

Chapter 7

**Analysis and Prospects of Research
Achievements on Korean Yangming Studies**

Sun Byungsam(Dept of Philosophy, Soongsil University)

: %

&' ' \$ ' \$ 0 ' ' \$! ! (' ! ' 0 &' 0 ' (- % . ' 8 ' 9) ' ! ' &' (' ' 0 * 2 0 # (9 ' ' * ' 0 <) ! < ! ' ' ' 8 ' 9 *) ' ' @ ' ' 0 0 D D ' * : ' ! ! > 0 * ') \$ 0 - ' + *N ' 2 12 7 M5 心 * O ! " 0 ") J \$ 0 . J 0 < ! ' * : ! ! !) & ! ' (0) " * ' ! < (0 \$ - ' .) *) (0 0 / ' " 0 " ! \$ * ' 2 ! 2 鄭齊斗 * ' ' 1 !') 江華 ! ! ' * ' ' ! ! ! ' ! < (0 % \$ - &' .

1) Papers Related to Jeong Jedu 鄭齊斗 (6)

1

Park Kil-Su

Critical Consideration on the Theory of the Principle of Living of Hagok – Centering
on Comparison with the Theory of the Principle of Living of Song-Ming’s
Neo-Confucianism –

YANG-MING STUDIES

The Korean Society of Yang-Ming Studies

2

Chen Han

Reinterpretation of the concept of Jeong Je-du’s Xin 心

GONG JA HAK

Korean Society of Confucian Studies

3

Park Hyunjung

The Knowing and Innate knowledge of the Good in Hagok School of Thought

YANG-MING STUDIES

The Korean Society of Yang-Ming Studies

4

Jinwook Jeong

Hagok[霞谷] Jeong Je-doo[鄭齊斗]'s introspective views of human body and its
significance

Journal of Korean Philosophical History

The Society for Korean Philosophical History

5

Geunsik Seo

A Study on the Development Patterns of in Janghwuahakpa(江華學派) Yi-Learning
(易學)(I): Characteristics on “Hado(「河圖」)”-“Naksu(「洛書」)” and
Preceding Heaven(先天)·Succeeding Heaven(後天) of Jeong Je-Du(鄭齊斗)'s
I-Learning(易學)

JOURNAL OF YULGOK-STUDIES

Yulgok Society

6

Han Jeonggil

Significance of Cultural Pluralism in Hagok Jeong Je-du’s Perception of the Ritual
System

YANG-MING STUDIES

The Korean Society of Yang-Ming Studies

Out of the twelve papers related to Korean Yangming studies published
in 2022, six directly address Jeong Jedu 鄭齊斗. This indicates a substantial

increase compared to the previous years, where, within fourteen papers in 2021 and thirteen papers in 2020 related to the Ganghwa 江華 Yangming school (including Jeong Jedu), only six papers in each year were specifically focused on Jeong Jedu. Alongside the increase in quantity, these papers represent a diverse array of analytical perspectives on the scholarship of Jeong Jedu.

Jeong Jedu is recognized as a preeminent Yangming scholar of the Joseon Dynasty and a leading figure in the Ganghwa Yangming school. Two perspectives dominate contemporary researchers' views on Jeong Jedu's academic philosophy. The first is that he valiantly promoted Yangming studies during an era dominated by Zhu Xi's Neo-Confucianism. The second is that he completed a uniquely Korean interpretation of Yangming studies, distinguishing it from Chinese Yangming studies. In particular, in relation to the second perspective, a prevalent approach within the Korean academic field is to understand Jeong Jedu's Yangming philosophy in relation to its affinity with Zhu Xi's teachings. That is, while Jeong Jedu is undoubtedly a scholar who revered Yangming studies, he is also considered to have integrated elements of Zhu Xi's teachings to overcome the shortcomings of Yangming studies.

Park Kil-Su's "Critical Consideration on the Theory of the Principle of Living of Hagok – Centering on Comparison with the Theory of the Principle of Living of Song-Ming's Neo-Confucianism –" reviews Jeong Jedu's theory of living principle (shenglishuo 生理說). The aspect most frequently associated with Jeong Jedu's discourse on innate knowledge (liangzhi 良知) is his theory of living principle.

Park Kil-Su states the origins of Jeong Jedu's theory as follows: "One of the main issues of Jeong Jedu's theory of living principle is where his thoughts originate between the Neo-Confucianism of Cheng Yi 程頤 and Zhu

Xi 朱熹 and the Heart Learning (Xinxue 心學) of Wang Yangming. ... First, to outline the ideological origins of his theory of living principle, the paper describes the main content and characteristics of the two theories of living principle during the Song Dynasty, represented by Cheng Yi and Zhu Xi. ... It clarifies that Jeong Jedu's theory of living principle was established by synthesizing the theories of living principle of Cheng Yi and Zhu Xi's Neo-Confucianism with the Heart Learning of Wang Yangming, based on his own original concepts and thought processes."

Park continues to clarify: "However, although this synthesis extensively incorporates Wang Yangming's ideas on living principle, the overall ideology and framework fundamentally rely on the basic structure and logic of the theory of living principle proposed by Cheng Yi and Zhu Xi. It can thus be seen as inheriting and developing the problem awareness of Cheng Yi and Zhu Xi's Neo-Confucianism."

Park's paper also reflects the position within the Korean academic community that seeks to interpret Jeong Jedu's Yangming philosophy within the context of its kinship with Zhu Xi's Neo-Confucianism.

Chen Han is a Chinese scholar who received a doctoral degree in 2022 from Sungkyunkwan University with a dissertation titled "Reinterpretation of the concept of Jeong Je-du's Xin 心." Chinese international students typically study Neo-Confucianism and Practical Learning (Shilhak 實學) of the Joseon Dynasty for their theses. However, Chen Han pursued the study of Yangming Philosophy, considered a heterodox teaching during the Joseon Dynasty, and received his doctorate focusing on Jeong Jedu's philosophy of mind.

In his dissertation, Chen Han preempts his basic stance by declaring, "Unlike existing studies that express Jeong Jedu's spirit of Yangming Philosophy through the Ganghwa 江華 School or Hagok 霞谷 Learning, this

paper examines the academic homogeneity between Jeong Jedu and Wang Yangming from the perspective of recognizing Confucianism as the philosophy of mind.” Chen Han’s declaration of this basic premise is a strategic move designed to reinforce the kinship between Zhu Xi’s teachings and Yangming Philosophy in advance.

Chen Han’s “Reinterpretation of the concept of Jeong Je-du’s Xin 心” in his doctoral dissertation significantly contributes to the establishment of the concept of mind as a whole, explaining the medical understanding of the heart as found in Yellow Emperor’s Canon of Medicine (Huangdi Neijing 黄帝内经). Positioning the heart from a medical perspective at the center is one approach to explaining Jeong Jedu’s theory of living principle (shenglishuo 生理说), which advocates for the unity of mind and principle. By focusing on the heart as a physical organ, one acknowledges both the activity and the vulnerability of the mind. Hence, he argues that one must select the true principle within the physiology that encompasses life and death, which also endorses the kinship between Zhu Xi’s teachings and Yangming Philosophy.

Park Hyunjung’s research on “The Knowing and Innate knowledge of the Good in Hagok School of Thought” addresses the relationship between perception and innate knowledge of the good (liangzhi 良知), a topic not unique to Jeong Jedu alone. Since Wang Yangming’s claim that innate knowledge of the good is the principle of heaven, this subject has been continuously raised. Zhu Xi’s scholars primarily criticize that innate knowledge of the good is an act of perception, thus similar to the Buddhist concept of mind, and they secondarily criticize that defining perception as the principle does not conform to the axioms of the theory of li and qi.

After reviewing the academic discourse surrounding perception and innate knowledge of the good, Park Hyunjung concludes, “The originality of Jeong Jedu’s understanding of Yangming Philosophy was found in his presentation

of the concept of the intrinsic principle based on his understanding of perception. That is, Jeong Jedu's understanding of Yangming Philosophy can be seen as a possible form of development within the overall framework of Yangming Philosophy and as a unique transformation of Korean Yangming Philosophy.”

Park Hyunjung's position is notably distinct from the viewpoints previously introduced by Park Kil-Su and Chen Han. Park does not place the uniqueness of Jeong Jedu's Yangming Philosophy within its kinship with Zhu Xi's teachings. Instead, Park evaluates Jeong Jedu's Yangming Philosophy as an original development within Korean Yangming Philosophy, viewing it as a progressive form of the philosophy.

Jung Jinwook's paper "Hagok[霞谷] Jeong Je-doo[鄭齊斗]'s introspective views of human body and its significance" approaches from the perspective of 'body-view.' Jeong Jedu's emphasis on the medical 'heart', the advocacy of the living principle (shengli 生理), and the principle of the unity of principle and vital energy (liqiyiyuan 理氣一元) indeed clashes considerably with the orthodoxy of Zhu Xi's teachings. While Wang Yangming justified his stance on the unity of principle and vital energy by championing 'innate knowledge of the good (liangzhi 良知)', Jeong, on the other hand, argued for it through concepts of the living principle and 'spirit' (shen 神). Jinwook's view of the body particularly focuses on this aspect. However, whether Jeong Jedu grounded his argument for the unity of principle and vital energy on his unique perspective of the body or presented his bodily discourse as a means to justify his understanding of 'innate knowledge of the good' remains a question for further examination.

Seo Geunsik's "A Study on the Development Patterns of in Janghwuahakpa(江華學派) Yi-Learning(易學)(I): Characteristics on “Hado (「河圖」)”·“Naksu(「洛書」)” and Preceding Heaven(先天)·Succeeding

Heaven(後天) of Jeong Je-Du(鄭齊斗)'s I-Learning(易學)" is a paper of significance. Jeong Jedu had considerable expertise in the study of change (yixue 易學), and the fact that the Cunyan 存言 begins with the discussion of the Qian hexagram (Qian gua 乾卦) is highly symbolic. The study of change is expected to contribute significantly to the understanding of Jeong's academic thoughts.

Seo Geunsik evaluates, "Jeong Jedu's study of change centers around Diagrams of the Yellow River and Luo River (Hetu Luoshu 河圖洛書), as well as the concepts of the pre-heaven (xiantian 先天) and post-heaven (houtian 後天), thus it follows the Song dynasty's School of Images and Numbers (tushuxiangshu yixue 圖書象數易學). The middle 5 in the 'Hetu 河圖' and 'Luoshu 洛書' is important because it represents the 'Supreme Ultimate' (Taiji 太極) at the center, which to Jeong, is akin to the 'heart'... The most striking part of Jeong's Pre-Heaven and Post-Heaven Diagram Theory (Xianhoutiantushuo 先後天圖說) is that he does not see the pre-heaven and post-heaven as two separate entities. From the perspective of essence (ti 體) and function (yong 用), he considered that they are not two in terms of essence, but can be divided into pre-heaven and post-heaven in terms of function." Jeong Jedu's understanding of Western astronomy culminated in texts like Xuanyuan Jingxue Tongkao 璇元經學通攷. He first wrote on the Pre-Heaven and Post-Heaven Theory (Xianhoutianshuo 先後天說) in his study of change works and then, acquiring more advanced knowledge, completed the Xuanyuan Jingxue Tongkao."

The discussion of essence (ti 體) and function (yong 用) is a crucial category within the Song-Ming Neo-Confucianism. While Cheng Yi 程頤 in his Introduction to the I Ching Commentaries (Yizhuan Xu 易傳序) affirmed the unity of essence and function, the followers of Zhu Xi based on the identity of nature and principle (xingjili 性即理) emphasized 'essence before

function' (xiantihouyong 先體後用), whereas the Wang Yangming School, based on the identity of mind and principle (xinjili 心即理), highlighted 'instantaneous essence and function' (jitijiyong 即體即用). Within the Yangming School itself, there was a major debate between those advocating for 'instantaneous essence and function' (the Present – Completed Good – Knowledge Faction, xianchengliangzhipai 現成良知派) and those for 'essence before function' (the Cultivation – Verification – Return – to – Quiescence Faction, xiuzhengguijipai 修證歸寂派).

Jeong Jedu's discussions on pre-heaven, post-heaven, and essence and function intertwine with his discourse on 'innate knowledge of the good.' However, as mentioned in Jung Jinwook's paper on body-view, whether Jeong Jedu developed his theory of essence and function based on his unique perspective of the study of change or whether he presented the I Ching's theory of essence and function as part of a process to justify his doctrine of 'innate knowledge of the good' remains a subject for further scrutiny.

In recent times, Han Jeonggil has turned attention to topics that have been somewhat neglected in the existing research on Yangming scholarship, such as aspects related to governing the world and the ritual governance. Han Jeonggil's "Significance of Cultural Pluralism in Hagok Jeong Je-du's Perception of the Ritual System" follows in this vein of scholarship.

Han Jeonggil's general thesis states: "Yangming scholarship tends to reduce all problems to the mind, which has led to a deficiency in the exploration of ritual as an institution. However, despite being a Yangming scholar, Jeong Jedu left behind many discussions on rituals. This is because his scholarship was conducted on the foundation of Korea's unique culture, specifically, the ritual education culture stemming from Zhu Xi's teachings. This indeed reflects the cultural pluralistic significance embodied in his recognition of ritual systems."

2) Paper Related to Yi Kwang-ryeo 李匡呂 (Ganghwa 江華 Yangming School of Thought) (1)

1

Chun, Byung-don

A Study on Yi Kwangryeo's Academic Thought and Spirit of Practical Theories in the First Book of 'YiKwangRyeoJip'(2)

YANG-MING STUDIES

The Korean Society of Yang-Ming Studies

Chun Byung-don annually publishes research papers on the Ganghwa 江華 Yangming School of Thought. In recent years, he has devoted effort to elucidating the historical transmission of the Hagok 霞谷 School based on newly uncovered materials. His paper, "A Study on Yi Kwangryeo's Academic Thought and Spirit of Practical Theories in the First Book of 'YiKwangRyeoJip'(2)," is a continuation in this series. It builds upon the findings of last year's paper ("A Study on Yi Kwangryeo's Academic Thought and Spirit of Practical Theories in the First Book of 'YiKwangRyeoJip'(1)").

Let us consider the words of Chun Byung-don: "Yi Kwang-ryeo's 李匡呂 'real heart (silsim 實心)' is the metaphysical essence of the moral mind. The 'real heart' manifesting in life is what constitutes Practical Learning (Silhak 實學). Rather than defining what the 'real heart' is, Yi Kwang-ryeo focused on how to practice the 'real heart' in daily life. As concrete methods to practice the 'real heart,' he suggested deep clothing, sweet potato cultivation, the addition of false hair pieces (gache 加髻), and the ritual for inserting a hairpin (gyeoryeo 笄禮). ... This is precisely 'loving the people (qinmin 親民).' 'Loving the people' is the 'real heart,' and the 'real heart' is 'loving the people.' Yi Kwang-ryeo expressed the 'real heart' through being

'loving the people.' This is indeed the spirit of practical learning pursued by Yi Kwang-ryeo."

3) Paper Related to Shin Jak 申綽 (Ganghwa 江華 Yangming School of Thought) (1)

1

Min Hye-yeong

A Study on the Views of 『Gomunsangseo』 of Seokcheon Shin Jak

Nammyung

Institute of Gyeongnam Culture

Shin Jak (申綽: 1760–1828) was a scholar who authored works such as *Exempla of Zuo's Commentaries on the Spring and autumn annals* (Chunchujwassijeonryeo 春秋左氏傳例), *Explanations and Analyses of the I Ching* (Yeokchago 易次故), and *Explanations and Analyses of the Book of Rites* (Sangchago 尙次故). His father was Shin Dae-woo 申大羽, who held the position of 'Vice Minister of Household Affairs (Hojo Champan 戶曹參判),' and his mother was the daughter of Jeong Hu-il 鄭厚一, who was the son of Jeong Jedu 鄭齊斗. Thus, Shin Jak was the great-grandson of Jeong Jedu. He had a close friendship with Jeong Yak-yong (丁若鏞, 1762–1836), who was moved by Shin Jak's profound filial piety and even composed poems to send to him. Shin Jak's scholarship is generally focused on three main areas: Yangming philosophy, Practical Learning, and classical studies.

Min Hye-yeong's "A Study on the Views of 『Gomunsangseo』 of Seokcheon Shin Jak" examines the classical scholarly nature of his work. "The debate over the Old Text and New Text of Confucian classics (jinguwenlunzhan 今古文論爭) is an important topic in the history of classical studies. Among these, the Book of Documents (Shangshu 尙書) has been one of the most controversial texts. After the Song Dynasty, many scholars in

China began to express skepticism about the authenticity of the Old Text of the Book of Documents (Guwen Shangshu 古文尚書), and as a result, during the Qing Dynasty, Yan Ruoqu 閻若璩 presented meticulous documentary evidence in the Proofs of the Old Text of the Venerated Documents (Guwen Shangshu Shuzheng 古文尚書疏證) to argue that the Old Text of the Book of Documents was a forgery. Scholars in Joseon also began to doubt the Old Text of the Book of Documents after the 17th century."

The paper then elucidates Shin Jak's perspective. "Shin Jak believed that although the current Pseudo-Kong Transmission Old Text Shangshu (Wei Kongzhuān Guwen Shangshu 偽孔傳古文尚書) is a forgery, if it has been continuously transmitted as a classic and its content is suitable and rational within the context of the classics, it should not be discarded but rather preserved. However, since it is not the genuine version from the Confucian wall, he aimed to correct the errors of the Pseudo-Kong Transmission Old Text Shangshu and search for its original form."

4) Paper Related to Park Eun-sik 朴殷植 and Jeong In-bo 鄭寅普 (Ganghwa 江華 Yangming School of Thought) (1)

1

KIM, Woo-hyung

A Study on the Self and Subjectivity in Park Eun-sik and Jeong In-bo: Focusing on the Philosophical Characteristics of Jin-ah Theory and Sil-shim Theory

JOURNAL OF YULGOK-STUDIES

Yulgok Society

In discussions about the late Joseon Yangming scholars, two figures who consistently emerge are Park Eun-sik 朴殷植 and Jeong In-bo 鄭寅普. While some researchers argue that it is not appropriate to label Park Eun-sik as a Yangming scholar, his contributions to the promotion of Yangming

philosophy are significant. Jeong In-bo is recognized for bringing the light of Ganghwa 江華 Yangming philosophy to the world and can be truly called a Yangming scholar. The claim that Joseon's Yangming philosophy, which started with Jeong Jedu 鄭齊斗, reached its culmination with Jeong In-bo is not an empty assertion.

KIM Woo-hyung's paper "A Study on the Self and Subjectivity in Park Eun-sik and Jeong In-bo: Focusing on the Philosophical Characteristics of Jin-ah Theory and Sil-shim Theory" positions Park Eun-sik and Jeong In-bo on the same trajectory.

Let's consider Kim Woo-hyung's words: "This paper examined the philosophical characteristics of the theories of True Self (jin'a 真我) and Real Mind (silsim 實心) as views on subject and self by Park Eun-sik and Jeong In-bo, with a focus on their interrelatedness. Although they are widely known as representatives of Korean modern Yangming philosophy, this research aims to explore their True Self and Real Mind theories not just within the context of Yangming philosophy, but in relation to the formation of modern and contemporary Korean philosophy."

Their views are summarized as follows: "Their perspectives on the self and subjectivity were formed within the intellectual current of East Asia at the time, which sought to affirm national identity and establish a native philosophical tradition. The True Self and the Real Mind embody the nature of both the subject of scientific and philosophical cognition and the subject of practical moral cultivation. The exploration of and emphasis on scientific and philosophical principles are key features of the theories of True Self and Real Mind. This impacts their moral theory, where an ethical conflict between the two minds is postulated, and autonomy is granted to the will, enabling the subject to possess free will. Moreover, while True Self and Real Mind are not ontological entities, they can attain eternity through the

functioning of good conscience, which intuitively discerns right and wrong and becomes aware of the fundamental principles of the universe. Despite detailed differences, the theories of True Self and Real Mind can be said to have critically appraised the Confucianism of Joseon and innovatively transformed it into a 'Korean philosophy' through the methodology of Yangming philosophy."

Kim Woo-hyung thus situates both Park Eun-sik and Jeong In-bo within the same trajectory of Yangming philosophy.

5) Overview of Research Papers on Korean Yangming Studies (3)

1

Han Jeong-gil

Analysis of Previous Research on the History of Korean Yangming Studies and
Suggestions for Future Research

The Society for Study of Korean History of Thoughts

The Association for the Study of Korean History of Thoughts

2

Kim, Sea-jeong

Current Status of Research on Ha-gok Jeong Je Du and Its Outstanding Issues
YANG-MING STUDIES

The Korean Society of Yang-Ming Studies

3

Zheng, Guang-hui

A Study on the Emendation Plan for The Critical Collation Book "The Works of
Hagok"

YANG-MING STUDIES

The Korean Society of Yang-Ming Studies

Han Jeong-gil has been consistently publishing his research findings on Korean Yangming studies. Based on years of research, he has endeavored to examine Korean Yangming philosophy from various perspectives.

Han Jeong-gil's "Analysis of Previous Research on the History of Korean

Yangming Studies and Suggestions for Future Research" is an overview based on extensive research. Let's hear his story: "For a systematic description of the history of Korean Yangming Studies, the following research topics and methods are required: 1) Establishing a research perspective on the history of Korean Yangming Studies. 2) Clarifying the characteristics and significance of Korean Yangming philosophy in the context of East Asian Yangming Studies. 3) Presenting clear definitions and criteria for the acceptance of Yangming philosophy. 4) Examining the political and academic background that led to the adoption and critique of Yangming philosophy in Joseon. 5) A systematic description of the existence and development patterns of Korean Yangming Studies is needed. 6) Under the premise that Confucianism, including Yangming Studies, explores the methods of 'self-cultivation and governing others (xiujizhiren 修己治人),' or 'inner sageliness, outer kingliness (neishengwaiwang 內聖外王),' Korean Yangming philosophy should also be illuminated from the perspectives of mind study and practical statecraft. 7) It is necessary to illuminate the significance of Korean Yangming philosophy in relation to the current real-world issues we face. 8) Extensive discovery and collection of materials related to Korean Yangming philosophy are needed."

Kim Sea-jeong has been consistently publishing almost every year, organizing research achievements related to Chinese and Korean Yangming philosophy presented in both China and Korea.

Kim Sea-jeong's "Current Status of Research on Ha-gok Jeong Je Du and Its Outstanding Issues" is an overview based on years of his research. Let's hear his story: "The scholarly achievements of Jeong Jedu 鄭齊斗 are preserved in Hagok Collection (Hagokjip 霞谷集), and research on his thoughts and scholarship centering on this collection began in the 1970s, leading to significant findings over the past 50 years. The research

achievements on Jeong Jedu up to 2019 include 7 books, 5 translations of original texts, 15 doctoral dissertations, 25 master's theses, and 186 academic papers, totaling 246 works. ... Research on Jeong Jedu can be broadly divided into four periods. First, the 1970s and 1980s were the 'Foundation Period' for Jeong Jedu studies. The 1970s were the 'Sowing Period,' and the 1980s were the 'Germination Period.' Second, the 1990s were the 'Rooting Period' for Jeong Jedu studies. Third, the 2000s were the 'Growth Period' of Jeong Jedu studies. Fourth, the 2010s were the 'Period of Deepening and Diversification.' Based on past research achievements, the following tasks must be addressed for further advancement in Jeong Jedu studies: First, the definitive edition of Hagok Collection and its complete translation are required. Second, based on the extensive research achievements, an academic book reevaluating Jeong Jedu studies in its entirety is needed, along with a popular book on Jeong Jedu studies that is accessible to general readers. Third, there is a need for more active engagement with Jeong Jedu studies in relation to various contemporary societal issues."

In recent years, the project to establish a definitive edition of the Hagok Collection has emerged as an important issue among researchers of Yangming Studies. In his work, "A Study on the Emendation Plan for The Critical Collation Book The Works of Hagok," Zheng Guang-hui presents a critical point: identifying the specific version of Wang Yangming's literary collection that was referenced by Jeong Jedu. He emphasizes that "It is crucial to determine which edition of Wang Yangming's writings Jeong Jedu referred to. Recent studies suggest that the texts used by Jeong Jedu were different from those commonly referenced by current researchers. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a critical examination based on the texts Jeong Jedu used. Presently, most researchers base their work on the

1572 edition of the Complete Works of Wang Wenchengong (Wangwenchengongquanji 王文成公全集), using it as the foundational text, while also incorporating newly discovered writings of Wang Yangming from before the 1990s. These are critically reviewed and supplemented in the modern Chinese version of Complete Works of Wang Yangming (Wangyangmingquanji 王陽明全集), published in 1992 by the Shanghai Ancient Books Publishing House. The 1572 edition itself is based on the Complete Works of Wang Wenchengong, edited under the guidance of Qian Dehong 錢德洪. However, a close examination of the writings in the Hagok Collection reveals that Jeong Jedu did not refer to the Complete Works of Wang Wenchengong, but instead to The Literary Record of Master Yangming (Yangmingxianshengwenlu 陽明先生文錄), compiled by Huang Wan 黃綰. Qian Dehong selectively edited and published Wang Yangming's works according to his own viewpoints, even compiling The Chronological Biography of Master Yangming (Yangmingfuzinianpu 陽明夫子年譜). Contrarily, Huang Wan opposed this approach and published a collection with as many of Wang Yangming's writings as possible, adhering to an objective perspective. Furthermore, understanding why Jeong Jedu exclusively referred to The Literary Record of Master Yangming and considering the academic environment of the time are also crucial elements that warrant attention.”

3. Major Papers Analysis and Critique

As previously mentioned in papers related to Jeong Jedu 鄭齊斗, categorized by individual scholars, it's pertinent to reiterate a crucial discussion point. Modern researchers observe Jeong Jedu's academic thought from two perspectives: emphasizing its distinction from Zhu Xi's philosophy

or highlighting its affinity with Zhu Xi's teachings.

Indeed, this issue is quite complex. It revolves around discussing the similarities and differences between Zhu Xi's teachings and Wang Yangming's philosophy, which together constitute the Neo-Confucianism of the Song and Ming dynasties. This debate, originating from the Zhu-Lu 朱陸 controversy during the Song Dynasty, continues in modern times as the Zhu-Wang 朱王 debate.

For instance, the debate over the nature of Yi Hwang's 李滉 heart/mind studies (Simhak 心學) was once heated in the Korean academic circle. Tu Weiming 杜維明 linked Yi Hwang's theory of principle-in-motion (lidongshuo 理動說) with Mou Zongsan's 牟宗三 notion of 'existence-in-action (jicunyoujihudong 即存有即活動),' sparking a significant debate over the character of Yi Hwang's heart/mind studies. No one denies Yi Hwang's status as a Zhu Xi scholar. However, complexities arise when attempting to establish him as the foundational figure of Korean Neo-Confucianism, necessitating a definition of the unique characteristics of Yi Hwang's interpretation of Neo-Confucianism compared to the Chinese Zhu Xi school. In this process, heart/mind studies gained prominence, showing a clear affinity with Wang Yangming's philosophy.

A similar situation arises in the study of Jeong Jedu. No one denies that Jeong Jedu was a scholar of Yangming philosophy. Yet, complexities emerge when attempting to establish him as the initiator of Korean Yangming studies, necessitating an identification of how Jeong Jedu's interpretation differs from the Chinese Yangming school. In this process, the study of human nature (Seonghak 性學) becomes prominent, which, in fact, shows a clear affinity with Zhu Xi's teachings.

Now we delve into a more detailed analysis, starting with Park Kil-Su's critical examination in "Critical Consideration on the Theory of the Principle

of Living of Hagok – Centering on Comparison with the Theory of the Principle of Living of Song–Ming’s Neo–Confucianism –."

Park Kil–Su explores the origins of Jeong Jedu's theory of living principle (shenglishuo 生理說) by dividing Song Dynasty Neo–Confucianism into two groups: the Cheng Hao 程顥 style and the Cheng Yi–Zhu Xi 程朱 style. "In this process, Cheng Hao equates 'living (sheng 生)' with 'living principle (shengli 生理)' and sees it as the universal creative source. In contrast, Cheng Yi 程頤 and Zhu Xi 朱熹, based on the theory of principle and vital energy (liqilun 理氣論), bifurcate 'living principle' into 'living' and 'principle,' attributing positivity only to the living principle as a principle of human nature (xingli 性理)."

What, then, is Park Kil–Su's understanding of Jeong Jedu's stance? "While Jeong Jedu views the living principle, in terms of creation and existence, as the creative source of heaven, earth, and all things, he limits its value and governance to the true essence and true principle, aligning closer to the Cheng Yi–Zhu Xi system of principle and vital energy theory and mind/human nature theory, and differing from Wang Yangming's perspective. This represents a thorough separation between living principle and human nature, and between 'living' and 'living principle.'"

Park clarifies his viewpoint further: "In this regard, Jeong Jedu largely adopts Wang Yangming's ideas and content regarding the living principle, but in constructing the overall framework and inherent logic, he fundamentally relies on the theories of Cheng Yi and Zhu Xi."

He then discusses the differences with Wang Yangming: "In relation to the identity of Jeong Jedu's heart/mind studies, the most crucial difference from Wang Yangming's theory is their respective views on the living principle. Wang Yangming considers the living principle as self–sufficient, whereas Jeong Jedu sees it as incomplete. The issue of the living principle's

self-sufficiency is inseparably linked to the explanation of its dominance. Acknowledging its self-sufficiency naturally leads to questions of spontaneous creation and self-balancing, while denying it necessitates defining dominance from a higher level of the mind that transcends the living principle. Wang Yangming defines the dominance of the living principle in terms of its constancy and stability, through moderation and determination, whereas Jeong Jedu defines it through the true essence and true principle, positioning it as the ruler and essence of human nature."

Park Kil-Su's position highlights Jeong Jedu's affinity with Zhu Xi's teachings while establishing him as a founder of Korean Yangming studies. However, accepting the premise that 'Jeong Jedu was a Yangming scholar' leads to the subsequent proposition that 'Jeong Jedu regarded innate knowledge (liangzhi 良知) as the principle of heaven (tianli 天理).' Accepting both propositions puts Park's position at risk.

Park Hyunjung, a burgeoning researcher who earned a doctorate focusing on Nie Bao 聶豹, a figure from the so-called 'Practice and Verification School (Xiuzhengpai 修證派)' (Yangming Right Wing 陽明右派) of the later Yangming studies, elucidates her reasoning for writing the paper "The Knowing and Innate knowledge of the Good in Hagok School of Thought." She states, "Previous studies on Jeong Jedu's perception concluded that he understood Yangming philosophy in a relatively Zhu Xi-oriented manner. This paper fundamentally questions whether Jeong Jedu's understanding of perception can indeed be interpreted as Zhu Xi-like... Specifically, it examines the perception theories of the later Yangming scholars and Jeong Jedu's perception, then explores the characteristics of Jeong Jedu's perception as presented in the Hagok Collection. Through this, it aims to illuminate the nature of Jeong Jedu's understanding of perception, its relevance to the later Yangming scholars, and ultimately demonstrate that it

is not merely a Zhu Xi-like interpretation of Yangming philosophy, but rather exhibits distinct features of Jeong Jedu's understanding of Yangming philosophy. The paper posits that understanding perception provides an effective criterion to examine the unique qualities of Jeong Jedu's Yangming philosophy."

Park Hyunjung's argument proceeds as follows: "We have examined Jeong Jedu's understanding of perception in the previous section. We observed that Jeong Jedu differentiates between the general sensory activity of perception (Perception A) and perception as the manifestation of the innate principle (Perception B). I believe that this directly relates to the concept of 'living principle' (shengli 生理) as the human counterpart to the principle of things."

In essence, "Human living principle takes the form of Perception A, but its essence lies in Perception B, where the innate principle manifests concretely. The spiritedness of the human mind is characterized by this Perception B, which is considered an active living principle."

She then critically evaluates the widespread academic distinction between true principle and living principle: "While true principle may be seen as a higher concept of living principle, representing only Perception B within the union of Perception A and B, in the realm of phenomenal perception, true principle always manifests as living principle. Therefore, true principle should not be considered a completely independent concept, but rather a limited one, used to specify the purity of the innate principle in phenomena."

Thus, Park Hyunjung summarizes the significance of Jeong Jedu's theory of living principle: "Jeong Jedu, while distinguishing between Perception A and B, asserts that Perception B always manifests in the form of Perception A and is essentially not different from the innate principle. The former is a shared aspect across Yangming philosophy, and the latter aligns with the positions of both the Realization School (Xianchengpai 現成派) and the

Practice and Verification School (Xiuzhengpai 修證派) of the later Yangming studies. However, Jeong Jedu's originality lies in reinterpreting this understanding of perception into his own terminology of living principle. Although previous research has identified the theory of living principle as a characteristic aspect of Jeong Jedu, analyzing this concept from the perspective of perception theory better reveals his intended meaning. He views the perceptual activity of humans and the manifestation of the innate principle encompassed within it as the lively principle of the mind, or living principle."

This view notably contrasts with that of Park Kil-Su.

4. Evaluation and Outlook

The number of papers on Korean Yangming studies has shown a consistent growth: 8 papers in 2014, 12 in 2015, 15 in 2016, 16 in 2017, 19 in 2018, 18 in 2019, followed by a slight decrease to 13 in 2020, 14 in 2021, and 12 in 2022. This trend is not unique to Korean Yangming studies but is also observed in studies of the Ming and Qing dynasties in China.

The number of papers on Korean Yangming studies published annually in major academic journals is certainly not negligible, reflecting the significant role of Yangming studies (especially the Jeong Jedu school) in the overall history of Confucianism in Joseon. Notably, this year has seen a remarkable increase in the number of papers centered on the academic thought of Jeong Jedu compared to previous years.

In the 2022 research, no particular 'problematic works' stand out, but two papers are worth mentioning. First is Jeong Jinwook's "Hagok[霞谷] Jeong Je-doo[鄭齊斗]'s introspective views of human body and its significance."

This paper offers a fresh perspective on the concept of the body, skillfully integrating existing research findings into its theme. Second is Chen Han's "Reinterpretation of the concept of Jeong Je-du's Xin 心." Chen Han meticulously examines Jeong Jedu's emphasis on the heart in the context of the Yellow Emperor's Canon of Medicine (Huangdi Neijing 黃帝內經), detailing Jeong Jedu's frequent use of concepts like spirit (shen 神), essence (jing 精), vital energy (qi 氣), blood and vital energy (xueqi 血氣), and form and vital energy (xingqi 形氣). This paper is expected to significantly aid in understanding relevant content in Cunyan 存言.

As previously emphasized, the future revitalization of Joseon Yangming studies requires the discovery of new Yangming scholars and exploration of new themes to expand the discourse. The major challenge remains the limitations of source materials. This area requires continuous attention and consistent improvement by researchers.