

Chapter 10

Studies of Modern Confucianism In Korea

1. Introduction

This report is a comprehensive analysis of research achievements published in Korea in 2021 in the field of modern Confucianism in Korea in two categories: school of thought and subject matter. The scope of research achievements covered in this report is research papers published in academic journals registered (or candidates for registration) in the Korean Citation Index (KCI) as well as master's and doctoral theses in the field of philosophy, focusing on the thoughts of Korean Confucianists who were active between the mid-19th century and Japanese occupation period and contemporary Confucian discourses. Of the papers retrieved, 60 met the selection criteria. When classified by school of thought, 43 belonged to Neo-Confucianism (性理學 Seonglihak in Korean), 7 to Yangmingism (陽明學 Yangmyeonghak in Korean, Yangmingxue in Chinese), and 10 to other modern Confucian schools of thought in Korea. Compared to 2020, while papers on Yangmingism and other schools were maintained at the similar levels, those on Neo-Confucianism soared by over 2.5 times.

The selected papers can also be classified into different types of Confucian discourses reflecting the situation in which Korea found itself during the modern era. Confucian discourse as referred to in this report, can be divided into three main categories: intensification of traditional Confucianism, transformation of traditional Confucianism, and Confucianism as a discourse of resistance. Intensification of traditional Confucianism means developing and intensifying the Confucian schools of thought handed down from the established Korean Confucian tradition; Transformation of traditional Confucianism means witnessing the limitations of the traditional Confucianism in turbulent times and criticizing and transforming it; Confucianism as a discourse of resistance means the position of Confucianism as the basis for the discourse of resistance against the lost national sovereignty around the Japanese occupation period.

2. Classification by School of Thought

(1) Neo-Confucianism

Occupying two-thirds of all papers, those on Neo-Confucianism are too extensive to be analyzed as one category. Therefore, they were subdivided into different schools of thought. With 19 papers, Nosa School was most frequently studied, followed by Ganjae School (12), Hanju School (7), Hwaseo School (4), and other neo-Confucian schools (2). When examined by individual Neo-Confucianists, Ganjae Geon Woo (艮齋 田愚, 1841-1922) was covered most frequently (8), followed by Songsa Ki Woo-man (松沙 奇宇萬, 1846-1916) of the Nosa School (4), and Hoebong Ha Gyeom-jin (晦峯 河謙鎭, 1870-1946) of the Hanju School (2).

(1) Nosa School

1. Kim, Goun Ho, Ki Woo-Man's theory on Neo-Confucianism and social practice (*THE JOURNAL OF KOREAN PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORY* (68), 2021)
2. Kim, Sang-hyun, A Study of Samsa(三山) Kwon Ki-deok(權基德)'s Neo-Confucianistic Theory(南冥學研究 (72), 2021)
3. Saemio Kim, A Study on Boohae Ahn Byung-Taek and Nosa School of Jeju(*DONG-BANG KOREAN CHINESE LIEARATURE* (89), 2021)
4. Hakrae Park, A Study on the Lecture Activities of Songsa(松沙) Ki Woo-man(奇宇萬) & the Expansion of Nosa School(蘆沙學派) (*Study of the Eastern Classic* (84), 2021)
5. Hakrae Park, A Study on the Academic Activities and Nosa(蘆沙) Ki Jeong-Jin(奇正鎭)'s Neo-Confucianism Succession of Songsa(松沙) Ki Woo-Man(奇宇萬)(南冥學研究 (71), 2021)
6. Hakrae Park, A Study on the Lecture Activities of the Disciples of Ki Woo-man (奇宇萬) & the Continuation of the Nosa academic vein (蘆沙學脈)(*Studies in Confucianism* (57), 2021)
7. Yang Soon-ja, The Philosophical Beginning of the Oepil: Focusing on the questions and answers between Ki Jeong-jin and Jo Seong-ga(*GONG JA HAK* (43), 2021)
8. Yun Ho-jin, A Review of Nongsan Jeong Myun-gyu's succession of Noesa study and the academic world(南冥學研究 (72), 2021)
9. HyangJoon Lee, Eopil猥筆, 1902 - The Beginning of Eopil-Debate (猥筆論爭) - (*PAN-KOREAN PHILOSOPHY* (100), 2021)
10. HyangJoon Lee, The Cry of Eopil(猥筆) Is the Rider Dead? (*Studies in Confucianism* (54), 2021)
11. HyangJoon Lee, A Study on 'Honam Travel Diary(湖行日記)' by

- Lee Jik-Hyeon(李直鉉) (*Studies in Confucianism* (55), 2021)
12. HyangJoon Lee, Park Rosool(朴魯述)'s Theory of Eopil(*THE JOURNAL OF KOREAN PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORY* (69), 2021)
 13. Hyung-sung, Lee, A study on Daegok kim Seok-gu's 'theory of good and evil' and 'theory of Confucius Classics' based on the thoughts of Unified Li(*Youngsan Journal of East Asian Cultural Studies* (34), 2021)
 14. Hyung-sung, Lee, A study on Dongo Jo Euigon's life as a secluded scholar and his pursuance of the natural law (*Study of the Eastern Classic* (82), 2021)
 15. Hyung-sung, Lee, A study on Hwang Chul-won's Theory of Mind-nature on Succession in Philosophy of Losa: fucused on Myeongdeok and Insimdosingseo(南冥學研究 (72), 2021)
 16. Jeon, Sungkun, A Study On Kwon Jae-gyu's Academic Method and Perception of the Times(南冥學研究 (72), 2021)
 17. Woojin Cho, Wolpa(月波) JungSirim(鄭時林)'s theory of JuLi(主理) - focus on social relationship and Oepil(猥筆) arguments(*Journal of Eastern Philosophy* (105), 2021)
 18. Woojin Cho, SeokJeon(石田) LeeChoeseon(李最善)'s Li-centered practice conciousness(*Yongbong Journal of Humanities* (58), 2021)
 19. Woojin Cho, Home education from the perspective of life and doseol(圖說) of Yaeun(野隱) ParkJeonggyu(朴廷奎)(*The Journal of Honam Studies* (70), 2021)

Of the 19 papers written about the Nosa School, 16 (excluding two on *Oepil* (猥筆) were authored by Lee Hyang-joon and one by Yang Soon-ja) were dedicated to discovering and examining Neo-Confucianists belonging to the Nosa School. They were subdivided into three types: (1) Seven papers introducing previously unknown scholars: Kim Sang-hyun, Yun Ho-jin, Cho Woo-jin, Lee Hyang-joon [on Park Ro-sool], and Lee Hyung-sung [3]); (2) Five papers on individual scholars' original Neo-Confucian theories or characteristics of the Nosa School (Kim Geun-ho, Lee Hyang-joon, Jeon Sung-kun, Cho Woo-jin [2]); and (3) Four papers examining the dissemination patterns of the Nosa School (Kim Saemio, Park Hak-rae [3]).

(2) Ganjae School

1. Gil Tae Eun, A Study on the Meaning of Taoist righteousness

through The Reading of The Analects of Confucius of Ganjae Jeon Woo(*GONG JA HAK* (43), 2021)

2. Hyun Soo Kim, A Study of Woo Jeon's Thought of Lixue - Centering around Funeral Ritual -(*THE STUDY OF CONFUCIAN PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE* (86), 2021)

3. KIM HYE SU, A study on The Life and Neo-Confucianism of Ganjae school's Ipwa Kim Jongyeon(*GONG JA HAK* (43), 2021)

4. MinJae Doh, The Life and Thought of Songwoon Jung-Woonhan(*JOURNAL OF YULGOK-STUDIES* (45), 2021)

5. BYEONGSAM SUN, A Study on Ganjae Jeon Woo's Neo-Orthodoxy in Korean Neo Confucianism(*人文科學研究* (44), 2021)

6. Yoo, Ji-Woong, Jeon Woo's Criticism and Problematic Consciousness of the Neo-Confucianism by the Hwaseo School(*Studies in Philosophy East-West* (102), 2021)

7. Lee, Sang-ik, On the Ganjae-Sungjae's Mind Theory Debate(*Yongsan Journal of East Asian Cultural Studies* (34), 2021)

8. Suhn-Gyohng Yi, Yijing thought of Jeon Woo(田愚)(*THE JOURNAL OF KOREAN PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORY* (68), 2021)

9. Lee Seung-Hwan, Inquiry on the Meaning of weifa and Quietsitting in Gan Jae's Theory of SelfCultivation(*THE JOURNAL OF ASIAN PHILOSOPHY IN KOREA* (55), 2021)

10. LEE, CHEON SUNG, An Analysis of the Commentary on '絜矩之道' of Ganjae Jeon-Woo in the Perspective of '修己治人'(*THE JOURNAL OF KOREAN PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORY* (71), 2021)

11. Hyung-sung, Lee, A study on Eom Meong-sup's Confucianism-inheritance of Monastic Life and Sim's Doctrine of Self Cultivation(*THE TOEGYE HAK NONCHONG* (37), 2021)

12. Jung, Jong Mo, Ganjae Jeon Woo's theory of Xin-tong-xing-qing(*Journal of Eastern Philosophy* (105), 2021)

While the majority of the papers written about the Nosa School are dedicated to discovering and introducing previously unknown scholarly aspects of Nosa's followers, the main focus of the studies on the Ganjae School is on discovering and elaborating various aspects of Ganjae's thought, which accounts for two-thirds of all papers written about the Ganjae School. This has added to the existing body of research achievements not only in Neo-Confucian theory (性理說), but also various topics covering classics, self-cultivation theory, ye-hak (li-xue [禮學], study of rites), and yeok-hak (yi-xue [易學], study of Yijing). The remaining papers on the Ganjae School introduce Ganjae's followers who were previously unknown to the academia, showing the patterns of succession of Ganjae's thought handed down to the present and the flow of traditional

Confucian thoughts, navigating through turbulent times. Two papers written about the relationships with other Neo-Confucian schools paid particular attention to the Hwaseo School positioned on the opposite side of the Mind Theory Debate.

(3) Hanju School

1. Kim, Goun Ho, What are the characteristics of Lee Seung-hee (李承熙)'s Neo-Confucianism?(*THE JOURNAL OF KOREAN PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORY* (71), 2021)
2. Kim, Nak-Jin, Heo yu's Debate on the Mind and Conflict Aspects(*THE JOURNAL OF KOREAN PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORY* (70), 2021)
3. JongSeok Kim, The Issues over Interpretations of diagram of saying, 'The Mind Combines and Governs the Nature and Feelings' by Yi Hwang and their context (*The Journal of T'oegye Studies* (149), 2021)
4. Lee Young Suk, The status of Hoe-bong Ha Gyeong-jin as an intellectual in the transition period(南冥學研究 (71), 2021)
5. Jun, byung-chol, A Process of Accommodating Hanju Seonri-seol and Discourse on Mind Theory of Jadong Lee Jeong-mo(*THE JOURNAL OF KOREAN PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORY* (70), 2021)
6. Han, GilRo, A Study on the Life of Lee Gi-Won and the Succession of Hanju Studies(*Journal of Koreanology* (78), 2021)
7. Chen I Ling / KIM EUN YOUNG, Ha Gyeong-jin's Criticism on Kang Youwei's Thought of Confucian Classics(*Humanities and Art* (10), 2021)

Seven papers were published on the Hanju School. Of them, four papers, excluding two papers on Ha Gyeong-jin, who authored Dongyuhakan (東儒學案), and Han Gil-ro's paper on Lee Gi-won, were written about the debates with other Neo-Confucian schools surrounding the Neo-Confucian theory (性理說). Of these four papers, three described the debate patterns between the Hanju School and other schools surrounding Hanju's Sim-jeuk-li (心即理, mind is the principle), and the remaining one paper by Jun Byung-chol examined the Mind Theory Debate between Hanju and Nosa schools. Two studies on Hoebong Ha Gyeong-jin concentrate on his person and work as a modern Confucianist rather than on his Neo-Confucian theory (性理說).

(4) Hwaseo School

1. park tae-ok, The Peace Thoughts and its Realization of Confucian Intellectuals in Modern Period ; Focused on Philosophical Thought of Wi-Jung-Chuk-Sa-Pa(*Humanities and Art* (11), 2021)
2. Lee, Sang-ik, On the Ganjae-Sungjae's Mind Theory Debate(*Younsan Journal of East Asian Cultural Studies* (34), 2021)
3. Lee , Hyang-bae, The Logic and Literary Spirit of Choogang Baek Nak-gwan's 'Protect the Orthodox, Repel the Heterodox'(*Studies in Confucianism* (55), 2021)
4. Ha Yoonseo, The Confucian meaning of Uiam Yoo In-seok and 'Gwanil Yak'(*TOEGYE-HAK-LON-JIB* (29), 2021)

Four papers were published on the Hwaseo School. Similar to the papers on the Hanju School, those on the Hwaseo School also covered Hwaser's followers rather than Hwaser himself. With the exception of Lee Sang-il's paper on the Mind Theory Debate, all papers are related to the anti-Japanese movement during the late Korean Empire.

(5) Other Schools

1. Jeong Seong-Hee , A Study on academic crisis response method and ideological background of the modern Hoseosanrim - Focused on Song Byung-Seon and Song Byung-Soon(*THE STUDY OF CONFUCIAN PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE* (85), 2021)
2. SoonWoo Chung , The process of differentiation of schools and the formation of theories through the lecture of seowon(書院講會) at the end of the 19th century(*The Journal of Korean Seowon Studies* (34), 2021)

Two papers were written about Neo-Confucian schools other than those presented above. Jeong Seong-hee examined the crisis management strategies of Yeonjae Song Byung-seon (淵齋 宋秉璿, 18361905) and Simseokjae Song Byung-soon (心石齋 宋秉珣, 18391912), and Chung Soon-woo examined the process of differentiation of the schools favoring Juriron (主理論, li-centered theory) through the lectures (講會) delivered at the end of the 19th century.

2) Yangmingism

1. Kim, Yong-hwan , A Study on the perception horizon of Park Eun-sik's morality(*THE TOEGYE HAK NONCHONG* (38), 2021)
2. Woohyung Kim , Philosophical Project of Park Eun-sik Implied in Theory of Renovation of Confucianism: Focusing on the Transformation of Old Learning into New Learning(*Studies in Philosophy East-West* (100), 2021)
3. Woohyung Kim , The Originality and Characteristics of Park Eun-sik's view on Yang-ming Learning: Focusing on the Self-Cultivation and the Matter of Mind(*GONG JA HAK* (44), 2021)
4. Park Jeung Sim , A Study on the Ideological Characteristics of Park Eun-sik's 「Mr. WONG Yeung-ming, Christopher」(*THE JOURNAL OF KOREAN PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORY* (69), 2021)
5. park tae-ok , A matter of identity recognition and social implementation of the modern Confucian intellectuals - Focusing on Cheong In-bo's theory of 'Emotional Interaction'(*Studies in Philosophy East-West* (99), 2021)
6. Daeseung Lee , The meaning of the times in the theory of Genuine Mind and Emotional Interaction of Widang Joseon-Hak (Korean Studies)(*The Korea-Japan Historical Review* (74), 2021)
7. Lim Boo Yeon , Park Eun-sik's Modern Study of Mind-heart Focusing on the Construction and Characteristics of True Self(*DAEDONG MUNHWA YEON'GU* (114), 2021)

Of the seven Yangmingism-related papers, five were about Baek'am Park Eun-sik (白巖 朴殷植, 1859-1925) and two about Widang Jeong In-bo(爲堂 鄭寅普, 1892-1950). All these papers examine the modern and contemporary interpretations of the Yangmingism-based thoughts advanced by Park Eun-sik and Jeong In-bo as representative modern Korean intellectuals.

All five papers on Park Eun-sik agreed regarding his achievements in fusing the pursuit of knowledge and moral realization by actively adopting Yangmingism, indicating the limitations of Zhu Xi's gewuzhizhi (格物致知, investigating things and gaining of knowledge) in the light of modern scientific technologies, under the influence of Liang Qichao (梁啓超, 1873-1929), a contemporary Chinese thinker. All researchers except for Park Jeong-sim concluded that Park Eun-sik attempted the fusion of Neo-Confucianism and Yangmingism, thus addressing the problem left unsolved by Liang Qichao, who criticized Neo- Confucianism.

Both papers covering Jeong In-bo examined the role played by the philosophy of emotional interaction (感通) advanced by Jeong In-bo based on Yangmingism, in establishing the Korean identity under the Japanese colonial rule. In Lee Dae-seung's view, Jeong In-bo's theory of Genuine Mind and Emotional

Interaction (本心感通論) offered a counterargument against the theories presented by government-patronized scholars including Takahashi Toru (高橋亨, 1878-1967), such as “national peril caused by Confucianism,” “absence of Korean identity,” and “Japanese loyalty militarism.” Park Tae-ok also noted that In-bo's philosophy of emotional interaction (感通) can be significantly used as theoretical framework in today's society, going beyond its contemporary significance, by evaluating it as a philosophy that “teaches us to break free from the 'social being of co-extinction' arising from 'the law of the jungle' and 'survival on their own' or the selfish habit of excluding others.”

3) Other Modern Confucian Schools of Thought

1. Yunkyeong Kim, Seol Tae-Hee's criticism of research on Confucianism in modern (I): Focusing on the criticism of Kang yu-wei' research on Early Confucianism(*PAN-KOREAN PHILOSOPHY* (103), 2021)
2. Yunkyeong Kim, Seol Tae-hee's Theory of Silhak and Criticism of Joseon Neo-Confucianism(*THE JOURNAL OF ASIAN PHILOSOPHY IN KOREA* (55), 2021)
3. Jieun Kim, The Origin of Seokju Lee Sang-Ryong's Ideological Changes and Confucian Reform Theory during the Modern Transition Period(*Korean Studies* (46), 2021)
4. Oh, Ju-Yeon / Min Cheol Park / Yun Tai-Yang , On the 1910's critical discourses of Confucianism: Focus on the articles of Hakjigwang(學之光) by new intellectuals(*Studies in Philosophy East-West* (100), 2021)
5. Lee Byeong-Tae , The Re-introspection of the Korean Modern Thought History and "Modernity": Focusing on the Writings of Korean Confucian History in the First Half of the 20th Century (*Journal of the Humanities for Unification* (85), 2021)
6. Jung, Byung Seok / Oh Ryun, Lee , Myuong-am Lee tae il's view point of Book of Changes (*Korean Culture Review* (79), 2021)
7. HAN BO RAM , The Value Orientation of the Capital Based Learned Circles' Reformism in the 19th Century and their Way to Confront the Realities(*The Society for Study of Korean History of Thoughts* (67), 2021)
8. Heo Jae-young , The Formation and Transformation Process of the Concept of GYEOKCHI(格致) in Modern China and Korea(*Studies of Chinese & Korean Humanities* (71), 2021)
9. Hwang, Yeong-rye , Confucius Religion Movement of Yeonsan Dotongsa Shrine and Joseon Confucianism Assembly Confucianism Religionization Movement of Ahn Sun-Hwan in

1930s(*TOEGYE-HAK-LON-JIB* (28), 2021)

10. Hwang, JeeWon , Meanings and Characteristics of 'Mind is God' in Confucian Religion of Jinam Yi Byeong-Heon(*DONGAINMUNHAK* (55), 2021)

In her two papers, Kim Yunkyeong examines the process by which Ochon Seol Tae-hee (梧寸 薛泰熙, 1875-1940), who advocated the recovery of Confucian essence based on moral realization, criticized the premodern Neo-Confucianism lopsided toward metaphysics and indicated the limitations of Kang Yu-wei's (康有爲, 1858-1927) commentaries on “innate goodness of human nature” (性善) and “destiny and nature inherent in a virtuous man”(命性). Kim Ji-eun examined how Seokju Lee Sang-ryong (石洲 李相龍, 1858-1932) embraced new learning in relation to his link with the Jungjae School and presented it to be on a continuum of ideological flow from premodern and modern times, not as a consequence of an interruption between the two eras. The paper coauthored by Oh Ju-yeon, Park Min-cheol, and Yun Tae-yang analyzed the process by which new intellectuals, who acquired Western knowledge during their study in Japan in the 1910s, developed a critical discourse of Confucianism by linking it with the conditions of colonization in their critical articles on Confucianism printed in *Hakjigwang* (學之光), a journal of Korean students studying in Tokyo. The authors evaluated the critical discourses of Confucianism in the 1910s as one of the intellectual combats waged in response to the challenges of the time imposed by the historical environment and social conditions of the colonial homeland. Lee Byeong-tae evaluated the writings of Korean Confucian history authored by those who lived across the premodern and modern periods, such as Jang Ji-yeon's *Joseon Yugyo Yonwon* (朝鮮儒教淵源, The Origin of Korean Confucianism) and Ha Gyeom-jin's *Dong Yuhak An* (東儒學案, Records of Eastern Confucianism), higher than the writings of Confucian history published after the Japanese occupation period, which presuppose otherized viewpoints on tradition, because the former could closely capture the inner movement of intellectual tradition.

Jung, Byung-seok, and Lee Oh-ryun examined various aspects of the unique views of the Book of Changes expounded by Myuong'am Lee Tae il (明庵 李泰一, 1860-1944), who analyzed the formation and transformation of Zhouyi (周易) in terms of numbers, while grounding his ideas on the Neo-Confucian traditional. Han Bo-ram explored how the personal networking and ideological features of the 18th-century Yeonam Club were taken over by the 19th-century reform camp affiliated with Park Gyu-su by expanding the boundaries of the personal networking of those in the enlightenment camp based on the Seoul region to the 18th-century Noron literati circles, particularly the Yeonam Club. Heo Jae-young examined the influence of the 19th-century Western science on the

formation of modern science in Korea and China through the process by which the traditional gyeokmulji (gewuzhizhi 格物致知, investigating things and gaining of knowledge) was transformed into “gyeokchi” (格致) as a term to describe modern science. The papers by Hwang Yeoung-rye and Hwang Jee-won describe the movement of religionization of Confucianism, that is, the Confucius Religion (孔教) Movement, which took place Korea during the Japanese occupation period. They interpreted the Confucius Religion Movement as attempts initiated by Ahn Sun-hwan and Yi Byung-heon to elevate the status of Confucianism by emphasizing the religious features of Confucianism, and in this respect, they evaluated the Confucius Religion Movement as differentiating itself from other Confucian reform movements of the time, which sought to reform the ideological and philosophical aspects of Confucianism.

3. Classification by topic category

As mentioned at the beginning of this report, the research achievements presented above can be divided into three topic categories: “intensification of traditional Confucianism,” “transformation of traditional Confucianism,” and “Confucianism as a discourse of resistance,” considering the contemporary situation of Korea. As the mainstream ideology of premodern Korean Confucianism was Neo-Confucianism, “intensification of traditional Confucianism” and “transformation of traditional Confucianism” can be interpreted as “intensification of Neo-Confucianism” and “transformation of Neo-Confucianism.” Papers irrelevant to the above three topic categories or related to mixed categories fall under the category of “others.”

1) Intensification of traditional Confucianism

Thirty-five papers on Neo-Confucianism and Jung Byung-seok and Lee Oh-ryun's paper mainly covered the contemporary intellectuals' philosophical thoughts based on the premodern scholarly tradition. Among them, the papers on Nosa School's expansion (Kim Saemio, Park Hak-rae Park) and those on Ganjae's followers (Kim Hye-Soo Kim, Doh Min-Jae Do, Lee Hyung-sung) examined how the scholars covered in the respective papers responded to their historical situations. However, they were classified into the category of “intensifying traditional Confucianism” in terms of the expansion of the Nosa and Ganjae schools, not into the category of “Confucianism as a discourse of resistance,” as the corresponding characteristics were unconfirmed.

2) Transformation of traditional Confucianism

Papers written about Park Eun-sik and some other papers belong to the category “transformation of traditional Confucianism.” If any of these papers demonstrates that Park Eun-sik's Yangmingist thoughts touch on the context of the existing Korean Yangmingism, such as the Ganghwa School, the paper would fall into the category of “intensification of traditional Confucianism.” Otherwise, they were all classified as “intensification of traditional Confucianism.” Among them, six papers cover the transformation of the existing Neo-Confucian tradition (Kim Yong-hwan, Kim Woo-hyung, Kim Ji-eun, Park Jeong-sim, Lim Boo-yeon), two papers focus on the critical aspects of Neo-Confucian ideology (Kim Yun-kyeong, Oh Ju-yeon et al.), and one paper covers the changes in traditional academic terminology due to the introduction of Western science (Heo Jae-young).

3) Confucianism as a discourse of resistance

Nine papers examined “Confucianism as a discourse of resistance,” which is a major social function of modern Korean Confucianism. Of them, three papers examined the Wijeon-Cheoksa (衛正斥邪, Protect right and reject evil) Movement, which was led by the Nosa and Hwaseo schools (Kim Geun-ho, Park Tae-ok, Lee Hyang-bae). Three papers traced back how the resistance discourse was formed as a scholarly response to the colonial rule (Tae-Ok Park, Dae-Seung Lee, Young-Sook Lee), and two papers covered the Confucian thoughts projected in the Confucian ideology reflected in the civilian army combats and independence movement (Ha Yoon-seo, Han, Gil-ro). Jeong Seong-hee examined the Confucian background of the spirit of resistance of the Yeonjae School's scholars whose loyalty resulted in martyrdom. Among the research achievements covering Confucianism as a discourse of resistance, six papers (2/3) described how Neo-Confucianism fulfilled its function as a discourse of resistance against foreign powers in the extreme situation of the late Korean Empire.

4) Others

Six papers did not meet any of the classification criteria mentioned above. Of them, two papers examined Korean Confucian scholars' criticism of Kang Yu-wei (Kim Yun-Kyung, Chen I-ling & Kim Eun-young), and two papers traced back the process of religionization of Confucianism during the Japanese occupation period (Hwang Young-rye and Hwang Ji-won). One of the remaining two papers focused on the writings of Korean Confucian history by scholars in the early 20th century (Lee Byeong-tae), and the other paper traced back the

process by which Park Gyu-soo's reform camp expanded its personal networking in the 19th century to the 18th-century Yeonam School (Han Bo-ram).

4. Analysis and Review of Major Papers

To begin with, by publishing four papers on the Nosa School, Lee Hyang-joon became the most prolific researcher in 2021. Of them, “The Cry of Oepil (猥筆 -- Is the Rider Dead?)” is the one fully reflecting the author's understanding of Nosa's thought. In this paper, the author explains that through Oepil, Nosa attempted to interpret Yi I's Neo-Confucianism from the perspective of zhuli (主理) against its counterargument of zhuqi (主氣), and that Nosa partially embraced Yi Hwang's idea to introduce qi (氣) to li (理) while being firmly anchored in Yi I's inclusive schematic reasoning of liwuwei (理無爲, principle of inactivity). It was also asserted that by writing Oepil, Nosa wanted to remind scholars of Joseon that they were jockeys riding the horse of Joseon as a historical structure and that they were supposed to perform their duties and do something for their country, thereby expressing the intrinsic logic using the Neo-Confucian terminology. This paper is significant in that it highlighted the position occupied by Oepil as an important text in modern Korean Confucianism, but there are several points where the author's explanations are missing.

First, in the dichotomy of the term zhuli/zhuqi (主理/主氣), the author assumes that this dichotomy originates from the intrinsic context of Korean Confucianism and presents three examples of its usage: the dichotomy of Toegye Yi Whang, that of Yulgok Yi I's critic, and internal division within the Yulgok School, interpreting Oepil in the context of the third case. Despite the seemingly reasonable argument of the author, the paper does not quote any previous research that can support the validity of the zhuli/zhuqi (主理/主氣) dichotomy, which is the basis for the development of the argument. Of course, the author notes that he used the zhuli/zhuqi framework based on Yoon Sa-soon Yoon's view. However, given the significant accumulation of critical views of academia regarding the rules of Toru Takahashi Toru associated with the zhuli/zhuqi dichotomy, it was necessary to introduce academia's current viewpoint, even if the three usages of the zhuli/zhuqi dichotomy were the author's own definitions.

Second, in the process of revealing that Nosa partially embraced Toegye's idea while being firmly anchored in Yulgok, the author mentioned that Toegye refuted liruo-qiqiang (理弱氣強, weak li and strong qi) and presented liqiang-qiruo (理強氣弱, strong li and weak qi), asserting that he reasoned the

li-qi relationship through a strength-weakness relationship, and considered the metaphor of 'man riding a horse' also in terms of strength-weakness relationship. However, as it can be inferred from the metaphor of 'man riding a horse,' the question of strength/weakness of li-qi is not one of defeating or not, but that of prevailing or not, and the author's understanding of strength/weakness li-qi relationship needs to be reconsidered.

Finally, the author's mention of the historical significance of Oepil is important, and it is a text that should be inevitably discussed to understand the social function of the writings of the 2-th-century Korean Confucianism. However, the author's claim seems to be a logical leap because it is only briefly mentioned at the end of the paper without a separate interim discussion, which may lead to a doubt whether this part can really constitute one of the three axes that define the philosophical significance of Oepil as mentioned by the author.

It is necessary to examine the role played by Neo-Confucianism, which was the main frame of thinking for premodern intellectuals, in the turbulent modern era to demonstrate that Neo-Confucianism is a meaningful framework of thinking in today's society. However, it is challenging to tackle the work of reproducing the philosophical context of Neo-Confucianism of the time and examining the role of traditional knowledge in contemporary society in a single research paper. Noteworthy in this regard is Kim Geun-ho's paper Ki Woo-Man's theory on Neo-Confucianism and social practice. After explaining that Songsa Ki Woo-man (松沙 奇字萬) inherited Nosa's Neo-Confucian theory (性理說), but transformed it into xinxue (心學, study of heart-mind) through xinshuo (心說, theory of hear-mind), which expands taiji's (太極) tiyong (體用) and mingde (明德) not only to benxin (本心), but also to xin (心) of ren-yi-li-zhi (仁義禮智), the author notes that this practical of xinxue (心學) was implemented in the form of fuzhen-chixie (扶正斥邪, support correction and reject evil), thus rejecting evil while preserving the scholars and their spaces within the school.

The author's claim that Songsa's scholarship in xinxue (心學) is yet to be discussed in academia, and the tie between the implementation of fuzhen-chixie (扶正斥邪) and xinxue (心學) is clear given that it was examined based on the personal networks formed through lecture activities. Nevertheless, as is the case with Lee Hyang-joon's paper discussed above, a lopsided focus on the theological aspects of Neo-Confucianism reduces the proportion of its social functions, and conversely, when the social functions of Neo-Confucianism of the time is expounded, its philosophical context is often insufficiently reflected. In view of this, the author's approach to strike a quantitative balance between philosophical and socio-functional aspects is necessary for in-depth understanding of the position occupied by traditional Neo-Confucianism in modern society.

5. Evaluation and Outlook

The research trends in modern Confucianism studies in Korea observed in the papers published in 2021 have the following characteristics. First, research in the field of Neo-Confucianism has increased significantly compared to previous years. A large proportion of these studies have introduced modern Confucian scholars previously unknown to the academia, showing, through various channels, the agony and struggle of traditional intellectuals who lived and the turbulent period of modern Korean history. Second, it is particularly noteworthy that amid the prevailing tendency to examine Neo-Confucianism from the purely philosophical viewpoint, many papers were written about Neo-Confucianism as a discourse of resistance against Japanese imperialism. Third, 2021 saw a revival of research into comparison between individual schools of thought, which was missing in 2020. However, more attention was paid to how specific schools of thought judged the theories of the opposing schools of thought than to the comparison of the individual school of thoughts on an equal footing. Fourth, in relation to the study of Yangmingism in modern Korean Confucianism, the prevailing tendency was to view Yangmingism as a fusion with Neo-Confucianism rather than a break from it. While researchers generally adopted Yangmingism in a state severed from Neo-Confucianism by Liang Qichao (梁啟超), who was set as the comparison figure of Park Eun-sik (朴殷植), Park Eun-sik embraced Yangmingism within the framework of the traditional Zhu-Xi School of Neo-Confucianism.

The research direction of the modern Korean Confucianism, as shown in the 2021 research achievements, presents a gradual increase in the movement to examine the patterns and characteristics of Neo-Confucianism in responding to the contemporary society. This has a certain relevance to the recent quantitative and qualitative surge in research into the contemporary Neo-Confucianism. From this perspective, Neo-Confucianism, a scholarly tradition of hundreds of years, acted as a major axis of Korean intellectual history while navigating through the stormy waters of modernity in the colorful Korean history. With research into the fusion of Neo-Confucianism and Yangmingism gaining momentum, along with research into Neo-Confucianism as a discourse of resistance, we hope to develop a clearer understanding of Neo-Confucianism both as a pre-modern mainstream ideology and as an ideology responding to the circumstances imposed by the times.

November 15, 2022 | Printing

November 15, 2022 | Publishing

**Publisher: Paju Cultural Center
Yulgok Studies Content Development and
International Dissemination Project Team**

Address: Wadong-dong 1358, Paju-si, Gyeonggi-do, Korea

Telephone: +82(0)31-941-2425 Telefax: +82(0)31-941-2511

Email: pajucc@naver.com

Website: <http://pajucc.or.kr/>

Project team bulletin board: <http://yulgok.geeo.kr/wordpress/>

Printer: Mun Sa-cheol Publishing Co.

*** No part of this book may be copied or reproduced in print or any
other media without permission in writing from the publisher.**

*** Not for sale**