Chapter 8

Korean Studies of Confucian Classics
1. **Introduction**

This report is an analysis of the research outcomes related to the Study of Confucian classics among the academic papers published in Korea in 2019. The selection criteria for the papers to be analyzed were: 1) papers on the study of Confucian classics that examine the annotations on the 13 classics (Shisanjing 十三經) written by Korean, Chinese, and Japanese scholars and 2) papers registered and selected for publication in the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) in 2019. The literature search yielded a total of 51 papers, listed below:


14. Kim Young-Ho, On Soonam Oh Jae-sun’s Collections of essential

15. Kim Yong-Cheun, The stipulation of ‘Shoufu(受服)’ after a funeral and Ritual studies argument, *Tae-Dong Yearly Review of Classics* 42, The Taedong Center for Eastern Classics, Hallym University


20. Bang In, The Problem of Contingency, Determinism and Free Will in Dasan Jeong Yagyong’s Interpretation of the Changes, *Korean Studies* 40, Korea Studies Adancement Center

21. Bang In, Chŏng Yag-yong’s cosmogonic idea and Matteo Ricci’s influence shown in his interpretation of the Zhouyi: A compromise between creationism and evolutionism, *Journal of Täsan Studies* 35, Tasan Cultural Foundation

22. Seo Geun-Sik, A Study on the Analysis Methodology of Yijing(周易)(II): Focused on the Contrast between the Jinjinanren(近畿南人) and Kim Jeong-hee(金正喜), *Journal of Korean Classics* 53, Institute Translation of Korea Classics

23. Seo Geun-Sik, Xinghuxuepai(星湖學派) process of the formation of
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the Dasan Jeong Yak-Yong Zhouyisijian(周易四箋) “Shiguazhuan(蓍卦傳)”, The Journal of Korean Philosophical History 60, The Society of Korean Philosophical History

24. Seo Geun-Sik, A Study in the Daxuehoushuo(大學後說) of the Ha-bin(河濱) Shin Hu-Dam(慎後聃), Journal of Yulgok-Studies 39, Yulgok Institute


26. Sim Soon-Ok, A Study on the Theoretical Differences in Jung-Jo(正祖)'s and Dasan’s Study, Studies in Confucianism 47, Confucianism Research Institute, Chungnam National University

27. AN Seung-Woo, A Study on the Characteristics of the Zheng Xuan(鄭玄)’s Interpretation on the Zhou Yi(周易) Using Li(禮) as a Concept of Immutability, Gong Ja Hak 37, The Korean Society of Gong Ja

28. AN Seung-Woo, A Study on the Thoughts of Li(禮) Shown in the Dasan(茶山)’s Interpretation on the Zhou Yi(周易), The Study of Confucian Philosophy and Culture 76, The Korean Society of Confucianism

29. An Yoo-Kyoung, A Study on Hosan(Park, Moon-ho)’s Daehakjanggusangsul(大學章句詳說), Journal of Yulgok-Studies 39, Yulgok Institute


31. Yoon Suk-Ho, Content Analysis on the Headnotes of the Sangseo jiwonrog[Boyu version], Han’guk Munhwa(Korean Culture) 85, Kyujanggak Institute for Korean Studies, Seoul National University
32. Yoon Suk–Ho, A Study on Zhouli Zhushu’s Interpretation about the Land System of Three Periods of Xia, Yin, Zhou, *Journal of Eastern studies* 106, Daedong Institute of Korean Studies, Sungkyunkwan University


37. LEE Eun–Ho, Misu Heo Mok’s Perspectives on *Shangshu*: oriented toward Governance from Confusion, *Studies in Confucianism* 47, Confucianism Research Institute, Chungnam National University


40. Lim Heon–Gyu, A Study on commentary and usage of righteousness and profit in Confucian analect, *Gong Ja Hak* 38, The Korean Society of Gong Ja
41. Lim Heon-Gyu, A Considerations on Chu-Hui & Dasan’s Commentary and Usage of Li (禮) in Confucian Analects, *Journal of Korean Philosophical Society* 152, Korean Philosophical Society


44. Jung Hae-Wang, An Comparison of the Interpretations of [the Great Learning] of Zhuxi, Wangshouren and Jung Yak-Yong, *Journal of Koreanology* 73, Korean Studies Institute, Pusan National University

45. Cho Hie-Young, The feature of Shim Daeyoon(沈大允)’s I–Ching in the Juyeogsanguijeombeob(周易象義占法), *Korean Classics Studies* 82, Research Institute of Korean Studies, Korea University


49. Hong You-Bin, The Restorative Characteristics in Dasan(茶山) and Bangsan(舫山)’s the Book of Songs(詩經) Theory and Its Meaning of the Historical Context of Confucianism, *DAEDONGHANMUNHAK* 60, DAEDONGHANMUN Institute

50. Hong You-Bin, The meaning of Hong Daeyong’s criticism about Kim
Chang-Hup’s Study on Shih-ching, *DAEDONGHANMUNHAK* 58, DAEDONGHANMUN Institute

51. Hwang In-Ok, A Study on the Monistic Interpretation of Wondu and Jigeun Presented in Dokseogijungyong, *Studies in Confucianism* 48, Confucianism Research Institute, Chungnam National University

The remainder of this report is organized in the following manner. First, for a clearer overview, these 51 selected papers are classified by two criteria: scholar and topic. The philosopher category is subdivided into papers covering Korean, Chinese, and Japanese Confucian scholars, and the topics category is divided into 13 classics. Second, three noteworthy papers are analyzed for each of the 13 classics. Third, the research outcomes of the study of Confucian classics published in 2019 are comprehensively reviewed. Last, a brief note on future research directions is presented.

2. Classification by scholar

Of the 51 papers on the study of Confucian classics, 46 provide scholarly views on the annotations of such works. They consist of 33 papers on Korean Confucian scholars, eight papers on Chinese Confucian scholars, four papers comparing Korean and Chinese Confucian scholars, and one paper comparing Korean and Japanese Confucian scholars.

1) Korean Confucian scholars

Of the 33 papers on Korean Confucian scholars’ views on Confucian classics, seven are by Dasan Jeong Yak-Yong, outnumbering all other scholars, followed by Kwon Geun, Kim Jang-Saeng, and Shin Hu-
Dam (two papers each). Thirteen scholars are covered by one paper each; chronologically, these scholars are Yi Eon‒Jeok, Yi Hwang, Jo Sik, Heo Mok, Yoon Hyu, Park Sedang, Eo Yu‒Bong, Oh Jae‒Sun, Shin Jak, Yi Kyu‒kyung, Shim Dae‒Yun, Jeon Wu, and Park Moon‒Ho. Six papers cover two scholars or schools of thought, namely Yi Eon‒Jeok and Yi I, Yi Hwang and Park Se‒Chae, Kim Chang‒Heup and Hong Dae‒Yong, King Jeongjo and Jeong Yak‒Yong, Jeong Yak‒Yong and Yoon Jeong‒Ki, and Kim Jeong‒Hi and Keun Ki‒Nam. One paper focuses on a school of thought, namely the Seongho school.

2) Chinese Confucian scholars

Eight papers cover the Confucian classics as expounded by Chinese Confucian scholars: one paper each for Zheng Xuan (鄭玄), Wang Bi (王弼), Wang Anshi (王安石), Zhu Xi (朱熹), and Lai Zhide (來知德); two papers comparing Zhu Xi and Qian Shi (錢時); and one paper comparing Zhao Qi (趙岐) and Zhu Xi.

3) Comparison of Korean, Chinese, and Japanese Confucian scholars

Four papers compare Korean and Chinese Confucian scholars: one paper each comparing Zhao Qi, Zhu Xi, Huang Zongxi (黃宗羲), Wang Fuzhi (王夫之), Jeong Yak‒Yong, and Jiao Xun (焦循); Shao Yong (邵雍), Zhu Xi, and Jeong Yak‒Yong; Zhu Xi and Jeong Yak‒Yong; and Zhu Xi, Wang Shouren (王守仁), and Jeong Yak‒Yong. One paper compares Korean and Japanese Confucian scholars: Ito Jinsai and Jeong Yak‒Yong.
3. Classification by topic

In a different section of this report, papers categorized by topic cover Confucian classics’ ideology, philosophy, politics and economics, education, and the like. In this section, each Confucian classic book is treated as the study topic when categorizing the papers by topic, taking into account the scholarly features of the thoughts expounded by the study of Confucian classics. Of the 51 papers selected, 49 cover Confucian classics. The Confucian classics studied most frequently are the Book of Changes(n=17), the Great Learning(n=9), Mencius(n=5), the Analects(n=4), the Book of Documents(n=4), Doctrine of the Mean(n=4), Classic of Poetry(n=3), Ceremonies and Rites(n=2), and Rites of Zhou(n=1).

4. Analysis of and commentary on major papers

1) On the Book of Changes

Regarding the Book of Changes(Yijing 易經 or Zhouyi 周易), Kim Young-Ho’s paper “On Soonam Oh Jae-sun’s Collections of Essential Points of Chou I: Focusing on the Hexagram of K’un and Gon” examines the interpretation of the Book of Changes provided by Oh Jae-sun(吳載純, pen name: Soonam 醴庵). This paper points out the structural characteristics of Soonam’s Yixue(易學, study of the Book of Changes): 1) no graphic representation of hexagrams; 2) importance attached to Xuguanzhuan(序卦傳, the order of the hexagrams), Zaguazhuan(雜卦傳, miscellaneous sayings on the hexagrams), and the entrance to the study of the Book of Changes; 3) presentation of new views on the author and the content of Ten Wings(十翼, a collection of commentaries
to the Book of Changes ascribed to Confucius); and 4) reorganization of punctuation, phrasing, and paragraphing of the existing versions of Ten Wings. As content–related characteristics, the author points out six salient features: 1) an understanding of the Book of Changes image (xiàng 象), time (shí 時), and righteousness (yì 義); 2) an understanding of the hexagram of Qian (乾) trigram as tian xing zhi xiang (天行之象), yang qi liu xing zhi xiang (陽氣流行之象), and tai yang zhao lin zhi xiang (太陽照臨之象); 3) pursuit of harmony between moral principle theory and image/number theory; 4) priority given to empirical exploration; 5) modification of original words in interpreting the Book of Changes; and 6) a novel interpretation of the words. The author also notes that Soonam’s interpretation of the Book of Changes involves not only its content, but also its implications for growing into a virtuous adulthood.

Another paper on the Book of Changes is An Seung–Woo’s “A Study on the Thoughts of Li (禮) Shown in Dasan (茶山)’s Interpretation on Zhou Yi (周易),” which examines the interpretation of the Book of Changes provided by Jeong Yak–Yong (丁若鏞, penname: Dasan 茶山). The author notes that Dasan provides examples to support his interpretation of the Book of Changes. Given that the first scholar who used examples from the Rites of Zhou (周禮 Zhōuli) and the ancient Zhou Dynasty (周代) to interpret the Book of Changes was Zheng Xuan (鄭玄), the author compared Zheng Xuan and Dasan. While both interpreted the Book of Changes through examples, Dasan criticized some of Zheng Xuan’s views regarding his interpretation of the meanings of the Book of Changes and the Rites of Zhou. Specifically, Dasan acknowledged only bianyi (變易) from the three meanings of the Book of Changes proposed by Zheng Xuan, namely yijian (易簡), bianyi (變易), and buyi (不易), dismissing the other two as fallacies. The author also noted that Dasan brought the practicable principles of Li (禮) to the fore in an effort to steer
people and society in a more positive direction, breaking away from the present errors and outdated customs, through the interpretation of the Book of Changes based on L by discovering the essential meaning of Li in linkage with the writing principles of the Book of Changes, i.e., rectifying things by correcting their defects and recovering the original form.

2) On the Great Learning(Daxue 大學)

Regarding the Great Learning(Daxue 大學), An Yoo-Kyoung’s paper “A Study on Hosan(Park, Moon‒ho)’s Daehakjanggusangsul(大學章句詳說)” closely examines the Great Learning as understood by Park Moon‒ho(朴文镐, penname: Hosan 壺山), which had previously not been very well studied. In terms of the salient features of Hosan’s interpretation of the Great Learning, the author points out that Hosan’s Daehakjanggusangsul(大學章句詳說) differentiates itself from Zhu Xi’s Daxuezhangju(大學章句) by broadly covering the views of Korean scholars in addition to Chinese scholars; clearly distinguishing between Er Cheng(二程, two Chens), Cheng Hao(程顥) and Cheng Yi(程頤); providing contextual clarification by underscoring the role of particles and pronouns; and deepening the content of Zhu Xi’s Daxuezhangju(大學章句) by interpreting Mingde(明德) and Wuge(物格). In particular, the author notes that Hosan made every effort in his Daehakjanggusangsul(大學章句詳說) to clearly understand each word and phrase within the context of the scripture. This was done through rigorous annotation work, and the author evaluates Hosan’s method as a genuine scholarly approach to studying Confucian classics, doing justice to Hosan’s reputation as the Joseon’s leading Confucian scholar comparable to that of the Joseon’s greatest compiler of Confucian classics.
Regarding the Book of Mencius (孟子), Chang Won-Ta’e’s paper “On Interpretations of Mengzi 8.19” compares the Iruha 19 interpretations of Zhao Qi (趙岐), Zhu Xi (朱熹), Huang Zongxi (黃宗羲), Wang Fuzhi (王夫之), Jeong Yak-Yong, and Jiao Xun (焦循). Chapter 19 of Lilouxia (離婁下, hereinafter Lilou II.19) covered in this paper is composed of six statements: 1) Humans differ from animals in very small ways (人之所以異於禽於獸者幾希); 2) What the mass of people cast away, virtuous men preserve (庶民去之，君子存之); 3,4) Emperor Shun clearly understood the working mechanisms of many things and closely observed the relationships of humanity (舜明於庶物，察於人倫); 5) He acted according to benevolence and righteousness (由仁義行); and 6) For this reason, he needed not act out benevolence and righteousness (非行仁義也). The author ascribes the differences existing in the interpretation of Lilou II.19 to the understanding of four questions: (1) Do humans and animals share the same nature? (2) What is the object of protection? (3) Is the Emperor Shun included in the Junzi mentioned in the text? (4) What is the relationship between acting according to benevolence and righteousness and acting out benevolence and righteousness? The author compares different interpretations provided by the aforementioned scholars as follows: Zhu Xi interpreted Question 1 based on the similarities of humans and non-humans while all others presented interpretations based on differences between humans and non-humans. Despite this difference, most annotators paid more attention to the differences in mind than in nature when explaining Mencius’ statement on the difference between humans and animals. Regarding Question 2, Zhu Xi, Wang Fuzhi, and Jiao Xun considered heavenly principles or human orders worthy of preservation, whereas the focus was the mind for Lu Jiuling (陸九齡), Huang Zongxi (黃宗羲), and Jeong Yak-Yong. Different opinions
as to whether Emperor Shun was meant to be Junzi (君子, virtuous man) in Lilou II.19 (Question 3) constitute the background of Question 4, whereby scholars following Yin Tun (尹焞) and Zhu Xi differentiated between Emperor Shun and Junzi and by assigning the stages of acting according to benevolence and righteousness and acting out benevolence and righteousness, respectively. However, with the exception of Yin Tun and Zhu Xi, most annotators did not differentiate between Junzi and sage (Emperor Shun) and did not regard acting according to benevolence and righteousness and acting out benevolence and righteousness as two development stages, but as a matter of right and wrong.

4) On the Analects (Lunyu 論語)

Regarding the Analects (論語 Lúnyǔ), Kang Kyung-Hyun’s paper “The Purpose and Significance of Noneosangseol Compilation: Recomposition of Zhuxi’s Letters for Understanding Analects” examines Noneosangseol (論語詳説) as completed by Eo Yu-bong (魚有鳳, penname: Kiwon 杞園). This paper assesses the significance of Noneosangseol based on two dimensions of Joseon’s chronicle of interpretation of Zhu Xi’s Lunyujizhu (論語集註) and reading of Jujadaejeon (朱子大全). The author assesses Noneosangseol as a book compiling Zhu Xi’s works about the Analects in which Zhu Xi’s endeavors to completely and correctly understand the Analects are brought to the fore. The author also notes that Noneosangseol selects, classifies, and reorganizes Zhu Xi’s writings according to the specific topic of the Analects, showing an advanced approach to interpreting Jujadaejeon. The author adds that Noneosangseol, which was written over the course of solving the interpretation problems of Noneojipjudaejon (論語集註大全) and Jujadaejeon, extended the scope of references to Jujadaejeon in interpreting Noneojipju and established a clear standard for the approach to Zhu Xi’s interpretation of the Analects.
in relation to reading Jujadaejeon in Joseon’s Neo–Confucianism. In this respect, Noneosangseol can be considered a work by which we can gauge the depth and scope of the Neo–Confucian interpretation of Confucian classics performed in Joseon.

5) On the Book of Documents (Shujing 書經)

Lee Eun–Ho’s paper “Misu Heo Mok’s Perspectives on Shangshu: Oriented toward Governance from Confusion” examines the understanding of the Book of Documents (書經 Shūjing) provided by Heo Mok (許穆, penname: Misu 眉叟). The author ascribes Joseon’s prolific period of the Study of Confucian classics starting from the 17th century in terms of literature and schools of thoughts starting from the 17th century to the appearance of scholars critical to Jujahak based on a sufficient understanding of Seonglihak [both Seonglihak and Jujahak traditions in Joseon are translated into Neo–Confucianism]. The author refers to Misu as a scholar positioned between orthodox critical Neo–Confucianism camps who understood the world and history as having a dual structure of governance (治) and confusion (亂) and who incessantly strived to overcome chaos and establish order. He also attends to Misu’s interest in pre–Qin (先秦) Confucianism shown in his study of ancient literature (古文) and six Confucian classics (六經), especially in the Book of Documents (書經 Shujing), the heritage of the era of Sage–Kings (聖王). The author commends Seoseol (書說), Misu’s reading notes of the Book of Documents, as a good explanation of the dual worldview of governance and confusion (治亂). He assesses Seoseol, which consists of 20 chapters (one on overview, 10 on governance, and nine on confusion), as Misu’s endeavor to overcome confusion (reign of chaos) and establish governance (reign or order), pointing out that Misu presented four ways of overcoming the chaotic time of Joseon of the 17th century he lived
in: King’s Susin(修身, cultivating moral character), establishment of an efficient civil service system(官制) and recruitment of competent officials, virtuous and wise governance, and proper punishment(刑罰).

6) On the Doctrine of the Mean(Zhongyong 中庸)

Regarding the Doctrine of the Mean, Hwang In–Ok’s paper “A Study on the Monistic Interpretation of Wondu and Jigeun Presented in Dokseogijungyong” examines the Doctrine of the Mean as understood by Yoon Hyu(尹鑴, penname: Baekho 白湖). The author interpreted Baekho’s Wondu(原頭) as the heavenly origin, i.e., Cheonmyeong(天命, fate or providence), and Jigeun(至近) as the attitude of Junzi to pursue self-cultivation(為己) by becoming aware of Wondu and serving heaven(事天) in awe of heaven(畏天). That is, Wondu becomes the heavenly path(天道), and Gigeun the human path(人道). According to Baekho’s interpretation, Cheonmyeong does not exist separately in a high and far dimension but exists in the abode of Wondu, which can be concretized only when humans realize the doctrine of the mean. Thus, Baekho explains the interlinkage of Wondu and Jigeun and the presence of Wondu inherent in Gigeun.

From his perception of Wondu and Gigeun sprouting from the same origin, Baekho’s interpretation of the Doctrine of the Mean reflects the organic integration of heaven, every creature, and human beings. Baekho believed that heaven is for humans and vice versa and each person is for others and vice versa and further, that the heavenly path is no separate path, but realizable through the realization of Gigeun, which is the goal of the Doctrine of the Mean. Baekho was also of the opinion that one can serve heaven(事天) only after preserving the mind and nourishing the inner nature(存心養性) and that heaven and earth can stand in harmony and all creatures can thrive(天地位萬物育) based on moral conduct,
insisting that if humans fail to orient their life toward moral realization, heaven will have its own way of working independently of humans. The author interprets Baikho’s interpretation of the Doctrine of the Mean, giving more emphasis to Gigeun, the matter of human endeavors, than to Wondu, the matter of heaven, as his measure for inducing voluntary and active realization of humanity.

7) On the Classic of Poetry (Shijing 詩經)

Regarding the Classic of Poetry (Shijing 詩經), Hong You-Bin’s paper “The Meaning of Hong Daeyong’s Criticism about Kim Chang-Hup’s Study on Shih-ching” analyzed Shijeonbyeonui (詩傳辨疑) of Hong Dae-yong (洪大容, penname: Damheon 湛軒). The author explores the salient features and significance of Damheon’s criticism of the Shijeonbyeonui part of the study of Shijing by Kim Chang-Heup (金昌翕, penname: Samyeon), who is Damheon’s elder in the same scholarly lineage of Nakron in Noron. According to the author, Samyeon’s Study of Shijing is partially estranged from Zhu Xi; Damheon tends to interpret Shijing within the scope of Zhu Xi’s study of Shijing while partially accepting Samyeon’s study of Shijing regarding the understanding of individual poems or overall interpretation of classics. According to the author’s assessment, Samyeon has an open outlook with regard to scholarly attitudes and ways of thinking, while Danheon’s outlook has more moderate and conservative aspects. More specifically, according to Damheon’s assessment of Samyeon’s 34 propositions, 11 were appropriate, 10 were partially appropriate, and 13 were inappropriate; that is, Damheon agreed to about 30% of Samyeon’s propositions and considered 70% to be in error and needing to be supplemented or rectified. From this, the author concluded that Damheon adopted an approach to select more appropriate views while maintaining a well-intended balance between Zhu Xi and Samyeon,
tending to lean toward Zhu Xi when he disagreed with Samyeon in part or in whole, prioritizing Zhu Xi over Samyeon.

8) On the Ceremonies and Rites (Yili 儀禮)

Regarding the Ceremonies and Rites (Yili 儀禮), Cha Seo–Yeon's paper “A Study on the Shapes of Sanggwan(喪冠): Focused of Jeong Yakyong's Sangboksang(喪服商) of Sangaesajeon(喪禮四箋)” examines Sanggwan(喪冠, mourning hat) with a focus on Dasan's Sangboksang(喪服商). The author explores the various shapes of Sanggwan(喪冠) among different components of Sangbok(Sangfu 喪服, mourning dress) as presented by Dasan. The Sangfu part of the Ceremonies and Rites had been handed down from generation to generation and adhered to by descendants as rules determined by Confucian classics; thus, Joseon's mourning apparel system was presumably based on the Jiali(家禮, Family Rites) written by Zhu Xi, taking into account Sangfu and the customs of the Song period. Dasan is assessed to have presented creative forms of Sanggwan based on an elaborate study of the Ceremonies and Rites preceding Zhu Xi's Jial while abiding by Jiali. Like any hat, Sanggwan carries a symbolic meaning emphasizing the importance of the head. It comprises the part covering the crown of the head(Guan 冠) and the part surrounding the head(Wu 武). Since Zheng Xuan(鄭玄) noted that Wu is made with one string, Sanggwan could not function as a hat, and the author presumes that Geon(Jin 巾, cloth) was used to fix one's hair and hat. Dasan argues that Sanggwan should be arranged based on the Byeon(弁) system because Sangbok was Byeonbok(弁服) in the ancient rites; he also contends that Sanggwan was not described in detail because Byeonbok(弁服) applies to Sangbok mutatis mutandis, with the material and size of Guan(冠) and Wu(武) coinciding with those of Byeon. Regarding the missing section of the Ceremonies and Rites, Dasan suggests that since Joseon's court
costume(朝服) and ceremonial garment(祭服) correspond to Byeonbok(弁服) in the ancient rites, Sanggwan should thus be made in the same manner as Yanggwan(梁冠). This suggestion by Dasan is evaluated as the results of his efforts to rectify Zheung Xuan’s erroneous interpretation of one-stringed Wu and to solve the resultant problems by elucidating this fact through an elaborate review of the ancient rites wherein Sanggwan has the same material and size as Byeonbok. Dasan’s effort is also assessed as an attempt to enhance adherence to rites by allowing Joseon people to make Sanggwan in shapes that are familiar to them and are easier to fabricate.

5. Evaluation and Outlook

One of the most important tasks for the Korean study of Confucian classics is describing the history of the study of Confucian classics for each classic with the goal of compiling a comprehensive and detailed history of the Korean study of Confucian classics. To this end, it is necessary to continue research on scholars of Confucian classics thus far unstudied. In this respect, it can be said that the Korean study of Confucian classics underwent a significant harvest in 2019. For example, research outcomes on Eo Yu-Bong’s study of the Analects, Oh Jae-sun’s study of the Book of Changes, and Park Moon-ho’s study of the Great Learning, which have rarely been studied thus far, are significant achievements. It is hoped that this trend of exploring the works of scholars of Confucian classics who remain unstudied will continue.