on Zhu Shunshui and Andō Seian58.

1.3 The Purpose of This Paper

Despite various attempts to establish Zhu’s influences in Japan, they are in many cases winding inferences. Lu Yuxin’s dissertation perhaps is the best in summarizing the process of such conjectures. The logic of these researches in proofing the influence of Shunshui is usually presented reversely by firstly stating that the slogans “sonnō jōi” and “fukoku kyōhei” 富国強兵 (enrich the state, fortify the military) were key political concepts for the Meiji Restoration. These concepts were promulgated by samurai scholars from various schools including kogaku 古学 (ancient learning school), kokugaku 国学 (national learning school), and of course Confucian advocates. All these schools evolved ideologically from Mitogaku. Mitogaku was founded by Mito Lord Tokugawa Mitsukuni. The single most important work in disseminating the core value of Mitogaku was the Dai Nihon Shi.59 Since Zhu Shunshui was employed by Mitsukuni as


his private tutor and consultant for the compilation of the History, “Zhu is thus regarded as a founder of Tokugawa philosophy in Japan”\(^{60}\). The evidences are, Lu summarised,

[Shunshui] was the mentor of 1) Mitsukuni, 2) Asaka Tampaku (or Azumi Tōru, Asaka Kaku, 1656-1737), the most important editor of the Great History of Japan [the History of the Great Japan] in the early Mito School, 3) and Andō Seian (1622-1701), a great samurai scholar in the Kansai area and the tutor of the lord of the Yanagi clan. Zhu was also 4) an advisor of Ito Jinsai (1627-1705), and Yamaga Sokō, and of 5) some high shogunal officials. Further, Zhu was 6) an intimate friend of Kinoshita Jun’an the founder of Kimon School.” (5-6)

The story that a Ming loyalist turned Japan into a Confucian country and inspired the Meiji Restoration which strengthened Japan into an Asian power and later invaded that very loyalist’s mother land is surely a fascinating one. However, when I comb through Shunshui’s collections, I often encounter materials that are obviously contradictory to the construct of such story. The purpose of this essay is primarily to investigate some of these evidences of Shunshui’s influence.

**1.4 The Objectives and the Scope of Research of this essay**

I am too fascinated by Shunshui’s story. However, as I dig deeper into his collections, I get more and more confused about who he is. I want to find out if current scholarship of asserting Shunshui’s great influence on Japan has any truth in it? I want to ascertain his historic role in Japan. Thus, this thesis is not intended to study Shunshui’s scholarship, nor is it intended to judge Shunshui’s character. The objectives of this paper are, as mentioned above, to verify the assertions that Shunshui has extensive influence on Japan, and, at the same time, to identify the influence he received and those transmitted via him.

The temporal scope of this paper is consequently limited to the life time of Shunshui. To verify his historic influence is much too large and complicated a job for this short paper to

\(^{60}\) Ibid., 4.
handle. And since there are almost no materials extant to facilitate the studies of his life before he fled China, the geographical focus of this paper is naturally on his sojourne life in Japan. Of course, the life before Shunshui sought settlement in Japan will also be examined as it forms part of his influence. Shunshui is a research subject with multi-facet, such as his scholarship, his contribution in constructing Chinese style of ancestor worship rituals, his disciples etc. The thematic scope of this paper is restricted to influence, his and those on him and via him.

1.5 Methodology

Liang Qichao had advised the direction for researching Shunshui’s influence on Japan: “If we want to understand how great his influence [on Japan] was, we would need to look into how his friends and students followed him in daily lives. 我們要了解他影響之偉大，須看他的朋友和弟子跟著他活動的情形。”61 This essay follows the same route. Despite the fact that there are still a lot of primary resources slumbering in archives and storage of different museum and private institutions, I believe it would be sufficient for achieving the objectives of this thesis by simply performing inter- and intra- textual study on materials available in two main collections, ZSJ and ZSJBY, supplemented by Zhushi Shunshui tan qi, and Xuegong tushuo yizhu 學宮圖說譯注 [Translation with annotations of the Illustrations explanation on the national academy]62, plus other primary sources. Shunshui spent the last twenty-three years in Japan63, during which time he lived among eminent Japanese scholars and socialized with high

61 Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1873-1929), Zhu shun shui xian sheng nian pu 朱舜水先生年譜 [Chronological biography of mister Zhu Shunshui], first edition, Taiwan first edition (Taiwan: Taiwan Zhonghua, 1957. Same is included in ZSJ, 644-729, hereafter cited as Liang-pu, which all citation will be based upon): 729.

62 Zhu Zhiyu, Xuegong tushuo yizhu 學宮圖說譯注 [Translation with annotations of the Illustrations explanation on the national academy], trans. and annotated Lin Xiaoming 林曉明 (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji, 2015).

63 From the end of 1659 when he decided to settle in Japan until he died in May 1682.
rank officials. There is no doubt he has influence on the people he has contact with. In a nutshell, the belief on Shunshui’s influence is based on five aspects. The first is his scholarship. According to Shunshui, he was from an official background and was well educated. The second is his contacts in Japan, many of whom are well-respected scholars and politicians. The third is his relationship with the powerful and benevolent domain lord Tokugawa Mitsukuni. The fourth is his involvement in the compilation of the *Dai Nihon shi*. The last is his eulogy on Kusunoki Masashige. After examining each of these, I have to refute these assumptions. Zhu Shunshui could not have the alleged extensive influence because firstly he had never intended to do so; secondly, his influence was being exaggerated; and lastly his influence was evisaged by Tokugawa Mitsukuni. The influence Shunshui has are mainly in aspects Shunshui dismissed as trivial, superficial, and coarse stuff of the Way, such as literary writings, the making of Ming style intellectual casual wares etc. Clarifying Shunshui’s influence is important, for only then can we place Zhu Shunshui justly in the position he should be in history.

Let me now move on to first look at Zhu Shunshui’s life.64

64 The first biography of Zhu Shunshui is arguably that of Zhu Shiqi 諸士奇 in the "Biographies of two atypical persons" (*liang yiren zhuang* 兩異人傳, probably around 1665) by Huang Zongxi 黃宗羲 (1610-1695). The biography is included in *Huang zongxi quanji* [the Complete collection of Huang Zongxi], ce 11 (Zhejiang: Zhejiang guji, 1985): 53-54. There are however debates among scholars whether Zhu Shiqi 諸士奇 is in fact Zhu Zhiyu 朱之瑜, i.e. Zhu Shunshui, in disguise. For interested readers, please refer to the debate between Bai Dimin 白砥民, "Huang zongxi yu zhu zhiyu" [Huang Zongxi and Zhu Zhiyu], *Journal of Ningbo University* (Educational Science Edition), No. 2 (1984): 1-8 and Qian Ming, “Huang lizhou zhu shunshui guanxi bian – jian yu Bai Dimin xiansheng shangque” 黃梨洲朱舜水关系辨 - 兼与白砥民先生商榷 [Clarifying the relationship between Huang Lizhou and Zhu Shunshui – and to discuss with Mr. Bai Dimin], *Journal of Hangzhou University*, Vol. 16 no. 4 (1986): 28-34. Zhuang Kaiwen also offers a comprehensive summary of the issue (Zhuang, *Zhu Shunshui xueshu sixiang*, 101-114). In any case, it is safe to say that the first one comes from Imai Kōsai 今井弘治 (1652-1689) and Asaka Kaku 安積覺 (1655-1737), “Shunshui sensei gyōjitsu” 舜水先生行実 [A brief biography of Master Shunshui], Shōkōkan 彰考館 eds., *Shu shunshui kiji sanroku* 朱舜水記事纂錄 [Collected Chronicles of Zhu Shunshui] (Tokyo: Yoshigawa Kōbun Kan, 1914): 1-11, [http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/950101/1](http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/950101/1). Same also available in ZSJ: 612-29. Citation is based on ZSJ and will be hereafter cited as *Gyōjitsu. Shu shunshui kiji sanroku* will be cited as *Sanroku*.}
2. The Wandering Patriot\textsuperscript{65} and Fugitive Scholar – The life of Zhu Shunshui

It seems common, starting from Ishihara Michihiro, to study Zhu Shunshui by periods.\textsuperscript{66} Many point out that the year 1645 when Zhu was forty-six \textit{sui}\textsuperscript{67} is a crucial dividing line when he was forced to flee China. However, I would argue that the year 1659 meant even more to Zhu because it was that year that he decided to leave China for good and sought asylum from Japan. Shunshui was an uncooperative defiant before he escaped China in the summer of 1645. He became a wandering patriot for fifteen years among different Asian countries, until he made his last trip to Japan in 1659. From then on, the fugitive scholar struggled to survive on foreign soil until he was hired by Mitsukuni in 1665. Zhu Shunshui entered the most glamorous part of his life and enjoyed the high-profile days beside Mitsukuni, surrounded by Japanese celebrities, immured within Kanto area of Japan in solitude till he died in 1682. I will go over the life of Shunshui according to these periods, and cover, as we move along, the five aspects upon which the beliefs of his extensive and lingering influence are based.

2.1 An Uncooperative Defiant – the Molding of a “Great Man” (Period I).

We know very little about Zhu Shunshui’s life in China. We can only draw information of his early life from his “Yu zhusunnan shu 與諸孫男書” [A letter to my boy grand children] (ZSJ, 45–47) and “Da Yuan Guangguo wen xianshi yuanyou lüli 答孫源光國問先世緣由履歷

\textsuperscript{65} Borrowed from Ching, “\textit{Chu Shun-shui}”, 180.

\textsuperscript{66} See Lin, \textit{Zhu Shunshui zai Riben}, 27, footnote 32 for different periodizations by various scholars.

\textsuperscript{67} Lin Junhong says (Lin, \textit{Zhu Shunshui zai Riben}, 27) it was when Zhu was forty-five, instead of forty-six \textit{sui}, which I think he confused with year 1645 numerically.

The counting of a person’s age in this thesis follows the “inclusive reckoning” practice (i.e. a person’s age was counted in current years) prevailed in China and in the Far East until the twentieth century, not in elapsed year (“consecutive reckoning”) we now commonly use. For detail discussion on such topic, please see Endymion Wilkinson, \textit{Chinese History – A New Manual}, second revised printing, (Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Asian Center, 2012): 160-161.
In response to Minamoto Mitsukuni’s inquiries about the background of my ancestry and my biographical data (cited as lüli hereafter) (ZSJ, 350-353)68. The following narration based mainly on lüli with occasional references to other sources as needed.

Shunshui was born in the eleventh month69 of 1600 in Yuyao 餘姚 of Zhejiang Province, named Zhiyu 之瑜, style name Luyu 魯琿70. He was better known by his hao 號 (alternative

68 Nearly all Zhu Shunshui’s early years information was provided by him. While I am not suggesting Zhu was being untruthful but there did exist motivations for him to manipulate at least some of the information to his favour, given his involvement in many secretive and sensitive missions. Also, memory is not reliable in reconstructing facts. We need to be critical, but not cynical, when handling this self-provided information.

Another point of caution is the reliability of the texts. Robert Chard has overtly cast doubt on them when he discussed the relationship between Shunshui and Mitsukuni: “Are Zhu's collected works in fact a true reflection of everything he wrote, or have they been subjected to a process of selection and alteration? Was the relationship between Zhu and Mitsukuni, and the circumstances of Zhu's life in Edō, really as described in the writings we have?... There can be no doubt that Zhu's writings as they have come down to us have undergone a degree of selection and alteration, which tends to obscure the true nature of Zhu's status and personal circumstances while in service to Mitsukuni. Nothing but high praise for Mitsukuni ever appears in his writings, though I think that this is due more to Zhu's own actual stance at the time rather than any subsequent editorial tampering. (Chard, “Patterns of Confucian Cultural Transmission”, 253(32)) I think Chard’s doubt should not be limited to those regarding Shunshui and Mitsukuni. Some of the texts in ZSJBY which are not included in ZSJ project a different Shunshui.

69 There are conflicting records on Zhu Shunshui’s birth month. Please see discussions in Nan, Bingwen 南炳文. “Bingbian Qing chu yimin shengping kaozheng zhiwu Zhu Shunshui (1600-1682) Zhejiang Yuyao renwu [Chapter Bing Evidential Research on the Lives of Remnants in Early Qing Dynasty Section 5 Zhu Shunshui (1600-1682) from Yuyao of Zhejiang Province]”, in Mingqing kaoshi lu 明清考史录 [Records of historical researches on Ming and Qing Dynasties] (Beijing: Renmin cbs, 2013): 195-196.

70 There are confusions on Shunshui’s style name: Luyu 魯琿 and Chuyu 楚瑜. In some documents 琿 is confused with another lüli, both pronounce the same. Zhu had once explained to Andō Seian that his style name is actually Luyu, but was mistaken as Chuyu when the captain of the commercial vessel reported his name to Nagasaki port authority when he arrived Japan. For some unknown reasons, he left it uncorrected and continued to use the mistaken name. He even has his seal carved as Chuyu. (ZSJBY, 194) Same was mentioned to Oyake Seijun 小宅生順 (1638-1674) in 1664 when they met in Nagasaki. See Oyake Seijun, “Saiyū shuroku”西遊手録 [Transcript of the tour to the west] (hereafter cited as Shuroku), in Sanroku: 7. Gyojitsu 有相似故事. (ZSJ, 612-629) Nan Bingwen tablizes the different usages of Zhu’s various names found in ZSJ and a few other records (Nan, “Qing chu yimin shengping kaozheng”, 199-203). It seems highly probable that Zhu’s original style name was Chuyu and he changed it to Luyu after he ran away from China as some material suggested, such as Ming yimin zuzu chu ya xiansheng jiazhouhuan 明遗民族祖楚琿先生家傳 [the Family biography of the forefather of our family clan the Ming remnant mister Chuyu] (1872) by Zhu Shunshui’s progeny Zhu Yanxu 朱衍緒 (?-?, note: he was a “provincial candidate” [juren 職人] in 1867) (Qian, Shengguo binshi, 21). It is beyond imagination though that an upright and principled man that Shunshui claimed himself to be would tolerate such error on his name. One possible reason is he wanted to hide his original identity Chuyu because it seems those who knew Zhu from China in general addressed him as Chuyu, including Zhang Fei 張斐 (1635-?) who was also a native of Yuyao. Since further investigation would be out of the scope of this thesis, I will not go further.
name) Shunshui 舜水, which he coined after the name of a river in his home town when Mitsukuni told Shunshui he “dared” not address his teacher by name and insisted Shunshui to gave him one. (ZSJ, 161) After he died, his disciples gave him a sishi 私諡 (private posthumous title) as Wengong 文恭 (J. Bunkyō). Zhu Shunshui was the third son of the family. He married twice. The first time with a Ye 葉 who brought him two sons; and the second time, after the first passed away, with a Chen 陳 who begot a daughter. There was a third marriage arranged with a Hu 胡 in 1643 but was shelved half way after Shunshui’s mother died in the same year (“Gyōjitsu”, in ZSJ, 620). Zhu lost her contact eventually.

There are two anecdotes about Shunshui’s family name. The first is that Zhu’s ancestor was the elder clan cousin of the Ming Dynasty founder Zhu Yuanzhang 朱元璋 (1328-1398, r. 1368-1398). Shunshui’s ancestor however did not want to be tied by the status of being a member of the royal family and therefore changed the Chinese character to 諸 which is pronounced the same as 朱. The clan decided to revert the situation in the year Shunshui was born. (ZSJ, 348)

Another one is that there were all the evidences that his clan was the descendent of the great Neo-Confucian scholar Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130-1200) except for one generation. Zhu Shunshui refused to acknowledge that due to that generation. He remarked that if their clan could stand on their own feet, it did not matter whether their clan was descended from Zhu Xi. (ZSJ, 348, 398). These two stories show Shunshui’s insistency on principles as well as self confidence. He did not deny categorically in both occasions, which would have objectively the effect of implying he might have a royal origin, and might be the descendent of the great Confucianist, both of which

71 According to Liang-pu, ZSJ, 653.
would be significant attributes for projecting him as someone from a family with good background.

In any case, according to what he provided in *lüli*, Shunshui did seem to be coming from an incorrupt and upright official family (ZSJ, 45, 295). He led an arduous life in Yuyao.

According to *lüli*, all his immediate forefathers bore official titles:

[My] great-great-grandfather was a commoner scholar (ZSJ, 45, 295). The Great Ming Emperor conferred him posthumously the Grand Master for Glorious Happiness. [My] grandfather was called Kongmeng, with alternative name Huweng. The Ming Emperor conferred him posthumously the Grand Master for Splendid Happiness. There were three other consecutive conferrals that were declined, and two special conferrals as favours due to the enthronement of a new emperor are not listed here. My father was called Zheng [1564-1607], with alternative names Dingyuan and Weiyuan. The Ming Emperor conferred him posthumously the Grand Master for Splendid Happiness, the Supreme Pillar of the State. [He was also offered the positions of] the Grand [texts missing] concurrent with the Heir Apparent [texts missing] concurrent with [texts missing] the Director of Grain Transport.

---

72 Shunshui told Mitsukuni that there were seventy-nine persons in his family clan that gained various titles since the founded of the Ming Dynasty: “寒宗入國朝來, 登鄉會榜者七十九” (ZSJ, 348).

73 The term 處士 *chushi* (commoner scholar) refers to a scholar who does not engage in public service and therefore have no official title. *Ryaku fu* (The Brief genealogy, hereinafter cited as *Ryaku fu*) (ZSJ, 631-633) by Asaka Kaku states that the title of Zhu’s great-great-grandfather was *longshan chu* 處士 (Longshan Commoner Scholar) (ZSJ, 631).

The reason Zhu did not mention the name of his great-great-grandfather here is not known.

74 Qian Ming states that Zhu’s great grandfather had another alternate name “Longshan Commoner Scholar” and had been in various prominent official positions but he does not cite his source. (Qian, *Shengguo binshi*, 27) This is contradictory to *Ryaku fu*. I follow *Ryaku fu* which was written right after Zhu’s death by his disciple and was allegedly in accordance with what Shunshui told him and the tablets Zhu made for his ancestors. More importantly, once a person has taken up a government position or was awarded a title, by definition he can no longer claim himself a *chushi*.

75 The translation of official titles in this thesis follow those from Charles O. Hucker’s, *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China* (Taiwan Ed. Taipei: Southern Materials Centre, 1988)

76 Probably declined by Shunshui’s father.

77 According to *Ryaku fu*, Zheng’s courtesy name was Cunzhi 存之. (ZSJ, 632)
Shunshui’s elder brother Zhu Qiming 朱啟明 (1590-1671) was also an official. After he won **wu jinshi**武進士 (Metropolitan Graduate for Military) in 1625, he was appointed **Songjiang**松江柘林守備 (the Commandant of Zhelin, Songjiang, present-day Zhelin Town in southern Shanghai). 79 Zhu Zheng died when Shunshui was not yet nine **sui**. Despite Shunshui’s family was one with members serving the court for generations, the family was the poorest among all gentries. Zhu Shunshui thus had to move his household register to Songjiang Prefecture (present-day Shanghai) and sojourned with his brother Qiming there afterward. Many years later, he summed up his earlier life to his grandchildren.

---

78 I guess the missing texts in the second part should read 大[學士]、兼太子太[傅]、兼[御]前總督漕運軍門 the Grand Secretary, concurrently the Grand Mentor of the Heir Apparent, concurrently the Supreme Commander of Grain Transport [and the Military, since the director also has the military responsibilities]. Qian Ming states that Zhu Zheng was a **juren** (a provincial graduate) of the 1603 Zhejiang examination. He did not get the **jinshi** (Metropolitan Graduates) title but was able to climb to the position of the Supreme Commander of Grain Transport and the Military. Later, due to the achievement of his eldest son Zhu Qiming, he was conferred the Grand Master for Splendid Happiness, the Supreme Pillar of the State. (Qian, **Shengguo binshi**, 27). Gyōjitsu states simply that he was gradually promoted to the position of the rank two Director of Grain Transport and conferred posthumously the Grand Master for Splendid Happiness, the Supreme Pillar of the State. (ZSJ, 612) Zhu Zheng did not fill the office probably because he died on his way to assume office.

79 Qian, **Shengguo binshi**, pp.27

80 See Nan, “Qing chu yimin shengping kaozheng”, 197-198 for a discussion of the exact **sui** Zhu became fatherless. However, Andō recorded Shunshui stated in his own **lì lì**履歴 [Curriculum Vitae] that he lost his father at ten. See Andō Seian, **Shinsō Shūgo 心喪集語** [Documents compiled during Bereavement], in **Andō Seian shū: ei’in hen 安東省庵集-影印編[Photocopy of the Collection of Andō Seian]**. Part II, in Yanagawa bunka shiryō shūsei 柳川文化資料集成 [Collection of cultural data of Yanagawa] 2.2, (Yanagawa: Yanagawa-shi, 2004): 338.

81 In **yu mou shu**與某書 [A letter to an anonymous person], Shunshui says, “of all gentries in the world, my family is the only poor ones.” 合天下缙绅，惟僕家獨貧 ZSJ, 109.

82 This happened probably when he was twenty **sui**. Please see Qian, **Shengguo binshi**, 37, especially foot note 1 on the same page, for a detailed discussion on the exact time and reasons for Zhu’s moving his registry. This also partly explains why Zhu Shunshui seemed to have no interaction with Huang Zongxi, who was ten years junior and also a native of Yuyao. To have a fuller description of the unresolved myth of why there seem no criss-crossing between Zhu Shunshui and Huang Zongxi, please see Zhuang, **Zhu Shunshui xueshu sixiang**, 96-101.
Your great grand father [that is Shunshui’s father] ‘s two sleeves [which were used for carrying money were so empty that they] flared in breeze [because he was not corrupted], [consequently] when he died, he left nothing but an emptied purse in the world. I have been living on provity since childhood, eating only pickles and salt, putting on clothes made from sparsely knitted cloth. At twenty sui, in spite of the seven-year famine I stumbled upon, I was still able to feed a family of a few dozen, leaving no one who did not get what he should. Although your grand uncle was a Commander [who was authorized to open his own office and hire his own staff], from the day he left his post, in one or two month’s time, his family had no more asset. When relatives from our own clan passed our house, they would all point to us and say, “this is the house of an upright official”. They meant to sneer at us, not to praise us. 汝曾祖清風兩袖,所遺者四海空囊。我自幼食貧,虀鹽疏布。年二十歲,遭逢七載饑荒,養贍一家數十口,無有不得其所者。汝伯祖官至開府,今日罷職,不及一兩月,家無餘財。宗戚過我門者,必指以示人曰：「此清官家」, 以為嗤笑,非讚美之也。ZSJ, 45.

Zhu Shunshui was a Confucian student in the prefecture academy (fu xue rusheng 府學儒生)83. He learnt under Li Qixuan 李契玄 (?-?) of Cixi 慈谿 initially, then with Southern Ming loyalist Zhu Yongyou 朱永祐 (style name Yuanqi 爱啓, ?-1651) of Shanghai. (ZSJ, 350), who was the Libu zuo shilang 吏部左侍郎 (the Vice Minister of the Left of the Ministry of Personnel) of the Yongli emperor (永曆, personal name 朱由榔, 1623-1662; r. 1646-1662). (ZSJ, 350, 386) Some scholars include also Chen Hanhui 陳函輝 (style name Mushu 木叔, 1590-1646) and Wu Zhongluan 吳鍾巒 (style name Luanzhi 巖穉, 1577-1651) as Shunshui’s teachers 84, particularly the latter one because Wu was a Tonglin leader as well as a student of Tonglin founder leader Gu Xiancheng 顧憲成 (1550-1612)85, a connection which would

83 The so called xiucai 秀才 (Cultivated Talent) (ZSJ, 613).

84 For example, Qian Ming counts Chen Mushu (Shengguo binshi, 37); Lai Qiaoben 賴橋本 counts Wu Zhongluan (“Zhu Zhiyu”, in Zhongguo lidai sixiangjia 《中國歷代思想家》 [The thinkers in different dynasties of China], Wang Shounan 王壽南 ed., vol. 14. (Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu yinshuguan, 1999): 223); Zhuang Kaiwen includes both (Zhu Shunshui xueshu xianshang, 121).

conveniently associate the origin of Zhu Shunshui’s practical, or real, scholarship (shixue 實學).

They have evidence to do so because in his letter to his grand children, Shunshui did mention both gentlemen as his zuoshi 座師 (ZSJ, 47) However, zuoshi actually refers to the officer in charge of a civil examination and the selection of the candidates for various titles. Chen is Shunshui’s benfang zuoshi 本房座師, meaning he was in charge of the examination room (benfang) Shunshui took the examination. Wu is Shunshui’s engong zuoshi 恩貢座師, who was the one in authority for recommending Shunshui to be a tribute student of grace (engong). Therefore, although zuoshi carries the word shi 師, they have more ties to their “students” career advancement in the court than in their academic development. That said, since a zuoshi has established link with those successful in examination, it is possible that “students” may acquire some sort of knowledge from their zuoshi through ongoing contacts, but their relationship is not that between a teacher and a student we understand it today. Da xueshi 大學士 (Grand Secretary) Zhang Kentang 張肯堂 (?-1651) is also included in some researches as one of Shunshui’s teachers. However, Zhu did not seem to have an amicable relationship with Zhang. (ZSJ, 655) The association of Shunshui with some of the well-known officials implies he was known to the court.

In terms of expertise, Zhu Shunshui was specialized in maoshi 毛詩 [the Mao edition of Shijin 詩經] (ZSJ, 350, 386). Obviously, his academic achievement must be very outstanding.

---

86 Engong 恩貢 is the short form of engongsheng 恩貢生 (A Tribute Student by Grace). An engongsheng is a “status entitling one to participate in xiangshi 郷試 (Provincial Examinations) in the civil service recruitment process and to be considered at least nominally a jiansheng 監生 (a National University Student) under the guozijian 國子監 (the Directorate of Education), gained by passing a special, irregular recruitment examination” (Hucker, A Dictionary of Official Titles, 204 #1817).

87 There are views that Zhu Shunshui is also an expert of li 禮 (rites), as he had stated that he had studied li for three years 三年讀禮 (ZSJ, 350 & 386). But this is a misunderstanding, although I am not refuting Zhu is an
for in 1638 at thirty-nine sui, the Provincial Education Commissioner of both Suzhou and Songjiang and Investigating Censor (提督蘇、松等處學政、監察御史) Qi Wei 亓煒 recommended Zhu Shunshui to libu 禮部 (the Ministry of Rite) as “the number one man in both civil and military ability (wenwu quancai diyi 文武全才第一)\(^{88}\). (ZSJ, 351) Five years later, Shunshui was recommended by Wu Zhongluan to be a Tribute Student by Grace, praising Zhu as “the best since the Dynasty was founded” (kaiguo lai diyi 開國來第一[sic.]) (Gyōjitsu, ZSJ, 613)\(^{89}\). Therefore, relatives from his clan and gentries in the proximity all had high hopes on him, expecting him to become a gongfu 公輔 (a grand councillor or a minister of the state).

(ibid.) In fact, Shunshui regarded himself high as well. Gyōjitsu says he “had held the ambition of [participating] in running the country and helping the people since he was young” 少抱經濟之志 (ibid.) He told Mitsukuni once that “[when I] was young, my family was quite established, [thus] my original goals were for official ranks and prominent positions in the court” 少壯家修，本志功名鍾鼎 (liüli, ZSJ, 352)

---

88 I follow Liang-pu for the year of the recommendation and the name of the Commissioner follow. ZSJ, 651-652.

89 I think the text of Gyōjitsu misses the word “以”. The phrase should read “開國以來第一” (kaiguo yilai diyi). This recommendation from Wu was mentioned with year in Liang-pu under thirty-nine sui (1638) but for unknown reason did not list under forty-four (1643) as an entry, as if he considered the two honours happened in the same year 1638. As well, based on his comparison on a few biographies, Liang questions the possibly Wu had the capacity to recommend Zhu.
Zhu had indeed many offers. According lüli (ZSJ, 351-352), excluding Qi’s recommendation in 1638, the number of recruits, summons, recommendations, appointments, conferrals, and proposals was twelve in total, which are listed hereunder in chronological order for ease of reference:

1. In 1643, jian ji tong zhi 監紀同知 (Vice Magistrate)⁹⁰ employed by Fang Guo’an (方國安, ?-?)⁹¹;
2. In 1644, feng zhao te zheng 奉詔特徵 (Special Recruit by an Imperial Edict)⁹² by Chongzheng Emperor 崇禎 (personal name Zhu Youjian 朱由检, 1611-1644, r. 1627-1644);
3. In February 1645, another “Special Recruit” by Emperor Hongguang 弘光 (personal name Zhu Yousong 朱由崧, 1607-1646, r. 1645-1646);
4. In May 1645, jiangxi tixing anchasi fushi 江西提刑按察司副使 (Assistant Provincial Surveillance Commissioner for Jiangxi) bestowed by Emperor Hongguang, concurrently bestowed to be bingbu zhifang qinglisi langzhong 兵部職方清吏司郎中 (the Director for the Bureau of Operation of the Ministry of War), jian zhendongbo 監鎮東伯 (supervising the Duke of Defending the East), soon promoted to jian jingguo cong fangmou jun 監荆國公方某軍 (supervise the army of a certain person by the name Fang, the Duke of the State of Jing)⁹³;
5. In 1647, changguo xian zhixian 昌國縣知縣 (the District Magistrate of Changguo County, present-day Dinghai district 定海區) appointed by Huang Binqing 黃斌卿 (?-1649)⁹⁴;

---

⁹⁰ The title and duty of 監紀同知 jian ji tongzhi is not known. Jian is to supervise, and, according to Hucker, is usually the head of an agency (145 #786); ji is to manage to control; and tongzhi Hucker translates as Associate Administrator or Associate, “common designation for a secondary executive official in an agency headed by an “Administrator” (知 zhi); or a “Vice Magistrate in a sub prefecture…” (553-554 #7471). As Vice Magistrate would refer to an assistant to the Magistrate, I therefore translate the title simply as Vice Magistrate.

⁹¹ Zhu Shunshui did not count this one in “Annan gongyi jishi”, in ZSJ, 20.

⁹² fengzhao tezheng 奉詔特徵 (A special recruit by an imperial edict) is considered to be a great honour as Zhu reassured Mitsukuni in lüli (ZSJ, 352-353). Zhu has also explained this to Andō Seian once that “it is a great honour, in ancient time as well as in present, to be specially recruited by an imperial decree. Comparing to getting a jinshi title, this is much greater. None under sky will not know it.” 詔書特徵，古今重典，此 (Zhu Qianzhi, the compiler of the Collection, suggests this word should be 比) 中進士，萬分隆重。溥天之下，莫不聞知。 (ZSJ, 370)

⁹³ The Fang refers to here is Fang Guo’an.

⁹⁴ According to Liang-pu, ZSJ.656. Exact time not known, Liang-pu suggests after the fourth month. Same is applicable also to appointment number 6 below.
6. In 1647, *jiancha yushi guanli tuntian shiwu* 監察御史管理屯田事務 (Investigating Censor responsible to manage state farms)\(^95\) recommended also by Huang Binqing;  
7. In November 1647, *junqian zanhua* 軍前贊畫 (Military Front Consultant) appointed again by Huang Binqing;  
8. In February, 1650, *jianji tuiguan* 監紀推官 (Assistant Surveillance Commissioner)\(^96\) recommended by Liu Shixun (劉世勳, ?-?);  
9. In 1650\(^97\), *bingke jishizhong* 兵科給事中 (Supervising Secretary of the Office of Scrutiny for War), soon changed (xuangai 旋改) to *like jishizhong* 吏科給事中 (the Supervising Secretary of the Office of Scrutiny for Personnel) assigned by Zhu Yongyou\(^98\);  
10. In 1650\(^99\), considered proposing for a certain position in the Hanlin Academy (*ni shou hanlinyuan guan* 擬授翰林院官)\(^100\) by Wu Zhongluan;  
11. In April, 1650, *jianju xiaolian* 薦舉孝廉 (recommended the title of Filial and Incorrupt) by Wang Anjun (王按君, ?-?);  
12. In 1654, specifically summoned to return to the court by an imperial edict (*qinfeng zhuanchi tezhao* 欽奉耑敕特召) issued by the Prince of Lu 魯王 (personal name Zhu Yihai 朱以海, 1618-1662, r. 1645-1655) in the capacity of *jianguo* 監國 (Acting emperor).\(^102\)

In sum, there were three recruits\(^103\) and thirteen positions (the specific of one is not known) involved in these twelve chances for Zhu Shunshui to fulfil his ambition of helping to run the country and relieving the people from suffering (*jingshi jimin* 經世濟民), two of which

---

\(^{95}\)屯田 *tuntian* (state farm) is a system since Han dynasty. These were farms on land owned by the government and were mainly intended to ensure garrisons were self-sufficient.  

\(^{96}\)監紀 *jianji*, see discussion in note 93 above. 推官 *tuiguan*, Hucker translates as Judge, stating that it is “from Sung till late 1600s, normally the third executive of a Prefecture of Superior Prefecture (*fu* 府)” (549 #7399).  

\(^{97}\) Exact month unknown. Probably early to mid March.  

\(^{98}\) According to Liang-pu, ZSJ, 659.  

\(^{99}\) Exact month unknown. Probably late March.  

\(^{100}\) Zhu did not know exactly what post it was.  

\(^{101}\) According to Chard, “Patterns of Confucian Cultural Transmission”, 264 (21).  

\(^{102}\) This twelveth appointment is not mentioned in Liang-*pu*. Han Dongyu also considers this as the twelveth one. See Han, “Zhu Shunshui ‘baiguan bujiu’ yu ‘ming zhengjun’ chenghao” 朱舜水 ‘拜官不就’ 與 ‘明徵君’ 稱號 ['The refusing of official appointments’ and the title of ‘summoned lord of Ming’ of Zhu Shunshui], in *zhongguoshi yanjiu 中國史研究 [the Study of Chinese history]*, issue 2 (2015): 131.  

\(^{103}\) The last was a recruit in nature, though without specific title, and should be counted together with the other two as three.
happened on the verge of the collapse of Ming, the rest after.\textsuperscript{104} Why did he not accept any of these honours if he really wanted to help? He explained to Andō Seian that it was because he thought the government at that time was hopeless. His refusal was never meant to cultivate his reputation. (ZSJ, 370.) In \textit{liüli} he told Mitsukuni:

“All under Heaven at that time was in great turmoil. Law and order were eroded away. [Those at] the front and [those at] the rear did not know each other. [Those from] outside and [those from] inside did not communicate with each other… I was grieved and furious at the calamities those vicious people created, which had caused the state capsized. I was fortunate to receive special recruit twice. Although these recruits [which showered great honor on me] were [so] extraordinary [that one rarely saw even] in one hundred years, [and they were] far better than [earning it through] examinations [or getting it from Grace Tribute]. Nevertheless, a fallen mansion is not a single piece of wood can support\textsuperscript{105}, … [Hence when] the main beam supporting a house was already crooked, putting more supporting pillars was surely not the remedy any more\textsuperscript{106}. Therefore, [I had] no choice but to hold back my passion [to help] and to decline and relinquished [offers and appointments]. I did not initially intend to hunt for fame and build my name.”

Apart from seeing it futile in serving the court, Zhu also did not want to be part of the corrupted government, whether of the late Ming or the Southern court\textsuperscript{107}. Had he had accepted any of their offers, he once explained to Andō Seian, he was confident that he would have been

\textsuperscript{104} One point should be noted here that there were at least three positions offered which were of military nature. Given Shunshui has a brother served as a military officer, he was recommended by Qi Wei as “the number one man in both civil and military ability, and he himself had involved in various military operations in later years, it is very likely that Shunshui processed military talents that were recognized by others.

\textsuperscript{105} This is a quote from Zhong Shuo 中說, \textit{juan} 3, \textit{shijun pian} 事君篇 [Chapter three, Serving the Emperor Chapter] by Wang Tong 王通 (584-617). The original text is “大厦将颠，非一木所支也。”

\url{https://zh.wikisource.org/wiki/中說/卷三}.

\textsuperscript{106} 棟橈 \textit{dong nao} is the same as 棟橈 \textit{dong rao}. It is from the \textit{xiang zhuan} 象傳 [On the images] of the \textit{daguo gua} 大過卦 [Hexagram #28] of \textit{Yijing} 易經: “棟橈之凶，不可以有輔也。” (The evil connected with the beam that is weak’ arises from this, that no help can be given [to the condition thus represented]) assessed from Chinese Texts Project, translation is from James Legg, \url{http://ctext.org/book-of-changes/da-guo}.

\textsuperscript{107} See “Zhongyuan yangjiu shulue”, in ZSJ, 1-14 for Zhu Shunshui’s views on late Ming’s situations, especially 1-4.
placed in important positions, in which case he had to, as required by political ethics, return the favours. When he did, he would be regarded as one of those treacherous court officials. If he did not but, instead, acted upright as he used to, he would be seen as an ungrateful subordinate who gained credits at the expense of his masters. Either way, he would be criticized.\footnote{See his detailed explanation to Andō Seian in ZSJ, 370-371.}

Therefore, as early as when he came of age, he told Oyake Seijun, he had already sprouted the idea of retreating to be just a farmer. (ZSJ, 311) At forty suì, he had decided not to sit in provincial or district civil examinations any more. He made it plain to his wife and children that:

“[If I took the examination, I would surely get the highest grade of \textit{Jinshi} 進士 (Metropolitan Graduate). If I became a \textit{Jinshi}, then a magistrate, in the first year, I would apprehend [a lot of outlaws]. In the second and third years, people would praise my feats. My supervisor would laud me, and I would for sure get promoted. Because of this, I would present proffers and would for sure get into great troubles, putting myself and my family in jeopardy. I suppose my shallow mind and ill temper cannot tolerate others and accept too much [other’s faults]. It was for this reason that I have given up the idea of making [social] progress [by taking examinations].” 我若第一進士, 作一縣令, 初年必逮係, 次年三年, 百姓誦德, 上官稱譽, 必得科道, 由此建言, 必獲大罪, 身家不保。自揣淺衷激烈, 不能隱忍含弘, 故絕志於上進耳。 (“Gyōjitsu”, in ZSJ, 613)\footnote{See also his letter to the Nagasaki bugyō 長崎奉行 (Nagasaki Magistrate) Kurokawa Masanao 黒川正直 (1602-1680), ZSJ, 37; as well as his letter to Andō Seian, ZSJBY, 275.}

For this firm stand, he had gained support from his wife, but not from his elder brother and relatives. (ZSJ, 311) Reluctantly, Shunshui had passively resisted the pressure and showed overt obedience by taking examination triflingly. (Gyōjitsu, in ZSJ, 613) Despite Shunshui’s effort in retreating, he still caught attention and was lavished with various offers. Zhu insisted not to accept any. His repeated refusals, or “self-marginalized”\footnote{\textit{ziwo bianyuanhua} 自我邊緣化 is borrowed from Qian, \textit{Shengguo binshi}, 52.} acts, provoked those in power. After Shunshui rejected the fifth offer in 1645, memorials came from all directions and various departments of the Southern court impeaching him for “being insolent and shirked his duty as a
serving to the Emperor” 僚僑不奉朝命，無人臣禮. (ZSJ, 20) Facing the severe situation, Shunshui escaped that very night to Zhoushan 舟山 (present-day Zhoushan City of Zhejiang Province), an island close by, without even the time to bid his family and brother farewell. (ZSJ, 20, 31, and 654). On the fifteenth day of the fifth month of the first year of Hongguang Era (June 8, 1645), when Nanjing, the capital of the Southern Ming fallen to the hand of Qing, Zhu Shunshui fled to Nagasaki. (ZSJ, 630, 655) This was his first visit to Japan. From then on, he wandered among Japan, Annam (present-day middle to northern Vietnam) and some South-Eastern countries until 1659 when he sought settlement in Japan.

This is the first period of Shunshui’s life. From the information he provided us, we understand he might be a descendant of the great Song scholar Zhu Xi as well as a distant relative of the royal family. Although he tried to be modest, the sheer mentioning of these will establish the impression that he was of blue blood, biologically and ideologically. Moreover, the fact that Shunshui came not simply from a family of official status for generations, the so called shidai zanying 世代簪纓 [generations wearing hair clasps decorated with tassels], but a financially poor one, suggests that he was decended from one which was different from the corrupted main stream. There are also attempts from modern scholars to link him with the Tonglin group 112. If successful, this would further prove that his scholarship was originated from the biggest opposition group in Ming history. His being nominated for official positions for so many times by various court members evinces that he was well known to the court. His continued refusals to accept the offers, even when he and his family were in destitute condition,

111 Also Qian, Shengguo binshi, 339.

112 For example, Lin Junhong says Zhu Shunshui can be considered as a disciple of the disciple of Gu Xiancheng and inherited the Tonglin spirit of emphasis the practicality in learning. (Lin, Zhu Shunshui zai Riben, 166.) Nonetheless, I believe the fact that they both promote practical learning is not enough to substantiate the link.
would on the other hand reinforce his image as a “Great Man” (*da zhangfu* 大丈夫) defined by Mengzi 孟子 (aka. Mencius, 372BCE-289BCE), that “wealth and prestige are in capable of seducing him; poverty and low status are incapable of moving him; awe and military might cannot bend him.” 富貴不能淫，貧賤不能移，威武不能屈

Up till here, Shunhui’s background was surely attractive to Japanese who all were desperately looking for Confucian to learn from. He had the family background. He had the scholarship. And more importantly, he had the virtues. It is therefore absurd that there is no mention of him in China, not even in his own home county’s annal. Huang Zongxi was Shunshui’s fellow townsman who had a similar background. Why are there abundant materials on Huang but not on Zhu? As well, Huang had endeavoured to collect as many records for late Ming loyalists and scholars as possible. However, there is none for Shunshui except that dubious one on Zhu Shiqi 諸士奇. The myth can unlikely be resolved until the discovery of more sources in the future.

Nevertheless, assuming all Shunshui told us is correct, there is not much uniqueness in the early part of Shunshui’s life. The poor family background and the way he began his education was common. The possible linking with Zhu Xi and the Ming royal family is not reliable, since nearly all genealogies connect with great historic figures one way or the other. With regard to Shunshui’s repeated refusals for government positions, his choice was in fact in accordance with, if not being carried by, the prevailing social torrent. The Ming court’s tradition of disrespecting intellectuals started from Zhu Yuanzhang. Since then, it has become a social

---

norm that intellectuals inclined not to join the government\textsuperscript{114}, because, among other things, serving the government could be a matter of life and death. The situation aggravated toward the end of Ming when the politics was dominated by eunuchs and corrupted officials. Shunshui’s brother was also one of the victims.\textsuperscript{115} The reasons for Shunshui’s refusing to serve the Ming court were, as Han Dongyu sums up, first, knowing his short temper, he did not want himself and his family to get into grave trouble; second, as a gesture of denying the late Ming politics. He did not want to be part of the corrupted gang; third, the struggle between the court and the opposition parties led by intellectuals outside of the government had divided the literati as much as it had divided the country. Politics and scholarship had become inseparable. Intellectuals proposed new ideas and thoughts one after another in order to compete for the lead of public sentiment. This trend further deepened the split in the society and the thoughts so promulgated by different schools are clearly deviated from the practicality and usefulness of learning that Confucius stressed upon. Shunshui wanted to return to the great tradition he understood once was. All in all, Shunshui’s refusal was not uncommon among literati. I will discuss this in more details in the next session.

Contrary to his defiance, Shunshui did treasure the twelve offers. And he should be, because they represented recognition and were great honour. No wonder he could not hold but mentioned them to various persons\textsuperscript{116}, despite he had once said he had never boosted about it to anyone (ZSJ, 111). This of course is understandable as these appointments had formed a solid background on his curriculum vitae (lüli), and had the effect of projecting his image as a well-

\textsuperscript{114} Zhao Yi 趙翼 (1727-1814), Nianer shi zhaji 廿二史劄記 [Notes on the twenty-two histories], mingchu wenren duobushi 明初文人多不仕[intelluals of the early Ming seldom willing to take up official positions] entry, juan 32, accessed from Chinese Texts Project \url{http://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=en&chapter=101619} on May 23, 2017.

\textsuperscript{115} “Gyōjitsu”, in ZSJ, 620.

\textsuperscript{116} For example, ZSJ, 370; ZSJBY, 189, 283.
respected person of talent. Literati who truly possessed such a *curriculum vitae* would surely be charismatic and could be influential.

At the end, when confronted by the whole court, Shunshui chose to evade his pursuers. Sarcastically, the regime Shunshui fled from is a dynasty formed by a Han ethnic group, not a “barbaric” one by the Manchu.

### 2.2 A Wandering Patriot – as a “Loyal Official and High-minded Man” (Period II)

During the fifteen years between 1945 and 1959, Zhu weltered on ships and wandered in desperation and plight among Japan, Annam, Siam (present-day Thailand) and China¹¹⁷ as a silk merchant.¹¹⁸ Lin Junhong has a very useful table listing out Shunshui’s itinerary in that period¹¹⁹, which I have modified and attached hereunder.

**Table 2.2.1 Zhu Shunshui’s Itineraries Between 1645 and 1659**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Itinerary</th>
<th>ZSJ</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Zhoushan→Nagasaki→Jiaozhi→Zhoushan</td>
<td>20, 614</td>
<td>¹ˢᵗ time in Japan in July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Zhoushan→Annam</td>
<td>614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Annam→Nagasaki→Zhoushan</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>²ⁿᵈ time in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Zhoushan→Annam</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Annam→Nagasaki→Annam</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>³ʳᵈ time in Japan in autumn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Annam→Nagasaki→Annam</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>⁴ᵗʰ time in Japan in July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Annam→Nagasaki→Annam</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>⁵ᵗʰ time in Japan in the first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Annam</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Detained in Annan for more than 50 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Annam→Nagasaki→Siming (present-day Xiamen)</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>⁶ᵗʰ time in Japan in summer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹⁷ “Gyōjitsu”, in ZSJ, 615; “Zhu Zhiyu biezhuan 朱之瑜別傳 [Supplementary biography of Zhu Zhiyu]”, in *Haidong yishi* 海東逸史 [the lost history of the east of the sea], by *Wengshou laomin 翁州老民* [an old man from Wengzhou], in ZSJ, 638.

¹¹⁸ In a letter to Andō, he said, “I didn’t process any silk products and yet I [still] recklessly mingled with those merchants. It’s really a ridiculous thing.” 不肖無寸絲尺帛, 亦與諸商貿貿往來, 真大可笑事, ZSJ, 174.

¹¹⁹ Lin, *Zhu Shunshui zai Riben*, 29-30. Zhuang, *Zhu Shunshui xueshu sixiang*, 451-452 also has a similar table, which is in a slightly different format but with almost identical wording.
After fleeing from Zhoushan, Shunshui went to Nagasaki in the summer of 1645 but soon left. This was his first visit to Japan. There were six other visits before he settled in Japan. Annam was another important stop on his itinerary. He had visited there eight times. In fact, he had spent longer time there than in Zhoushan, not to mention Nagasaki. There is no information as to why Shunshui chose Nagasaki first, and Annam after. However, since both places were popular for merchants in the area, it seemed natural for Shunshui to pick Nagasaki.

Not only his itinerary was winding and confusing, so was his behaviour and deeds during this period. In numerous occasions, Zhu Shunshui had claimed himself as a “loyal official and high-minded man” (zhongchen yishi 忠臣義士) to many. There were people who doubted this and questioned why he did not die for Ming like thousands had but ran away instead. For instance, a famous Confucian scholar Satō Naokata 佐藤直方 (1650-1719) criticized that:

“Shunsui failed to follow the ethic of dying for the calamity [of the fall of the Ming], violated the best practices between a ruler and a minister, [and] forsook the love for close family to escape chaos and conserve his life in our country …” 舜水不能伏節死難，背君臣之義，棄親族之恩，避亂全軀於我國… Criticism as such would not be easy for Shunshui to defense himself

---

120 Exactly which port is not known, but very likely Huian 會安 (present-day Hội An). Julia Ching also suggested so and said the king Shunshui met was probably Nguyễn Phúc Tần. Please see her “The Practical Learning of Chu Shun-shui”, 194-5 for discussion details. Huian was an important trade port and a common place for Ming remnant. Therefore, it had a nickname Mingxiang 明鄉 (“Town for the Mings”). There converged a lot of Chinese as well as Japanese merchants. The city was divided into two parts by a bridge called Laiyan Bridge 來遠橋 (V. Lai Viên Kiều, Bridge for [Receiving] Visitors from Afar) built by Japanese, thus nicknamed “Japan Bridge”, on one side of which lived Chinese and the other Japanese.

121 I believe Satō is referring to a narrower definition of junchen 君臣 here than the broader a-ruler-and-a-subject.

122 韞韞藏 [Records from seclusion] (Japanese reading not known), quoted from ZSJBY, 20.
against, because there were indeed people who chose to die immediately when they heard the empire collapsed and Chongzhen Emperor 崇禎 (personal name Zhu Youjian 朱由檢, 1611-1644; r. 1627-1644) committed suicide. Nevertheless, to the Chinese at the time, being officials or not, there were more than one way to react to the calamity. According to Ho Koon-piu 何冠彪’s analysis¹²³, confronted by the situation, Ming Chinese had the choices of to die or to live. The “to be or not to be” question was of course not an easy one. The existence of many tortuous complications made it even more difficult for one to decide.

In general, literati at that time seemed to agree that it was the duty of a subject to die for his emperor, just as Ling Yiqu 凌義渠 (1593-1644) said, “if our monarch dies for the state, then [I shall follow and] die for him; if our monarch flees for the state, then [I shall follow and] flee for him. To die is my duty, why are there [needs for more] utterings? 君為社稷死，則死之；為社稷亡，則亡之；死吾分也，復何辭？¹²⁴ There were however debates over who were obliged, or even qualified, to die. Basically, the prevailing ethic only called for those holding critical positions to follow their emperor. Literati who did not have official positions in the government were not required to do so.¹²⁵ Even when one had decided not to live, the dilemma did not end there. One needed to decide how and when to execute that decision. Such as, an instant death by commit suicide, or to fight till the end and got killed?¹²⁶

¹²³ Ho Koon-piu, Sheng yu si: mingji shidafu de jueze 生與死: 明季士大夫的抉擇 [To live or to die: the options for late ming literati and officialdom] (Taipei: Lingking, 2005)

¹²⁴ Quoted from Ho, Sheng yu si, 34.

¹²⁵ Please see Ho, Sheng yu si, 97-105 for a detailed discussion.

¹²⁶ Ho Koon-piu terms them xiaoji tuisuo 消極退縮 (cringe “reactive” type) and zhiji jinqu 積極進取 (audacious “proactive” type) respectively. See Ho, Sheng yu si, 207-219 for a more elaborated discussion.
But to die was never easy. There never lacked reasons, let alone excuses, not to, at least not immediately. Filial piety was one of these, perhaps the biggest. Famous examples were Huang Zongxi and Chen Que (陳確, 1604-1677), both painfully deplored that they could not die for Ming cause because they still had elderly mothers to take care of and had to wait on. The “filial piety is the root of all virtues” argument was not strong enough to convince those martyrs to do otherwise. They steadfastly believed being loyal and die for the emperor had in tandem fulfilled the requirement of being filial to parents. However, those waiving the banner of filial still insisted on believing they had a bigger moral obligation to stay alive. This eventually evolved into a more ideological disputation on whether literati should shoujing (維經, maintain principles) or daquan (達權, attain expediency), by which the former referred to die and the latter not to. The shoujing side had an upper hand at first but soon lost to the daquan advocates. This is natural since time was, in the first place, on the latter’s side, and, after all, survival is human being’s primary and ultimate goal. Soon literati further concluded that “to live” was even harder, and therefore morally better, than “to die”. Apart from the need to take care of parents, one had the responsibility to help restore the fallen empire. As Qian Xin (錢穞, ?-?) had rightly pointed out, “with regard to an official’s loyalty in serving his country, how can we take his death alone as his merit? If it is all about dying, then the state can be a ruin, the monarch can be ostracized, and all under heaven can be handed over to enemies.” 人臣謀國之忠，豈徒賢於一死哉？如皆死而已耳，是社稷可以墟，國君可以亡，天下可以拱手而授賊。 More importantly, literati believed they had an innate burden of safeguarding and imparting the culture and tradition. They believed, as Confucian scholars, they had the responsibility of mingjing yi hedao 明經以荷道

---

128 Quoted from Ho, *Sheng yu si*, 216, exact source is not cited.
elaborated that if literati

“[aim at just] achieving minor conducts by discarding our lives, then the Principles would be unimparted and the Way beclouded; if the Principles are unimparted and the Way is beclouded, then [we are] disabling mankind to participate inside the universal norms of conduct and the proper human relationship, [we are] disallowing all things [on earth] to live their lives as long as they should be and to germinate their nature to the greatest extend, [and we are thus] making heaven and earth missing their [appropriate] positions and the sun and the moon lose their luminosity.” 蹈小節而輕吾身,是使經不傳而道不明也;經不傳而道不明,是使斯人不得與於綱常倫序之中也,是使萬物之不得遂其生而盡性也,是使天地之失其位而日月之失明也

How did Zhu Shunshui react when confronted by the dilemma with the social norm behind them? He declined to be a martyr and had almost used all the reasons above to explain why he could not die. In 1651, he told the Nagasaki bugyō Kurosawa Masanao in a letter that: “since there are unfinished business related to [my] parents, righteousness disallows me to promise [my] monarch [my] life.” 家有父母未裏之事,義不得許君以死. The unfinished business was probably referred to the tombs of his parents. (ZSJ, 37) Not only that he could not die, Shunshui as a student should not die. Once a rumor has it that Shunshui was a zhuangyuan 状元 (Principal Graduate), he immediately explained to Mitsukuni as soon as he heard it that he was not:

“Had I personally received imperial favours for twenty years but did not join the fate with the monarchy and instead wandered to your honorable country just to keep myself alive, how different would I be to an animal? How dare I shamelessly present myself in your honour’s court, and drag an ignoble being. Had I had ever accepted any minor official position from the Ming Court, and gotten a salary as minimal as a bushel for just a couple of days, I would not have been able to stand here.” 若使僕二十年身受皇恩,不能與國存亡,而轉展貴國以偷生旦夕,則與犬豕何異？尚敢靦顏於上公之廷,

129 Xu Fang, juyi tang ji 居易堂集 [Collection of Tranquil Hall]. juan 15, 20a-21a, quoted from Ho, Sheng yu si, 111.

130 Same as note 83.
The fact that Shunshui rushed to Mitsukuni to explain his status proves in reverse the common understanding that anyone with an official title in the court and earned a stipend was obliged to die when the Dynasty fell. As a Ming subject who did not require to die had only the choice of fleeing. (ZSJ, 38) Reiterating this fact was important for Shunshui to project a consistent image as a “loyal official and high-minded man”. He did not die for Ming cause because he needed not and could not. He had more importantly things to do. “Cowards regard death grave, their loyalty is therefore incomplete; martyrs regard death light, their loyalty\(^{131}\) is therefore not grand.” 懦夫視死重，故其節不完；烈士視死輕，故其節不大 (ZSJ, 565). He was neither of these. He had to help fight the Manchu. Shunshui seemed to have partook in anti-Qing operations led by the Prince of Lu and later by Zheng Chenggong (鄭成功, Coxinga, 1624-1662). Apparently, he had also tried seeking assistance from Japan and Annam. However, Shunshui had never been explicit to anyone\(^{132}\) about what he had actually done during this period, even risking his life at least twice\(^{133}\). Even to his most respected Prince of Lu, he only said “he had been operating business abroad”\(^{134}\). *Gyōjitsu* states that Zhu Shunshui “intended to

\(^{131}\) Jie 節 in this context refers more to loyalty than to the generally understood concept of “honour” or “moral integrity”.

\(^{132}\) For example, in 1652 to Zhang Mingzhen (張名振, ?-1654) : “I was entrusted [to do something] by someone there. It would be unpropitious [if I] leave it unfinished and go.” 瑜彼中受人所託，不終其事而棄去之不祥 (ZSJ, 40) He never said what was being entrusted to him. In 1659, he told Andō Seian that “there is a cause for [his] fifteen years of difficulties and privation 瑜十五年間關困苦，原有本情 (ZSJ, 153) but gave no specifics.

\(^{133}\) Once on a boat to Japan in 1652. He was captured by Qing army and forced to shave his head but he refused (ZSJ, 660); another time was in 1657 when he refused to prostrate before a Vietnam king. He was then retained, threatened, and many times, he was at the verge of being executed for not subduing. For details, see “Annan gongyi jishi”, in ZSJ, 14-33.

\(^{134}\) In his memorial to the Prince of Lu in 1657, he reported that, “I have been operating abroad for a few years, and thought I could obtain something in order to return [favours] to the court.” 臣數年海外經營，謂可得當以報朝廷 (“Shang jianguo luwang xieen shu” 上監國魯王謝恩疏 [the Memorial to the Acting Emperor the Prince of Lu Expressing Gratitude for the Favour], in ZSJ, 31) Later in Edō, he admitted to Hitomi Sakudō 人見竹洞...
go around foreign countries to collaborate assistance for restoration activities” 有意於經歷外邦，而資恢復之勢 (ZSJ, 615) From extant resources, Shunshui did involve in some such operations. He seemed to have stayed in Siming shangzhai 四明山寨 (Siming Mountain Fastness, in present-day Yuyao) with Wang Yi 王翊 (1616-1651) between 1650 and 1651. He had taken part in Zheng Chenggong’s northern expedition in 1659. Therefore, Zhu was by no mean bluffing when he told Oyake Seijun in 1664 that “what [he] had personally been through were certainly different from eggheads’ empty talks on paper”. 一身親歷之事，固與士子紙上空談者異也。(ZSJ, 311) Nevertheless, he did not seem to have taken part in combats. His bigger contribution was to seek military help and funding for operations. There are debates over whether Shunshui had participated in Feng Jingdi’s (馮京弟, ?-1654) qishi 乞師 (troops beseeching) mission despatched by Huang Binqing. However, there is no doubt that he did plead for military assistance from Japan. Less was mentioned about his similar endeavours in (1638-1696) that he could not die and had to flee to overseas because he had wishes that he wanted to accomplish. 僕遭國難而不能致死，苟免而遠去海外，以有所思也。(ZSJBY, 230)

135 Liang-pu, ZSJ, 660-661.

136 “In the year of Jihai (1659), I follow Guofan [i.e. Zheng Chenggong] and entered Changjiang…” 己亥年，同國藩入長江…” (“Zhongyuan yangjiu shulue”, in ZSJ, 2; “Zhu zhiyu biezhuan”朱之瑜別傳 has a little more detailed narration on this event. See ZSJ, 638

137 Gyōjitsu, “the reason why Master went to Japan often was because he wanted Wang Yi to be the chief commander and he be his guide to get military support. However, he had never revealed such secret in Japan.” 蓋先生所以屢至日本者，欲以王翊為主將郷導，而借援兵也。然在日本，未嘗露情洩機。ZSJ, 614.

138 Please see Riben qishi 日本乞師 (Beseeching Troops from Japan), juan eight in xingchao lu 行朝錄 (Records of Royal Sojourn) by Huang Zongxi (Huang zongxi quanji, ce two, 180-184). For the background of troops begging from Japan, see ZSJBY, 11-14. For debates over Zhu Shunshui’s possible participation, see Lin, Zhu Shunshui zai Riben, 30-31.

139 At the end of “Zhongyuan yangjiu shulue”, in ZSJ, 13, Shunshui alluded himself to Shen Baoxu 申包胥 (fifth century BCE), who pleaded army from Qin State 秦國 and successfully restored Chu State 楚國, and he hinted to Andō Seian that Japan should send troop to China. Same was reiterated more explicity in another letter to Andō (ZSJBY, 95). Later, Zhu asked Andō directly if his domain lord would be interested to send troops to China (ZSJBY, 95) He went even as specific as requesting at least ten thousand, if not thirty thousand, rifles. (ZSJBY,
Annam. Qian Ming suggests Shunshui had been there requesting supplies (qixiang 乞餉) (Qian, Shengguo binshi, 67). Unfortunately, Qian does not reveal more details. However, given Zhu Shunshui had spent almost half of the fifteen years in Annam, and Annam was a fertile in rice production, it is probable that he did try soliciting rice or other material supplies there.

To his dismay, all his efforts were in vain. He had nowhere to go. Shunshui could not go back to China, not only because he “refused to eat Zhou’s (i.e. Qing’s) grains” (bushi zhousu 不食周粟), but because he could not tolerate shaving his head and submit conformity. He chose to live on foreign soil. Gyōjitsu has a good summary of his feeling at the end of this period:

“At that time, the country was torn in pieces, agitated by warfare… Zhoushan had fallen, Master’s teachers and friends, who commanded armed forces and were loyal, had all died for Ming cause. When Master learnt the news, he was confused and did not know what to do. Nonetheless, he [still] wanted to closely study the situation at the time and meticulously calculate the chance of winning and losing. For this reason, he tarried along the coast and suffered [a lot of] hardship and danger, missing death at hair’s breath for ten thousand times. He finally admitted that the impetus [of the anti-Qing forces] could not match [that of the Qing], the [lost] land could not be recovered, [and] the defeated armies could no longer be motivated. If he stayed in China, he would have no choice but to conform to Qing Dynasty’s custom. [He would have to] rend his cap and rip his clothes, to shave his heads and restrain his hands [by Qing’s style sheaved sleeves]. So, he decided to head out to sea to follow his will of upholding the principles.是時海內幅裂，兵革鼎沸…而舟山既陷，先生師友擁兵懷忠者皆已死節。先生聞之，進退狼狽。然欲審察時勢，密料成敗，故濡滯沿海，艱厄危險，萬死如髮。於是熟知聲勢不可敵，壤地不可復，敗將不可振。若處內地，則不得不從清朝之俗，毀冕裂裳，髠頭束手，乃決蹈海全節之志。（ZSJ pp. 616–617）"
Few scholars have noticed an important reason for Shunshui’s deciding to leave China, except Ishihara. The reason was Shunshui’s eldest son died due to unknown sickness when he accompanied Shunshui in the “northern expedition”.  

One cannot help but wonder if Shunshui refused to serve in the Chongzhen court, why did he bother to try so desperately to help the lamed and even more corrupted Southern Ming courts? Though he did not take up official positions, he sometime offered admonishments and assistance (ZSJ, 657). Why did he cherish so much about an edict from the Prince of Lu, who was not even a proper emperor? Zhu was with his bosom friend Wang Yi in Siming Shan. They had discussed the situation and were both aware that they would not stand a chance. Why did Zhu Shunshui leave this best friend to death instead of helping him to fight? Is it not those who know they have no chance of winning but still continue to fight on for their lord that would be considered loyal? Apart from the challenges lodged by Satō Naokata, can one leave his family behind be considered a Confucian scholar and a “loyal official and high-minded man”? These are not easy questions to answer. Perhaps we can treat his not serving the government and running around to help the Southern Ming as two separate periods to study. The first part before Chongzhen fell and the second after. The first is, I would argue, a loyalty problem but the latter is more of a conformity issue.

141 Ishihara, Shu Shunsui, 93-94.

142 The edict is extant and included in ZSJ, 34. By this imperial decree, the Prince of Lu summoned Shunshui to help him to restore Ming. Zhu Shunshui treated the edict with due care and respect. He carried it with him everyday but never showed the original to anyone. After his death, it was found well kept in a box decorated with dragons. See “Gyōjitsu”, in ZSJ, 624. Same is mentioned in “Ming gu zhengjun wengong xiansheng beiyin”明故徵君文恭先生碑陰 (The Biography engraving at the back of the stele for the late Ming Speical Recrit Mister Wengong), in ZSJ, 631.

143 Qiang Ming has questioned if Zhu Shunshui had failed to maintain brotherhood in this incident. See Qian, Shengguo binshi, 61-64.
Before continuing on these two different stages, it may be helpful to first look at two concepts: “recluse” (yimin 逸民) and “remnant” (yimin 遺民).\textsuperscript{144} The two terms are identical in Chinese pinyin and pronounced almost the same in modern Chinese. In fact, in many instances, they are used interchangeably. But they are different. “Recluse” refers to those who refuse to enter the establishment. During late Ming, refusing to join the government was a common way, almost the only path available, for these people to show their flagrant defiance of the corrupted court. Therefore, Zhu Shunshui was not the only one who refused to accept offers from the court, there were those who were much more famous than Zhu was and did the same, such as Sun Qifeng 孫奇逢 (1585-1675). To these recluses, they cared not the destiny of the corrupted monarchy, which would be replaced by someone more capable.

Situation will be completely different and much aggravated when a Han Chinese monarchy is replaced by non-Han, and thus considered less civilized, or “barbaric”, people, as was in this case, because it was no longer a matter of yidai 易代 (replacing a dynasty), or wangguo 亡國 (losing the state), it was a much more serious matter of wang tianxia 亡天下 (losing all [civilization] under heaven). Gu Yanwu had explained the difference,

“There is the loss of a state, and there is the loss of all under heaven. How do we differentiate the loss of a state from the loss all under heaven? The changing of the [ruling] clan’s name and the title of a reigning dynasty is what I call the loss of a state; when benevolence and righteous are obstructed to the extent of leading beasts to eat human, people might even eat each other, that is what I call the loss of all under heaven.”

有亡國，有亡天下。亡國與亡天下奚辨？曰：「易姓改號，謂之亡國；仁義充塞，而至於率獸食人，人將相食，謂之亡天下。\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{144} Zhao Yuan 趙園 has a thorough discussion on this topic in Mingqing zhiji shidafu yanjiu – zuowei yizhong xianxiang de yimin 明清之際士大夫研究 - 作為一種現象的逸民 [A Study of Literati During the Ming Qing Period - Remnant as a Phenomenon] (Beijing: Beijing Shifan, 2014): 1-37.

\textsuperscript{145} Gu, Yanwu 顧炎武 (1613-1682), Ri zhi lu 日知錄 [Daily records of recognizing what have not been achieved], with collected exegesis by Huang Yucheng 黃汝成, reprint of woodblock printing version (Shanghai: Shanghai Classics, 1984): juan thirteen, 1014.
Losing *tianxia* was not just losing China proper. It meant the collapse of the Chinese culture and was considered something not tolerable, since when that happened, the literati did not even have an identity they could attach to and claimed themselves human. In Shunshui’s case, his being a recluse was a political gesture common to his contemporaries in refusing to be part of the demoralized regime. After Chongzhen committed suicide, he, like many, suddenly lost the target to which he evinced his defiance. The existence of the short lived Southern Ming, in one hand, continued, albeit on the wane, the role of the target for Zhu to manifest his contumacy, but on the other hand, when Qing’s occupation became more and more obvious and inevitable, this fifteen years became a transition period of Zhu from being a recluse to a remnant. He by then did not only lost his target, but also his identity. “To preserve a state, it is up to its ruler and his officials who [can afford to] eat meat; to preserve all under heaven, even individuals with lowest status have the responsibility.” 保國者，其君其臣肉食者謀之；保天下者，匹夫之賤與有責焉耳矣。146 It would be too indiscriminate to generalize the goals of loyalists who participate in anti-Qing activities as simply to restore Ming (*fanqing fuming* 反清復明). Some might have a grander target to preserve, since “to differentiate the civilized (*hua*) and the barbarians (*yi*) is more important than to maintain the proper ruler-subject relationship. [The difference between] *hua* and *yi* is the line demarcates human and non-human. This is the primary principle to all under heaven.” 華夷之分大於君臣之倫,華之與夷,乃人與物之分界,此乃域中第一義。147 This was the reason Shunshui risked even his life but still refused to kneel to

146 Ibid.

147 Words of Ming remnant Lü Liuliang 吕留良 (1629-1683), from *Deyi juemi lu* 大義覺迷錄 [Awaken to the Grand Justice], by Yongzheng Emperor 雍正帝 (personal name 爱新觉罗•胤禛 1678-1735; r. 1722-1735) of Qing Dynasty, quoted from Han Dongyu, “The Qing Dynasty’s ‘Greater Chinese’ Expression toward “the Non-Han Chinese Region” --- from *Awaken to the Grand Justice* to the Imperial Edict of Abdication 《清帝遜位詔書》” 清朝對“非漢世界”的“大中華”表達——從《大義覺迷錄》到《清帝遜位詔書》, Zhongguo
the Annam king. Kneeling to him was something “about the thousand-year-old principles of a subject when [he represents his own ruler in] meeting [with a foreign king]” 相見之際，遂為千古臣節所關。148. He was a special recruit and in foreign court, he represented the Chinese emperor. The Annam king was only a king among Nanman 南蠻 (southern barbarians). It was impossible for a special recruit from China to kneel to a Nanman king. The Annam king could not use the language of a Chinese emperor to “summon” him because he simply was not qualified to. A person who assumed such a heavy burden for a long course would certainly put family second on his priority for, if there was no country, there would be no family. The edict from the Prince of Lu to which Shunshui held dear to was a representation of the tianxia 他 was trying to preserve. The image of a quixotic remnant who bore all the hardship trying to accomplish the unachievable goals was thus established, which was, as we shall see later in this essay, very attractive to Japanese during the time they promoted absolute loyalty. He once told Dai Li 戴笠 (aka. Dokuryū Shyōeki 獨立性易 in Japanese, 1596-1672) in 1662 that:

“During this time of obliteration, loyalists are abundant but only me who is the most strenuous and most resolute. Yet I am still cautiously endeavouring at the dead end. [I have] once said, ‘the judgement on [my achievement] can only be made when my coffin is [finally] closed.’ [To bear] humiliation and hardship suits my position. There is no need to talk about it.” 今日革除之際，忠臣極多，惟弟最為艱難，最為堅忍，而尚兢兢於末路，嘗曰：『蓋棺事始定也。』羞辱困苦，分所宜然，總不必論。ZSJ, 58149

Nevertheless, when he reached the dead end, he had to consider what to do next. It seemed that when he learnt that his best friend Wang Yi died in 1651, he had given up hope and

---


148 ZSJ, 14. Please see “Annan gongyi jishi”, in ZSJ, 14-31, for a detailed account of the incident.

149 ZSJBY, 97 has a letter to Dai Li with similar wordings. Xu Xingqing says judging from the contents, the letter was sent by Zhu Shunshui in 1662. See footnote 1 on that page.
had sought to stay in Japan. In the tenth month of that year, he wrote to Nagasaki Magistrate complaining not been able to meet him even once hitherto for the seven years he had been in Japan. He pointed out that the Japanese authorities were rigorous in searching and inspecting incoming cargo for valuable goods of all sorts from China, immediately sending unusual items to Edo by rapid couriers, and yet “when it comes to a capable man and a [Confucian] gentleman who is a precious treasure to a nation, you neither search nor inspect, but throw him away like a worn-out shoe, place him in a situation where he has no choice but to die - what could possibly be the reason for this?”

至於賢人君子, 為國重寶, 既不簡搜, 亦不看驗, 棄之如敝屣, 置之不得不死之地, 亦獨何哉? (ZSJ, 38-39) He continued,

now my homebound route is cut off...and it is up to your Excellency to judge and make your choice, and recommend same to [your] government: either [you] would let me stay in Nagasaki...or [order me to] take a ship to the Eastern Capital of Annam151 and wait there for [your] instructions. My ancestors’ graves and my beloved children are all in [my] motherland, [but now I have to] take abode far away on a foreign soil, how can I not feel deep sorrow? [But] I have no choice [if] I wish to [at least] preserve loyalty and righteous to myself. I would be grateful if your Excellency would pity [my situation] and bestow your instructions on me. 今瑜歸路絕矣…惟閣下裁擇而轉達之執政。或使瑜留長崎…或附船往東京交趾, 以聽後命。瑜之祖宗墳墓, 家之愛子女, 皆在故國, 遠託異域, 豈不深悲! 祇欲自存忠義, 不得已耳。幸閣下哀憐而賜教之 (ZSJ, 39)

After much efforts152, Zhu Shunshui was finally allowed to stay in Nagasaki and started his life as a sojourn in Japan. We have thus walked through the first part of Shunshui’s life which forms his background. The background of “an erudite Confucian scholar and loyalist” which support the suggestion that he have influence on Japan. Scholars with that character and

---

150 Translation is from Chard, “Patterns of Confucian Cultural Transmission”, 278 (7)

151 Dongjing 東京 (also spelled Tonkin, Tongkin, or Tonquin. Vietnamese: Đông Kinh) here refers to the Red River Delta Region of present-day northern Vietnam. Lê Lợi 黎利 (1384-1433, r. 1428–1433), founder of Later Lê Dynasty, ascended throne in Thang Long 昇龍 (present-day Hanoi) and called it the Eastern Capital, Dong Kinh. The name becomes genetically referring to the region and is used interchangeably with Jiaozhi 交趾.

152 I will discuss in more details about what those efforts were later in this paper.
background surely have the charisma and ability to exert influence on other. However, the fact that there are not extant third party primary sources to verify Shunshui’s alleged background weakens the credibility of his background as a whole. Furthermore, even if what he stated in his lüli was flawless, it is still not convincing to assert that, since he has such background and scholarship, he should have the force field to impact on the development of Edō thought, because he was not the only one who processed such background, and his background was certainly not the strongest. As for the issue of him being a Ming loyalist, as discussed above, his participating in anti-Qing armed forces was not to restore Ming. He actually wanted to expel the barbarian (yi 夷) and re-illuminate the civilized hua 華 (i.e. literally fuming 復明). As long as light was brought back to tian xia, whether or not Ming was restored (fuming 復明) would no longer be an issue. Again, such mentality was shared by many loyalists at the time. As we shall see, there was nothing unique that Shunshui had done during this time. Many had contributed in the fight against the Qing. Many had travelled abroad to seek help, and, when all hopes were gone, to seek shelter for themselves on foreign soil.

On the other hand, this brings us to notice the influence Shunshui received up till here. In those turbulent years, Shunshui had to, along with others, let the current drift him. He refused to take part in civil examinations, declined to accept any offers from the court, participated in anti-Qing activities, mixed with refugees and merchants to do trading, sought a sojourne life in neighbouring countries, all these were common among literati. It was a social norm to which Shunshui had to conform. Shunshui as a scholar and loyalist were in fact the product of the influence of such social force.153

---

2.3. A Fugitive Scholar\textsuperscript{154} (Period III)

After the failure at the verge of a success \textit{beifa} 北伐 (northern expedition) led by Zheng Chenggong, Zhu Shunshui had totally lost hope on the ill managed and corrupted forces of the Southern Ming and of the Zheng’s family. He could not go back to China, because, in the first place, as he had always openly claimed, he did not want to live under the Qing’s rule, and, besides, though not documented, he was probably on the wanted list as well. It can be imagined how hard the live would be as a refugee to live in a foreign country with different language and customs. Fortunately, beyond his expectation, Shunshui’s life was changed completely there under the help of a few friends. Praised as a great loyalist, he was also celebrated as a Confucian scholar. Eventually, Mitsukuni noticed him and invited him to be his teacher. Shunshui’s life entered into a completely different trajectory afterward. Perhaps it worths our while here to first take a look at the Japanese society as a whole at the time when Zhu sought to settle there.

When Zhu Shunshui finally decided to settle down in Japan in the winter of 1659, Japan was under the rule of the fourth Shogun Tokugawa Ietsuna 徳川 家綱 (1641-1680; in office 1651-1680). He, in turn, inherited the legacy and governance from his great-grand father Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川 家康 (1543-1616, in office 1603-1605), the founder of the Tokugawa Shōgunate. Ieyasu is said to have eaten “the pie which Nobunaga [Oda Nobunaga 織田 信長, 1534-1582] had prepared and Hideyoshi [Toyotomi Hideyoshi, 豊臣 秀吉 1536-1598] had baked”\textsuperscript{155}. Nevertheless, he was the one who finally united Japan and led the country to walk

---

\textsuperscript{154} Japanese scholars often regard Zhu Shunshui as a \textit{bōmei jusha} 亡命儒者 (fugitive scholar), according to Xu Xingqing, ZSJBY, 5.

out from centuries of chaos dazzled with usurpations and wars. He wanted to bring an era of peace to Japan under an absolute state ruled by the Tokugawa perpetually. The many policies adopted, and laws and measures thence enacted in several decades following the founding of the Tokugawa regime, are for but two objectives Ieyasu and his successors strove to achieve: that the Tokugawa had the right to rule and that they could “establish and maintain its authority over all the orders of society which together constituted the body politic.”  

The first objective was to resolve the issue of legitimacy. Traditionally, this could be achieved, as Ashikaga Yoshimitsu 足利義満 (1358-1408, in office 1368-1394) did, by submitting to the Chinese world order (Ch. huayi zhixu, J. kai chitsujo 華夷秩序), manifested through a tributary system between the sovereign and the vassals, prevailed in East and South-East Asia. This however would put Tokugawa under the same criticism of compromising Japanese sovereignty Yoshimitsu received throughout Japanese history. Instead, the Tokugawa government, in addition to proving his legitimacy domestically by receiving the imperial appointment, managed to offer it externally by proclaiming Ieyasu had acquired three classical criteria for the identification of legitimacy: Ieyasu has unified the country; he has rectified administration and brought prosperity to the people; and his dynasty has already attained its third generation. This last is clearly making more of the seven-year-old Iemitsu 157 than is warranted, but each of these is an index of legitimacy with roots deep in the classical tradition: Ou-yang Hsiu [ouyang xiu 歐陽修, 1007-1072] treatise on legitimacy [zhengtong lun 正統論]” 158

Since the Tokugawa had determined not to participate in the Chinese world order any longer, they managed to weave a new Japanese style world order “in which Japan had shaken

---

156 Ibid., 6.
157 Tokugawa Iemitsu 徳川家光 (1604-1651; in office, 1623-1651) was the third shogun.
free at last from the grip of China. In this order, Japan was a peer to Korea. Ryūkyū was its vassal state. To both, Japan maintained formal relationship with. Contacts with China were limited to private business deals with Chinese merchants in the designated port of Nagasaki only. As for the western world, after the expulsion of the Portuguese, and the leaving of the English, Japan maintained informal business tie only with Holland, through the East India Company, also at Nagasaki exclusively.

To accomplish the second objectives, the new government basically achieved it through strengthening itself militarily and financially on one hand, and weaken respectively the bifurcated domains on the other. By promulgating the *buke shohatto* 武家諸法度 (the Rules for the Military Houses) in 1612 and the *kinchū narabi ni kuge shohatto* 禁中並公家諸法度 (the Rules for the Imperial Court and Court Nobles) in 1615, Ieyasu had stabilized the positions and roles of samurai as well as those of the court. The social structure of the hierarchical four classes, that is the samurai, the farmer, the artisan, and the merchant, in descending order, also became definite and secured. Movement of people, especially the peasants, outside of their original locations was strictly regulated. *Fudai daimyō*, 譜代大名 (trusted vassals) were strategically positioned among the uncommitted *tozama daimyō* 外様大名 (outside lords) to safeguard the *bakufu* from surprises. For the sake of national security, Christianity was wiped out by 1640. By a series of edicts, Japanese was forbidden to travel out of Japan, and those already out from returning. Foreigners, mainly Portuguese, were expelled except the Dutch and Chinese, whose

---


160 For detailed discussion of how Tokugawa handle the matter of legitimacy, foreign relationship etc., see Tashiro, “Foreign Relations during the Edō Period: Sakoku Reexamined” and Toby “Reopening the Question of Sakoku: Diplomacy in the Legitimation of the Tokugawa Bakufu”.

51
activities are restricted to Nagasaki only. All these made entering Japan difficult, let alone being approved for staying.

At the same time, all administrative measures needed to be bolstered by ideologies. Since the Buddhist church was no longer an estate of the realm, and Shinto was yet matured enough to have political influence, Neo-Confucianism became a natural choice. Neo-Confucianism was introduced into Japan by Buddhist monks in the thirteenth century. It was not very popular at the beginning because it was mainly treated as a subsidiary of Buddhism. Besides, during those chaotic times, nobody would have the time for new thoughts. After the Tokugawa united Japan, Neo-Confucianism suddenly gained flavour. “The governing élite of the Tokugawa regime found in the Shushigaku 朱子学 (C. zhuzi xue; Zhu Xi School) a powerful political panacea to strengthen the legitimacy of their rule and to explain the entire social complex, including the existing pattern of power.’’\textsuperscript{161} The discourse for an ideology for the new Japan has thus started. The first attempt was to put Japan in a less inferior, if not equal, status by asserting the Chinese sage Wu Taibo 吳太伯 (or 泰伯, ?-? roughly eleventh century BCE) as the imperial ancestor of Japan. This established Japanese as descendants of the sage and therefore could not be barbarians. The myth was first created by Japanese envoys and sojourners between the third and fifth century.\textsuperscript{162} It did not catch much attention in Japan since. In late sixteenth century, a Zhu Xi School Confucian Fujiwara Seika 藤原惺窩 (1561-1619) brought it up again.\textsuperscript{163} His disciple, the


\textsuperscript{162} Ng Benjamin Wai-ming 吳偉明, “Wu T'ai-Po in Early Tokugawa Thought- Imperial Ancestor or Chinese Sage”, \textit{East Asian History}, No. 21 (June 2001): 61.

\textsuperscript{163} For an introduction on Zhu Xi School in Japan, see Robert Armstrong, \textit{Light from the East: Studies in Japanese Confucianism} (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1913, BiblioBazaar reprint, Charleston, 2012): Part II, for Seika, 39-46 within that Part; For the same but more comprehensively in Chinese, see Zhu Qianzhi 朱謙之 (1899-  
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influential Confucian official Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657) supported his master and furthered his theory that “since the imperial family enjoyed an unbroken lineage…the T’ai-po [Taibo] line would last forever in Japan.” Razan’s son Gahō 鷺峰 (1618-1680), grandson Hōkō 凤岡 (1644-1732) and other Fujiwara school scholars such as Matsunaga Shakugo 松永尺五 (1592-1657), Kinoshita Jun’an 木下順庵 (1621-1698), Muro Kyūsō 室鳩巢 (1658-1734), all either supported or developed the theory. Other great thinkers, such as Yamasaki Ansai 山崎闇斎 (618-1682) refuted the link but they respected Taibo for his loyalty in not revolting against the Shang (1675-1046 BCE) and his filial piety in giving up his right to succeed the throne to fulfill his father’s wish. Tokugawa Mitsukuni on the other hand regarded the theory an offence to the imperial family because that would place Japan a subordinate of China. The discussion eventually died down due to, among other reasons, the rise of national sentiment and pride which would not allow such humiliating legend. “[T]his debate reflects the larger issue that Chinese Confucian doctrines did not always fit with the Tokugawa system. Tokugawa intellectuals were in a dilemma as to whether to choose a Chinese Confucian sage or a Shinto deity as the originator of their history and world order. Advocates of the T’ai-po [Taibo] legend attempted to accommodate Chinese Confucianism within the Japanese tradition, whereas critics of the legend upheld Japanese political orthodoxy and cultural integrity in the face of unwanted Chinese

---

164 Ng, Benjamin Wai-ming 吳偉明, “Wu T’ai-Po in Early Tokugawa Thought- Imperial Ancestor or Chinese Sage”, East Asian History, No. 21 (June 2001): 58.

165 Ibid., 61.

166 Ibid.

167 Ibid., 63.
influence.” Whatever was the choice, the quest showed that the awareness of their national identity and pride among the early Edo government and the intellectuals had been elevated to a historic high level. They unanimously agreed that Japan should not live under the shadow of China any more, “a pervasive psychological unease” as Kate W. Nakai puts it. Since Japan has an unbroken imperial line without revolt and dynastic changes, Japan is better than China, they asserted. The difference between the civilized (J. ka, Ch. hua 華) and barbarian (J. i, Ch. yi 夷) was no longer geographical but rather cultural. Japan can and should take over and be the centre of a new world order – the Japanese ka-i world order. The twist and changes that followed did not happen instantly. To become the centre of the world, Japan needed to possess some overt and visible qualification. Therefore, the Japanese intellectuals at early Edo period were eager to write their own history in Chinese style, to learn the Chinese examination system, to build Confucian temples, to practise the worshipping rituals, to wear the Ming style clothes, to adopt even the format of correspondence etc. The easiest way to gain access to the Chinese source other than going to China was to meet Chinese élite from China. Nagasaki, being the only port under the direct control of the bakufu that was open to foreigners, transformed into a busy place not only for trades, or for Ming remnants seeking shelters, but also for Japanese looking for targets from whom they can acquire the necessary knowledge to equip themselves to build Japan.

168 Ibid., 64.


170 Mencius had said, “I have heard of using our culture to transform the uncivilized, but I have not heard of being transformed by the uncivilized.” 吾聞用夏變夷者，未聞變於夷者也。 van Norden, The Essential Mengzi, 32. The falling of the sixty million civilized Ming people to the hands of the less than one hundred thousand uncivilized Manchu startled not only Chinese but Japanese. In the preface of Kai Hentai 華夷變態 (1732) Hayashi Hōkō 林鳳岡 (1645-1732) remarked, “Chongzheng died…and the barbarian runs amok at the Central Plain. This is the state where the civilized mutated to be uncivilized.” 崇禎登天…而韃虜橫行中原。是華變於夷之態也。 Hayashi Shunsai and Hayashi Hōkō 林鳳岡 (1645-1732) ed., Kai hentai 華夷變態 [the position swop between the civilized and the barbarians] (Tokyo: Orient Bookstore, 1981.): 1.
into the centre of the world.\textsuperscript{171} As Marius Jansen points out, “direct access to Chinese nationals at Nagasaki was important to the scholarly achievements of most of the official projects at Edo.”\textsuperscript{172} The interest in Confucianism and the flourishing of thousands of private schools (\textit{shijuku 私塾}) after all was a matter of profit and fame, which was particularly attractive to those marginalized samurais who became jobless but could not degrade to be farmers or artisans. These private schools focussed mainly on the teaching of practical side of Confucianism, which was a tradition passed down from Ashikaga Gakkō 足利学校 (Ashikaga School), which taught Confucianism, \textit{I-jing 易經} (or \textit{I Ching}) and Chinese medicine in eastern Japan since early fifteenth century. Graduates from Ashikaga Schools mainly became military consultant (\textit{gunshi 軍師}) for daimyos in the Sengoku period (\textit{Sengoku jidai 戦国時代}, Age of Warring States, 1467-1603). These consultants were responsible not only for military affairs, but also the logistics, finances etc for garrisons, as well as topography and meteorology. During peace time, they also offered advices on political and fiscal policies.\textsuperscript{173} However, we should not have the impression of Confucianism as the dominating ideology of Edo period. As Kojima Tsuyoshi cautions, “Throughout Edo Period, that Shushigaku in the end become a national standard in education has not happened.” 江戸時代を通じて、朱子学はついに国民的レベルでの体制 教学にはならなかった\textsuperscript{174} The teaching of Zhu Xi was for providing moral admonition only.


\textsuperscript{172} Jansen, \textit{China in the Tokugawa World}, 70.

\textsuperscript{173} Kojima Tsuyoshi 小島毅, “Nihon teki Shushigaku no keisei – bunka kōshōgaku no shikaku kara” 日本的朱子学の形成 - 文化交渉学の観角から [The Formation of Japanese Shushigaku - from the angle of cultural interaction], \textit{東アジア文化交渉研究 別冊 East Asian Cultural Interaction Studies Supplemental}, No.8 (Kansai University, Feb 1, 2012): 104, URL http://hdl.handle.net/10112/6253

\textsuperscript{174} Ibid., 105.
With regard to weltanschauung, or world-view, particularly that deals with life and death, people in Edo Period in general still resorted to, say Buddhism, for advices. Kojima calls this “sentaku teki juyō 選択的受容” (selective acceptance) 175. Similarly, it should be pointed out that there were many other private schools teaching philosophies other than Shushigaku, especially in Kyoto.

This was the Japan Zhu Shunshui found himself in when he sought asylum in the archipelago. The process of getting permission to stay was not an easy task because Japan at that time adopted what later referred to as sakoku 鎖国 (lit. lock up the country) policy under which foreigners are forbidden to come to Japan. Dutch and Chinese merchants were exempted but their come and go were heavily regulated and their stay, if approved, were confined to Nagasaki only176. In 1666, Shunshui wrote to his good friend Chen Zunzhi 陳遵之 (?-?) and stated that his being allowed to stay was an exception in thirty years (ZSJ, 43). He repeated the same to Oyake Seijun at about the same time and added that it was due to the goodwill of Kurogawa Masanao 黒川正直 (1602-1680), the Magistrate of Nagasaki. According to Shunshui’s letter of gratitude sent in 1661 to Nabeshima Naoyoshi 鍋島直能 (1623-1689) (ZSJ, 70-71), daimyō of Ogi 小城 (Ogi City, at the middle of present-day Saga Prefecture in Kyushu), was also involved in pushing for the approval. In 1679, he told his grandson Yuren 毓仁 (style name Tiansheng 天生, ?-?) in

175 Ibid.

176 An artificial island called Dejima for the Dutch. Chinese lived all over Nagasaki until a Chinese quarter called Tōjin yashiki 唐人屋敷 was built by the end of the sixteenth century. Jansen, China in the Tokugawa World, 10.
a letter\textsuperscript{177} with more details that it was his first Japanese student Andō Seian’s imploring him to stay, and entreating the Magistrate of Nagasaki for approval that had made his settlement in Japan possible\textsuperscript{178},

Japan has been forbidding Chinese to stay for forty years.\textsuperscript{179} A few years ago, seven ships from Nanjing arrived Nagasaki together, nineteen wealthy merchants jointly signed a memorial pleading for the approval of [my] stay. It was [still] not allowed after many times [of trials]. I therefore have no intention [to stay] here. However, Andō Seian earnestly begged [me] to stay and [at the same time] made requests to various people and so I [finally] stay here. This is an exception exclusive to me under the strict law.”

To be able to acquire an approval to stay in Nagasaki in the Edo period is certainly not easy but to say he was the only one in thirty, forty years perhaps is not accurate. Many of Shunshui’s friends arrived much earlier than Shunshui did and they have each made their contributions as expatriates individually, for example: Chen Yuanyun 陳元贇 (J. Chingen Pin, 1587-1671) arrived Japan in 1617 and allowed to stay and employed by the Owari han 尾張藩 (Owari Domain, west of present-day Aichi Prefecture) as an official in 1627 (ZSJBY, 324); a doctor, a Tō tsūji 唐通事 (Chinese interpreter) and Shunshui’s guide Chen Mingde 陳明德 (? to 1689) arrived in 1660 and employed by the same Owari Domain. Gyōjitsu states that Shunshui’s grandson Yuren arrived Nagasaki in the twelfth month of the year wuwu 戊午 (1678, but the twelfth month has already headed into 1679 in Gregorian calendar). However, the laws by then disallowed him to travel to Edō to see his grandfather, and Shunshui to see his grandson. In the end, Shunshui could only ask his disciple Imi Kōsai 今井弘濟 (1652-1689) to bring letters to Nagasaki for Yuren and his other grandchildren. (ZSJ, 621) Yu sunnan yuren shu 與孫男毓仁書 [The letter to my grandson Yuren] (ZSJ, 48) which I am translating hereunder is one of them.

\textsuperscript{177} Gyōjitsu states that Shunshui’s grandson Yuren arrived Nagasaki in the twelfth month of the year wuwu 戊午 (1678, but the twelfth month has already headed into 1679 in Gregorian calendar). However, the laws by then disallowed him to travel to Edō to see his grandfather, and Shunshui to see his grandson. In the end, Shunshui could only ask his disciple Imi Kōsai 今井弘濟 (1652-1689) to bring letters to Nagasaki for Yuren and his other grandchildren. (ZSJ, 621) Yu sunnan yuren shu 與孫男毓仁書 [The letter to my grandson Yuren] (ZSJ, 48) which I am translating hereunder is one of them.

\textsuperscript{178} Shunshui thanked Andō Seian for his efforts in a letter dated the second day of the tenth month (of 1661) as soon as he learnt the approval. (ZSJBY, 56)

\textsuperscript{179} The last of a set of five so called seclusion edicts were issued in 1639, which was exactly forty years from the year this letter was sent.
migrated to Nagasaki in 1627 (ZSJBY, 318); Monk Itsuren Shōyū 逸然性融 (1601-1668) in 1641; Monk Chii Dōryō 澄一道亮 (1608-1692) in 1653 (ZSJBY, 322); Dai Li 戴笠 (aka. Dokuryū Shōeki 獨立性易, 1596-1672) in 1655 (ZSJBY, 335); Kerin Shōei 化林性侷 (1596-1667) in 1661. (ZSJBY, 323). Shunshui knew many of these persons. In fact, in one of his letters, he quoted the case of Dai Li as precedence and asked why he could not follow Dai’s example and be permitted residency in Nagasaki. Obviously, Zhu Shunshui was aware that he was not the first and certainly the only to receive such “special” treatment. It is possible that he said so simply wanted to make him looked and felt better, especially in front of his family that he deserted.

Another point worth noting is that it was probably Shunshui himself who initiated the application. In *Shang changqi zhenxun jie* 上長崎鎮巡揭 (the Memorial to the Magistrate of Nagasaki) (ZSJ, 37-39) submitted in 1651, he had complaint that he had not had the chance to meet the Magistrate even once in the past seven years; and that he urged the Magistrate to let him have his decision on whether he could stay in Nagasaki or he should wait else where. Therefore, it seems Shunshui had requested Japan to let him stay as early as he first left Zhoushan in 1645.

Some researches seem overlook the above two points but take instead Shunshui’s words that he was being begged to stay and he was the only one in forty years to be allowed to, and

---

180 Also, Lin, *Zhu Shunshui zai Riben*, 34.

181 ZSJBY, pp.199. The letter is titled as 32. *Zhu shunshui ji andong shengan biyu 1321* 三二、朱舜水寄安東省菴筆語一三二一 [32. A Pen Conversation Zhu Shunshui sent to Andō Seian 1321], but the tone of the letter is closer to that in Zhu’s letter to the Magistrate of Nagasaki than to his student.
believe these as evidences that Shunshui was being highly valued by the Edo government \(^{182}\), and thus infer that Shusnhui has influence in Japan.

Now that Shunshui could reside in Nagasaki, but his problem did not stop there. For a Chinese remnant who did not have much assets, did not know the rules and customs, and did not speak the language, life could not be easy\(^{183}\). To make ends meet, apart from borrowing from friends, he planned to acquire a small piece of land to do farming\(^{184}\). Chen Mingde suggested him to open a private school for children, but he did not favour the idea too much because, as he explained to Seian, his house would be noisy and become a “battleground”. It was not worth it for the tuition he could get. (ZSJBY, 208) Indeed, the purpose of his desire to reside in Nagasaki was not for any grand reason other than simply seeking refugee. Shunshui had in several occasions stressed he did not come to preach. He told Seian that he “came here [Nagasaki] initially to take refuge, not to explicate Neo-Confucianism” 不肖本為避難, 初非為倡明道學而來 (ZSJ, 181)\(^{185}\). This is contrary to those who compare Shunshui to Jizi 箕子 (11th century BCE)\(^{186}\), who had moved to an eastern land. Zhu Shunshui did later accept students and teach

\(^{182}\) **Gyōjitsu** only states that it was due to Andō’s persisting requests that Shunshui decided to stay. It does not mention Shunshui was the only one in thirty, forty years. (ZSJ, 617). Ishihara however states that Andō was Shunshui’s reason to stay (Shu Shunshui, 91) and that Shunshui was the only one allowed in forty years (Shu Shunshui, 101-102); Li, Zhu Zhiyu pingzhuang, 19; Lin, Zhu Shunshui zai Riben 37-38; Tan, Zhu shunshui dongying showe, 58-59; Wang, Zhu Shunshui pingzhuang, 24 etc.

\(^{183}\) See Qian, Shengguo binshi, pp.82-84 for a brief account on how tough Zhu Shunshui’s life was in Nagasaki. For original sources, see ZSJBY, 69, 75, 111.

\(^{184}\) See for instance ZSJ, 159, 176, and 311.

\(^{185}\) See also ZSJ, 62-63, 112.

\(^{186}\) Jizi was a semi-legendary Chinese sage who is said to have ruled Gojoseon (ancient Korea) in the 11th century BCE. Early Chinese documents like *Shangshu* 尚書 (the Book of Documents) and *Zhushu Jinian* 竹書紀年 (the Bamboo Annals) described him as a virtuous relative of the last king of the Shang dynasty. After Shang was overthrown by Zhou in the 1040s BCE, he allegedly went to Korea after giving political advice to King Wu, the first Zhou king.
Confucian subjects. However, to praise Zhu Shunshui’s purpose for going to Japan was to preserve Chinese culture and to transmit the Way187 was too imaginative. He did not plan to transform the “eastern barbarian” and bring influence to Japan originally. Part of the reasons was of course deep in his heart back then that he was still hoping a Han monarchy could be restored and he could return. The main reason, though, was he considered Japan an “unlearnt” (buxue 不學, i.e. uncivilized) country and therefore the Japanese were not transformable:

“[when one is] unlearnt, [one] would hold fast to non-ritual as ritual, follow the unrighteous as righteous. Even the wisest [among them] would make mistake, how much more so are those worse? There are three shortcomings: Solemnly extol oneself, boldly assume oneself is infallible, be ashamed of being inferior to others, this is one; those in Japan fail to act properly to their position [as a less civilized peripheral of the cultural centre, at the same time those] from the central kingdom [i.e. the cultural centre] frequent themselves in picking the minor errors [of the former], just want to fight for victory over quarrel, this is the second; [ignorant of oneself] being deceived by other [irrelevant] subject matters but strive for the illusive goals, never repent till one dies, this is the third. With this in one’s bosom, how can one advance to [the stage of the] learnt? ” 不學、則執非禮以為禮，襲不義以充義，雖上智容有過差，況其下焉者哉？其為弊亦有三端，岸然自高，枵然自是，而耻於下人，一也；在日本者不自安其分，中國者嘗欲求其疵，鬪捷於口頰，二也；愚蔽於他端，而希必不然之獲，老死而不悔，三也。三者橫於中，其何以進於學哉？" (ZSJ, 169-170).

Another reason is that Shunshui thought Japan has been indulged in Buddhism too much too long, a bad old habit that is impossible to be rectified (ji zhong nan hui 積重難回) (ZSJ, 181)188. This was how he saw Japan, at least up till this moment. Robert Chard stated that

---

187 As Lu Jiuyuan (陸九淵, 1139–1192) said, “In the transition between the reigns of Yao and Shun, the Dao rested in Gao Yao’s [hands]. In the transition between the Shang and Zhou dynasties, the Dao rested in Jizi’s [hands]. Heaven, in producing human beings, certainly ensures that there will be some who take up the responsibility of making clear the Dao. Gao Yao and Jizi were such men. The reason Jizi feigned madness was precisely so that he could transmit the Dao. Once he had presented the “great Plan” to King Wu, he lived among the barbarians so that he would not have to eat the grain of the Zhou dynasty.” 唐虞之際, 道在皋陶; 商周之際, 道在箕子。天之生人, 必有能尸明道之責者, 皋陶箕子是也。箕子所以佯狂不死者, 正為欲傳其道。既為武王陳洪範, 則居於夷狄, 不食周粟。Lu Jiuyuan Ji 陸九淵集 [The Collection of Lu Jiuyuan], juan 34, quoted by Philip J. Ivanhoe, in Readings From the Lu-Wang School of Neo-Confucianism (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2009): 76.

188 In a letter to Seijun in 1664, he remarks, “your honourable country has been misled by heresy [i.e. Buddhism] deep down to the soul. How can it be cleared up overnight?” 貴國惑於邪教, 深入骨髓, 豈能一旦豁然? (Shuroku, 5; also ZSJ, 407)
Shunshui had always wanted to secure a high official position in another Confucian country\textsuperscript{189}. I agree with this insightful conclusion but would argue that such idea did not emerge until situation changed later.

During the six years of his residing in Nagasaki, he relied mainly on assistance, financial and physical, from friends and acquaintances\textsuperscript{190}. There he met his first student in Japan, Andō Seian, who changed Shunshui’s life. Many say Seian was the key person that turned Shunshui’s life around\textsuperscript{191}, but I agree with Tan Qixun, the key person should be Chen Mingde because it was him through whom Zhu was introduced to Seian, and the Magistrate of Nagasaki, and perhaps later to Oyake Seijun as well.\textsuperscript{192} Despite Zhu sometimes did not have kind words on Chen\textsuperscript{193}, Chen in fact collaborated with Seian in many ways to ensure Shunshui had a better living environment and prospect in Japan. That said, being a Japanese Confucian scholar, Andō Seian, was more influential and his help was more effective than Chen.

Andō Seian (1622-1701) was born in Yanagawa han 柳川藩 (present-day Yanagawa city in Fukuoka prefecture, Kyushu), original given name was Moritada 守正, later changed to Morinari 守約, courtesy name Romoku 魯默, alternative names Seian 省菴 and Chisai 恥斎. At the age of seventeen, he travelled between Edo and Nagasaki to learn.\textsuperscript{194} Four years later, he

\textsuperscript{189} Chard, “Patterns of confucian Cultural Transmission”, 272(13).
\textsuperscript{190} See ZSJ, 48, 183, 184; ZSJBY, 90 for examples.
\textsuperscript{191} Robert Chard for one. See Chard, “Patterns of Confucian Cultural Transmission”, 270(15).
\textsuperscript{192} Tan, Zhu shunshui dongying shouye, 75.
\textsuperscript{193} For example, he told Seian once that he need not believe in every word Chen said. (ZSJBY, 205 #1328), other instances such as ZSJBY, 186-187.
\textsuperscript{194} Hikita, “Shu Shunsui to Andō Seian”, 26.
learnt poetry and writing skill from two monks. In 1649, he went to Kyoto and followed the famous poet and Confucian Matsunaga Sekigo 松永尺五 (1592-1657). Sekigo was one of the four most famous disciples of Fujiwara Seika. Seika was celebrated as the forefather of modern Neo-Confucianism in Japan. For five years, Andō studied under Sekigo together with great scholars such as Kinoshita Jun’an 木下順庵 (1621-1698), Kaibara Ekken 貝原益軒 (1630-1714), Utsunomeya Ton’an 宇都宮遯庵 (1633-1707). Seian knew and maintained good terms with both Chen Mingde and Dai Li, with whom he often consulted issues regarding his studies. Since Chen Yunyuan was a friend of Sekigo, Seian might also have acquaintance with Chen through his teacher. In 1654, he met with Chen Mingde and Dai Li at Nagasaki and heard from them Zhu Shunshui’s name for the first time. After reading Shunshui’s Jianque fu 堅確賦

---

195 Lin, Zhu Shunshui zai riben, 90.


198 Sekigo was the first in Japan to open and run a private school (Shijuku 私塾) Shūjikan 春秋館 in Kyoto in 1628.

199 Qian, Shengguo binshi,160; Hikita, “Shu Shunsui to Andō Seian”, 26. Chard says in “Patterns of Confucian Transmission”, 268(17), that Ishihara states in his Shu Shunsui, 289-290, that Seian first heard of Shunshui’s name was in the year of 1658. That part of Ishihara’s book is a Ryaku nenbu 略年譜 [brief chronological biography] for Shunshui but I cannot locate Ishihara’s mentioning anything about when Seian first heard Shunshui’s name. Chard himself follows Shu Zenan’s argument that the correct year Seian first hear about Shunshui should be 1659, in Shu’s dissertation “Cultural and Political Encounters with Chinese Language in Early Modern Japan: the Case of Kinoshita Jun’an (1621-1698)” (D. Phil. Thesis, University of Oxford, 2009), 119-21. I have no access to Shu’s dissertation, but 1659 seems a bit late, for Seian seemed to have started exchanging letters with Shunshui latest by 1658. Since I found Qian and Hikita’s arguments are convincing, I will follow these two scholars.
(Rhapsody on Tenacious and Resolute)\textsuperscript{200} (ZSJBY, 65), Seian was deeply impressed and started exchanging letters with Shunshui and requesting to be his student. He finally met Zhu in 1660.\textsuperscript{201}

\textsuperscript{200} Both \textit{jian} and \textit{que} can be adjective, adverb as well as verb. \textit{jian} can be a noun too. In the rhapsody, which is extant and included in ZSJ, 24-25, Shunshui plays around these different concepts.

\textsuperscript{201} There is conflicting information about when Seian first met Shunshui face to face. Although I cannot confidently point to an exact date, I still consider it worth my efforts trying since that piece of information will determine the length of time Seian actually studied under Shunshui.

- Xu Xingqing states it was 1957, which is an obvious misprint. I believe what he meant was 1658 (first year of the Manji 萬治 era) (Xu, “iliki chishikijin no deai”, 256(31)). However, in ZSJBY Xu edited five years earlier, up to 1658, Seian was only able to communicate with Shunshui by letters. Xu stated in his brief chronological list of Shunshui’s activities that in 1659 Shunshui was allowed to reside in Japan under the help of Seian, which hints they met that year. (ZSJBY, 307-308);
- Lin Junhong holds the same view, i.e. it was 1658 that Zhu first met Andō (Zhu Shunshui zai Riben, 90);
- Gyōjitsu stated it was before the second year of the Manji era (i.e.1659) (ZSJ, 617);
- Hikita Keiyū asserts that they met in 1659 (“Shu Shunsui to Andō Seian”, 27);
- Qian Ming said more specifically that it was the winter of 1659. (Shengguo binshi, 342);
- Ishihara Michihiro said that they met in 1660 the first time (Shu shunsui,105, 290);
- Seian himself said in Shunsui sensei bunshū Jo 朱舜水先生文集序 [The Preface to the Collection of Master Zhu Shunshui’s Writings] that in the second year of the Manji era (1659), Shunshui came again and sojourned in Nagasaki. He immediately rushed to see Shunshui and was accepted as one of his disciples. (ZSJ, 784). However, in his Tō Shu sensei bun 悼朱先生文 [An Eulogy for Mister Zhu], Seian said, in the second year of the Manji era Chen Mingde gave him an article written by Shunshui. (ZSJ, 735) He was glad and wrote to thank Zhu. Shunshui replied in the tenth month of the following year (yinian 明年, 1661) Shunshui did come back as promised in the letter. (ZSJ, 736).

The most detailed information I can acquire however is from a web site named Shofuku 庄福 BIC site under the subject of Yanagawa gakumon no sō Andō Seian 柳川學問の祖安東省菴 [Andō Seian the forefather of the academy of Yanagawa] (see link http://www.geocities.jp/bicdenki/andouseian.htm ) with the footnote stipulated the sources documents. The web page said originally, Seian planned to go to see Shunshui in 1659. Nevertheless, since he was a Confucian officer and had the responsibility of bringing a few students, he did not have the permission to go until 1660.

According to dated documents, Shunshui was in Annan in1657 (in his memorial to the Prince of Lu, as late as in the sixth month that year, he was still in Annan, ZSJ, 34. On the fourteenth day of the eighth month, he offered sacrifices to his best friend Wang Yi in Annan, ZSJ, pp. 587). In 1658, he went to Nagasaki from Annan, his sixth visit to Japan (in his third elegiac essay to Wang Yi, he offered sacrifices to his friend again, in Japan, in the second half of the ninth month, ZSJ, 589.) In accordance with Liang Qichao’s research (ZSJ, 674-675), on the seventeenth day of the tenth month that year, Andō Seian sent a letter to Shunshui and requested to be his student. (ZSJ, 169) On the nineteenth day of the same month, Shunshui responded to Zheng Chenggong’s summon and left for Xiamen 廈門, carrying with him the gold Seian gave him as assistance. Since he was in a great rush, he promised Chen Mingde he would reply Seian when he arrived Xiamen. (ZSJ, 60) And he did (ZSJ 169-172), in which he committed to return to Nagasaki the following summer. The expedition of Zheng failed in the seventh month, 1659 and he planned to stay in Xiamen a little longer and return to Nagasaki the following summer instead (ZSJ, 153). For unknown reasons, he changed his mind again and, according to Gyōjitsu, went to Nagasaki in the winter of 1659. (See research in Liang-pu, ZSJ, 682-683). Up to this moment, Shunshui had not yet agreed to receive Seian as his student and there is no evidence they had already met. In the summer of 1660, he showed Dai Li his “Chronological records of laboring in Annam”. (ZSJ, 35) The words Dai used in his colophon to the “Chronological records of laboring in Annam” is “Mister came again this summer unexpectedly” 今夏忽逢先生再臨, the “this summer”, according to the context, refers to 1660. Ishihara Michihiro explicitly stated they met in 1660 between autumn and winter. (Shu shunsui, 105)

Theoretically, we can use the year Shunshui acquired approval to stay in Japan to infer conversely the time they met. Unfortunately, it is uncertain when exactly Shunshui was permitted to reside in Nagasaki. Qian Ming says it
For a Japanese Confucian scholar who has been pursuing for years for authentic Confucianism from China, it should be no surprise that Andō was willing to do whatever he could to learn from Shunshui. Through Andō, Shunshui gained assistance that made his settlement in Japan much easier.

As mentioned above, Seian was one of the key persons that changed Zhu Shunshui’s life. He was the main person that took care of Shunshui’s living by sharing half of his meager stipend. He was also the one who looked after Shunshui when the latter was in trouble, such as the Great Fire in 1663 which burnt Shunshui’s house to the ground. He rushed to Shunshui’s aid even during his own younger sister was deadly sick (ZSJ, 165). At one point, he even invited Shunshui to Yanagawa to stay with him. (ZSJ, 158) It was also Seian who pulled the thread and make Shunshui’s name known to Edo, which will be covered later. During the six years before

---

202 Zhu Shunshui’s life style can appear a little bourgeoisie. He had requested maids, servants and boy servants. See ZSJBY, 70, 75, and 87 for example.

203 ZSJ, 48, 165-166, 617 and 737.
Zhu Shunshui left for Edo to be Mitsukuni’s teacher, Seian visited Shunshui twice a year. He
told his fellow study mate Okumura Yasuhiro 奥村庸禮 (1627-1687)²⁰⁴ once that:

[When] Master Zhu came, for [learning the Neo-Confucianism of] Cheng [Yi and Cheng Hao and] Zhu [Xi], [I] carried my box with books and set sail [to Nagasaki where the Master was and] be one of his students. My hometown is over thirty ri [about 120km present-day] to Nagasaki. I paid visit to him twice every year. We could not communicate due to language difference, and [since I] do not have much literary talent, even [by] brush conversation I could not express myself as well as I wish to. I studied under him for less than [x years], then we have to bid each other farewell for his travelling east for good. 朱老師來, 為程朱負笈航海, 就弟子之列。敝家與崎相距三十里許, 每半年兩次省之, 言語不通, 兼無文采, 筆語亦不如意, 受業不足□□, 為東關萬里之別。 (ZSJBY, 155)

Shunshui accepted Mitsukuni’s offer and left for Edo in the summer of 1665. During the six years Shunshui stayed in Nagasaki before he left, if we accept 1660 was the year they first met face to face, they could not have met more than twelve times (because there were times when Seian could not afford the trip²⁰⁷). Assuming Seian would stay in Nagasaki for 10 days for each meeting²⁰⁸, their total time spent together face to face would be merely four months at most.

When Seian met with Shunshui, Seian would let his own disciple Liu Ruyuan 柳如瑗 (?-?) to

²⁰⁴ Shunshui used Xiangqi 賢契 (ZSJ, 274), Xiandi 賢弟 (ZSJ, pp. 275) to address Yasuhiro, who is a standard term a teacher uses to address his students.

²⁰⁵ The sentence is a bit awkward here. Literally it means “twice every half year”, in which case normally it would be rendered as “four times a year” instead. According to Zhu Shunshui’s letter to his grandson Yuren, Seian visited him twice a year (ZSJ, 48), the sentence here should be the same. The word ban 半 (half) is redundant.

²⁰⁶ From the context, there seem to have at least two words dropped. There should be something like liu 六 (six) or qi nian 七年 (seven years) to link the sentence grammatically with the following one.

²⁰⁷ See ZSJ, 156.

²⁰⁸ According to letter number nine, which was probably written in 1661, of the Shang zhu xiansheng ershier shou “上朱先生二十二首” [The twenty-two letters presented to Master Zhu], Seian wrote: “last summer and a few days ago, I had the chance to be taught by you face to face. Despite it was just ten days teaching…往夏與前日獲親炙，雖僅旬日之教… (ZSJ, 750).
help translating when the latter was available\textsuperscript{209}. Other wise, they could only use their brushes to communicate, the so called \textit{hitsudan} 筆談 (Ch. \textit{bitan}, brush conversation). Shunshui’s another student Hitomi Sakudō 人見竹洞 (1638-1696), a famous \textit{bakufu} Confucian officer who has also had a lot of brush conversations with Shunshui, once humorously compared his tacit conversation with Shunshui as “drifting in an imagined boat”: “I used a brush as my tongue, he used his eyes as ears. Often, we face each other in dead silence as if drifting in an imagined boat” 我以筆為舌，他以眼為耳，每相對杳然，如泛虛舟而已. (ZSJBY, 158) Seian must have felt the same frustration, judging from his complaint to Okumura Yasuhiro quoted above.

The fact that Seian was Shunshui’s student let many scholars conclude that Shunshui has overwhelming influence on Seian. It cannot be denied that there was. The question is how extensive and how deep. We must bear in mind that when Seian met Shunshui, he was already thirty-eight. In fact, Seian was quite established when he sought to be Shunshui’s student. He has his own students, and apart from being the Confucian official in Yanagawa domain, he was also the scholar-in-waiting and tutor to the domain lord. He had spent twenty-six years studying Confucianism, five of which full time with a famous scholar, who spoke his language and shared the same background. He had been proactively seeking orthodox Zhu Xi School of Confucian teachings from Chinese scholar refugees in Nagasaki for years before he met Zhu Shunshui. Seian did not stop looking after Shunshui had passed away. He befriended Shunshui’s fellow townsman Zhang Fei and maintain a very close friendship with him after Shunshui has gone. Similar to what he did to Shunshui, he had even tried, though in vain, recommending Zhang to Edo. All these show that Shunshui alone could not satisfy Seian’s appetite for learning Neo-

\footnote{209 Quote from Qian, \textit{Shengguo binshi}, 164.}
Confucianism. Seian’s proactively seeking to learn from various individuals simultaneously makes it a harder, if not exaggerated, case to assert Shunshui was the sole influence source. Of the 176 correspondences between them (104 were from Shunshui)\textsuperscript{210} very few discuss serious academic issues. Among the 32 pairs questions and answers plus 10 Shunshui’s remarks annexed (probably are from their brush conversation records), only one entry relates to the difference between Zhu (Xi) and Lu (Jiuyuan), one on (Wang) Yangming and one remark on the Cheng brothers and Zhu (Xi). The contents of his *Shinsō Shūgo* [Documents Compiled during Bereavement], which are available in both ZSJ and ZSJBY, with a few exceptions and minor text variances, there is no other Neo-Confucianism discussion found. It is difficult to imagine that there are so few about Confucianism between their communications? Hikita Keiyū has done a focused but specific analysis on the possible influences Shunshui had on Seian and concludes that, one, Shunshui had softened Seian’s antagonism against Lu (Jiuyuan) Wang (Yangming), and, two, encouraged Seian’s enthusiasm in producing rudimentary publications. Thirdly, on the subject of loyalty, Shunshui emphasised on filial piety while Seian paid more attention to the issue of regime legitimacy (*seidō* 正統; Ch. *zhengtong*). Hikita adds that Seian was fond of Shao Kangjie 邵康節 (given name Yong 雍, 1077-1077).\textsuperscript{211} Xu Xingqing’s essay, written 13 years after Hikita’s, opined the same and agreed that Seian was indeed influenced by Shunshui in being more receptive to Lu Wang. He does not touch on too much on Seian’s rudimentary writings but points out that if there is one point that Seian was quite different from Shunshui, then it will be their polarized attitude towards poetry. Shunshui did not like composing poems, disparaging it to word game aiming only to impress others and was useless for self cultivation (ZSJ, 257, 382, 403, 628 etc.). To the contrary, with his background with the famous poet Sekigo,\textsuperscript{210} ZSJ and ZSJBY combined, neglecting a few duplications.

\textsuperscript{211} Hikita, “Shu Shunsui to Andō Seian”, 35.
Seian liked lyrics, even after being discouraged by Shunshui (ZSJ, 394-395), he still presented poems to Shunshui’s for corrections. (ZSJ, 186). He seemed to like Shao Kanjie’s poetry a lot. With regard to Shao, I think Seian was also deeply attracted by the metaphysical discourses Shao is famous for, because he has inquired Shunshui at least once about the augury of Liu Ji 劉基 (1311-1375) (ZSJ, 395). The debate in Japan on whether to follow Zhu Xi’s doctrine in emphasising learning or Lu Wang’s shigaku 心学 (Ch. xinxue 心學, School of Intuition of Mind) was started by Nakae Tōju 中江藤樹 (1608-1648). His follower Kumazawa Banzan 熊沢番山 (1619–1691) introduced Yōmeigaku (陽明学, c. yangming xue 陽明學) to challenge the official designated Shushigaku 朱子学 (Ch. Zhuzixue 朱子學). By mid sixteenth century, Yōmeigaku has grown into a prominent branch of Neo-Confucianism in Japan. It may not be factual, therefore, to allege that it was all because Shunshui that Seian became more receptive to Yōmeigaku. Besides, of the 39 pieces of articles Seian chose for his Shogaku Shinhō 初学心法 (Helpful insights for beginners, 1669), 8 were from Zhu Xi, 6 from Xue Xuan 薛瑄 (1389-1464), 2 each from Yang Shi 楊時 (1053-1135), Li Dong 李侗 (1093-1163), Zhen Dexiu 真德秀 (1178-1235) and Lo Qinshun 羅欽順 (1465-1547), who are all scholars within the Cheng Zhu system. Their essays accounted for close to three quarters of the total. On the other hand, Lu Jiuyuan has 2 and Wang Yangming 5. Since the book was published in 1669, four years after Zhu Shunshui had left Nagasaki, it is not too convincing to state Seian has, under the influence of Shunshui, become equally receptive to Both Cheng Zhu and Lu Wang. As for loyalty, Seian, who emphasised the importance of loyalty to state, without which a home has no place to

---

212 Xu, “Iiki chishikijin no deai”, 237[50]-235[52].

213 Hikita, “Shu Shunsui to Andō Seian”, 30 b.
attached to, he said, was obviously different from Shunshui, who valued more on filial piety, which is, according to Shunshui, the origin of all virtues, including loyalty. Regarding rudimentary writing, it was a popular undertaking intellectuals did throughout Edo period and into Meiji (1868-1912). Neo-Confucianism, in fact all Chinese classics, were foreign concepts in foreign language, which were difficult for averaged Japanese people to understand. The market for such elementary materials was therefore quite substantial. In fact, there were all sorts of ruisho 類書 (Ch. leishu, reference books) proliferated through out pre-modern Japan. Edo Japanese intellectuals were keen on producing such rudimentary publications, for one they consider themselves being the learnt had a mission to transmit the Way to the unlearnt; and on a more quotidian level these products are their means of living for selling as well as for using as text books in their own shijuku.

From a different angle, the difference between Seian and his teacher was more than just poem writing. One example is their attitude toward time management. Shunshui loved receiving guests (ZSJ, 625) to the extend that Seian had to admonish him that he should save more time for his own studies and cultivation than to unproductive meetings with guests. (ZSJ, 753) Zhu Shunshui said he did not easily accord someone as zhiji 知己 (bosom friend) (ZSJ, 186). Through out his life, he has only done so to Wang Yi. Seian is the next. Nevertheless, the relationship between these “bosom friends” seemed turned sour after Shunshui moved to Edo. During the 17 years before Shunshui died, there were perhaps less than 10 letters from Seian (#17-22, ZSJ, 754-759; ZSJBY, 106-107 has a letter similar to ZSJ, 757-758 #21 but the text varies a little) despite Shunshi’s repeated urges for more, even simple notes, almost in a begging tone (ZSJ, 163, 168; ZSJBY, 62, 65-67). To Shunshui’s disappointment, Seian did not respond positively, failing even to inform him the death of his father, who was also well known to
Shunshui. (ZSJ, 163). Seian’s explanation for not replying, even though letters from Shunshui piled up (Shinsō Shūgo, 375 b; ZSJ, 737), is that:

The Master has been advanced to a higher level. I am [just] a despicable in the remote western, I dare not bother [him] with useless talks and greetings. As well, since the Master is thousands ri away from here, we do not have the convenience of exchanging letters as we did when [he was] in Nagasaki. For these reasons, there were times that I did not present my letters [to the Master] for years…” 先生既已升進，守約西鄙賤人，不以寒暄無用之談，叨煩左右；加以東關萬里，乏便風，從此通信亦不如在崎，至有經年不奉書… (Shinsō Shūgo, pp. 374 b)

For a puritanical person like Seian, his response perhaps is understandable, although describing himself as a despicable would sound too much. In fact, the relationship between him and Shunshui might have been affected by relationship deterioration between Shunshui and Chen Mingde, who is well respected by Seian, as well as that with Liu Ruzhuo (?-?)214, Seian’s own student. It is not known exactly what had happened between Shunsui and Mingde, and Ruzhuo, but the quarrels seemed like those between petty persons, which is not one would expect a grand Confucian master would engage himself in, and Shunshui’s repeated plead for Seian to take side must have become annoying to Seian. I have therefore strong reservation on claims that Shunshui has great, or even absolute, influence on Seian. The actual feeling of Seian had toward Shunshui might lie beyond his label of being Shunshui’s first student and the formulaic style and language he used in the eulogies for Shunhui.

Despite the above, Seian remained respectful to Shunshui all his life215. And Shunshui was grateful to the assistance Seian rendered. He had sought ways to pay Seian back, including,

---

214 See Qian, Shengguo binshi,176-191 for the discussion of how it happened and to what extend.

215 Perhaps out of the principle that one should always be respectful to one’s teacher who represented the Way being transmitted. To Andō, Shunshui was a reflection of that principle. The respect of a person should be differentiated from that of a larger principle that person represented.
as Qian Ming points out\(^{216}\), trying his best to help Seian progress in his quest to be a Confucian, seeking way to be financially independent from Seian, requiting him with gold, rice, clothing, and other materials when he had the resources, and promptly fulfilled all his requests for writings and calligraphy, whether for himself or asked on others’ behalves, without questions. Requesting for calligraphies or hand written proses from famous scholars, especially those from China, has been a long-time custom in Japan. This was why when Seian received the two articles of Shunshui’s from Mingde, he was overjoyed. We must bear in mind, though, these were special treats Shunshui gave Seian because Shunshui did not easily agree to give out his writing and calligraphies (ZSJ, 56). There was once, before Shunshui was permitted to stay in Nagasaki, Chen Mingde suggested Shunshui to write a prose to praise the Magistrate of Nagasaki Kurosawa Masanao, obviously as a lubricant for an early approval of Shunshui’s application. Shunshui refused the request outright as he insisted all writings should base on facts, and he would not write to flatter anyone:

[Mingde] asked me to fabric blandish writings again. [He] does not know writing has its own time, its own form and style. There are people who can tell [which] is written rashly and preposterously [when they see one]. And [he] was unwilling to provide facts. What good would it be if a prose is nothing but words from unreal fabrication… [the stele of] Chen Taiqiu [named Shi 寔, 104-187] commented [on Deng Ai 鄧艾, 195-264], ‘[his] proses are the models for the world, [his] deeds the examples for intellectuals.’ A single unwise word would cost [the reputation] of a gentleman for [his] whole life…I have always led a simple life…if [however Mingde] wants me to act like a woman [to put on pretenses to please others], follow others action and emotion, then I do not have to spend my life here. If [he] argued [this is] to protect me from scourges, then my nose would be open to be controlled by anyone [like an ox]. The mistake would be even more extensive. I have no idea for what reason he is urging me [to write such thing].” 完翁又命作文頌美，不知作文自有時候，自有體局。造次誕妄，自有識者。又不肯與事實，徒構虛辭，於文何取？…陳太丘云：『文為世範，行為士則。』君子一言不智喪其終身。…不佞居身本自淡泊…若欲不佞作妾婦眉目，隨人俛仰悲歡，則不須於此間生活也。若曰免我於刀俎，鼻孔便當隨人牽掣，失之更遠矣。所以迫之者，不知何心？ (ZSJ, 177-178)

\(^{216}\) Qian, *Shengguo binshi*, 172-5.
Shunshui’s frustration was pronounced. Nevertheless, he did give in, stating he had no choice under Mingde’s repeated requests. (ZSJ, 55) Or maybe Shunshui was too desperate to acquire the permission and had no choice but complying to the social norm? After all, the Magistrate held the card for the permission for his residency. In his collection, there are in fact a lot of writings he did under other’s requests, including the three well-known eulogies he wrote for Kusunoki Masashige (contents of which will be covered later). After all, being a Chinese remnant who was deep in financial difficulty, composing proses for others was not a bad way out. We see here that Shunshui once again conformed to the situation he was in.

Now came an event that changed Shunshui’s life completely: the interview by Oyake Seijun in the summer of 1664. Seijun was born in 1638. Intelligent as he was praised for, Seijun was said to be good at writing at youth and was thus liked by the first daimyō of the Mito han Tokugawa Yorifusa 徳川頼房 (1603-1661). Yorifusa sent Seijun to learn from his scholar-in-waiting, a Confucian, Hitomi Bokuyū 人見卜幽 (1599-1670). Seijun then advanced even more and was famous for being erudite and belle lettres. The succeeding daimyō Mitsukuni also appointed him as his consultant, as well as his Confucian officer. In the summer of 1664, he “followed the order [from Mitsukuni] to Nagasaki and have brush conversations with Ming sojourners such as Chen Sanguan, Lu Fangkun, Monk Dulī etc. Subsequently, he got Zhu Shunshui.”

The post-face at his Saiyū shuroku have a similar narration, saying at his leisure, he met with foreigners through brush conversations to obtain updated information. However, although he did come across a few dozen who know something, he found Zhu Shunshui the only one who

---

217 From biography of Oyake Seijun in “Mito sanshi shōden” 水戸三士小傳 [The petite biographies of the three officers in Mito] in Sanroku, 1.
was truly knowledgeable.\textsuperscript{218} It sounds as if Seijun was just randomly bumped into Shunshui, and the subsequent meetings between the two were not planned. However, Xu Xingqing has argued convincingly that the “encounter” theory\textsuperscript{219} could not be the case. Based on materials from 
\textit{Sufukei san} 水府系纂 [Sources of the Mito school], \textit{Kokushikan nichiroku} 國史館日錄 [Dairy in the bureau for national history], and \textit{Tokugawa jikki} 徳川實記 [Records of actual events in Tokugawa], Xu contends that because the \textit{bakufu} had been keeping an eye on foreigners for a long time, especially those Ming remnants beseeching military assistances, they were well aware of Zhu Shunshui’s background before meeting him. He further points out that from the biography of Mitsukuni included in biographical sources of [Shunshui’s] friends and disciples in annex 5 of ZSJ, one can discern that as early as 1660, Mitsukuni might have already heard of Shunshui’s name. (ZSJ, 802)\textsuperscript{220}

In fact, there are other evidences that can supplement Xu’s argument. The third entry of the \textit{Shuroku} records Seijun said to Shunshui, “Your \textit{belle lettres} have reached Edo. [People] such as your pupil [i.e. me] have studied them with reverence for sometimes already.” 先生文章、已達東武，如小生者，拜讀有日 (\textit{Shuroku}, 1) This evidences that not only was Shunshui known to Edo, his essays had also been circulating there for a while already. In the 130\textsuperscript{th} entry of the \textit{Shuroku}, towards the end of their last meeting, Seijun requested Shunshui’s calligraphy for the name of his studio before he returned to Edo, Shunshui tactfully declined but promised instead

\textsuperscript{218}The text of the post-face goes: this year I was ordered to travel to Nagasaki in the west. I hung around there for three months. At leisure, I mingled with foreigners in order to obtain news. In the process, I often used brush instead of employing interpreters. Although I have acquainted a few dozen, only Zhu Luyu is truly erudite. 今年承君命，西遊紫陽，棲遲三月，公務之暇，泛交蕃客，以欲得異聞，往往拈筆代譯。所交雖及數十輩，而有學者，獨有朱魯璞而已” (\textit{Shuroku}, 15).

\textsuperscript{219} The term he coins is \textit{xiehou lun} 邂逅論, ZSJBY, 26.

\textsuperscript{220} Please see ZSJBY, 22-26 for details of Xu’s argument.
that he would instead mail it to Edo after, because Seijun was on duty, he reminded him, and it would not be discreet for him to mix it with his private business. This indicates that Shunshui was aware of the reason Seijun was in Nagasaki. Thus, it is not a surprise when we come across in Sensei Ryaku Nenpu [the Brief chronological record of master [Zhu]] in Sanroku that “that year, (1664) Gikō of Mito sent Confucian officer Oyake Seijun to Nagasaki to visit the Master. The Master and Seijun communicated brush by conversations. Subsequently, Seijun [used these brush conversation materials to] compile the “Transcript of the tour to the west” as a report for Gikō. (Sanroku, 20). More specifically, the whole mission was known not only to Shunshui, but also to Seian, who was probably the one initiated the event, Mingde, who was the interpreter and the agent representing Shunshui, and Kurosawa Masanao, who was responsible for screening and recommending to bakufu candidates in whom bakufu might be interested. In a letter to Seian, Mingde remarks:

With regard to the business of Mr. Zhu, recently Lord Mitsukuni ordered Oyake Seijun to Nagasaki to investigate his actions and scholarship. [Seijun] even frequented his visits to his [Shunshui’s] home and spent a full day conversing by brush without barrier…the following day, Seijun went to the city office and told the Magistrate that Mr. Zhu was an erudite great Confucian scholar, [his] essays were grand and classical, his posture and appearance were solemn, [who would be an example we can] follow and imitate. [He is really] the number one in us Confucian.’ I too went to the city office. The Magistrate told me that the day before, Seijun from Edo said the personality of Confucian Zhu is identical to what I said previously. I became relieved after hearing such. He also asked if Seian of Kanagawa could come to Nagasaki? Edo heard about his name also.

221 He hinted him with the set phrase shishi you zhi 使事有職 [an envoy has a duty] originated from a story from Zhao Ce 趙策 [the History of Zhao State] of Zhanguoce 戰國策 [Histories of the Warring States]. In the episode, Xin Yuanyan 辛垣衍, who was the envoy of Wei state 魏國 and was lobbying the King of Zhao state 趙國 at the time, refused to see Lu Zhonglian 魯仲連, who happened to be in Zhao also, on the ground that he was carrying out duty he was ordered and could not therefore meet Lu, which was not part of his mission.
The whole process of meeting between Seijun and Shunshui can then be understood from the above as: Seian, through seeking approval for permitting Shunshui to stay in Nagasaki, made Shunshui’s name heard in Edo. The reasons Mingde reported the progress of Seijun’s visit to Seian was of course because the latter was the one who initiated the whole chain of actions. The Magistrate of Nagasaki did the initial screening, including acquiring the subject’s background, the *curriculum vitae*, or *lüli*, of Shunshui in this case\(^{222}\), and reported to Edo candidates they considered *bakufu* would be interested in. In Mingde’s letter quoted above, it shows Magistrate Masanao himself also cared about the outcome of the interview. This is natural because if the recommendation was deemed as an inappropriate one, it would cast doubt on his judgement, if not bringing punishment on him.

After Seijun bringing back a positive report on Shunshui, Mitsukuni then sought approval from Shōgun Ietsuna 徳川家綱, and the council of *Rōjū* 老中 led by *Tairō* Sakai Tadakiyo 酒井忠清 (1624-1681)\(^{223}\). When all official procedures were cleared, Mitsukuni formally sent out invitation in the sixth months of 1665. Many researches state that it was owing to Seijun’s repeated invitation that made Shunshui decided to accept the invitation and went to Edo\(^{224}\). This unfortunately is not what actually happened. In his letter to Masanao, Shunshui had already discussed the possible appointment with him in details,

\(^{222}\) Part of it has been discussed earlier in this paper. Please see ZSJ, 350-3 for the full content.

\(^{223}\) See also Lin, *Zhu Shunshui zai Riben*, 44.

\(^{224}\) For example, Qian, *Shengguo binshi*, 343; Lin, *Zhu Shunshui zai Riben*, 43.
On the 15th day, there was a letter to His Excellancy Shimada, together with memorandums to various interpreters (i.e. *tsuji*) [instructing them to recommend suitable candidates for leading a national school]. I heard that the Superordinate Duke from Mito in his position as superior as Ji Dan (the Duke of Zhou, 11th century BCE) wanted to promote education through establishing national school [and hope to look for an appropriate person to assist him]. This is surely a ten-thousand-year long perspicacious policy of your honor country which would remains splendid for generations to come and help brighten up [your country’s] history. How grand a policy it is! But out of Your Excellancy’s deep compassion [on me], Your Excellancy unexpectedly summited Zhiyu [i.e. me] as a response to the order. How could Your Excellency not even worry about my short of talent and training? With [my] pedantic demeanor and clumsy nature, how can I be qualified to be used as other’s pillar and foundation. [I] hesitated for four days, consulted extensively many people but still could not come up with an excuse to decline. In the evening of the 18th, hesitantly, bashfully, [I] replied His Excellancy Shimada [that I would accept the offer]. Then, I thought that the Superordinate Duke is a public esteem to me as well as to both countries (i.e. Japan and China), and the sages’ teachings are primary for [establishing] the kingly way. [I can imagine that within] the sixty-six regions of your honorable country, the many domain lords, great scholars, leaders, nobles, bureaucrats, cultivated youths, and talented individuals among common people, [they all] would crane their necks and wipe their eyes to look forward to [the carrying into effect of this policy]. Should there be any tiny deviations or mistakes, it would certainly be a pivot of whether the Confucian education be flourish or be in decline. With my unsubstantiated reputation and shallow inferior ability, how can I be capable to fulfil such ardent expectation? But there is not much can be done now. As for my salary, your servant has never put his mind to it for his whole life. As long as it is enough to keep those from coldness and hunger, why must [we] worry [its amount is] too much or too less…” …望月書致島嶋田公，并劄諭諸通事，如聞水戶上公，以姬旦之尊，欲興庠序之教。此誠貴國萬年之聖政，丕顯於後昆，增光於史册，是何如重典也! 臺下乃緣垂愛之深，竟以之瑜應命，臺下獨不念之瑜才短學荒，體迂性拙，何堪為人作楹礎之用! 徬徨四日，博議多人，终不得一可辭之語。十八日暮，逡巡忸怩，奉復島嶋田公。因思上公之於僕，為兩國之望，而聖教又王道之首務，貴國六十六州，羣后百辟，鴻儒鉅公，卿士大夫以及成德小子，民間俊髦，引領拭目而望此舉。若使小有違錯，此誠聖學興廢之關。僕虛聲謬劣，何足以塞眾望，然亦無可

---

225 望月, can also be a family name reads Mochizuki in Japanese from Shinano Province 信濃國 (present-day Nagano Prefecture). Since I could not figure out who with such family name had the authority at the time to instruct people on such business as keeping an eye on possible candidate the bakufu was looking for, I assume the term refered to the time the letter to the Nagasaki Magistrate was sent. What follows contains the mentioning of a day, i.e. the 18th.

226 That is Shimada Morimasa 嶋田守政 (1624-1699) who succeeded Masanao to be one of the two Magistrates of Nagasaki from 1662 to 1666. (Qian, Shengguo binshi, 75, footnote 3)

227 I am not certain the meaning of *ruwen* 如聞. Since before Qing, the word 如 sounded close, if not identical, to 瑜 (still identical today in many dialects), it is possible that 如 should be 瑜.

228 The sentence is a bit confusing here because it is not clear who is considered as the wang 望 (public esteem). I have only rendered an approximate meaning here.
From this letter, it is obvious that Shunshui had prior knowledge that he was being shortlisted before he met Seijun. Leung-pu put this event under 1665 when Shunshui was sixty-six sui and remarked that it was probably written in the sixth month right before Shunshui set off for Edo. (ZSJ, 705) I think 1665 is too late for the event. From the tone of the letter, it is obvious that Shunshui’s appointment had not yet been finalized. It would be beyond imagination that such a complicated matter as appointing a foreigner during the time when Edo Japan was adopting the so-called seclusion policy took only a month or two to prepare. At the beginning of the letter, Shunshui indicates that he just learnt after the new year that Masanao has just retired. He further probed Masanao rhetorically how the latter could just leave and enjoy life without considering his subjects that he had taken care of for thirteen years. Masanao took office in 1650229. He retired in 1662230, which is exactly thirteen years. His successor Shimada Morimasa assumed office in 1662.231 Therefore, as early as 1662, Shunshui was aware that Mitsukuni was interested in hiring him as his teacher. In fact, Shunshui had also privately discussed with many people if he should go.232 From the discussion above, it is clear that there were a lot of collaborations behind the scene to complete the process of hiring Shunshui. Shunshui was informed all along. The interview was only the confirming procedure.

In any case, in the sixth month of 1665, the appointment letter from Mitsukuni reached Nagasaki. Shunshui set off for Edo within the last ten days of the month. On the 11th day of the

---

229 Qian, Shengguo binshi, 75.

230 Qian, Shengguo binshi, 76.

231 Weblio Dictionary http://www.weblio.jp/wkpja/content/長崎奉行_歴代長崎奉行

232 “Gyōjitsu”, in ZSJ, 618. There is also a letter he sent to Seian, saying it was not him who initiate the idea of going to Edō, and that because he did not come to Japan to teach Confucianism and Japan was not a place ready for such education, he would rather stay at Nagasaki with Seian. (ZSJ, 181). This was probably at the very beginning of the appointment process.
seventh month, he arrived Edo but felt sick on arrival. He waited until he felt better, and subsequently on the 18th he presented himself to Mitsukuni. From then on, his found himself in a glamorous live he had never dreamed for.

2.4 A Lonely Teacher (Period IV)

The year 1665 is the dividing line in Zhu Shunshui’s life. He struggled in hardship before that. After he became the teacher for Mitsukuni, not only did he have all the material means he needed but also the attention he never dreamt of. More specifically, during the first two stages of his life, he could not help himself conformint to the humungous social forces in the late Ming. His defying the government and self ostracizing were only acts to identify himself to the literati at large. He did not change anything. When the Japanese government allowed him to stay, the “strayed dog”233 finally had a shelter. But the hardship was by no mean less than the previous. Originally, he had but a humble wish of having a small piece of land to farm, a tiny hut and at leisure a few friends to chat with. Shunshui had to adjust himself in the new environment in order to survive. Among his many changes, the prominent one was his view on Japan. Shunshui regarded himself high in social and political status which he inherited from his family and “had earned through his Confucian learning and moral cultivation”234 He was “a treasure to a nation” 國之重寶 (ZSJ, 39) from the centre of the Central Kingdom. Thus, when he first set foot on the Japanese archipelago situated in the peripheral of the Sinosphere, he was of the opinion that the “unlearnt” Japan was not transformable.235 Since “the Sage Way [in Japan] has left wild” 聖道榛

233 Sang jia quan 丧家犬 [a strayed dog], a term Sima Qian 司马遷 (145-90 BCE) employed to describe Confucius. See Confucius biography in Shiji, juan 47.

234 Chard, “Patterns of Confucian Cultural Transmission”, 283(2).

235 His “Chronological records of laboring in Annam” can be used as a reference of his mind set (ZSJ, 14, 16, 19)
and Japan’s centuries “long indulgence in heresy [was] nonreversible” 處積重難回之勢 (ZSJ, 63, 181), he did not plan to waste his time to promulgate Confucianism. As he got in touch with more people, and knew Japan better, his view changed. Seian was of course the first catalyst. In his letter to Chen Mingde, Shunshui commended Seian “[had] insight that [was] outstanding and [was] not the averaged people [could] compare with. [He] had never expected anyone emerged here would have such an eminent caliber.” 見解超卓，非凡輩所得比擬。不意此中崛起，乃有如此異姿。 (ZSJ, 60).

Another one would probably be Itō Jinsai 伊藤仁斎 (1627-1705). Jinsai wanted to be Shunshui’s disciple and had requested Seian in a letter to introduce him to Shunshui. (ZSJ, 781) Since the letter mentioned his knowledge about Shunshui’s appointment, I reckon it safe to assume the letter was sent in 1665 before Shunshui set off to Edo. From the reply Shunshui sent to Seian (ZSJ, 160), Seian did introduce Jinsai to Shunshui after all. Although Shunshui agreed that Jinsai was “a talent in Japan who had some insight” 貴國之翹楚，頗有見解 (ibid.), and commended Jinsai’s knowledge and level of writing was “outstanding” (baiimei 白眉) in Japan (ZSJ, 162), he refused to see him and instructed Seian to stop him if he was about to set off to visit him (ZSJ, 160, 162 and 166-167) on the ground that their approaches toward Confucianism were completely different. However, his attitude toward Jinsai changed completely later. In his letter to Seian, he affixed the honorific term xiong 兄 236 to Jinsai’s name when mentioning him, and praised that

Our friend Itō Sai Shū’s answers to questions on current affairs are very good. Comparing to those he composed in past years, the difference has become that between the sky and the bottom of a deep sea. Should he advance from here, [he would] certainly become a famous writer. How would he be worse than talents from China. He has my

236 A courteous way to address a friend.
admiration and respect. He has my admiration and respect.” 伊藤誠修兄策問甚佳，較之舊年諸作，遂若天淵。儻由此而進之，竟成名筆，豈遜中國人才也。敬服敬服。(ZSJ, 194)

Many scholars use this one as a prove on Shunshui’s influence on Itō and thus his kogigaku 古義学 (Ancient Exegesis School), and farfetchingly on kogaku 古学 (Ancient School) led by Yamaga Sokō 山鹿素行 (1622-1685), and even on kobunjigaku 古文辞学 (Ancient Rhetoric School) started by Ogyū Sorai 萩生徂徠 (1666-1728). Lin Junhong has correctly remarked that such interpretations of Shunshui’s praise on Itō is rather implausible because they neglect the direct reason Shunshui repeatedly rejected Itō and the fact that their difference in thinking was ideological. I would further point out that in the letter, Shunshui seemed to be focusing on Jinsai’s improvement on prose writings only, not his views on Shushigaku. Cewen 策問 refers to questions asked in court examinations. Students who prepared to take civil examinations would normally drill themselves in providing answers to mock cewen. There was no civil examination in Japan but intellectual who wanted to master knowledge in Chinese would need to be proficient in Chinese writing and cewen was a good means for practising. From this letter, it is obvious that despite Shunshui had turned down Jinsai’s repeated requests for meeting, Jinsai still submitted his writings to Shunshui’s for correction. Shunshui was only praising Itō progress in writing. That is why he said if Itō continued such progress, he would be famous in belle lettres. From this letter, Shunshui’s change on his view on Jinsai is obvious and significant comparing to the time when he seemed not even willing to hear Jinsai’s

---


238 Lin, Zhu Shunshui zai Riben, 179.
name. But the letter is not sufficient to proof Jinsai was influenced by Shunshui ideologically and thence freed from Song Neo-Confucianism.239

The view change is also noticeable on Oyake Seijun. According to Shuroku240, at their second meetings (there were six in total at least), Shunshui boldly, which is not normal between new acquaintances, showed, may be subconsciously, his haughty remarks on Japanese Confucian development. Seijun told Shunshui that in Japan the trend in Confucian studies had also grown vibrant. Shunshui immediately challenged him to list out those who were both virtually and academically accomplished and those whose writings championed the whole generation, if Confucian studies was indeed flourishing. (Shuroku, 2; ZSJ, 404). In their following meetings, Seijun showed off his broad knowledge of eminent Chinese scholars to a point Shunshui must have felt difficult to respond. Then when Seijun named a few Japanese literary collections written in Chinese, and one scholar official241 and inquired Shunshui if he had a chance to read any their writings, Shunshui was obviously embarrassed and admitted he had not read any (Shuroku, 6-7), adding that, as an effort to defend his ridicule on the development of Confucianism in Japan,

239 ZSJBY has a letter from Seian to Shunshui (#46, 107), inside which Seian spoke favourably of a person named Renzhang 任丈 (Mr. Ren), explaining how that person became the one Shunshui saw then. I suspect Seian was referring to Jinsai in that letter. If this conjecture is not too far from the fact, then Shunshui’s change of view on Jinsai was at least partly a result of Seian’s influence.

240 There is a total of 134 entries, roughly 67 pairs of questions and answers, in Shuroku, 53 (26 pairs plus one remark from Shunshui) of which can be found in ZSJ between page 404 and 412. At the same time, there are also 70 entries, or 35 pairs, in ZSJ from page 412 to 421 that are not included in Shuroku. As well, many of the letters from Shunshui recorded in ZSJ between page 298 and 321 were, judging from their contents, sent to Seijun after they had met and were meant to supplement points Shunshui thought not thoroughly expressed during their meetings.

241 The name of the Chinese proses and/or poems collections are Kaifūsō 懷風藻 (751-752), Ryōun Shū 凌雲集 (814), Bunka Shūrei Shū 文華秀麗集 (818), Keikoku Shū 経国集 (827), Hifuryaku 秘府略 (831), Kanke Bunsō 菅家文草 (900), Honchō Monzui 本朝文粹 (11th century), Honchō Zokumonzui 本朝續文粹 (11th century) and Seisai Sensei Bunshū 嬰齋先生文集. The scholar mentioned is the famous Heian official Miyoshi Kyoyuki 三善清行 (847-919).
since your esteemed self has been honest and sincere, your humble servant therefore spoke of it in full sincerity. If [I] only aimed for adulatory words, [I] would not be that brusque. Your humble servant has always regarded your honorable country [and our country] as one whole. [I] was thus faithfully frank, without abstaining from any taboo. My comments were not swayed by personal feelings.”

Although we need not take the “two countries as one” utterance seriously, there we sense a change of attitude was taking form. After being “lectured” by Seijun, he understood that what he learnt about Japan for the past twenty years have been all wrong.242 And when Seijun presented him a few articles he wrote, Shunshui commented with admiration that for twenty years, he had been wondering how come such a great country did not produce literati. Now he saw one. At the same time, he told Seijun that when he heard Mitsukuni, Seijun’s lord, was also promoting Confucian education, he was so happy that he could not sleep. Shunshui was certain that civilization will be flourished in Japan.243 The bias he had on Japan seemed vanished.

The biggest change did not come until he met Mitsukuni in Edo. Mitsukuni was twenty-eight years younger than Shunshui. Mitsukuni had almost all the bearings and virtues a

---

242 The text is “僕在此廿年，所聞俱謬，矜承大教，積疑釋然，果爾世道人心之大慶也。” (Shuroku, 5; ZSJ, 407) Counting from 1645 when Shunshui first reached Nagasaki till 1665 he met with Seijun, it is exactly twenty years.

243 The original text is: “僕至貴國，今二十年矣，並未見貴國之大。竊怪如此大國，人物之秀美，地里之廣饒，物產之豐盈，山川之靈毓，如何不產文人？及詢之本地之老唐，又曾至東武之人，皆云無有，即見一二故文，甚不滿意。前有略曉文義者至東武而歸，亦云無人。僕應之曰：如此之大，豈得竟無一人，特未之見耳。終不信其言。前得兩書，頗不恊意。昨在尊寓讀佳製，亦未見其妙。纔見兩篇耳。歸來又復以別事應酬，漏下二鼓而客散，燃燈讀佳作終卷，喜為不寐。前得兩書，頗不恊意。昨在尊寓讀佳製，亦未見其妙。纔見兩篇耳。歸來又復以別事應酬，漏下二鼓而客散，燃燈讀佳作終卷，喜為不寐，方知貴國有人，而人文之興也必矣。且意在於尊經翼聖，何等光大。讀致林弘文學士書，又知貴國主之志之學，益為之喜。晤來兩月有餘矣，何不早示，而珍藏至今，方以付閱，何吝教如此？驚喜之深，不能無憾矣！” (Shuroku, 12)
Confucian ideal ruler should process. He was brave, erudite and good at martial art, frugal, clever, conversant with both civil and military matters, and have sound judgement. The benevolent policies he practised in Mito even influenced the bakufu to adopt it country wide. He was well trained in both Japanese and Chinese classics before he hired Shunshui in 1665 when he was thirty-eight. But the deed of Mitsukuni that impressed Shunshui most was the way he returned the seat to his eldest brother’s family which he considered the only legitimate heir for succession according ancient principles. Mitsukuni was the third son of the first-generation Mito domain daimyō Tokugawa Yorifusa (徳川頼房, 1603-1661). At the age of six, he was appointed heir (seja 世子) for his outstanding bearing. Mitsukuni was very uncomfortable for overtaking his two elder brothers to succeed the position. When he was eighteen, one day after he read the Boyi zhuan 伯夷傳 (Biography of Boyi) in Shiji, he was deeply moved but he chose not to run away as the Boyi brothers did in the story, lest others might slander that father and son were in bad terms. Instead, he decided secretly to return the seat to the son of his eldest brother Yorishige 賴重 (1622-1695). After Yorifusa died in 1661, in the night before he officially succeeded the seat as the daimyō for Mito, Mitsukuni summoned all his brothers and families to the family temple, gathered them in front of the tablet of Yorifusa, requested Yorishige to let him

---

244 Of course, those remarks in laudatory tone should not be taken as facts. Chard has cautioned that they may be part of the process to idealized Mitsukuni. (“Patterns of Confucian Cultural Transmission, 272(13).)

245 See anecdotes when he was six, seven and eleven in Gikō Gyōjitsu (Nenpu wo tsuke) 義公行実(附年譜) [Biography of Gikō with chronological records] (hereafter cited as Gikō Gyōjitsu): 11-12, in Sanroku.

246 At fifty-six, he was bestowed by the emperor with some gifts praising him “perfect both militarily and academically, the unique man of letters of his contemporaries” (備武兼文，絕代文士). Gikō Gyōjitsu, 24.

247 Such as the eradication of the junshi 殉死 custom (to commit suicide after the death of one’s lord). For other benevolent policies please refer to Gikō Gyōjitsu, 16-17 after he succeeded the position as the daimyō of Mito.

248 Gikō Gyōjitsu, 1 and 12.
adopt his two sons. Yorishige objected at first, but after Mitsukuni threatened he would follow the example of Boyi and run away if he was not promised for the adoption, Yorishige had to give in at the end. So, he reported his decision of naming Tsunakata 綱方 (1648-1670) as his heir to the bakufu and was officially permitted in 1663. Unfortunately, Tsunakata died young.

Fortunately, Mitsukuni had also adopted his younger brother Tsunaeda 綱條 (1656-1718).

Mitsukuni was therefore able to immediately name the latter to replace. His skill and foresight showed not only his determination was sincere, but his ability in planning and execution was also unparallelled. When Shunshui knew this, he was extremely impressed,

The seamless way the honorable Duke in yielding his domain was such an intelligent move that left not trace. Since antiquity, Taibo 泰伯 (?-?), Boyi and Shuqi 249 have been praised as the role models who processed the highest virtue, but their ways of performing it [i.e. the yielding of the throne] were still traceable. Therefore, they were yet the match [of Mitsukuni]. The people in the world have always insisted that ‘people in the antiquities are better than people of today; China is better than foreign countries.’ These are but short vision words from petty remote hamlets. Should this man be born in China and put to the throne, and assist him with virtuous and worthy individuals, how can there be any difficulties for him to reach a harmonious and peaceful society… even as a foreigner, I would like to see him every success in transforming [this country] into a virtue one.”

From belittling Japan as an unlearnt country to praising Mitsukuni had the quality to be a sage king is certainly a big change. The prerequisite was, of course, Mitsukuni has the assistance from people with virtue, like Shunshui. Therefore, “the sources present his service under Mitsukuni in formulaic, in idealized terms: Mitsukuni the enlightened ruler following the Way of

---

249 All three are traditional role models of yielding thrones in Chinese history.
the True King (wang dao), recognizing the worth of Zhu, the wise Confucian minister, and
according him the position and honour he deserved.250

We do not have enough materials to discern the actual terms of relationship between the
two.251 Perhaps it would be helpful to clarify here what post Shunshui was hired for. Some said
he was appointed as kokushi 国師 (Ch. guoshi 國師, state counselor), some said it was hinshi 賓師 (Ch. binshi, teacher). The former refers to the teacher of an emperor, and was an honorary
title conferred to people with highest virtue, typically with religious background. The latter was a
title for a private tutor hired, who resides in the patron’s premises (hence the word hin/bin 賓, guest) and was basically responsible for routine teaching. To be sure, kokushi is much higher in
status compare to hinshi. It would also be more convincing to speak of Shunshui’s influence if
he was a kokushi. Nevertheless, Mitsukuni was not an emperor, and according to Gikō Gyōjitsu,
Shunshui was hired as a teacher only.252 According to Shuroku, Seijun inquired Shunshui if he
would agree to go to Edo if his lord hired him as a teacher 教授之師 (13). Therefore, it is clear
that Shunshui was not hired as a kokushi.253 Unfortunately, not only some researchers wishfully
think Shunshui was one, but, as Robert Chard points out, Shunshui himself has also mistaken his
role and thought he was taking up a position with authority to allow him to contribute to the

250 Chard, “Patterns of Confucian Cultural Transmission”, 248(37).

251 For example, we do not have remarks from Mitsukuni’s side to help us understand his views on his
teacher.

252 The original text is “聘明遺士朱之瑜為師，問道講學，自執弟子禮。” (Gikō Gyōjitsu, 3); “聘舜水為師，問道講學，自執弟子禮。” (Gikō Gyōjitsu, 18).

253 See Qian, Shengguo binshi, 131-141 for a thorough discussion on the difference.
forming of a Confucian state. As Shunshui told Seijin, he has the way to contribute to such change,

my way is vividly in front of us. Everybody possesses it, every household has it. It is like a broad and level road, it does not matter whether one is from high or low, is a man or a woman, is wise or stupid, is virtuous or wicked, all can walk on it. As soon as one lift one’s foot then he can achieve [it to a certain level]. If a benevolent lord maneuver it at the top, a premier is strict [in executing it] under, then in less than a few years, the social customs would be changed immediately. If for ten years, then even the transformation [of the whole country] due to the virtue of the king is possible, not only limited to the change of their social customs. And, it is very easy to implement, not as difficult as the banning of [Christianity from] Nanban [i.e. the Portuguese].

Shunshui admired Mitsukuni a lot. He was impressed by Mitsukuni’s dedication in propagating Confucian learning. Confucian education to Shunshui was a key step for a country to evolve from a “barbaric” state into a civilized one. He told Seijun that everything in Japan was good and Japan was second only to China except the lack of culture and education, which was something generations should feel pity for. (Shuroku, 2; ZSJ, 404) The matter of promoting national education was a grand policy for a country and it was especially so for Japan. (Shuroku, 13; ZSJ, 411) When he heard that the Edo government was planning to build schools, he was

254 Chard, “Patterns of Confucian Cultural Transmission”, 255(30).

255 Compare this with what Julia Ching describes how Confucian perceived themselves: “These thinkers of the Sung and Ming dynasties considered themselves rather as the rulers’ teachers and judges, either through word or action. Their profound awareness of the unity which should exist between ethics and politics made of them the conscious bearers and spokesmen of the Confucian conscience, the “prophets,” who, like Confucius and Mencius before them, had received the charismatic mission from Heaven to stand up to the kings, to offer them counsels and criticisms, on behalf of the people for whom the state existed. These men saw clearly the important position of the ruler in the absolute imperial system. Although they did not directly criticize the system itself…they were volatile in their praises of the Golden Past, when rulers were sages who governed by moral persuasion rather than by the force of their will made into law. They were also persevering and courageous in their repeated efforts, in and out of office, to convert the ruler’s mind and heart, to make him into a true sage-king. If the ruler-subject relationship implies a mutual obligation, it would seem that the philosophers regarded the ruler’s responsibility of loving the people to be infinitely heavier than the subject’s duty to show loyalty - a duty which is, besides, only conditional to the ruler’s merits and virtues.” (Julia Ching, “Neo-Confucian Utopian Theories and Political Ethics”, in Monumenta Serica, Vol. 30 (1972-1973): 54.)
very pleased because, he told Seian, “everything in your honorable country is good, except this [building of school] … This [school building] will be a [good] omen for your country, signifying future prosperity! 聞貴國京江戶有設學校之舉，甚為喜之！貴國諸事俱好，只欠此耳。… 是乃貴國興隆之兆也。 (ZSJ, 183)

How much did Shunshui eventually contribute to the national education is not easy to say but it is possible that his contribution was rather minute. He did give public talks but only twice from he was hired in 1665 till he died in 1682. The first time was in Mito from the ninth month of 1665 which lasted for four months^256 and the second from the eighth month of 1667 for six months^257, a total of ten months in the most glamourous seventeen years of his life, which cannot be regarded long, especially considering the purpose Mitsukuni hired Shunshui for was to answer questions about the Way and to give lectures (wendao jiangxue 问道讲学). For constructing a ritual environment, Shunshui composed the Zhuhou Wumiao Tushuo 諸侯五廟圖説 (Discourse with illustrations on the five temples of feudal lords) in 1669. (ZSJ, 619). In 1670, he wrote the Xuegong Tushuo 學宮圖說 (Discourse with illustrations on the central college) which was a blue print for building a Confucian temple. Since the construction of the temple could not be carried out immediately, he taught carpenters to build a scaled miniature model for future reference.\(^258\) Regrettably, despite all these, the building of a Confucian temple in

^256 Lin, Zhu Shunshui zai Riben, 46.

^257 Ibid., 47.

^258 Among the building instructions, there was a creative shock proof construct, which is uniquely designed for Japanese buildings, called pingzhenfang 平震枋 (Japanese reading not known, could be rendered as heishinhō, Sock proof beam). It was perhaps for this and his skill in making various type of sacrificial utensils that amazed even the professionals. (ZSJ, 619-20). Although Confucius had said, "When I was young, my condition was low, and therefore I acquired my ability in many things, but they were mean matters." 吾少也賤，故多能鄙事。 (Analects, 9.6, translation is James Legg’s, from Chinese Text Projects, accessed on May 31, 2017, http://ctext.org/analects/zi-han) but to be as skilful as Shunshui was indeed amazing. No wonder he was slandered as a painter from Nanjing, not a scholar (ZSJ, 637). See Xuegong tushuo yizhu 學宮圖説譯注 [Translation with
accordance with Shunshui’s layout never did materialize. The model and the utensils though are extant and are now stored in Shōkōkan 彰考館.\textsuperscript{259} To prepare for the worship of Confucius upon completion of the planned Confucian temple, Shunshui was also invited to teach scholars and students within the Mito han the respective ritual called Sekiten Rei 釈奠禮 (Ch. shidian li 釋奠禮). The grand ceremony was rehearsed twice in 1672 and 1673 (ZSJ, 620) and then died down. These major academic activities were all initiated by Mitsukuni, not at the will of Shunshui. Similarly, Shunshui could not help their dying without cause. It was Mitsukuni who pulled the strings behind the scene. In 1673 the middle-age Mitsukuni was recorded to remark that,

\begin{quote}
It is the legacy of the Three Dynasties [i.e. Xia 夏, Shang 商 and Zhou 周] and the fundamentals for the Kingly Way for a sovereign to establish [national] schools. Nothing can be better than [such an establishment] for lecturing and propagating the Way, educating children and transforming customs. Recently, in prefectural cities of various domains, domain lords seek to build Confucius temples, set up central schools, recruit intellectuals, promulgate orders to promote [learning] and supervise [its progress]. When there are those who have achievements in their studies and whose conducts stand out, then [the domain lords would] award [them] with commendations and promotions. Such practices can be considered as not failure to keep the original intentions of the former kings. As for [exact forms of] the institution of royal academy, and the system of imperial examination [implemented in the ancient time], they could no longer be duplicated at this age again.\textsuperscript{259} 邦設學校，三代之遺法，而王道之本也。講書弘道，訓蒙化俗，莫善於斯。今諸侯府城下，營建聖廟，設庠序，招儒士，下令勸督，有業成行立者，褒論進其品秩，則庶乎不失先王之遺意矣。若辟雍之制，科舉之法，則今世不可復行也。(Gikô Gyôjitsu, 21)
\end{quote}

Combining this comment with his other opinions on, for example, the ancestor of Japan and the use of chūka 中華 mentioned later in this paper, we can sense a consistent pragmatic approach in Mitsukuni’s slecting Confucian practices from China to be adopted in Japan. The “dissonance”, as Robert Chard puts it, comes from the difference political system of the two countries which

Zhu was not aware of. Qualification for public office in China was meritocratic based on Confucian learning and cultivation while that in Japan was inherited with no connection to Confucianism scholarship. To Japanese government with basically no upward movement among the four classes, adopting a meritocratic system could be subversive.\textsuperscript{260} In China, Chard continues, “Confucianism drove political power. Confucian learning was inherently political: it was in itself a source of power, in that men could master it and hold office, and rulers were obliged by long tradition to adopt the forms and trappings of Confucianism to establish legitimacy of government.”\textsuperscript{261} This explains why Zhu was so keen on the building of a Confucian national school, hoping that the new establishment can bring forward the meritocratic system to Japan as well. He failed to perceive though that, in Japan

“the situation was just the opposite: political power drove Confucianism, in government at least. Confucian learning was a resource to be tapped by those in political power. Rulers could choose aspects of it to use, or not. The learning itself entailed no political power, and no one held political power purely through the mastery of Confucian learning. Mitsukuni honoured Zhu as a teacher and a man of wisdom who could guide his own exercise of power. He never thought of him as a minister with power of his own. Confucianism was to him useful for providing moral instruction to his people and a better administrative order, but he had no interest in creating a Chinese-style meritocracy. A genuine transmission of Confucianism of the sort Zhu thought he was leading ran up against an absolute cultural barrier.”\textsuperscript{262} (word underscored by me)

And as Mitsukuni steered towards a more indigenous orientation, plans for building Confucius temple, regularizing the sekiten rei etc. lost their flavor.

Owing to Mitsukuni’s eminent political position and fame for his scholarship\textsuperscript{263}, Shunshui was connected to a lot of people and received many students. All his disciples, except

\textsuperscript{260} Chard, “Patterns of Confucian Cultural Transmission”, 254(31).

\textsuperscript{261} Ibid., 247(38).

\textsuperscript{262} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{263} Though Mitsukuni of Mito did not involve in the daily operation of the bakufu, Mito domain, or the Mito Tokugawa Ke 水戸徳川家 together with Owari Tokugawa Ke 尾張徳川家 and Kisyū Tokugawa Ke 紀州徳川家 are called the gossanke 御三家 (the three branch Tokugawa families). They are the most prestigious among all daimyō and are designated to shield the bakufu and to provide service to the shōgun as councillors. The Mito
Seian, were accepted after Shunshui moved to Edo, including his four well known students Asaka Kaku, Hitomi Hōsai, Imai Kōsai, Isogawa Kakugō 五十川剛伯 (1649-1699). During their interactions with Shunshui in his last seventeen years, they had certainly taken advantage of the chances and asked Shunshui questions. Nonetheless, the scope of their inquiries surrounded mainly on how to write better proses in Chinese and on some factual, and perhaps even *mamechishiki* (trivial knowledge) about China. The topic frequently touched on was how a Ming style casual wear (*shenyi* 深衣) for literati to put on was like and how to make one. The higher-level ones included only things like the examination system, Chinese geography, critics on Chinese historic figures etc. Rarely can we find in his collections questions related to ancient Chinese classics and Neo-Confucianism. This is true even to learnt and both intensively and extensively trained Confucian scholars such as Seijun, or Sakudō. Although many Shunshui met with were important figures in cultural history of Japan, it would be hard to estimate Shunshui’s influence on them, if any. It would be equally difficult to measure the social influence on Shunshui at the same time, but given he was hired by Mitsukuni and the fact there he was able to put into contact with many academically renown persons in Japan, it might be more realistic to discuss their influence on Shunshui because Shunshui’s well-being depends on his popularity among them. Two anecdotes may be useful to help us understand Shunshui’s influence from different angles. In the autumn of 1666, a year after Shunshui arrived Edo, following a decree promulgated the previous year, Mitsukuni demolished nine hundred and ninety-seven non-Tokugawa Ke, though is the lowest in rank amongst the three, is the vice Shōgun and is exempted from *Sankin-kōtai* (alternate attendance, a policy forces daimyō to move between their residence in Edō and their domain periodically.) Apart from his political background, Mitsukuni was known and respect for his eruditeness. It is therefore natural for people to converge around Shunshui to investigate what kind of scholar he was that even their lord or a powerful Tokugawa pay so much respect to.

264 Many scholars have discussions on Shunshui’s students, however, it seems Lin Junhong has the most comprehensive ones including providing a detailed academic genealogy chart. See Lin, *Zhu Shunshui zai Riben*, 90-129.
regulated temples within his domain.\(^{265}\) This caused a big stir in the society and many pointed their fingers at Shunshui, who was known for his anti-Buddhism attitude. Shunshui explained to a couple of friends that it was not his idea (ZSJ, 93, 98). One cannot help but wonder, then, could some of the said influences of Shunshui be similar to this one, that we assume the happening of something was due to the influence of Shunshui but in fact it was someone else’s? Another story is that in the twelveth month of 1678, Shunshui’s grandson Yuren came all the way from Zhejiang to see his grandfather but was ended up kept in Nagasaki because, due to regulation, he was not permitted to go to Edo. (ZSJ, 621) This makes me doubt how influential can Shunshui be? Since there had been precedential exceptions, including the one to Shunshui, granting permission to Yuren was theoretically viable. And it was Mitsukuni who offered, latest by 1671, Shunshui to send one of his grandchildren to Japan to look after him. (ZSJ, 43)

From the above discussion on Shunshui’s contacts in Japan and his relationship with Mitsukuni influence, I could not accept allegations of Shunshui’s influence based on these two factors. Among Shunshui’s contacts, Seian had the longest relationship with him. He was highly respected by many contemporary scholars but his name was not mentioned after he passed away. He had learnt from many. I find it unacceptable to say his scholarship was all from Shunshui. And even if such conjectures were correct, one cannot deduce that Shunshui has a lot of influence on the development of Edo Japan’s philosophy because Seian seemed to have brought his scholarship with him into his grave. Similarly, the evidences of Shunshui’s influence on his other Japanese contacts were not strong, if ever existed. As for Mitsukuni, more will be

discussed later in the paper, but at least it is also obvious that Mitsukuni had his own established will and Shunshui’s influence on him was very minor.

To investigate Shunshui’s influence, one of the best ways is, as Liang Qichao had suggested, through his students. And since many of his students were engaged in the project of compiling the *Dai Nihon Shi*, it would be more direct and convenient to look into the compilation process to investigate Shunshui’s influence. It seemed the Boyi’s biography that Mitsukuni read at eighteen *sui* (1645) had changed his life a lot. Apart from deciding to return the seat to his eldest brother’s family, it had also encouraged him to change from a teen indulged only in aberrant activities to an erudite scholar and started his lifelong interest in academic pursuance. In 1657 at the age of thirty, Mitsukuni had already started the project of compiling the *Dai Nihon Shi* in his residence Komagome Tei (the Komagome Residence). After Mitsukuni ascended to the seat of the daimyō for Mito in 1661, he started building the Shōkōkan 彰考館 (Bureau of past exhibition and future discrimination) as an office for the project, and recruiting talented scholars to be compilers and editors. According to Lin Junhong, many of the recruits were Shunshui’s students:

---


267 Shōkō 彰考 (Ch. *zhangkao*) was from Du Yu 杜預’s *Chunqiu Xu* 春秋序 [Preface for the book of spring and autumn] “*zhang wang kao lai* 彰往考來” (Lin, *Zhu Shunshui zai Riben*, 218), which is a quote from *Xici* II of *Yijing* 易經繫辭下 [the Great treaties II of the Book of Change]: *zhang wang er cha lai* 彰往而察來 ([The *Yi* exhibits the past, and (teaches us to) discriminate (the issues of) the future], from Chinese Text Project with James Legg’s translation, accessed May 31, 2017, [http://ctext.org/book-of-changes/xi-ci-xia](http://ctext.org/book-of-changes/xi-ci-xia).

268 The following table is based on Lin, *Zhu Shunshui zai Riben*, 90-129. Lin also includes Oyake Seijun as Shunshui’s student. There are of course a lot of correspondence between Seijun and Shunshui, a lot of which are to answer Seijun’s questions on writing technique, Chinese systems etc., but from the way Shunshui honorifically addressed Seijun as *taixiong* 台兄 and self addressed humbly as *di* 弟, there seemed not a formal teacher-student relationship existed between Shunshui and Seijun.
Table 2.4.1 Editors of Dai Nihon Shi Who Were Said to Have Learnt from Zhu Shunshui

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (year of birth and death) number of letters from Shunshui</th>
<th>Year joined project Dai Nihon Shi (position)</th>
<th>Year became a student of Shunshui (length in years)</th>
<th>Subjects learnt from Shunshui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hitomi Bōsai 人見懋斎 (1638-1696) 55.5</td>
<td>1683 (the first chief editor)</td>
<td>Unknown (?)</td>
<td>Exegesis on Classics, Chinese systems and institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sassaki Munekiyo 佐佐宗淳 (1640-1698) none extant</td>
<td>1675 (compiler) 1688 (chief editor)</td>
<td>1674 (?)</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakamura Yoshitoki 中村顧言 (1647-1712) 3</td>
<td>1667 (compiler) 1691 (chief editor)</td>
<td>1665 (?)</td>
<td>Prose writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imai Kōsai 今井弘濟 (1652-1689) no records</td>
<td>1667 (compiler)</td>
<td>1664 (17? He was one of the four students that took care of Shunshui till he died)</td>
<td>General knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakaizumi Hiroshi 酒泉弘 (1654-1718) no records</td>
<td>After 1691 (chief editor)</td>
<td>1674 (?)^{269}</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asaka Kaku 安積覺 (1655-1737) 3</td>
<td>1683 (compiler) 1693 (chief editor)</td>
<td>1665(1) 1667 (2)</td>
<td>Rudimentary Chinese knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*compiler (henshū 編修); chief editor (sōsai 總裁), there were more than one.

From the table above, it is natural to conclude that Shunshui should has influence in the compilation of the *Dai Nihon Shi* because not only at least six of his students participated in the project, but five of them were the chief editor, including the initial one. Regrettably, with the

^{269} Lin Junhong says after twenty-five *sui*, Sakaizumi went to Nagasaki to find teacher to learn from (*youxue* 遊學, literally tour to study) and subsequently learnt from Shunshui. (Lin, *Zhu Shunshui zai Riben*, 114). This seems not possible as when Sakaizumi was twenty-five, i.e. 1679, Shunshui has long moved to Mito.
exception of Bōsai, there are not enough materials in ZSJ and ZSJBY\textsuperscript{270} to evaluate what, if any, historiographic view points they have discussed with Shunshui. Secondly, judging from the tone of discussions and title Shunshui used to address these scholars, only Imai Kōsai and Asaka Kaku can be verified as Shunshui’s formal students. There are researches which tend to name Japanese scholars or officials as Shunshui’s students simply because there were a few letters extant showing they have asked Shunshui questions. This of course can help indicate the broadness of Shunshui’s influence. However, such loose criteria will decrease it credibility. Traditionally, a teacher would address his formal disciples as \textit{xianqi} 善契 or \textit{xiandi} 善弟, or simply \textit{ru} 汝 (you) if the student was at his youth. By differentiating the way Shunshui addresses the recipients of his correspondences can help decide who he recognized as his students. It does not work the other way round. It would not be accurate to take whoever addressed Shunshui \textit{laoshi} 老師 (teacher, master) as his student because \textit{laoshi} here was an honorific term used toward respected person, or person who taught as a profession. Therefore, it would not be realistic to include all who have asked Shunshui questions - they might not agree or be satisfied with Shunshui’s answer - as his students. Strangely, there are few exchanges of letters between Shunshui and his students included in his collections. Shunshui has more correspondences with his friends Den Shikyū 田止邱 (1637-1682) (5 letters) and Yoshihiro Mototsune 吉弘元常 (1643-1694) (34), both are erudite scholars and founding members of the \textit{Shōkōkan}. In any case, there are very limited academic discussions in those letters. Among the six editors of the \textit{Dai Nihon Shi}, Asaka Kaku, who learnt from Shunshui when was young, was probably the one contributed most to the project. He

\textsuperscript{270} Bōsai has 55 plus one shared correspondences, Yoshitoki and Satoru 3 each, Kōsai has 1 essay, nil for Munekiyo and Hiroshi.
worked on the project for over forty years. However, such relationship is not enough to deduce that Shunshui had any influence on the compilation of the history book. Kaku did not study long under Shunshui. He learnt from Shunshui at ten when Shunshui arrived Edo in 1665. His father passed away the following year and he had to leave Shunshui and go back home. At thirteen, he returned to learn from Shunshui again. Unfortunately, at fifteen sui, he had smallpox and was forced to leave again. There was no mention of his going back to Shunshui to study after. During that three years with Shunshui, Kaku have learnt nothing but rudimentary stuffs only:

```
[I] have only learnt Xiaojing (Classic of filial piety), Lunyu (Anaclets) ,Xiaoxue (Study of characters) and punctuations. If [I] felt sleepy, I would take a nap. I did not contemplate other things else. I have not learnt about his scholarship and his way.” 僅受孝經、論語、小學、句讀，...倦則瞌睡，不思其他，其學其道，一無所聞。（ZSJ, pp.825）
```

He replied [Ogyū] Sorai [1666-1728], “[I] served Zhu Wengong as his student when I was young. I have only learnt from him nominally, nothing substantial.” 答徂徠：幼師事朱文恭，徒有其名而無其實。（ZSJ, 819)

In the preface to Zhushi Shunshui tan qi, he admitted that “when [he] served the Master [Zhu Shunshui], [he] was not yet a grown child. For the so-called names of things, I didn’t know even one out of ten.” 逮事先生之門，未屆成童。所謂事物名稱，什之未能得一。271

It would be hard to imagine the renown scholar, who had only learnt rudimentary knowledge from Shunshui, was heavily influenced by Shunshui, not to mention about the Dai Nihon Shi, bearing in mind that he entered Shōkōkan only after Shunshui’s death. Other compilers or editors might have the same situation. As well, it was common that literati at the time were all hungry for Confucian and other knowledge from the continent and seldom would

271 Zhu Zhiyu, Zhushi Shunshui tan qi, preface, 4.
they learn from just one master, a circumstance which makes it even more difficult to trace the influence of any single person on any individual.

Many would expect Mitsukuni to be a different case since it was him who took the initiative to invite Shunshui to be his teacher and Shunshui’s influence on him would be easier to trace. Unfortunately, even Mitsukuni is not an exception. When he met Shunshui, he was already thirty-eight and very knowledgeable. Many of his benevolent policies were implemented years before he became Shunshui’s student, including his ingenious flawless engineering of returning his seat to his brother’s family inspired by Shiji.

What inspired Mitsukuni was not only the desire to return the seat, but also the fact that had there been no history, he would not have had been inspired. Thus, he had already sprouted the idea of compiling Japanese history since young and had, as soon as he had the resource to, started the project in his thirty’s. In Baili sensei no hiin narabi ni mei 梅里先生の碑陰並びに銘 (the eulogy for Baili Sensei [Mitsukuni’s alternate name]) he composed for himself, he explained,

Since early [of his life, he] has the will to compile history, but there were few books [for him] to adduce. [He,] therefore, searched for and purchased them. After [he] acquired them, [he] screened and selected by comparing them to unofficial stories and novels, then [he] picked the correct ones and shelved those he has doubt on. [He used the materials to] rectify the imperial genealogy and to critique people and officials, and thus accomplished his private system of thought.

---

272 In the preface written in 1715, his successor Tsunaeda wrote, “when my ancestor read the Biography of Boyi at eighteen sui, he jumped up on his feet in awe of their flawless deeds. He held the book and sighed, ‘had there be no books, the records of Yu and Xia could not be studied; had there be no historical writings, rely on what could the people come after to observe and feel [the deeds of the old]’ It is due to this reason that my ancestor started to have the idea of compiling history. 先人十八歳讀伯夷傳, 蹍然有慕其高義, 撫巻而歎曰：「不有載籍，虞夏之文不可得見；不由史筆，何以俾後之人有所觀感？於是乎慨焉立修史之志。 (Tokugawa Mitsukuni 徳川光圀 [1628-1701], Dai Nihon shi 大日本史 [the History of Great Japan], edited by Tokugawa Tsunaeda 徳川綱條校, re-edited by Tokugawa Harumori; 徳川治保, https://babel.hathitrust.org/shcgi/p?id=keio.10811092020;view=1up;seq=1 : Preface, 1)
It is obvious from the above that Mituskuni had his objectives of compiling the *Dai Nihon Shi* quite clear in his mind. The concept that formulated the three special accomplishments of the *Dai Nihon Shi*, viz.: exalting the biography of Prince Ōtomo [648-672, r. 672 for 8 months] as one for an emperor; listing the biography of Empress consort Jingū [169-269, r. 201-269] as one for an empress only; rectifying the legitimacy of Nanbo Chō 南北朝 [the Southern and Northern Courts, 1336-1392] by identifying solely on where the [three] sacred treasures were kept. 陛大友于帝紀; 列神功于后妃; 南北之亂，正閏皇統，唯神器之在否。  

has taken shape before he revered Shunshui as his teacher. Therefore, it would be unfair to Mitsukuni if we give all the credits of compiling the *Dai Nihon Shi* to Shunshui. We must note that while Mitsukuni was willing to listen and ever ready to correct himself, he was also a man with insight and firm will. His admiration of the Chinese culture and his respect for Shunshui did not however alter his nationalistic stance. In 1670, a Confucian officer presented the draft of the *Honchō Tsugan* 本朝通鑑 (Comprehensive mirror for our government, 1670) to the court to obtain a permission for printing. Mitsukuni was among the audience. When he read the mentioning of Wu Taibo as Japan’s founding ancestor, he was shocked and commented that that was a tale not stated in Japan’s own history. “Now our development has way surpassed the old times. If we let such tale prevails, then our country will for ever be a dependency to outside

---

273 That is Kusanagi no Tsurugi 草薙劍 (the sword Kusanagi), Yata no Kagami 八咫鏡 (the mirror Yata), and Yasakani no Magatama 八尺瓊勾玉 (the jewel of Yasakani)

274 Tokugawa Mitsukuni, “Memorial presenting the *Dai Nihon Shi*”, in *Dai Nihon Shi*, 3a-b.

275 The *Honchō Tsugan* is an imitation of *Zishi Tongjian* on the history of Japan by Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657) and his son Hayashi Gahō 林鵞峰 (1618-1688).
countries. This is a matter worth deep signs.” 今也天下文明，遠超昔時，而使此說一行，則
我神州之大寶，永為外國之附庸，是可歎也。(Gikō Gyōjitsu, 20). And, once he overheard
someone uttered the term chūka 中華 and he remarked

“it is acceptable for that country’s people to use the term to address their country, but not
for us. To call where our emperors found our capital as chūka is acceptable, but to call
[that] outside country as chūka is pointless. [To call an] outside country should use the
outside country’s language to call them. We should called them shintan, shina. Or it is
also acceptable to follow the contemporary and call them Tangshan (the land of the
Tang).” 彼國之人稱之則可，自我稱之則不可；若本邦帝王所都則可稱中華，指外
國為中華，甚無謂也。外國從外國之語，以震旦、支那稱之，或從當時俗語稱唐
山亦可。(ibid.)

It is therefore not surprising to hear him said, “[I] revere Shintō and Confucianism but
rebut Shintō and Confucianism; venerate Buddha and Laozi but reject Buddha and Laozi” 尊神
儒而駁神儒，崇佛老而排佛老276 although his teacher Shunshui was steadfastly a Confucian
and an anti-Buddhism advocate.

But to Mitsukuni, he was consistent. He valued Japan and he cared only Japan. He
wanted to set things right. He wanted to establish a system so that everyone can follow without
much discretion. The reason he was so devoted in the project of compiling the Dai Nihon Shi277
was he wanted to launch an objective precedent for verifying the legitimacy of governance
through demoting or upgrading historic figures during the compilation of the history of Japan.
The rules must be simple, visible and non-discretionary. For that matter, he chose the three
Imperial Regalia. Whoever possessed the three Sacred treasures was the legitimate ruler for

---

276 “Gikō Gyōjitsu”, 27 in Sanroku.

277 He spent a third of the domain’s income in the project.
Japan. In this way, the phenomenon of *gekokujyō* 下剋上 (the low overcomes the high)\(^{278}\) which lasted for two three hundred years would not recur. People would then act discreetly and behave in the way their status and position require, a moral standard called *taigi meibun* 大義名分 (supreme duty and status distinction) emphasised by the Chinese classic *Chunqiu* 春秋 (the annals of spring and autumn). In China, the emperor received the heaven’s mandate to rule. It was a little different in Japan, where the emperor was a descendent from heaven as has proven, as some insist, by the unbroken imperial line. *Tenshi* 天子 (Ch. *tianzi*) was a deity and truly the son of heaven, not a human agent for heaven as in China. Unlike the *tenshi* in China who received mandate to rule, the *tenshi* of Japan bestowed them. Under such an arrangement the emperor and the shōgun no longer were enemies to each other, contending for power. They were on the same side of the table. This pacified the confrontation between the Tokugawa *bakufu* and the emperor at the early Edo period, especially when under the rule of Iemitsu. As well, the rule of the Tokugawa Shōgun could be legitimized. The Tokugawa Shōgun was no longer a usurper any more. Mitsukuni could confidently proclaim: “our emperor is our *tenshi*; Shōgun is our ‘royal’ clan.” 我が主君は天子也、今将軍は我が宗室也\(^{279}\)

The skillfully theorized system needs precedents, which are now available in the *Dai Nihon Shi*. The execution of the system required absolute loyalty *sono* 尊王 (revere the emperor) under *taigi meibun* from subordinates, a loyalty that is resolute always. And one of the icons for such loyalty was Kusunoki Masashige.

Glamorous the life Zhu might seem to be in Edo as the teacher for Mitsukuni, but deep inside, Shunshui must have felt differently. What he wanted to do in Edo or Mito were short-

---

\(^{278}\) *Gekokujyō* is a phenomenon where the junior seize power from their superior, normally through military means.

\(^{279}\) Kaku, “*Tōen iji*”, 22.
lived. Mitsukuni was no longer as keen on institutionalizing Confucianism. Shunshui was often sick. He was surrounded by, to him, foreigners and his activities was restricted. He could not see his grandson who came to visit him all the way from Yuyao. Suffering from homesick, he had no one to share his emotion and feelings (ZSJ, 253). Shunshui must have felt lonely and frustrated.\(^{280}\) The remnant was once again forced to become a recluse, not voluntarily this time. He died in 1682. In the coffin he prepared\(^{281}\), Shunshui was buried in the family cemetery of the Mito Domain in a Chinese style tomb with stele inscribed as he preferred to as “The tomb of Ming Zheng Jun Mister Zhu” (明徵君朱先生之墓). Now that the coffin of Shunshui was cover, but can we, base on the above discussions, still confidently assert Shunshui had a great deal of influence during his life time? His background was not unique, his scholarship was not among the top rates, and he did not have much influence on his students, his contacts, on Mitsukuni and on Dai Nihon Shi. These are the factors that form the bases upon which the beliefs on Shunshui’s influence are built. If Shunshui did not have immense influence on his contemporaries, could he have deep rooted influence on Japan as many scholars have claimed?

On the other hand, we seem to have neglected the influence Shunshui received from the political and social norms during those trouble years he was through. He did change to adapt to them. Shunshui himself was a product of other influences too. These impacts had molded the Shunshui we come to know today. The study on Shunshui’s influence would not be complete if we ignor the other side of the coin.


\(^{281}\) Zhu worried if one day the Qing is expelled but his body would have decayed in ill prepared coffin, he cannot return. Consequently, he built one for himself. (ZSJ, 619)
3. The Eulogy of Kusunoki Masashige

Eight years after Shunshui died, Mitsukuni retired at sixty-four (1690). One of his retirement hobbies was to collate and revised various history books. Once he lamented, in 1691, that there is no stele to commemorate a general as loyal as Kusunoki Masashige. He thus commissioned Sassaki Munekiyo to buy a piece of land in Minadogawa (in present-day Kobe City), where Masashige fought his last battle and died, and erected there a monument for Masashige. He brushed ten large Chinese characters “呜呼忠臣楠子之墓” (wuhu zhongchen nanzi zhi mu) and have them inscribed on the façade of the monument. He also selected and engraved at the back of the monument one eulogy Shunshui wrote for Masashige. Before we take a look at the eulogy, let us briefly go through the life of Masashige.

3.1 The Tragedy of a Patriotic Hero

Kusunoki was born in 1294 to an aristocratic family in Kawachi no kuni (Kawachi Province, east of present-day Osaka City). He later became a captain of hyōefujyō (the royal guards). In 1331, Go-Daigo-tennō (Emperor Go-Daigo, 1288-1339; r. 1318-1339), during his escape from the army led by Kamakura bakufu regent Höjyō Takatoki, he rested in a temple and had a dream. He had a priest divined it and recruited Kusunoki Masashige in accordance with the dream and inquired Masashige if he had any good strategies to get him out of the difficulties. Kusunoki asked the Emperor left everything to him and not to worry. After fighting for two years Kusunoki welcomed the emperor back to the capital. Emperor Go-Daigo then staged a lot of new policies which were later collectively

282 The Emperor was trying to remove the powerful bakufu and resume his power as emperor but his plan was leaked before taking action and was therefore forced to flee.
referred to as the *Kenmu no shinsei* 建武の新政 (Kenmu Restoration) (1333-1336). However, Emperor Go-Daigo did not gain a lot of support, especially from the warriors. His frugal policies drove even more away. His unfairness in rewarding the warriors - including Kusunoki, although Kusunoki did not mind it - after he returned to the throne had aroused grievances within the army. Consequently, one of the leaders, Ashikaga Takauji 足利尊氏 (1305-1358. r. 1338-1358) turned his back to Emperor Go-Daigo. Kusunoki was forced to fight on horseback again. With his expertise in fighting tactics, he was still able to win many battles. Nevertheless, the number of the army on his side was far fewer than those in the Ashikaga’s, especially after the latter successfully incorporated all combat forces from Kyushu (九州 Kyūshū). In 1336, the Ashikaga’s led his troops on land, and fleets at sea to attack Kyoto. Emperor Go-Daigo ordered Kusunoki’s exhausted army to defend the capital. Kusunoki advised that since the enemy was fresh and larger in number, his exhausted men could not win, it would be better to retreat and wait for another chance. The Emperor turned down this face losing advice and, taking the words of his assistant Fujiwara Kiyotada 藤原清忠 (or Hōmon Kiyotada 坊門清忠, 1283-1338), ordered Masashige to immediate set off.

Kusunoki knew he would not be able to return from the battle field this time. So at *Sakurai Eki* 櫻井驛 (Sakurai Station) he sent his son Masatsura 正行 (?-1348) back to Kawachi and entrusted him the duty to protect the court in future. After this he entered the battle field in Minatogawa calmly. Despite he fought ferociously with all his men, there were only sixty men left in the end. He knew that it would be his last day. He asked his brother Masasue 正季 (?-1336) what his last wish was. Masasue laughed and replied, “I wish I can live seven times to

---

283 He, himself a traitor to the Hōjyō, was the founder of the next Shogunate.
extinguish the rebels.” Grinning, Kusunoki Masashige and his brother Masasue stabbed each other to death. All his family and the remaining soldiers also committed suicide by seppuku (belly-cutting). The Emperor mourned his death and promoted him and his brother posthumously as the third rank General of the Left Guard.

### 3.2 The Background of the Eulogy

Masashige was very popular at the beginning of the Edo period. Many well-known scholars suddenly became very interested in Masashige. He was the subject of many prose and paintings. This of course had to do with the taigi meibun 大義名分 (highest duty in fulfillment of one’s proper role) and sonnō ron 尊王論 (discourse on revering the emperor).

284 This is the origin of the phrase Shichishō Hōkoku 七生報図 (to be devoted to pay the country back in seven lives) which loyalists during the Meiji Restoration found appealing to them.

285 This account of Kusunoki’s life is based mainly on his biography in the Dai Nihon Shi 169.1a-11a.

286 Apart from Kusunoki Masashige Den 楠正成伝 [The biography of Kusunoki Masashige] written by Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657), and Nankō Ron 楠公論 [On Nankō] by Ōda Dōkan 太田道灌 (1432-1486) mentioned by Kinoshita Hideaki 木下英明, Shichishō Hōkoku 七生報国 [To be devoted to pay the country back in seven lives] which loyalists during the Meiji Restoration found appealing to them.


sponsored and propagated by the Tokugawa bakufu. Masashige’s loyalty was the icon for these two important ideologies derived from legitimacy.

Zhu Shunshui had written at least three eulogies for Kusunoki Masashige, texts of all are extant and included in his collection (ZSJ, 571-2). According to the research by Kinoshita Hideaki 木下英明, Shunshui wrote the first piece (i.e. the second piece printed in ZSJ, 572) for a friend in Nagasaki on a painting titled Nankō fushi zuzan 楠公父子図贊 (A Picture in praising Mister Kusunoki and his son) in 1660. It was Seian who provided the biographical details to facilitate the composition, which later become one of his San Chū no Den 三忠伝 (Biographies of the three loyalists)\(^{288}\). The second piece (i.e. the first piece printed in ZSJ, 571-2) was probably written between 1665-1670 at the request of Lord of Kaga Domain 加賀藩守 Maeda Tsunaori 前田剛紀 (1643-1724, in office 1645-1723) through his Confucian officer Kinoshita Jün’an 木下順庵 (1621-1698) and was to be added to a painting titled Nankō fushi ketsubetsu no zu 楠公父子訣別の図 (The picture of Mister Nankō father and son parting each other). The background biography was provided by Shunshui’s another disciple Isogawa Kakugō.\(^{289}\) This was the one Mitsukuni selected to encrave on Masashige’s monument. There are no historical sources regarding the third piece (i.e. the third piece in ZSJ, 572), but Hideaki suggests that it was probably written between the two.\(^{290}\)

---


\(^{289}\) It is not known why Shunshui required Kakukō to write him another one again.

\(^{290}\) Kinoshita, Hideaki 木下英明. Shu Shunshui no Kusunoki Masashige zōsan sanshu ni tsuite 朱舜水の「楠正成像贊三首」について [On the three eulogies for Kusunoki Masashige by Zhu Shunshui], Script of talk
3.3 The Text of the Eulogy

Below is the translated text of the eulogy at the back of Masashige’s monument:

Loyalty and filial piety\(^{291}\) are prominent parts of the world\(^{292}\) [order as obvious] as the sun and the moon are main parts of the sky. If heaven and earth do not have the sun or the moon, there will be obscurity and occlusion; if people’s heart-mind abrogate loyalty and filial piety, then usurpations will come one after another, the hierarchy of high and low\(^{293}\) will be reversed. I have heard about the honorable Kusunoki whose respectable name was Masashige. He was so loyal and brave, majestic and staunch that there was no match among the most outstanding figures in the country. However, when [I tried to] gather his deeds, [I found that] records are few. Generally speaking, the honorable Kusunoki’s way of commanding troops was to first inspect the pivot of [both side’s] strength or weakness prior to the emergence of [respective] signs, and then within the moment of a breath to make a decisive move that would turn a defeat into a victory\(^{294}\). He was good at assigning the right men to the right tasks and was considerate to his subordinates, treated them with sincerity. Therefore, his stratagem\(^{s}\) always hit, and in battles he had never failed conquering. He vowed wholeheartedly to heaven and earth [to restore Emperor Go-Daigo]\(^{295}\), [and his mind was as stern and] unalterable as metal and rock, never turned around because of [personal] advantage, nor to be scared away ever by [possible] sufferings. Hence, he was able to resurrect the court and brought it back to the previous capital\(^{296}\). As a proverb says, “repelled a wolf at the front door only to find a tiger entering from the rear.”\(^{297}\) The strategies of the imperial court were ill-advised, and

\(^{291}\) The phrase \textit{zhong xiao} 忠孝 consists of both the virtues of loyalty (\textit{zhong}) and filial piety (\textit{xiao}). It is used as a set phrase here with meaning more inclined to loyalty since filial piety is not mentioned again in the text that follows.

\(^{292}\) \textit{Tianxia} 天下 is normally translated as “all under heaven”. I deem it more natural here to render as “the world”.

\(^{293}\) An allusion to \textit{xici} 繫辭 [On the Appended Phrases] of \textit{Yijing}: “天尊地卑，乾坤定矣” (“Heaven is lofty and honourable; earth is low. [Their symbols] Qian and Kun, [with their respective meanings] were determined [in accordance with this]”, Chinese Text Project with James Legge’s translation, accessed May 31, 2017, \url{http://ctext.org/book-of-changes/xi-ci-shang}.

\(^{294}\) Zhu is praising Kusunoki’s military skill, such as those shown in the defense of the \textit{Chihayaakasaka Mura} 千早赤阪村 (within present-day Minamikawachi District in Osaka) and at the battle near the \textit{Tennō ji} 天王寺 (Temple for the Heavenly King, in the southern part of present-day Osaka) etc. See Kusunoki’s biography for more examples of his using tricks and tactics (\textit{Dai Nihon Shi} 169, 1a to 11a; \textit{sanchūden}, book 2).

\(^{295}\) See \textit{sanchūden}, book 2, 15a to 16b.

\(^{296}\) That is, Kyōto 京都 (present-day Kyōto).

\(^{297}\) This is a common proverb, which Andō Seian also used in Kusunoki’s biography he compiled. See \textit{sanchūden} book 2, 12a.
villains came one after another. [They] conspired to kill the heir apparent\textsuperscript{298} and overthrow the court\textsuperscript{299}. His almost succeed contributions [of restoring the court] was so great that it threatened the emperor\textsuperscript{300}, and thus his strategy [of temporary retreating], although advantageous, was not accepted\textsuperscript{301}. Since antiquities, there has been not a case that a general can accomplish anything outside the court when there were envious supreme commanders and incompetent dictatorial ministers in the court. In the end, proving his steadfast loyalty\textsuperscript{302}, Kusunoki offered his life to his country\textsuperscript{303}. When he instructed his son before he calmly went to his martyr death\textsuperscript{304}, he had not uttered a single word about his own private matters\textsuperscript{305}. Had his loyalty [to the emperor] not been as towering as if it could cover the sun, he would not have been able to be so brave and yet so calm\textsuperscript{306}. For two generations, father, sons\textsuperscript{307}, and siblings\textsuperscript{308}, were all earnestly loyal. How magnificent it is to have all the filial kind converged in one family\textsuperscript{309}! Up till today, from high officials and important persons at the top to commoners in the streets, they all praise [Kusunoki] in unison. This proves that he must have virtues that surpass others.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{298} Shunshui is referring to Moriyoshi Shinnō 護良親王 (Prince Moriyoshi, 1308-1335).
\item \textsuperscript{299} See sanchūden, book 2, 17a to 18a.
\item \textsuperscript{300} Perhaps that explains why the biggest rewards went to Kikuchi Taketoki 菊池 武時 (1292-1333), although it was mainly due to Kusunoki that Emperor Go-Daigo was able to be reinstated. (Dai Nihon Shi, 171.3a).
\item \textsuperscript{301} See Dai Nihon Shi, 169.6b.
\item \textsuperscript{303} After a fierce fight, and bearing eleven wounds on his body, he and his brother Masasue committed suicide by stabbing each other. (Dai Nihon Shi, 169.10a-b)
\item \textsuperscript{304} I have not translated “託孤寄命” (entrusted the care of orphan-to-be children and the charged with the administration of a state), which is an allusion to 可以託六尺之孤，可以寄百里之命 (“...there is an individual who can be entrusted with the charge of a young orphan prince, and can be commissioned with authority over a state of a hundred li...”) (the Analects, 8.6, Chinese Text Project with James Legg’s translation, accessed May 31, 2017, http://ctext.org/analects/tai-bo), which would appear a little clumsy and is not literally true.
\item \textsuperscript{305} See Dai Nihon Shi, 169. 7a; sanchūden book 2, 29b has more details.
\item \textsuperscript{306} The original zheng er xia 整而暇 is extracted from Zouzhuan 左傳 [Zuo’s Comments] on the sixteenth year of Chenggong 成公 [the Duke of Cheng]. “子重問晉國之勇，臣對曰，好以眾整，曰，又何如，臣 曰，好以暇”。 (When I was sent on an envoy to the state of Chu, their high official asked, “how do you Jin people regard as valiant?”). I replied, “We love being orderly” he asked again, “then what?” I responded, “we love doing it leisurely”). Chinese Text Project, accessed May 31, 2017, http://ctext.org/chun-qiu-zuo-zhuan/cheng-gong.
\item \textsuperscript{307} “Father and son” refer to Kusunoki Masashige and his elder son Masatsura and the second son Masatoki 正時 (1327-1348). Masatsura’s biography is annexed to his father’s in Dai Nihon Shi, juan 169 and sanchūden book 2, 31b to 37a.
\item \textsuperscript{308} “Two brothers” refers to Kusunoki Masashige himself and his brother Masasue; Masatsura and Masatoki.
\item \textsuperscript{309} Jie 節 here has the same meaning of ji 集 (to gather).
\end{itemize}
greatly. Unfortunately, there is nothing in history that we can verify his deeds and leave us unable to transmit and disseminate his grant virtuousness. 忠孝著乎天下，日月麗乎天。天地無日月，則晦蒙否塞；人心廢忠孝，則亂賊相尋，乾坤反覆。余聞楠公諱正成者，忠勇節烈，國士無雙，蒐其行事，不可概見。大抵公之用兵，審強弱之勢於幾先，決成敗之機於呼吸。知人善任，體士推誠。是以謀無不中，而戰無不克，誓心天地，金石不渝，不為利囘，不為害怵。故能興復王室，還於舊都。諺云：「前門拒狼，後門進虎。」廟謨不臧，元兇接踵。構殺國儲，傾移鐘簴。功垂成而震主，策雖善而弗庸。自古未有元帥妒前，庸臣專斷，而大將能立功於外者。卒之以身許國，之死靡佗。觀其臨終訓子，從容就義，託孤寄命，言不及私，自非精忠貫日，能如是整而暇乎！父子兄弟，世篤忠貞，節孝萃於一門，盛矣哉！至今王公大人以及里巷之士，交口而誦説之不衰，其必有大過人者。惜乎載筆者無所考信，不能發揚其盛美大德耳。(ZSJ, 571-2)

For the ease of reference, I have also attached the other two composed by Zhu Shunshui as appendixes 1 and 2. The reasons Mitsukuni chose this one over the other were not known. Comparing with the other two, this one is the longest in length and the richest in details. Appendix 2, that is the one Kinoshita suggests written between the other two, is a poem which is not easy to read and understand. Moreover, there are two things in the above eulogy that Mitsukuni had long sought propagating which the other two are lack of. The first and the most important one is the emphasis on loyalty. This eulogy starts with loyalty (zhongxiao) right at the beginning and wraps up also with loyalty (no private utterance before death and all family members are loyalists). The second point this eulogy helps Mitsukuni to achieve is it provides a historical record in proper form that did not exist hitherto for future historian to verify the loyal deeds of Masashige. As well, the other two impute Masashige’s failure to the incompetence of the court, and thus imply the emperor’s responsibility. The one Mitsukuni opted for focuses only on the loyalty of the Kusunokis.

3.4 The Influence of the Eulogy

The monument is praised for exceptional in three aspects: the loyalty of Masashige, the righteousness of Mitsukuni and the belles-lettres of Zhu, and becomes a symbol of loyalty.
Before the dawn of the Meiji period (1868-1912), it further evolved into a sacred place
for the pilgrims who hoisted the banner of “revere the Emperor and expel the barbarians” (sonnō
jōi 尊王攘夷). Numerous activists paid their tributes to the tomb of Masashige at least once. At
its peak, three million supporters including loyalists and political leaders\(^{310}\) were recorded to
have visited the monument in a year\(^{311}\). Yoshida Shōin (吉田松陰 1830-1859) is said to have
gone to the Kusunoki’s shrine three times. Every time he read the eulogy, he was in tears.\(^{312}\)
Kubota Osamu 久保田 収 (1910-1976) articulates that there was a phenomenon of worshipping
Masashige at bakumatsu 幕末 (End of Edo period, first half of the nineteenth century).\(^{313}\) The
phenomenon in fact might have started even before Edo period, as we have seen, when there
seemed to be a deification movement for Masashige and lot of writings on Masashige
mushroomed. The Eulogy of Masashige was therefore praised for its inspiration to bakumatus
shishi 幕末志士 (end of bakufu loyalists) and was said to have enduring influence on Japan.

Shunshui as the author naturally gained the credit. This eulogy is considered one of the most
influential work from Shunshui.

\(^{310}\) Including Maki Yasuomi 真木保臣 (1813-1864), Sanjyo Sanetomi 三条実美 (1837-1891), Higashikuze
Michitomi 東久世通禧 (1834-1912), Murada Seifū 村田清風 (1783-1855), Yoshida Shōin 吉田松陰 (1830-1859),
Kuruhara Ryōzō 来島良蔵 (1829-1862), Saigō Takamori 西郷隆盛 (1828-1877), Ijichi Masaharu 伊地知正治
(1828-1886), just to name a few.

\(^{311}\) According to “柳川人から見た安東省菴とその著《三忠伝》” (Andō Seian and his ‘Biographies of
the Three Loyalists’ as Seen from the Perspective of Yanagawa people) by 柳川山門三池教育会 (Yanagawa
Temple Gate Miike Education Board), pp. 155, quoted from Lin, pp.140 note 29.

\(^{312}\) ZSJBY p.21.

\(^{313}\) Kubota Osamu 久保田 収 (1910-1976), Kenmu chūkō 建武中興 [Kenmu Restoration] (Tokyo: Nippon
Kyōbunsha, 1965): 201-209.
No doubt Shunshui did write it, but it was done at the request of a friend as a favor, not out of his admiration to Kusunoki Masashige. Shunshui knew very little about Masashige, and I doubt he understood the significance Masashige represents. He had no idea it would be inscribed on a piece of tablet. It was Mitsukuni who made the choice. Mitsukuni used the eulogy Shunshui wrote to commemorate Masashige in order to promote the spirit of *sonnō*. If the eulogy can be regarded as a text of influence, then it should be from Mitsukuni more than from Shunshui. If we say Shunshui had illuminated generations after him, then Shunshui was at best a light bulb installed by Mitsukuni on a circuit he designed. The influence of Shunshui on this piece of eulogy was in fact the influence of Mitsukuni emitted via him. Claims of Shunshui’s long lasting influence using the Eulogy as a strong evidence is invalid.

4. Shunshui’s Actual Influence

We have seen that the five aspects that build the foundation for the beliefs on Shunshui’s influence on Japan are all not solid. It would be nonetheless equally incorrect to state that Shunshui has no influence at all. For someone at his positions for so long in Japan, it would be beyond imagination that Shunshui has no impact on anyone. Shunshui of course did have influence on his contemporaries in Japan. Such influence was, many may find it disappointing, on aspects Shunshui himself had already dismissed as superficial and coarse. The evidence is not too difficult to locate from his collections. The reasons for overlooking Shunshui’s influence in these areas are due to the discordant of the views on Shunshui’s scholarship (*xue*). The focus of us on Shunshui’s scholarship, including Shunshui himself, is different from that from the Japanese.

Many analyses on Shunshui’s scholarship highlight the so-called *shili shixue* 實理實學 which is usually translated as real or practical learning, real and practical in the sense of able to
yield result and solving daily life problems. As he said, his teaching was just “wooden utensiles, tiles, cloths, fabrics, beans and millet.” 木豆、瓦豋、布、帛、菽、粟而已 (ZSJ, 162) “we should look for it at the neglectable moment when our heart-mind functions, and verify it at family daily life…therefore the best way is during our interactions between ruler and subjects, father and son, husband and wife, and among siblings and friends, we practice it plainly, then eventually there will come a wonderful moment spontaneously which will make us wave our hands and stamp our feet…all these are real and practical means.” 當求之於心性氣志之微，體之於家庭日用之際…故不若君臣、父子、夫婦、昆弟、朋友之間，平平常常做去，自有 一段油然發生，手舞足蹈之妙。⋯凡此皆實理實學. (ZSJ, 110) But shili shixue was not a new direction in Confucianism. The once revered Neo-Confucianism had mutated to empty talks. The collapsed of Ming had proved its failure. The advocacy of the late Ming scholars of discarding Song exegesis to classics and going back directly to Confucius and Mencius for explanations was a natural reaction to the corrupted Neo-Confucianism. It started much earlier than Shunshui’s time. The “rational, social and historical”314 approach in thought was commom to seventeenth century literati in China in the failure of Confucianism.

To Japanese, shili shixue was nothing new either. As have discussed, earlier shogunate has already borrowed Confucianism to resolve their daily administrative issues. The acceptance of Confucianism at the beginning of the Tokugawa bakafu was a practical preference. It was a conscientiously choice to make possible the transition from frequent warfare to peace time rule.

314 Qian Mu, "Lun Qing ru" 論清儒 [On Qing confucianists], Zhongyang chaokan 中央周刊 [Central weekly], juan 9, issue 3 (Nanjing, 1947): 5, accessed May 9, 2017, http://img.dachengdata.com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/n/dcjour/jour/dacheng/20865818/bb71a10f480340d5888ca0c3ea f2629e/fb7c4b6868018fda563352d846f1befd.shtml.
“It was an indigenous movement stimulated by indigenous conditions.” Confucianism is something practical and pragmatic in Japan since its introduction from China. It was only through a Chinese lens that one would excitingly come up with the conclusion that Confucianism was overwhelmingly dominating in Edo Japan, and it was due solely to Zhu Shunshui. It was never the case. In Edo Japan, while Confucianism might provide a rational explanation of the social order, it was the traditional feudal and Shinto-based ceremonies and beliefs which gave emotional unity and meaning. The typical Tokugawa samurai saw some value in each of the three world views that competed for his allegiance. Buddhism and Shinto provided for his religious needs; Confucianism gave him a rational cosmology and a social ethic; Confucianism and Shinto both contributed to his conceptions of the political order…the Tokugawa samurai found compatibility among them an easy matter.

“Most Japanese of the time were not disturbed by the antagonism between Neo-Confucianism and Buddhism.” Confucianism was only one of the three ideologies prevailed at the time, and obviously not the one valued most. Confucianism, to Edo Japanese, was a process of reading Japanese concepts into Chinese Neo-Confucian texts. The motivation for the acceptance of Confucian since its early stages in Japan was deeply militant and practical. The Chinese characters for practical learning in both Chinese and Japanese are the same but pronounced differently, shixue in Chinese but jitsugaku in Japanese. For Shunshui, shixue is functional and was in line with the sage’s original intent, while jitsugaku, for the Japanese, they refer to the
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316 Hall, “The Confucian Teacher”, 291.

317 Ibid., 289.

318 Ibid., 294.

319 Ibid, 298.
means to acquire foreign knowledge. I agree with Robert Chard that Shunshui’s “pragmatic approach makes it difficult to establish a tie to any particular strand of Confucism.” 320

The proliforation of Confucian teaching in early Edo Japan was, as we have seen, practical, political and, I would like to add, economical. To low ranking samurai, to be specialized in Confucianism was a means of living.321 According to John Hall, a Tokugawa Confucianist, or jusha 儒者 in Japanese, has four roles: first, as a ritualist and a philosopher-moralist; second, as an authority on the Confucian texts; third, as keeper of the basic educational texts; and fourth, as a leader in cultural activities.322 With the promotion of Confucianism from top down, jusha competed for the attention from feudal lords as well as from the mass at large. Buddhism has of course been already out of flavor. These jusha need something grand to let them standout of the crowd. It is not hard to imagin how disappointed they were when they found this Ming Confucian they so earnestly approached taught nothing but day to day matters. No doubt Shunshui had tried to teach what he believed is authentic Confucianism. But to these samurai scholar, shili shixue was too common to raise any eyebrow. Apparent, Shunshui could not have exerted much influence on these Confucianism chasers.

Then, what did jusha and Confucian learners in Edo Japan need? They were diaowen 雕文 (engraved decorative inlays), kelou 刻鏤 (carved and etched ornamental objects), jinxiu 錦繡


321 For higher rank samurai with handsome stipend, to spend years in learning a foreign concepts in foreign language but getting an incommensurable increment to their income was something “not worth the candle”. Please see discussion in Hall, “The Confucian Teacher”, 285-287.

322 Ibid., 272.
(brocade and embroidery), and zuanzu 纂組 (silk stripe and band) (ZSJ, 162), what Shunshui categorically brushed aside as xue sheng zhi cuji 學聖之粗跡 (coarse and superficial outline for learning to be a sage) (Shuroku, 2; ZSJ, 404), directly opposite to “wooden utensiles, tiles, cloths, fabrics, beans and millet.” (ibid.) Shunshui insistently advocated. As evidenced from the contents of the letters and brush conversations Shunshui exchanged with Japanese samurai intellectuals, “establishing correct external forms was a distinct priority [among Japanese intellectuals]”. They frequently asked him for instructions on the design of such items as the ‘long garment’ (shenyi 深衣), the temple to Confucius, ancestral shrine buildings, ritual vessels, and coffins.”323. They were also anxious to know the Chinese, reads proper, form of writing an envelop, a memorial etc. Questions most frequently asked were about how to write better proses. For instance, among the 139 entries in Shuroku which records the brush conversations between Shunshui and Seijun, 33 were about prose writings. As Lan Hongyue points out, to Edo intellectuals, especially after the founding of kogaku 古學 (Ancient Learning) promoted by Yamaga Sokō, Itō Jinsai and later Ogyū Sorai 萩生徂徠 (1666-1728), bun 文 (Ch. wen, belle lettres, in its narrowest sense)324 was the michi 道 (Ch. dao, way)325. It was not what Chinese in


324 Wen 文 in Lan’s essay has 6 definitions: A. the original meaning of cross strokes; B. graceful, magnificent, the opposite of unadorned; C. the opposite of wu 武 (military, martial, physical). This is philosophical, literature, social science concept and can be sub-divided into a. the wen as in Confucianism concept; and b. the act of composing poems and belle lettres. D. Texts and printed matters related to C; E. the counterpart of poetry, refers both to ancient and contemporary proses; and F. criminal codes. Lan’s essay focuses on B, C and D. Lan, Hung- yueh (Lan Hongyue) 藍弘岳, “Wuguo de ruxue – wen zai jianhu qianqi de xingxiang bianhua yu qi fazhan” 「武國」的儒學 - 「文」在江戶前期的形象變化與其發展” [The Confucianism of Bukoku: On the Changing Image, Publication and Study of Civil Culture in the Early Edo Period], Hanxue yanjiu (Chinese Studies), Vol. 30 issue 1, (2012): 242

general consider as a basic skill for the learnt. It was not a means to access dao as Zhu Shunshui understood it. It was the dao in its own right. Coase and superficial they might seem to Chinese, but it was these knowledge that the jusha had wanted. Therefore, if one wants to understand Shunshui’s influence on Japan, one should look to Zhushi Shunshui tan qi, instead of to his collections. Although Asaka Kaku had dismissed at the preface of the book that its contents were no more than study notes containing only rudimentary matters, which were not worth for connoisseurs to look at, it was these knowledges that the early Edo jusha wanted from Shunshui. Comparing to life long cultivation on Confucian ethics, these cuji were skills that could be mastered much faster and could be showcased externally to their patrons and target audience. And installing Shunshui in Mito was a way to manifest that the proper form of Confucianism was there.

5. Conclusion

We have examined the five major areas on which the foundation of the beliefs that Zhu Shunshui has immense and long-lasting influence are built. The findings do not support most of such assertions. One’s background is no doubt an important attribute for one to become a force field to emit influence on others. Shunshui did have that sort of scholarship and background. He knew it and kept insisted it to people he knew in Japan. However, he was not the only one, and certainly not the greatest. Investigations above also indicate that Shunshui’s influence on his contacts in Japan, especially that on Mitsukuni, was not obvious, overwhelming, and certainly not the sole source. Many of these claims are based on misinterpretation of the texts, misunderstanding of the relationships Shunshui has with others, and misled by wishful thinkings,

326 Zhu, Zhushi Shunshui tan qi, preface. 5. The original text is “雖不足為大方之觀，亦可以塞童蒙之需。”
a belief that it was Japanese culture is simply a copy of Chinese culture. The Dai Nihon Shi and the Eulogy for Kusunoki Masashige are the two pieces of objects extant today that many have used a material evidence for Shunshui’s immense and longlasting influence on Japan. Unfortunately, there is no direct evidence that Shunshui was involved in the project Dai Nihon Shi. Nor there were any proofs that he had indirect influence on its compilation through his students. The Eulogy was written by Shunshui and it has indeed inspired the bakumatsu shishi. However, the Eulogy was simply one piece of many writings Shunshui wrote to entertain requests from his acquaintances. It was Mitsukuni’s choice to put the Eulogy on the stele. It was Mitsukuni’s influence, via Shunshui’s writing, rather than Shunshui’s. Shunshui’s real influence, as I have suggested, is on matters that could be used to prove its bearers’s authencity in Confucianism. Many scholars discount, or simply ignore, them because they worry they are too trivial and does not commensurate with Shunshui’s towering image as an erudite scholar. In turn, it will dwarf Shunshui’s, and Chinese, influence on Japan.

The fortuitous change in Shunshui’s life is unusual for a Chinese, which leads many to deduce that Shunshui must have an important role in the cultural history of Japan. The zeal blinded them in their research. They are obscured in the first place by the biased belief that Japanese culture is only a mirror of the Chinese. Chinese culture is the major source of inspiration for constructing Japanese culture, with or without Zhu Shunshui, but not the only one. To ignore this will, in the extreme case, entail nothing but laugh.327 Another reason that has created the obscurity is the text. Nearly all the correspondences and writings are undated. This

327 For example, Tan Qixun quotes Wang Jinxiang’s discussion on Shunshui’s personality in his Zhu Shunshui pingzhuuan 朱舜水評傳 (41-2) in prasing Shunshui’s not having any relationship with any woman for forty years as a proof of his steadfast loyalty to his wife. (Tan, Zhu shunshui dongying shouye, 112) This is of course too much of an imagination. One husband one wife is a very modern concept, especially in non-Christian countries. More importantly Shunshui has explained this to Andō Seian and Hitomi Sakudō that it was only because of his poor health. (ZSJ, 391-2, 586)
makes it difficult to understand the chronological order of different events and Shunshui’s psychological changes respectively. There are also cases that the texts of has been edited, for some purposes. For example, by juxtaposing texts in ZSJ with those similar ones in ZSJBY, readers might have a different Shunshui.\textsuperscript{328} Also, the lack of third party evidence on Shunshui’s early life in China also decreases the credibility of his self purported background. He had mentioned to Mitsukuni in \textit{lǔlì}, and to others in other places\textsuperscript{329}, that thanks to the chaotic situation after Ming fell, he was able to hide his title even to the Prince of Lu. (ZSJ, 352) If he could do so to Prince of Lu, it would be even easier for him to do the same to Mitsukuni. This leads to the reliability issue on the collections raised by Robert Chard\textsuperscript{330}.

The third reason that obscure the counter evidences in Shunshui’s collections was, as the earlier part of this paper points out, the development of geo-politics in East Asia. Shunshui has been used for many occasions by Chinese as well as by Japanese to serve as an agent for political cause. In either case, his influence will be extolled, though for different beneficiaries. We have seen the repaid restoration of the strength of China in recent years. Will Shunhui be a hot topic again?

It is obvious now that to better facilitate the research on Zhu Shunshui, there requires a re-edited collection, in chronological order as much as possible, with annotations and notes on different texts in various editions. There is also a need to adjust our bias during our studies of the influence of the Chinese culture to other countries in inter-cultural interaction in East Asia, that non-Chinese countries would copy Chinese culture as was without any modifications or re-

\textsuperscript{328} For instances, ZSJBY 58, 69-72, 75-77.

\textsuperscript{329} For example, ZSJ, 370.

\textsuperscript{330} See note 70 on page 20 above.
creations. This will help to have a more realistic approach to study influence. Consequently, specifically on Zhu Shunshui, we should also pay attention to the influence others on him, as we have seen, during the early part of his life, he was molded by prevailing social currents. In Japan, especially in Edo, he was isolated in effect. He need to conform to new custom\footnote{It is widely believed that Shunshui did not know any Japanese. I find it incredible for someone who has lived in Japan and surrounded by only Japanese for over twenty years did not know a word in Japanese. For one, Shunshui had to communicate to maid and servants who knew no Chinese day in day out. And in a letter to Hitomi Sakudō, he told him he could have written a letter in Japanese to Councillar to admonish Mitsukuni but he did not know the proper format. (ZSJ, 250) This indicates he knew at least some Japanese.} and identify himself to the circle he was in in order not to be alienated.

Influence is something difficult to measure and trace, especially about a certain person’s inspiration on others’ mind. As Shunshui has remarked, if we want to comment on historic people, we have to discuss it in a way that they would wholeheartedly agree. Otherwise, it would only be a slander to the death. (ZSJ, 165) I just endeavour to point out in this paper that we have yet had enough concrete evidence to prove Shunshui has had the big scope of influence many scholars say he has on Japan. By and large, I agree with Robert Chard that “Zhu’s influence is a reflection of Mitsukuni’s authority.”\footnote{Chard, “Patterns of Confucian Cultural Transmission”, 249(36).} Shunshui is a light bulb placed in the location where Mitsukuni wanted him to be. The light emitted from the light bulb is generated from energy provided through the wire network Mitsukuni designed. With reference to his real influence identified above, many scholars would discount it as trivial and consider it not commensurate with Shunshui’s image as an erudite scholar. These influences were therefore chosen to be ignored or down played.

As I have said at the beginning, this paper is not intended to evaluate the scholarship of Shunshui. Nor is it my intention to belittle Shunshui, He was a schoar with broad knowledge. There is no doubt about it. It will not affect this observation even this paper concludes that he did
not have that extensive and lingering influence on Japan as some scholars have asserted. That Shunshui has no direct influence on Edo thought would not cast any doubt on Chinese Culture as an influence force field in Asia. Shunshui was like the Kongzi (Confucius) statues he brought to Japan.\footnote{Shunshui has brought two, one is now archive in Andō’s family, one is in Imperial Archive. Li Dachao, “Zhu Shunshui de haitian hongzhao” 朱舜水的海天鴻爪 [The distant footprints of Zhu Shunshui], in Zhushi Shunshui tan qi, appendix, 13.} The statues reflect the Confucius people wanted them to represent. Those who held the statues dear and displayed them at prominent place had but one purpose, that symbolically true Confucianism was there.
Bibliography

1 Primary Sources

1.1 Chinese


——. Xuegong tushuo yizhu 學宮圖說譯注 [Translation with annotations of the Illustrations explanation on the national academy], translated and annotated by Lin Xiaoming 林曉明, Shanghai: Shanghai Guji, 2015.


1.2 Japanese


——. *Tōen iji 桃園遣事* [Memories of the peach garden], aka *Seisan iji 西山遣事* [Memories of the West Hill Residence], reprint, Tokyo: Ibaraki ken kokumin bunka kenkyūsho 茨城県国民精神文化研究所 National spiritual and cultural research center for Ibaraki Prefecture and Kōbunsha 弘文社, 1935.


Hayashi, Shunsai and Hayashi Hōkō 林鳳岡 (1645-1732) edited, *Kai hentai 華夷変態* [the position swop between the civilized and the barbarians], Tokyo: Orient Bookstore, 1981.

Hitomi Sakudō 人見竹洞 (1638-1696). *Shunsui pokudan 舜水墨談 (c. Shunshui motan)* [the ink talks with Shunshui]. Unpublished manuscript, a collection of *Nakagawa bunko 中川文庫* [Nakagawa collection] of *Yutoku inari jinja 祐徳稲荷神社* [Yutokuinari Shrine], images obtained through online data base of *Koku bunkaku kenkyū shiryōkan 国文学研究資料館* National Institute of Japanese Literature, accessed May 14, 2017. http://base1.nijil.ac.jp/iview/Frame.jsp?DB_ID=G0003917KTM&C_CODE=XYU1-28506&IMG_SIZE=&PROC_TYPE=null&SHOMEI=%E3%80%90%E8%88%9C%E6%B0%B4%E5%A2%A8%E8%AB%87%E3%80%91&REQUEST_MARK=null&OWNER=null&IMG_NO=1


Secondary Sources and References


Gu, Yanwu 顧炎武 (1613–1682). *Ri zhi lu* 日知録 [Daily records of recognizing what have not been achieved], with collected exegesis by Huang Yucheng 黃汝成, reprint of woodblock printing version, Shanghai: Shanghai Classics, 1984.


Hikita, Keiyū 足田啓佑. “Shu Shunsui to Andō Seian – so no shisō ue no eikyō no ittan” 朱舜水と安東省菴 - その思想上の影響の一端 [Zhu Shunshui and Andō Seian – some of the

Ho, Koon-piu 何冠彪. Sheng yu si: mingji shidafu de jueze 生與死: 明季士大夫的抉擇 [To live or to die: the options for late ming literati and officialdom], Taipei: Lingking, 2005.


Ivanhoe, Philip J. Readings From the Lu-Wang School of Neo-Confucianism, Indianapolis: Hackett, 2009.


Kinoshita, Hideaki 木下英明. Shu Shunshui no Kusunoki Masashige zōsan sanshu ni tsuite 朱舜水の「楠正成像賛三首」について [On the three eulogies for Kusunoki Masashige by Zhu Shunshui], Script of talk delivered at the 13th round “Mitogaku symposium 1996” on November 1, 1996 retrievable at www.komonsan.jp/mitogaku/post_237.html. Kinoshita has an essay with same title published in the same year but I have yet the chance to read it. I do not expect the contents of both would have much material differences. The script does not have page numbers. The page numbers cited in this article is entirely based on the order of the relevant page downloaded.


Liang, Qichao 梁啓超 (1873-1929). Zhu shun shui xian sheng nian pu 朱舜水先生年譜 [Chronological biography of mister Zhu Shunshui], first edition, Taiwan first edition, Taiwan: Taiwan Zhonghua, 1957. (Also included in ZSJ, 644-729).

——. Zhong guo jin san bai nian xue shu shi 中國近三百年學術史 [The Academic History of China in the Recent Three Hundred Years], Shanghai: Shanghai Sanlian, 2006.


Ng, Benjamin Wai-ming 吳偉明, “Wu Tai-Po in Early Tokugawa Thought- Imperial Ancestor or Chinese Sage”, *East Asian History*, No. 21 (June 2001): 55-64.

Qian, Ming 錢明. “Zhu Shunshui de Zhengzhi, xueshu sixiang ji qi dui riben de yingxiang” 朱舜水的政治、学术思想及其对日本的影响 [The political, and academic thoughts of Zhu Shunshui and their influen on Japan], *Zhejiang xuekan 浙江學刊 Zhejiang Academic Journal*, No. 4 (1981): 111-116+86

——. "Huang lizhou zhu shunshui guanxi bian – jian yu Bai Dimin xiansheng shangque" 黃梨洲朱舜水关系辨 - 兼与白砥民先生商榷 [Clarifying the relationship between Huang Lizhou and Zhu Shunshui – and to discuss with Mr. Bai Dimin], Journal of Hangzhou University, Vol. 16 no. 4 (1986): 28-34.


Qian, Mu 錢穆 (1895-1990). “Lun Qing ru” 論清儒 [On Qing confucianists], Zhongyang chaokan 中央周刊 [Central weekly], juan 9, issue 3 (Nanjing, 1947): 5-7 and part of 3, accessed May 9, 2017, http://img.dachengdata.com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/n/dcjour/jour/dacheng/20865818/bb71a10f48034d5888ca0c3eaf2629e/1b7c4b6868018fda563352d846f1bcfd.shtml (for page 5-7) and http://img.dachengdata.com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/n/dcjour/jour/dacheng/20865818/1a36f59a05e943fd83795ee2d5b06ef1/f9ac6edec464dc478b3c306817bfe32f.shtml (for part of page 3).


Xu, Xingqing. *Zhu Shunshui yu dongya wenhua chuanbo de shijie* 朱舜水與東亞文化傳播的世界 [Zhu Shunshui and the world of East Asian culture transmission], Taipei: Guoli Taiwan daxue chuban she, 2008.


Zhao, Jianmin 趙建民. “Zhu Shunshui yanjiu de huigu yu qianjian” 朱舜水研究的回顧與前瞻 [Review and outlook of Zhu Shunshui studies], *Zhejiang Academic Journal 浙江學刊*, no. 2 (2001):147-150, accessed on May 30, 2017 http://eng.oversea.cnki.net.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/kcms/detail/detail.aspx?filename=ZJXK200102026&DBName=cfjftotal&dbcode=cfj&quid=WEEvREcwS1JHSldRa1Fhb09jMjQxRGxxWjhaaldkZzBDWUtUeE5BQ01POD0=$9A4hlF_YAuVQ5obgVAqNKPCYcEiKensW4ggI8Fm4gTkoUKaID8j8gFw!!

Zhao, Yuan 趙園. Mingqing zhiji shidafu yanjiu – zuowei yizhong xianxiang de yimin 明清之際士大夫研究 - 作為一種現象的遺民 [A Study of Literati During the Ming Qing Period - Remnant as a Phenomenon], Beijing: Beijing Shifan, 2014.


Internet:


The Eulogy for the Portrait of Kusunoki Masashige

(appendix piece in ZSJ, 572)

[Kusunoki was] fond of learning and had expositive opinions. He revered humanity and justice and sought eagerly for talented people. He was truly the mainstay for the country, and the shield and castle in battlefields. How appropriate he was to be congruous with [Emperor Go-Daigo’s] dream of getting a worthy man. Because of this, [Kusunoki] was able to vow wholeheartedly to heaven and earth and immediately destroyed the rebels. [Had the Emperor] used Kusunoki to plan strategies and policies in the imperial court, then he could have had conquered [enemies] during the enjoyment of banquets. Had the emperor had done so, this would have been a model to a myriad of states and he could have eradicated the disobedient before they ever emerge. To be able to [have someone that could] beat many with few, generate endless surprise [ambushes], and subdue without having the need to go to battle, these were [comparatively] only unimportant aptitudes. [Regrettably, the Emperor’s] rewards did not commensurate with [Masashige’s] contributions; his appointments did not match [Masashige’s]

---

334 Kusunoki was familiar with Buddhist sutras and might have studied classics such as the Analects, and possible knew Cheng-Zhu neo-Confucianism. Please see Uemura Seiji 植村清二, Kusunoki Masashige 楠木正成 (Tokyo: Shibundō至文堂, 1963):198-206.

335 That is the soldier that can really defense a country, which is an allusion to tuju 兔置 (the rabbit net) of Shijing.

336 The original two sentences contains two allusions respectively: xiongpi zhi meng 熊羆之夢 (the dream of bear and brown [grizzly?] bear) to kangwang zhi gao 康王之誥 (Announcement of King Kang) of Shangshu instead of to sigan 斯干 (that brook) of Shijing; and weixiao zhi qiu 惟肖之求 (look only for the resemblor) to yueming shang In 說命上 (Charge to Yue I) of Shangshu. Here I do not translate them separately but combine the meaning of the two sentences.

337 Zuzu 樽俎 are eating utensils. The former is used for containing spirit and latter for meat. They together represent banquets. This is to indicate the ease and quickness of winning with the help of Kusunoki as if a matter between changing from wine to meat.

338 Wanbang wei xian 萬邦為憲 (A pattern to all the States) is an allusion to liuyue 六月 (the Sixth Mouth) of Shijing.
calibers; his favorite lovers instigated in the inner court[^339], while imperious ministers arrogated decisions in the imperial court[^340]. [Under such situation], generals who could accomplish any achievement outside the court would be rare. [Kusunoki] offered his life for his moral integrity. He was a pure loyal minister[^341]. His death was not celebrated by his enemy but was conversely pitied. Those who rule, why not give some thoughts on this[^342]

楠正成像贊三首之二

好學宏論，尚仁義，務人才，真國家之柱石，疆場之干城。宜乎叶熊羆之夢、應惟肖之求。用能誓心天地，立摧叛逆。以之謀謨廟堂，制勝樽俎，豈不萬邦為憲，潛消反側耶？以寡制眾，出奇無窮，不戰而屈人，猶一節也。賞不酬功，位不稱才，女寵煽于內，權臣擅于朝，大將能立功於外者鮮矣！以身殉節，純臣乎！不為敵之所喜，而反為所惜，有國者盍思之！

[^339]: Zhu is referring to Emperor Go-Daigo’s consort, Prince Moriyoshi’s step-mother, Ano Yasuko 阿野廉子 (1301-1359).

[^340]: Such as Ashikaga Takauji 足利尊氏 (1305-1358, in office 1338-1358).

[^341]: The term *chunchen* 純臣 (pure loyal minister) is from Zuo’s commentary of the fourth year of the Duke of Yin of Lu 魯隱公四年左傳.

[^342]: After Kusunoki died, his head was well treated and was couriered back to his home town. (Taiheiki [太平記] quoted in Uemura, *Kusunoki Masashige*, 196)
The Eulogy for the Portrait of Kusunoki Masashige

(The Third Piece in ZSJ, 572)

Mighty was [our] general[^343^], his eminence could only be given birth by heaven.

Loyal and with grand stratagems, strict, impartial yet wise and benevolent[^344^].

A great aide bestowed by shangdi, powerfully he forestalled anyone.

Like a hawk that chases away birds[^345^], [the loyal Kusunoki] established his name with his great achievements.

Too bad the time he was in[^346^], when foxes and mice contended for dominance.

Being ordered to suppress the rebels, [he] responded by same night dispatchment.

Great plans and regularly reports despite he had made, [he] was still unable to conquer all resistsants[^347^].

[^343^]: Huanhuan 桓桓 is from mushi 牧誓 (the Oath at Mu) of Shangshu. For tingwei 廷尉, I think Shunshui used the term literally meaning the guard for the court, and not Qin and Han title for the equivalent of today’s Attorney General as seen in baiguan gongqing biao 百官公卿表 (A List of Titles and Descriptions of Dukes and Officers of All Ranks) in Hanshu 漢書 (the Book of Han).

[^344^]: I have switched the sentences order for the sake of rhyming here.

[^345^]: This is an allusion from the Zuo’s commentary of the eighteenth year of the Duke of Wen of Lu 魯文公十八年.

[^346^]: Buzao 不造 is from minyuxiaozi 閔予小子 of Shijing.

[^347^]: Xumou chengao 訡謀成告 is an abstraction from xu mou dingming, yuan you chengao 訥謀定命、遠猶辰告 from yi 抑 (Restrain) of Shijing.
[that is because] he was impeded by war plans in court, sanguinary battles helped no performance\textsuperscript{348}.

Running out of arrows and losing all men though he was, his heroic morale was bold enough to swallow those ferocious villains\textsuperscript{349}.

Confronted by the dilemma he had decided, compare to his country his life was a lighter determinant.

To famous Han Xin and Peng Yue\textsuperscript{350}, he Kusunoki was their companion\textsuperscript{351}.

Bravely he sure had fought that his spirit still, hovers from above light and brilliant. \textsuperscript{352}

楠正成像贊三首之三

桓桓廷尉，維天挺生。精忠偉略，智仁嚴明。帝賚良弼，奪人先聲。鷹鶻逐鳥，名立功成。遭時不造，狐鼠爭衡。詔公討逆，拜表星征，訏謨辰告，賊不足平。廟算掣肘，血戰鍧鍧。矢窮兵盡，氣吞鯢鯨。二難決計，殉國生輕。有雙國士，一姓韓彭。信勇戰烈，白雲英英。

\textsuperscript{348} \textit{honghong} 鍧鍧 is an onomatopoeia imitating the sound of swords and knives clashing.

\textsuperscript{349} \textit{nijing} 鯢鯨” (whale and giant salamander) are metaphors for cruelly malicious persons.

\textsuperscript{350} Both Han Xin 韓信 (230-196 BCE) and Peng Yue 彭越 (?-196 BCE) are famous Han generals who had helped founding the Han empire. The actual word Zhu used is not just companion, but family.

\textsuperscript{351} Zhu is playing with style here. In the First Piece, he said Kusunoki has no compare among the most outstanding figures in Japan (\textit{wushuang} 無雙, no match), but in this poem, he commended Kusunoki was in the family of Han and Peng (\textit{youshuang} 有雙, has match).

\textsuperscript{352} \textit{Bai yun yingying} 白雲英英 is from \textit{baihua} 白華 (White Flowers) of \textit{Shijing}.