Chapter 9

Studies of Modern Confucianism In Korea
1. Introduction

A total of 30 papers have been published on modern Confucianism in Korea, broken down into 10 papers on Neo-Confucianism (Seonglihak 性理學 in Korea, Songminglixue 宋明理學 in China, also known as Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism), 10 papers on the Yangming School (Yangmyeonghak/Yangmingxue 阳明學, also known as Xinxue 心學 or Lu-Wang Neo-Confucianism), and 10 papers on other schools. Broken down by topic, 10 papers are about philosophy, 5 about the theory of Confucian reformation argument, 2 about the discourse of civilization, and the remaining 13 papers cover other Confucianism-related thoughts or activities. Most of the papers on Neo-Confucianism cover different schools of Neo-Confucianism, such as the Hwaseo School, Hanju School, Ganjae School, and Nosa School, focusing on their respective thinkers and successors. More specifically, they discuss school-specific interpretations of the main theories of Neo-Confucianism, such as theories of li-qi(理氣), xinxing(心性), mingde(明德), and xinshuo(心說), and the genealogy of each tradition. Also covered is Song Jun-pil, who sought a consensus on the debates among different Neo-Confucian schools. Specific topics covered include the role of Confucianism as an ideological rationale for the anti-Japanese movement during the Japanese occupation period with a focus on the succession and refinement of Neo-Confucianism in the late Joseon period, foregrounding various Confucian features in the modern age such as the religionization of Confucianism, the theory of Confucian reformation, and the formation of a Confucian platform. The movement of religionization of Confucianism was driven by self-reflection and a will to reform from within, not by the passive and formal conformity with the trends of modern religions. Research on the theory of Confucian reformation was conducted in the Yangming School more intensively than that of Neo-Confucianism. Park Eun-sik is still studied
in research on the theory of Confucian reformation. A study exploring the interface between Yangminghak and Neo–Confucianism based on the key words Silsim(實心 sincere mind) and Silhak(實學 practical learning) is a noteworthy contribution in the Korean history of thought. A series of studies extends the scope of research of modern Korean Yangminghak to East Asian scholars and traditions, breaking away from a frame limited to Park Eun–sik and Jeong In–bo. These studies, which drew attention to a facet of modern Confucianism in Korea that differentiates itself from modern Chinese or Japanese Confucianism in an overpowering imperialist academy, allow us to expect more follow–up comparative studies of Korean, Chinese, and Japanese modernization trajectories and the Confucian response to modernization, which have been overlooked in the shadow of the generality and specificity of civilization or modernity discourse. Noteworthy among the papers covering topics other than Neo–Confucianism and the Yangming School are those delving into the Confucian perceptions of the modern Confucian intellectuals expressed through modernist newspapers or journals published by them, the spiritual value of Confucianism behind the anti–Japanese movement, the Confucian thoughts reflected in the discourse of civilization, and the Confucian views of women shown in the materials related to modern women’s education.

2. Classification by School of Thought

1) Neo–Confucianism


Two trends of research on Neo-Confucianism in Korea were observed: 1) the extension to new scholars in studies on the genealogy of different schools of Joseon Neo-Confucianism centering on the Hanju School, Nosa School, Hwaseo School, and Ganjae School and 2) a conspicuous research approach to foreground Neo-Confucian theories as the practical basis for an anti-Japanese movement as well as the xinshuo(心說 morality) dispute and scripture interpretation around the turn of the 19th century. In addition to papers on the thoughts of Jeong Tae-jin and Lee Seung-hee(Hanju School), Kim Pyeong-muk and Yoo Jung-gyo(Hwaseo School), Lee Hyeon-Oh(Nosa School), and Kim Jun-Yeong and Choe Myeong-hee(Ganjae School), Lim Heon-hoe, who passed down his teaching to Ganjae, and Song Jun-pil who asserted Simheolikiseol(Xinheqishuo 心合理氣說, theory of human mind as the combination of li and qi), were also studied, thus succeeding Yi Hwang. One paper revisited the life and teachings of Nambung, a Yeongnam-based Confucian scholar who sought pragmatic implementation of Neo-Confucianism in daily lives on the one hand and religionization of Confucianism on the other amid a theological flood.

Kwon Oh-Young attended to the ideological trait of Jeong Tae-jin’s Silhak of Gyeongsechiyong(經世致用, public administration and practical usage) by seeking practical benefits with a sincere mind, thus succeeding Yi Hwang’s Juliron(Zhulilun 主理論, theory of supremacy of li over qi) and Yi Jin-sang’s Simjeukliseol(Xinjilishuo 心卽理說 theory of mind-li concurrence). Applying an exegetical approach to the analysis of Ganjae’s
Jungyonggieui(中庸記疑), Gil Tae-eun pointed out that it provided the philosophical basis for Jonseong(Zunxing 尊性, human dignity) of Seongsasimje(Xingshixindi 性師心弟, master-disciple relationship between human nature and mind). The content of this paper was deepened in the doctoral thesis “A Study of Ganjae Jeonu’s thoughts on Confucian Classics: with focus on Saseogangseol”(Jeonbuk National University, 2020), thereby characterizing Ganjae’s hermeneutics of classics as theories of learning(Daehakgieui 大學記疑), human nature(Jungyongtieui 中庸記疑), Daoism(Doknoneo 讀論語), and cultivation(Dilmaengja 讀孟子). The morality dispute(心說論爭) initiated by Jeonu of the Nakhak School and Yoo Jung-gyo of the Hwaseo School continued until the early 20th century with the involvement of the Hanju School and Nosa School. Kim Geun-Ho pointed out that the self-cultivation argument(Suyangron/ Xiuyanglun 修養論) of the Hwaseo School represented by Yoo Jung-gyo justified human morality and moral duties and theorized the self-cultivating effect of moral implementation. Kim Bong-gon noted that not only did Yi Hyeon-oh, a Yeongnam-based Confucian scholar who succeeded the Nosa School and maintained an extensive exchange with the Hwaseo School, succeeded Nosa’s Li-il bunsuseol(liyifenshushuo 理一分殊説, theory of one li and many manifestations), but he also adopted Yi Jin-sang’s Simjeukdileol(Xinjilishuo 心卽理説 theory of mind-li concurrence). Kim You-gon ascertained that Kim Jun-Yeong, who succeeded Ganjae’s theory of mind(simseol/xinshuo 心說) that Li(理) is inactive and Qi(氣) is active, regarded true intention(bonsim/benxin 本心) and highest virtue(myeongdeok/mingde 明德) as Li and criticized Yi Hang-Ro and Yoo Jung-gyo’s theory of mind that the nature of mind is also Li. Kim Jong-Seok presented a case of the 20th-century preservation of Confucian ideology based on Four Beginnings and Seven Feelings(sadanchiljeong/ Siduanqiqing 四端七情) and theories of li-qi and xin-xing(likisinseong-ron/lqiqixinxing-lun(理氣心性論), thereby using Nambung’s Haeju’illok,
and examined the theological basis for the movement toward the religionization of Confucianism. Lim Heon-hoe, a Confucian scholar representing the mid-19th-century Neo-Confucianism of the Nakron Linage of the Kiho School, set out the basis for moral actions at the mind level by differentiating between mind and disposition and sought to establish the orthodoxy of Joseon Neo-Confucianism as brought forth by the Nakron Linage by asserting a supremacy of qi over li in inherent human nature (Mingdezhuqi vs. Mingdezhuli). Yoo Ji-woong noted that Lim Heon-hoe’s philosophical thoughts served as the theoretical basis for Jeonu’s criticism of the Hwaseo School, Nosa School, and Hanju School. Lee Gyu-Pil closely examined the Seongju-based Confucian scholars who led the petition to the Paris Peace Conference and actively participated in the March 1st Movement and shed light on the scholarly origin and spirit of loyalty of Song Jun-pil, who argued that the human mind is the combination of li and qi (Simheolikiseol/ Xinheliqishuo 心合理氣說). Lim Jong-jin noted that Daoism is the underlying philosophy for Lee Seung-hee’s commitment to the anti-Japanese movement; he succeeded Yi Jin-sang’s theory of supremacy of li over qi (Juliron/Zhulilun 主理論) based on the spirit of social engagement. Choi Young-Sung found that the scholarship and thoughts of ideas of Ganjae’s writer Choe Myeong-hee were based on Xiaoxue (小學, Book of Elementary Learning) and ignited by the spirit of loyalty.

2) Yangming School

Research Institute.


Yangminghak–related papers were also centered around Park Eun–sik and Jeong In–bo, with research methods and topics significantly diversified. Individual topics can be roughly categorized into three areas: 1) Park Eun–sik’s Confucian reformation argument, 2) Jeong In–bo’s Joseon Yangming School genealogical grouping and its relevance to Joseonhak(Joseon Studies), and 3) comparative studies of Liang Qichao(梁啓超) and Park Eun–sik, Takahashi and Jeong In–bo, Jeong In–bo and Schleiermacher, and so on. The point that Jung In–bo’s thoughts contributed to the formation of the identity of “Joseon” as the ideological foundation for the movement of Joseon Studies provides a clue to rectify the severed perception of the history of modern Korean thought. Moreover, the comparative study of Liang Qichao(梁啓超) and Takahashi is remarkable in that it expanded the perspective on the history of modern Korean thought biased toward the theory of modernity or discourse of civilization and proposed a new research perspective.

In the paper “Multi–level Implications of Practical Learning Based on the Sincere Mind in the Transition Period of the Modern Age,” Kim Yun–kyeong suggested that the Yangminghak–based Silhak of sincere mind was not dominated exclusively by the Hagok School by comparing it to that of Neo–Confucian scholars such as Gwak Jong–seok and Jeonu, analyzing that the former sought to establish subjectivity and the latter universality. On this note, in the paper “Theoretical Ground of Joseonhak(Korean
Studies) Written by Jeong In-bo from the Perspective of Modern East Asia,” the same author argued that Jeong In-bo’s Joseonhak was characterized by Joseon-centered subjective traits as opposed to Japan’s chauvinistic national studies, China’s xenophobic patriotism represented by Zhang Binglin (章炳麟), and Choe Nam-seon’s Joseonhak trapped in alterity. Noh Kwan-beom demonstrated that Park Eun-sik’s theory of Confucian reformation emerged in consequence to accepting Liang Qichao’s Moral Education Guide (Deokyukgam/Deyujian 德育鑑) as the solution in proper learning and savior consciousness. Shin Hyung-seung derived Jeong In-bo’s views of history and learning from the latter’s Yangmyeonghak-Yeonron and explained the descriptive characteristics of Sino-Korean Yangminghak history and its implications for modern academia. Lee Nan-su reviewed the notions of Shin Chae-ho’s “self” (我), Park Eun-sik’s “national soul” (國魂), and Jeong In-bo’s “spirit” (eol) from the perspective of establishing national subjectivity and identity.

In the paper “Revitalized Yangming School in Colonial Modernity: Is Jung Inbo’s Yangmyeonghak Yeonron Countering Takahashi’s History of Korean Thoughts?,” Yi Hye-gyung evaluated Jeong In-bo’s Yangminghak as Joseonhak and Silhak seeing a recovery of genuine Confucianism, criticizing Takahashi’s “Joseon Stagnated in Zhu Xi Studies” while adopting Tetsujiro’s Japanese narrative of “From Zhuxi to Yangming Studies.” In the paper “From Tianxia to Nation State: The Whereabouts of Universal Principles in Pak Únsik and Liang Qichao,” the same author compared and analyzed the ideological trajectories of Park Eun-sik and Liang Qichao, who lost the essence of Chineseism as a general principle. Comparing Jeong In-bo and Schleiermacher, Han Sang-yeon argued that they have commonalities in ontological and epistemological understandings in that the latter acknowledges the sensory and affective interactions between our consciousness and the outer world, not countering each other, as our reaction to our existence as an entity in
fundamental unity with the world.

The remaining two papers present an overview of the Korean Yangminghak research history and future research direction, which allows us to realize the sizeable knowledge base of the Yangming School, which was built by Korean academics. Kim Se-jeong performed a quantitative analysis of the research outcomes regarding Yangming Studies from the 1970s up to now and presented tasks and outlooks. Kim Yong-jae noted that Yangminghak–related research now needs to extend its boundaries from the Hagok School or Gangwha School, suggesting the relationship between the Seongho School’s evaluation of Yangminghak and Seohak as one of the research topics. Both authors make proposals for the direction of Yangminghak–related research with the aim of establishing “Modern Yangming Studies in Korea” as an independent discipline.

3) Others


Out of the 30 papers published in 2019 regarding modern Confucianism in Korea, 10 papers on topics other than Neo–Confucianism and the Yangming School cover a wide variety of Confucianism–related topics including the theory of Eastern moral and Western material(東道西器論), enlightenment, the spirit of anti–Japanese fidelity, the movement of Confucian religionization, the modern Confucian platform, and
modern Confucian views on women. Park Jeong-sim analyzed the Hwangseong Shinmun to examine the self-reflection and limitations of Confucian intellectuals. Editors of the Hwangseong Shinmun had the cultural-historical transformative task of seeking to establish a modern state system and steering away from Sinocentrism. The author criticized the adoption of the Japan-centered orientalism without proper reflection on Confucianism's self-reform attempt toward national identity and civilization while rejecting literary monks and emphasizing practical studies. Park Joon-won highlighted Gwak Jong-seok's leading discipline and Lee Ki-su's commitment to the independence movement and the spirit of fidelity demonstrated in “Praise of a Patriotic Martyr” (殉國義士贊). Park Tae-ok argued that Yu Gil-jun, who was mainly discussed only in the context of enlightenment and civilization ideology, did not pursue de-Confucianism, but strove to reproduce Confucian traditions and values in tune with modernity. Shim Eui-yong evaluated the modern implications of Kim Yun-sik's theory of Eastern morals and Western material (東道西器論) with zest for universality based on traditional ideas. An Seung-woo ascribed the Confucian reformist Lee Byung-hun's recognition of Dongyi to his attempt to enhance cultural and national identity of Koreans through the origin of the Confucian civilization in East Asia. Lee Su-jin and Kim Youny discovered Kim Pyeong-muk's Booin-Sooji (婦人須知 [Book for Women's Lessons], 1941) and examined the circumstances in which Confucian moral norms were taught to women at that time. Lee Jung-min examined the differences of Jang Ji-yeon's Yeoja Dokbon from traditional women's instruction guidelines and noted that the former reflects the changes of the times, showing different images as a mother and spouse, that is, from a daughter-in-law who serves the family to a mother serving the nation and disciplining the children and from a role following the distinction between husband and wife to a spouse performing an equal role. Choi Young-sung evaluated Lee Byeong-do's (李丙薰: 1896–1989)
“Rough Copy of Data on the History of Korean Confucianism” as a resource comparable to Hyeon Sang-yun’s “History of Korean Confucian Studies,” published in 1949, in deriving the research patterns and characteristics of modern Confucian studies in Korea. Choi Jeong-jun found that Lee Byeong-heon’s Goae-Byeon(卦變) and Chaek-Su(策數) theory brought forth in Yeongkyeonggeummungo(易經今文考) from the perspective of Geummun-Kyeonghak(Jinwen-Jingxue 今文經學) is based on Seogwae(筮卦) logic, striving for Zhong(中), the core value of the Book of Changes. Hwang Tae-muk explored the character of literati communities and the Confucian network centering on the Honam Academic Society of the Seoul-based Honam intellectuals and its journal and examined the characteristics of the discourse platform.

3. Classification by Topic

1) Philosophy

In modern Confucian studies in Korea, 10 papers were classified into the field of philosophy. Among the philosophical discourse in the field of Neo-Confucianism studies on different schools and the ideological and practical aspects of their successors centered around the morality dispute(心說論爭) from the 19th century to the Japanese occupation period, centering on profound debates, a hermeneutic approach as can be found in the study on Ganjae Jeonu gained a foothold as one of the important research methods. In the field of the Yangming School, a long-awaited departure from the person-centered research trend can be observed. Representative in this trend are Kim Yun-kyeong’s paper in which the notions of silsim(sincere mind) as used by Neo-Confucianism and the Yangming School in the context of Silhak are juxtaposed, Yi
Hye-gyung’s paper in which differentiation from Chinese or Japanese trajectories of the history of thought is attempted, and Han Sang-yeon’s paper comparing Yangminghak and Western philosophy in terms of epistemology and ontology. Even though Park Eun-sik and Jeong In-bo are still the main foci of research, these studies are significant in that they opened the door to various philosophical interpretations by drawing attention to the need to re-examine the history of Korean modern thought from the perspective of the history of East Asian modern thought and comparing and analyzing Jeong In-bo’s thoughts from the phenomenological viewpoint.

2) Theory of Confucian reformation

The movement of religionization of Confucianism belongs to the theories of Confucian reformation in a broader sense. The Confucian religion and Taigeuk religion are representative of this movement. The religionization movement at that time was greatly influenced by Kang Youwei. On the other hand, Nambung focused on educational function rather than faith although he built churches, and on practicing the universal truths of Confucianism in contrast to the patriotic and national pursuit characteristic of Kang Youwei’s Confucian religion movement. The foundation was Cheng–Zhu–Lihak. In this respect, Nambung’s criticism of both Gwak Jong-seok’s Shimjeukli(mind is li) and Yoo Jung-gyo’s Shimjeukki(mind is qi) as theories trapped in the theory of mind was based on his reverence of Jeongja’s teaching “A sage is grounded in heaven and a buddha in the mind.” In contrast, Lee Byeong-heon’s Confucian religionization movement has a very strong ethnographic orientation, as shown by his recognition of Dongyi. By taking Fuxi, Shun, and Confucius as their ancestors, they attempted to link Confucianism with the roots of Korean national and cultural identity but faced the accusation
by Confucian scholars of altering history and blaspheming sages. Both Nambung and Lee Byeong-heon advocated Confucian religionization to cope with the crisis of Confucianism in the course of the transition to the modern era, but they differed in the concrete methods used to realize and defend the truth. Park Jeong-shim Park and Hwang Tae-muk studied the Confucian discourses of Confucian literati in general using newspapers and academic journals, distinguishing themselves from other researchers who focused on specific scholars. Both authors have the same research objectives in that they examine the perception of Confucian intellectuals about their tasks of the times and the role of Confucianism. They only differ in their respective specializations, with the former on the analysis of Confucianism-related discourses in the Hwangseong Shinmun and the latter on the characteristics of a Confucian platform centered around the literati network involved in Honam Academic Society such as the Nosa School, Hwaseo School, Ganjae School, and Hayngyo literati. In modern Confucian studies in Korea, media research is only in its beginning stage, and its methodology leaves much room for improvement. Nevertheless, considering that the main characteristic of the transition to the modern era is the development of media and that many Confucian intellectuals who advocated Confucian reform actively used modern media such as newspapers and journals, media-based research is essential for modern Confucian studies in Korea, and follow-up studies are expected.

3) Discourse on civilization

Two papers covered the discourse on civilization: Yu Gil-jun’s ideas on enlightenment and Kim Yun-sik’s theory of Eastern morals and Western material (東道西器論). Yu Gil-jun was selected as the most influential socialist thinker in Joseon by the 1920s magazine Gaebyeok. At that time, enlightenment was a synonym for civilization, and its core content
was close to Westernization. However, Park Tae-ok argues that Yu Gil-jun, who was greatly influenced by Fukuzawa Yukichi, attempted a self-directed enlightenment stemming from the Confucian ideology instead of breaking with Confucian traditions on account of the concurrence of a Confucian ideal world and the blueprint of a human image combining the attitude of Confucian studies and an awareness of reality (Gyeokmulchiji/ Gewuzhizhi 格物致知) as well as a daily renewal (日新) on the one hand and realizing freedom and a consensus in community based on moral responsibilities on the other. Raising the question regarding the implication of the logic of the theory of Eastern morals and Western material (東道西器論), which pursued a realization of Western civilization while maintaining Asian spiritual values, in the modern era where the East and West merge, Shim Eui-yong traced the process of adaptation of Kim Yun-sik's theory of Eastern morals and Western material, attending to an open attitude of pursuing a higher universality by understanding differences.

4) Others

There are 13 papers covering other very diverse topics. From individual scholars such as Jeong Tae-jin, Song Jun-pil Song, Lee Seung-hee, and Choe Myung-hee, to the study of Myeonwoo linage in the Geochang region, the scholarship and thoughts of Confucian intellectuals who spearheaded the Enlightenment and anti-Japanese movements have become the central theme of modern Confucian studies in Korea. Two papers review the research history of the Korean Yangming School, which rose to the status of a full-fledged research area in the early 1970s, and present an outlook for future study. Kim Se-jeong presents the list of the studies on the Yangming School in Korea as an appendix based on a quantitative analysis by period and classification by topic. Kim Yong-
jae, who emphasized the expansion of research “From Hagok School to Korean Yangming School,” points to the Sungho School’s criticism of the Yangming School and its relationship with Catholicism by way of example. This proposal is in line with the problem awareness of Jeong In–bo, who expressed difficulties in establishing the genealogy of the Yangming School in Korea. As many as three papers directly examine Jeong In–bo. One paper compares Shin Chae–ho’s “self” (我) and Park Eun–sik’s “spirit” (eol) in terms of the problem of the Yangming School’s genealogy and the ideological foundation of Joseonhak. In fact, “Joseonhak,” as proposed by Choe Nam–seon in the 1920s, was an academic movement seeking to establish the origin and identity of Joseon, as shown by the priority given to the historical and cultural evidence of Dangun. The paper by Kim Yun–kyeong and Lee Nan–su highlights the ideological value of Jeong In–bo in pioneering the Joseonhak movement and planning modern subjectivity, thus clarifying the link between the Korean Yangming School and the Joseonhak movement.

4. Analysis and Review of Major Papers

A paper by a researcher of the Yangming School in Korea, “Various Problems of Yangminghak Studies in Korea: Based on the Expansion from the ‘Hagok School’ to the ‘Yangming School in Korea’ and the Relationship Between Silhak and Catholicism Along with Their Modernity” (Kim Yong–jae, 2019), contains various proposals worthy of attention. However, it tends to overemphasize its aspect of Korea’s Yangming School subjugated by Cheng–Zhu Neo–Confucianism in its early development stage. Of course, the historical fact is that the Yangming School was dismissed as heresy by Neo–Confucian scholars, including Toegye; however, viewing the development of the Korean
Yangming School from the perspective of indoctrination and ideological repression by Cheng–Zhu Neo–Confucianism undermines the correct understanding of the Korean history of thought. As mentioned by the author, a number of Confucian scholars studied the Yangming School, defying limited freedom of thought, and integrated it into their own system of thought. Furthermore, viewing the development of the history of thought from a broader horizon contributed to a deepening of philosophical reasoning by sharpening this thought, as demonstrated in the morality dispute in the late Joseon period.

In this respect, there is a compelling need for problem awareness and research, as shown in the paper “Multi–level Implications of Practical Learning Based on the Sincere Mind in the Transition Period of the Modern Age.” Noteworthy here is the examination of the implication of the term “Silsim Silhak” (practical learning based on the sincere mind) used by both Neo–Confucianism and the Yangming School, starting from the premise that the term does not exclusively pertain to the Yangming School. The author points out: “Silsim Silhak as understood by the Yangming School and Cheng–Zhu Neo–Confucianism in the course of the transition to the modern era were oriented toward the establishment of subjectivity and universality, respectively. That is, the differing implication for Silsim Silhak led to the differences in theory and pattern of pragmatic implementation.” In “Ideological Foundation of Jeong In–bo’s Joseonhak Viewed from the Horizon of Modern East Asia,” the author argued that Jeong In–bo’s thought was oriented toward the establishment of “Joseon–centered subjective Joseonhak,” in contrast to Choe Nam–sun, who emphasized the uniqueness and superiority of our culture based on alterity or Japanese and Chinese “national studies” biased toward chauvinism. However, the attempt to find the uniqueness and universality of our own culture during the transition to the modern era was triggered by the perception of other cultures, and, above all, at its origin lies an awareness
of a national crisis. As a limitation, it can be pointed out that there is no explanation about the mechanism by which the theories of Hagok School and Daejonggyo worked in detail in pressing ahead on a way different from the above-mentioned Japanese and Chinese national studies or Choe Nam-seon’s path while thoroughly examining the formation process of Jeong In-bo’s Joseonhak.

Answer to this problem may be found in Yi Hye-gyung’s two papers: “Revitalized Yangming School in Colonial Modernity: Does Jung Inbo’s Yangmyeonghak Yeonron Counter Takahashi’s History of Korean Thoughts?” and “From Tianxia to the Nation State: The Whereabouts of Universal Principles in Pak Ûnsik and Liang Qichao.”

5. Evaluation and Outlook

The characteristics and achievements of the studies of modern Confucianism in Korea published in 2019 can be summarized by three features. First, Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism maintained its mainstream position as an influential ideology centered around the morality dispute throughout the late Joseon period until the Japanese occupation period. This provided the spiritual foundation for the Confucian religionization and anti-Japanese movements. Second, there is a conspicuous trend toward media humanities using the newspapers and journals published in the transition period. With a strengthened methodological support, a new series of follow-up studies may be expected on the social role of modern Confucian perception and the Confucian platform in Korea. Third, the Yangminghak research has expanded its horizons from scholar-centered research, above all on Park Eun-sik and Jeong In-bo, to the East Asian history of thought, and the salient features of the Korean Yangming School have been revealed through comparative studies. Furthermore, Yu
Gil‒jun, who was considered a leading proponent of civilization, was found to have integrated Confucian ideology into his theory of civilization without breaking with Confucianism. It was also a valuable gain to discover cases of the formation of the modern image of women in Booin‒Sooji(婦人須知, Book for Women's Lessons) and Yeoja Dokbon(women's instruction guidelines) and to examine them from a Confucianism viewpoint. They are expected to greatly contribute to the expansion of the boundaries of modern Confucian studies in Korea and removing the perception of disruption between tradition and modernity still lingering in Korean modern history of thought.

Confucian studies in contemporary society also involve forming the Confucianism of the present out of the Confucianism of the past. The papers emit an academic tension facing the researchers regarding how Confucianism can make any social contribution in the era of the 4th Industrial Revolution, an information reform going far beyond the production‒based industrial society. The main reason for the attention given to the silsim aspect of the Yangming School by many researchers may be ascribed to their judgment that it is advantageous for the modern application and utilization of traditional values and ideas. In doing so, however, vigilance needs to be exercised not to drift away from the original purpose of research by foregrounding pragmatic problems of the present. New experimentation and challenge in the Korean Yangming School seeking expansion to cultural movement and public implementation is a research topic worthy of reflection in Neo‒Confucianism as well as the Yangming School in relation to the modern application of Korean Confucianism.