

Special Feature

The Learning of Principle and the Governing by Culture in Joseon

LEE Bongkyoo

www.kci.go.kr



The Review of Korean Studies Volume 23 Number 2 (December 2020): 11-37

doi: 10.25024/review.2020.23.2.11

©2020 by the Academy of Korean Studies. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Confucianism sought to govern state affairs through virtue and ritual. It was a way to resolve and prevent disputes arising from governing by way of force and punishment. The learning of principle (*ihak* 理學) reestablished the political ideology of Confucianism using Mencius (*Mengzi* 孟子). It aimed to guide rulers including kings to first suppress their individual desires and practice human imperatives. As the popularity of the learning of principle grew, various systems and schools of study guiding the willing and spontaneous practice of human imperatives were established and implemented throughout East Asia. A variety of books on rituals including *Family Rites* as well as books on the learning of principle for the education of the sovereign such as *Extended Meaning of the Great Learning* (*Daxue yanyi* 大學衍義) were produced and used widely, while institutions such as the royal lectures (*gyeongyeon* 經筵) that held the power of the king in check and ruled through public opinion spread as new forms of politics. As a result, state affairs were governed through various learnings, which sought to realize human imperatives through virtue, and through laws pertaining to rites and rituals, which were the embodiment of human imperatives in everyday life—in other words, governing by culture (*munchi* 文治) developed across East Asia.

The learning of principle was accepted by the intellectuals of Goryeo during their exchanges with Yuan as a line of reformist thought. It provided the basic political ideology for the founding of Joseon and functioned as the central principle throughout the Joseon period, from politics to everyday life. Examining how Joseon made use of the learning of principle therefore will give us a better understanding of the characteristics of Joseon as a Confucian society, as well as the status and historical significance Joseon carries in the history of Confucianism in East Asia. The present article focuses on how the learning of principle was used politically in Joseon and analyzes the following three areas.

The first is how *Family Rites* (*Jiali* 家禮), the product of the learning of principle, was used in the process of establishing and completing the state rituals of Joseon. Although *Family Rites* had been compiled as a guideline for performing family rites in scholar-official households, the government also used it to establish and supplement the manuals of state rituals in addition to its use as the standard for family rites practiced among scholar-officials. In this article, I focus mostly on its use by the government and cast new light on how *Family*

Rites was used in Joseon.

Second, I look at features of the textbooks used in royal lectures that were newly compiled or used in Joseon after the *Extended Meaning of the Great Learning*. The royal lecture was a political institution that was actively and continuously utilized in Joseon after it was revitalized during the Song dynasty. Based on the idea of rectifying the mind of the ruler (*gyeokgunsim* 格君心) of Mencius, scholars of the learning of principle established the political theory of the learning of the sages (*seonghak* 聖學), compiled books on the learning of the sages, and used them to educate the king during royal lectures. Among the countries of East Asia, royal lectures were the most actively held in Joseon over a long period of time. Therefore, examining the books used during the royal lectures that were compiled or used in Joseon can provide us with insight into what was emphasized or deliberated over in realizing the political ideology of the learning of principle in Joseon.

Third, I look at the political stance Joseon took in response to the international changes the Ming-Qing transition brought through the lens of the Sino-barbarian dichotomy (*hwairon* 華夷論). Although this dichotomy was proposed in each East Asian country, Joseon was distinct in that it was argued in the context of realizing the ideology of the learning of principle. Thus, the present article looks at how the Sino-barbarian dichotomy developed in Joseon in relation to the legitimacy of the dynasty and takes a fresh look at how the argument to revere the Confucian king (*jonwangnon* 尊王論) changed to practicing the Confucian king (*haengwangnon* 行王論).

The Use of *Family Rites*

Rule by ritual was carried out by documenting the laws governing rituals into manuals and continuously supplementing them. After the *Manual of the Five State Rites* (*Gukjo oryeyi* 國朝五禮儀) was compiled in 1474, the 5th year of the reign of King Seongjong, supplemented manuals for state rites were further compiled during the reign of King Yeongjo, including *Sequel to Manual of the Five State Rites* (*Gukjo sok oryeyi* 國朝續五禮儀) (1744), *Supplement to Sequel to Manual of the Five State Rites* (*Gukjo sok oryeyi bo* 國朝續五禮儀補) (1750), and *Compiled Supplement to Manual of Funerary State Rites* (*Gukjo sangnye bopyeon* 國朝喪禮補編) (1752, 1758) (An 2006). King Jeongjo subsequently had these

combined into the *Comprehensive Collection of Manual of the Five State Rites* (*Gukjo orye tongpyeon* 國朝五禮通編) (1788, 1810),¹ while also compiling all the laws governing rites and rituals that had been established and implemented during the Joseon period into the *Comprehensive Study of the Board of Rites* (*Chungwan tonggo* 春官通考) (1788). The process of supplementation continued on to the *Handbook of the Five Rites* (*Orye pyeongo* 五禮便考) and the *Illustrated Handbook of the Five Rites* (*Orye pyeongo dosik* 五禮便考圖式), although these did not make it to publication (Kim 2004).

A prominent feature in the continuous process of documenting manuals of state rituals throughout the Joseon period was that the rules of *Family Rites* were used as a standard. Although *Family Rites* was created based on rituals carried out in scholar-official households, it was used throughout as a standard for rituals of the royal household before and during the establishment of the *Manual of the Five State Rites* as well as during its modification.

In the *National Code* (*Gyeongjuk daejeon* 經國大典), the examination on *Family Rites* and *Elementary Learning* (*Sohak* 小學) were designated as prerequisites for the second examination of the Classics Licentiate Examination, in essence, making into law what had been the practice since King Sejong.² Yi Hwang 李滉 specified in the school regulations of the Nisan private academy (Nisan seowon 尼山書院) that *Family Rites* and *Elementary Learning* would be studied as the first step of the school curriculum. This regulation was later widely selected in the private academies of Joseon (Lee 2010, 112). With *Family Rites* selected as a test subject and introductory subject for private academies, it became possible for the scholar-officials of Joseon to study and acquire *Family Rites* as basic knowledge in addition to *Elementary Learning*. According to one study, there are more than 480 types of books on family rites personally compiled by the scholar-officials of Joseon, which is far more than anywhere else in East Asia including China, Japan, and Vietnam (Jang 2013b, 210).

The Joseon court used *Family Rites* as an important reference in creating

illustrated records of funerary rites of the royal household including the king before establishing the *Manual of the Five State Rites*.³ Specifically, King Taejong followed *Family Rites* for the mourning of King Taejo and recorded the funerary ritual process in the *Illustrated Record of the Funerary Rites for the Great King Taejo Gangheon* (*Taejo Gangheon daewang sangjang uigwe* 太祖康獻大王喪葬儀軌), which King Sejong followed when mourning for King Jeongjong. When mourning for King Taejong, King Sejong compiled the *Illustrated Record of the Funerary Rites for the Great King Taejong Gongjeong* (*Taejong Gongjeong daewang sangjang uigwe* 太宗恭靖大王喪葬儀軌), which used the *General History of Institutions and Critical Examination of Documents and Studies* (*Wenxian tongkao* 文獻通考), *Encyclopedia of Rites* (*Tongdian* 通典), and *Family Rites* as reference. For example, the ceremonies preceding the ceremony of repose (*uje* 虞祭) were to be performed by designated attendants for each step, while the ceremony of repose and those following it were to be done by the successor king, according to the *Rites of Zhou* (*Zhou li* 周禮) and *Family Rites*. This deviated from the *Commentary of the Death Rites of Emperor Taizong of Great Tang* (*Datang Yuanling yi zhu* 大唐元陵儀注) and the rites performed for the mourning of Emperor Qinzong of Song, which stipulated that the ceremonies starting from the second ceremony to clean and shroud the deceased (*daeryeomjeon* 大斂奠) were to be done by the successor emperor in person.⁴ In other words, the Joseon court used *Family Rites* and ancient examples as the basis to revise Chinese commentaries on rites.

The early laws of Joseon were based on the *Six Codes of Administration* (*Gyeongje yukjeon* 經濟六典). During the reign of King Taejong, suggestions to revise the dress code of the *Six Codes of Administration* based on the rules of *Family Rites* were raised and subsequently applied in enacting the *National Code*. For instance, (a) the attire for the mourning of nieces and nephews on the maternal side were to be mourning clothes called *sogong* 小功, while those for a married niece were to be *sima* 緦麻; (b) the mourning attire for one's wife's

1. Following the order of King Jeongjo, Yu Uiyeong combined these manuals on ritual into the *Comprehensive Collection of Manual of the Five State Rites* (*Gukjo orye tongpyeon* 國朝五禮通編), producing a draft in 1788, which Yi Jiyeong completed after correcting in 1810. It was not, however, published. For more on this, see Kim 2007.

2. *Sejongillok, gwon* 31, 27th day of the 1st lunar month, 1426: “赴生員試者, 始令文臣監察, 分臺于成均正錄所, 考講小學家禮.”; Regulations of the Second Exam of the Classics and Literary Licentiate Examination 生員進士覆試 in “Manual of Rites” 禮典 of the *National Code* 經國大典.

3. After King Taejo died in 1408, most of the mourning attire for funerary rites of the royal household followed *Family Rites*. *Taejongillok, gwon* 15, 24th day of the 5th lunar month: “太上王薨于別殿... 治喪一依朱子家禮.”; *Sejongillok, gwon* 5, 27th day of the 9th lunar month: “主上齊衰期年, 亦以日易月, 十三日而除, 其服制, 並依朱子家禮. 大妃·明嬪以下宮人, 並斬衰三年; 恭妃, 齊衰期年; 誠妃·貞慶宮主以下宮人齊衰三年, 其服制亦依朱子家禮. 參用俗制. 宗親斬衰三年, 十三日而練, 二十五日而祥, 二十七日而禫, 服用家禮之制.”

4. *Sejongillok, gwon* 22, 8th day of the 10th lunar month.

parents and one's son-in-law were to be *sima*; (c) the mourning clothes for maternal female cousins that were not married were to be *sima* or none if they were married; and (d) the mourning attire for the wife of one's daughter's child was *sima*, same as that for a grandchild.⁵ The second example (b) was a revision of the custom harkening back to the Goryeo dynasty when the system of one's son-in-law living together (*deril sawije*) was popular and the mourning for the parents of one's wife had required wearing mourning attire for a year and *sima* for the son-in-law. Based on *Family Rites*, the mourning clothes for both cases, as mentioned above, were modified to be *sima*. This example shows that during early Joseon, *Family Rites* was used as a standard in the revision of the law and customs of the previous dynasty, Goryeo.

The *Manual of the Five State Rites* (1474) was established based on Chinese books of rituals, from *Rites of the Kaiyuan Period* (*Kaiyuan li* 開元禮) to the *Hongwu Book of Rites* (*Hongwu lizhi* 洪武禮制), and *Prescribed Ritual Texts of Past and Present* (*Gogeu sangjeongrye* 古今詳定禮) of Goryeo, in addition to *Family Rites*.⁶ *Family Rites* was particularly referred to for rules regarding high officials and both elites and non-elites (Jang 2013a). Even after the *Manual of the Five State Rites* was established, previous examples in the *Book of Etiquette and Ceremonies* (*Yili* 儀禮) and the *Book of Rituals* (*Liji* 禮記) as well as the rules of *Family Rites* were used for revision.

Proposals regarding the revision of the *Manual of the Five State Rites* were actively made in the 17th century. Kim Jip 金集, in response to King Hyojong's request for advice regarding the mourning of King Injo, presented his proposal for revision under the title "Discussion of a Comparative Study of Funerary Rites of Old and New" (*Gogeu sangnye idong ui* 古今喪禮異同議), which was a collection of pertinent discussions during that era. This proposal, together with the one proposed by the Board of Rites and Yi Gyeong-seok, were used as reference for revision when King Yeongjo was compiling *Sequel to Manual of the*

Five State Rites, Supplement to Sequel to Manual of the Five State Rites, and again when compiling *Compiled Supplement to Manual of Funerary State Rites* (1757).

The *Manual of the Five State Rites* stipulated that during the funerary ritual of the 1st anniversary of one's mother's death that was performed after 11 months in the case that the father was still alive (*yeonje* 練祭), the mourning dress and head ornament should be *choebok* 衰服 and *yeongwan* 練冠. In the case of King Hyojong in 1660, Song Jun-gil 宋浚吉 argued that the *yeongwan* and *yeonbok* 練服 should be worn based on "Diagram on Changing Clothes during the Yeonje Ritual" (*Yeonje subok do* 練祭受服圖) of the *Comprehensive Explication of the Book of Etiquette and Ceremonies* (*Yili jingchuan tongjie* 儀禮經傳通解), and this revision was carried out with the support of the officials of the court. Song Jun-gil's proposal was documented in *Sequel to Manual of the Five State Rites* during the reign of King Yeongjo.⁷ This shows an example of revising the rules of the *Manual of the Five State Rites* based on ancient examples recorded in the *Comprehensive Explication of the Book of Etiquette and Ceremonies*.

Compiled Supplement to Manual of Funerary State Rites was the result of revisions carried out after King Yeongjo discussed with court officials the parts he found unreasonable in the funerary rites and proprietary rules of the royal household that he had experienced. The revisions were based either on ancient examples or on *Family Rites*, or Zhu Xi's explanations of rites. The following are examples of the latter: (a) revision of the rules regarding official attire for officials and when marriage ceremonies could be carried out during periods of national mourning based on the Zhu Xi's "Explanation of Court Attire" (*Junchen fuyi* 君臣服議); (b) requiring that the morning and evening offerings of food in front of the altar (*sangsik* 上食) be continued until the funerary ritual offered at the second anniversary of a person's death (*daesang* 大祥) following the explanation of Zhu Xi; (c) following *Family Rites*, if the gravesite was too far and the first funerary ritual after the funeral (*chou* 初虞) was hard to perform upon returning from the gravesite, it could be done in a temporary palace, and to discontinue the morning and evening wailing after a person's death (*joseok gok* 朝夕哭) after *yeonje*; and (d) the ritual of putting a marble or rice in the mouth of the deceased when dressing it in shroud (*banham* 飯含) would be done not by the

5. *Taejong sillok*, 23rd day of 12th lunar month.

6. Gang Huimaeng 姜希孟, "Orye ui seo" 五禮儀序, *Collected Writings of Sasukje Gang Huimaeng* (*Sasukje jip* 私淑齋集), *gwon* 8: "及我世宗莊憲大王...乃命禮曹判書臣許稠, 詳定諸祀序例及吉禮儀, 又命集賢殿儒臣, 詳定五禮儀, 悉做『杜氏通典』, 旁采羣書, 兼用中朝『諸司職掌』、『洪武禮制』、『東國』、『古今詳定禮』等書, 參酌損益, 裁自聖心, 未及施用, 而賓天斯迫, 嗚呼痛哉!"; *Jungjong sillok*, *gwon* 46, 5th day of 10th lunar month: "禮曹參判金安老啓曰: 『五禮儀註』與『大明會典』, 頗多抵牾. 『五禮儀』做『朱文公家禮』士大夫之禮而爲之, 故祝辭皆士大夫之禮. 『大明會典』乃帝王之禮, 祝辭、節次簡約而有等級. 今此冠禮自今創爲之事, 不可容易爲之, 必須會議, 酌二禮『大明會典』、『五禮儀註』, 而取中撰定其禮, 故今日不得爲習儀也."

7. *Hyeongjong sillok*, *gwon* 2, 24th day of the 4th lunar month.

eunuchs but the successor king himself following ancient precedent and *Family Rites*.

Family Rites was also used when compiling the *Handbook of the Five Rites* during the reign of King Gojong. The *Records of Filial Piety and Compassion* (*Xiao ci lu* 孝慈錄), which was promulgated following the orders of Zhu Yuanzhang, Emperor Hongwu, of Ming, defined the mourning attire of the concubine of one's father as wearing the designated *zicui* clothes and carrying a cane (*zicui zhangqi*; K. *jachoe janggi* 齊衰杖期) and this had been replicated in the *National Code*. King Gojong listened to the opinions of his officials and, based on ancient examples—manuals of rites and rituals until then—and *Family Rites*, ordered it to be restored to *sima*.⁸ In other words, the rules that Emperor Hongwu had arbitrarily elevated were revised to suit the idea of propriety in the learning of principle based on *Family Rites* and rules governing rites and ritual.

As we have seen until now, the way Joseon used *Family Rites* to revise manuals of rites and rituals displays the following characteristics: first, when the *Manual of the Five State Rites* was revised based on ancient examples, rules of decorum were supplemented by referring to *Family Rites* and Zhu Xi's explanations of rites in the case that the rules of ancient examples were insufficient. This shows how *Family Rites* was not simply used among the scholar-officials but instead as universal rites practiced by both top and bottom alike. Also, the involvement of the eunuch was reduced and the role of the successor king and relevant officials were expanded, thus strengthening the official aspect of state funerary rites. Having the king do the ritual of placing a marble or rice in the mouth of the deceased by himself, lengthening the period of offering food in front of the alter morning and night to until the funerary ritual of the second anniversary of the deceased's death, and having the king himself perform the ceremonies starting from that of repose all aimed to guide the king toward the path of faithfully practicing filial piety and veneration. All these revisions were the practice and realization of the belief of the learning of principle—that to maintain one's role and position while faithfully practicing filial love and veneration formed the foundation of propriety⁹—in politics.

Educating the King with Books on the Learning of Principle

Effectively putting a check on the political power that was concentrated in the king was an extremely important and difficult task throughout the history of East Asia. Mencius argued that the foremost political task of the minister in order to stabilize the state was to “rectify the king's mind” (*gyeokgunsim* 格君心).¹⁰ The learning of the sages and royal lectures were specific realizations of Mencius's argument by scholars of the learning of principle. These scholars reestablished the study of Confucianism from the perspective of the learning of the sages, which contemplated ways to attain the ideal character of the sages such as that of Emperor Yao and Emperor Shun. By presenting the methods they developed to the king during royal lectures and educating him, they controlled the political power that was centered on the king.

Making the learning of the sages the main line of pursuit in the study of Confucianism, that is, understanding the sages not as objects of worship but as model characters anyone could attain by self-cultivation, was a novelty that distinguished the learning of principle from previous traditions of Confucianism. Based on the learning of the sages, scholars of the learning of principle proposed that the more urgent political task for the king than displaying heroic abilities was to ceaselessly guard against and suppress his individual desires. For instance, Zhen Dexiu 真德秀 pointed out in the *Extended Meaning of the Great Learning* that in the politics of the three dynasties of Xia, Shang, and Zhou, the king always cautioned against the human mind (*insim* 人心) that could devolve into human desire (*inyok* 人欲), and the minister stood on his guard and corrected the king lest he fall into committing wrongdoings, thereby arguing that this should be the foremost political priority for the kings and ministers of future generations.¹¹ In other words, the king possessed physiological and personal wants (*insim* 人心) that could degenerate into human desire (*inyok* 人欲), and the most fundamental qualities of a good king was whether he could be constantly watchful of the former. He also saw the minister

10. “Iru sang” 離婁上, Mencius: “人不足與適也, 政不足與間也, 惟大人爲能格君心之非, 君仁莫不仁, 君義莫不義, 君正莫不正, 一正君而國定矣。”

11. *Extended Meaning of the Great Learning* (*Daxue yanyi* 大學衍義), *gwon* 1: “「誠意正心之要二·戒逸欲·逸欲之戒」: 人心惟危, 自昔所畏, 雖聖主, 不敢忘操存之功, 大臣事聖主, 不敢廢規儆之益, 後之君臣宜視以爲法。”

8. *Gojong sillok*, 15th day of the 10th lunar month, 1870.

9. “Garye seo,” *Family Rites*: “(凡禮有本有文...)名分之殊, 愛敬之實, 其本也。”

as holding the immensely important responsibility of making sure the king was vigilant against any behavior that followed his individual desires.

Unlike China, where royal lectures were not regularly held after the Ming dynasty except for the 10 years following the Wanli Emperor's ascension to the throne, Joseon continued to hold them, from King Taejong to King Gojong. Joseon thus can be described as having been a dynasty of royal-lecture politics. Under the Yongle Emperor, textbooks of the learning of the sages such as the *Precious Mirror for the Palace of Literary Splendor* (*Wenhua baojian* 文華寶鑑), *Method of the Mind for the Learning of the Sages* (*Shengxue xinfa* 聖學心法), and *Lessons of Attending to the Fundamentals* (*Wuben zhi xun* 務本之訓) were compiled; during the Chenghua 成化 era, Qiu Jun 丘濬 wrote the Supplement to Extended Meaning of the Great Learning (*Daxue yangui bu* 大學衍義補), which was reprinted several times after that; and finally, during the first 10 years of the Wanli Emperor, when Zhang Juzheng 張居正 was in charge of state affairs, royal lectures were held actively (Zhu 2007, 428-39). Seen as a whole, however, the royal lectures remained an institution that did not exert much practical influence until the end of the Qing dynasty. In contrast, the royal lectures of Joseon were continuously held starting from the earlier days of its founding to the reign of King Gojong. Although it was discontinued for a while during the reign of King Sejo, it was back in full swing after the restructuring King Seongjong carried out in 1470, moving the Hall of Worthies (Jiphyeonjeon 集賢殿), which was in charge of the royal lectures during the reign of King Sejong, to under the control of the Office of Special Advisors (Hongmungwan 弘文館). Following Kim Sangheon's suggestion in 1646, King Injo invited scholars that had not taken the civil examination and instead were devoting themselves to research and practice of the learning of principle in realms outside of politics, appointed them as officials, and bestowed upon them governmental posts including senior 3rd rank of the academy for the crown prince (Chanseon 贊善) and senior 4th rank of the academy for the crown prince (Jinseon 進善), thus allowing them to join royal lectures. In this way, during the latter half of Joseon when private academies flourished, the scholars that were not in power did not serve on any governmental post, and instead devoted themselves to passing down and carrying out the learning of principle in private academies—the so-called rustic literati (*sallim* 山林)—directly participated in managing state affairs through royal lectures. Unlike those that had passed the civil examination, the rustic literati held responsibilities not as the king's subject but as his teacher, and thus

could voice their opinions with a certain level of independence. The influence of the rustic literati who participated in royal lectures changed depending on the period, but the participation of these scholars in royal lectures including voicing their own opinions regarding state affairs was a distinct characteristic of the royal lectures of Joseon (Ji 2009).

The textbooks used during the royal lectures in the Joseon period produced the required text along two lines. One direction not only referred to Chinese history but also made sure the historical experience of Joseon informed the education carried out during the royal lectures. The *Exemplar for Efficient Government* (*Chipyeong yoram* 治平要覽) (1516), compiled by the orders of King Sejong during the reign of King Jungjong, and the *Compendium of Extended Meaning of the Great Learning* (*Daehak yeonui jimnyak* 大學衍義輯略) (1472), which was compiled by Yi Seokhyeong under King Seongjong,¹² included cases of Korean history preceding Joseon in addition to Chinese history as a resource for the king. As for the politics of the period of preceding kings, the *Newly Compiled Precious Mirror for Succeeding Reigns* (*Sinchan gukjo bogam* 新撰國朝寶鑑) (1458), *Sequel to Precious Mirror for Succeeding Reigns* (*Sok gukjo bogam* 續國朝寶鑑) (1500), *Precious Mirror of the Reign of King Seonjo* (*Seonmyo bogam* 宣廟寶鑑) (1684), and the *Precious Mirror of the Reign of King Sukjong* (*Sungmyo bogam* 肅廟寶鑑) (1730) were compiled and were continuously referred to. King Jeongjo gathered examples of the politics of all the kings from King Taejo to King Yeongjo and published it as the *Precious Mirror for Succeeding Reigns* (*Gukjo bogam* 國朝寶鑑) in 1782, which was supplemented again in 1908 under the reign of King Sunjong, two years before Joseon fell (Hong 2017, 189-95). Reflecting upon the politics of preceding kings thus continuously took place in Joseon.

The other direction in which text for the royal lectures was produced was to supplement the books on the learning of the sages. Yi Hwang's *Ten Diagrams on the Learning of the Sages* (*Seonghak sipdo* 聖學十圖) (1568) and Yi I's *Essentials of the Learning of the Sages* (*Seonghak jipyo* 聖學輯要) (1575) were initially ways to study the learning of the sages that were presented to the then king, King Seonjo, but became the foundation of the learning of principle of Joseon after that. Yi Hwang explained the whole structure of the learning of principle with

12. *Seongjong sillok*, 16th day of 4th lunar month, 1472.

10 diagrams and accompanying captions and attributed meaning in terms of self-cultivation onto them in relation to the main entities of *Elementary Learning and Great Learning* (*Daxue* 大學). Specifically, the study of *Elementary Learning* was the study of fostering (*hamyang* 涵養), which was to familiarize oneself with something as to make it natural and entailed the practice of human imperatives in everyday life so that the goodness innate in human nature would naturally settle and spread throughout the body and mind. The study of the *Great Learning* was the perfection of knowledge until all doubt was resolved (*chiji* 致知) and meant deepening the intellectual understanding of the learning of principle. Yi Hwang presented the side-by-side pursuit of these two studies as the method of self-cultivation and emphasized that these two studies must always be based on the efforts to abide in attentiveness (*geogyong* 居敬) (Lee 2010, 116-17).

Regarding the king's self-cultivation, Yi I placed significance on transforming the physical constitution (*gijil* 氣質), or disposition, and appointing wise and talented individuals.¹³ To transform the physical constitution, Yi I argued, one must study in the following sequence of convergence (*suryeom* 收斂), i.e., collecting the distracted mind to one, the exhaustive search for principle (*gungni* 窮理), i.e., ensuring sufficient intellectual understanding, and the completion of the truth (*seongsil* 誠實), i.e., to exclude individual desire and making one's thoughts sincere. Efforts must also be made, he also argued, to subdue one's self (*geukgi* 克己). In addition, he asserted that to appoint wise individuals, virtuous men, and petty men must be distinguished, and the latter, who pursued desires of the self, must be expelled. As a way to detect the latter, Yi I recommended examining the ways in which human imperatives operate and grasping the intention of what was said (*jieon* 知言) while exhaustively searching for principle.¹⁴

The study and practice of the learning of the sages, although effective when practiced, could not yield any results if the king himself did not willingly make an effort. Thus, Yi Hwang and Yi I emphasized to King Seonjo that the king

should be the first to set his mind on the learning of the sages.¹⁵ In particular, Yi I placed the chapter proclaiming the intention to embark upon this path of study (*ipji jang* 立志章) to come at the beginning of the *Essentials of the Learning of the Sages and Important Methods of Eliminating Ignorance* (*Gyeongmong yogyaeol* 擊蒙要訣), thus making the determination to pursue the learning of the sages be the first step of study.

During the royal lectures of late Joseon, Zhen Dexiu's *Classic of the Mind and Heart* (*Xinjing* 心經) was often used as the textbook. Zhu Xi referred to the section on the human mind and the moral mind (*renxin daoxin* 人心道心) of "Da yu mo" 大禹謨 of *Hallowed Documents* (*Shangshu* 尚書) as the origin of the study of mind and heart. Based on this perspective of Zhu Xi, Zhen Dexiu extracted proverbs that could serve as guidelines in the study of the learning of the sages, beginning with the section on the human mind and the moral mind from the Classics and writings of the scholars of the learning of principle during the Song dynasty and compiled them into *Classic of the Mind and Heart*. In early Ming, Cheng Minzheng 程敏政, given that Zhu Xi focused on maintaining constant inquiry and study, i.e., the pursuit of knowledge (*daowenxue* 道問學), early on, after which the focus of his studies shifted to honoring one's virtuous nature (*zundexing* 尊德性), added relevant comments of the scholars of the learning of principle during the Song dynasty as additional notes along with his explanations and compiled this as *Additional Explication of the Classic of the Mind and Heart* (*Xinjing fuzhu* 心經附註). Yi Hwang used *Additional Explication of the Classic of the Mind and Heart* in his own self-cultivation throughout his entire life and wrote the *Sequential Discussion of Simgyeong* (*Simgyeong huron* 心經後論) in 1565, explaining that the *Classic of the Mind and Heart* itself was helpful as a guideline for self-cultivation regardless of the argument of Cheng Minzheng. The contents Yi Hwang lectured during his later years remain in Yi Hamhyeong's *Lecture Notes on the Classic of the Mind and Heart* (*Simgyeong gangnok* 心經講錄) and Yi Deok-hong's *Questions about the Classic of the Mind and Heart* (*Simgyeong jirui* 心經質疑). In Joseon, the version of *Additional Explication of the Classic of the Mind and Heart* that included Yi

13. Yi I, "Seonghak jipyo jincha" 聖學輯要進筭, *Seonghak jipyo* 1 聖學輯要, in *The Complete Works of Yulgok Yi I* (*Yulgok jeonso* 栗谷全書), *gwon* 19: "帝王之學, 莫切於變化氣質, 帝王之治, 莫先於推誠用賢."

14. Yi I, "Yonghyeon jang 2" 用賢章, *Essentials of the Learning of the Sages* (*Seonghak jipyo* 聖學輯要), *gwon* 24.

15. Yi Hwang, "Jin Seonghak sipdo cha" 進聖學十圖筭(并圖), *Collected Works of Toegye Yi Hwang* (*Toegye jip* 退溪集), *gwon* 7: "蓋聖門之學, 不求諸心, 則昏而無得, 故必思以通其微; 不習其事, 則危而不安, 故必學以踐其實. 思與學, 交相發而互相益也. 伏願聖明深燭此理, 先須立志, 以爲舜何人也, 予何人也, 有爲者亦若是, 奮然用力於二者之功, 而持敬者, 又所以兼思學, 貫動靜, 合內外, 一顯微之道也."

Hwang's *Sequential Discussion of Simgyeong* was published and used along with *Lecture Notes on the Classic of the Mind and Heart* during royal lectures (Lee 1995; Yi et al. 2014, 1300-05).

The Classic of the Mind and Heart was used in Joseon during royal lectures in order to provide the king with a way to control the human mind, or physiological wants (*insim* 人心). After Yi Hwang, the Confucian scholars of Joseon reestablished the study of mind and heart within the learning of principle to distinguish the human mind (*insim* 人心) and human, or immoral desires (*inyok* 人欲). Yi Jeong mostly equated the two. Despite what Zhu Xi had said, it was not uncommon to see the former regarded to be the same concept as the latter. However, the Confucian scholars of Joseon saw what Zhu Xi argued during his later years as the orthodoxy of Confucianism, which was that the former (*insim* 人心) was physiological wants that were common to anyone with physical form, or the body (*hyeonggi* 形氣), from sages to ordinary people. The human mind (*insim* 人心) was distinguished from individual wants (*sayok* 私欲), which was desire that had lost its balance and had fallen into selfishness or excess or deficiency. After Yi Hwang, Confucian scholars of Joseon, irrespective of their school of study, saw the human mind (*insim* 人心) as wants that should be appropriately realized according to decorum and individual wants (*sayok*) as wants to overcome. What the learning of principle during the Song era had explained from the perspective of abstinence, these scholars interpreted from the realm of restraint (Lee 1995, 29-40).

Along with *Additional Explication of Xinjing*, Yi Hwang's lecture notes were used during royal lectures starting from the reign of King Hyojong. In 1658, King Hyojong, accepting the suggestion of Yi Dansang, encountered Yi Hwang's *Lecture Notes on the Classic of the Mind and Heart* in person, after which the officials conducting the royal lectures used the *Classic of the Mind and Heart* as well as Yi Hwang's arguments for supplementations. Song Jun-gil, lecturing the idea of the human mind and the moral mind of the *Classic of the Mind and Heart* to King Hyojong, explained that the human mind (*insim* 人心) was a natural and innate desire that stemmed from the physical form (*hyeonggi* 形氣), which, when practiced with appropriate constraint, could become a moral mind (*dosim* 道心).¹⁶ In essence, he explained the physical and physiological desire not

from the stance of abstinence but of controlled restraint, telling the king that its measured use was a core point in the studies of the learning of the sages. This was in line with Yi I's opinion that the appropriate use of the human mind was thus to achieve a moral mind.

The use of Zhen Dexiu's *Classic of the Mind and Heart* in royal lectures was a distinct feature that has not been discovered in other areas of East Asia including China. Reestablishing the orthodoxy of Zhu Xi and the learning of principle during his later years through the examination of the human mind and the moral mind and applying them in the study of the learning of the sages was the essence of Confucianism in Joseon after Yi Hwang. Educating the king during the royal lectures to use this as a way to pursue the learning of the sages continued throughout late Joseon. This scene could not have been seen in other countries of East Asia, including China.

Revering the Confucian King, Practicing the Confucian King, and the Sino-barbarian Dichotomy

Each country across East Asia, including Qing, faced the task of reestablishing their political identity as the Ming dynasty transitioned to the Qing dynasty. During that process, the dichotomous concept of Sino-barbarian (*hwai* 華夷), which used to represent the international order of East Asia, underwent changes. The former concept, Sino- (*hwa* 華) was originally a combination of a value concept—civilization—with geographic and ethnic concepts. As the Chinese characters of the term Middle Kingdom (*Jungguk* 中國) indicated, China was the center of all under the heavens in terms of geography as well as civilization. However, as geography gradually become relative, the countries of East Asia, depending on their political situation, reexamined the implicit significance of the term Sino- from the geographically independent perspective of civilization or culture in contrast to barbarianism.

Qing established a system where the Manchu, which formed the minority, governed a variety of ethnic groups that were spread out over the wide territory, including the Han, the Mongol, the Uyghur, and the Zang 藏族. In order to integrate these multiple ethnic groups, Qing reestablished the Sino-barbarian dichotomy from the perspective that regarded the Han and the barbarians as one family (*hwai ilga* 華夷一家). The logic was that regardless of geography or

16. *Hyojong sillok*, 14th day of the 10th lunar month, 1657.

ethnicity, he who was virtuous became the owner of all under the heavens, and once the owner of all under the heavens was determined, all ethnicities under the heavens were united as one family regardless of geography. Naturally, the Han as an ethnic group and the geographic concept of the Middle Kingdom were left out from the concept of Sino- as civilization. In terms of political institutions, important ruling organs such as the Deliberative Council of Princes and Ministers (Yizheng wang dachen huiyi 議政王大臣會議), the Southern Study Room (Nan shufang 南書房), and the Office for the Handling of Confidential Military Affairs (Junji chu 軍機處) excluded the Han while the Manchu emperor allied with the Mongols, the Uyghur, and the Zang to govern. The position that the Han and the barbarians were one family, in other words, was a logic of integration at the same time it was a logic to exclude the Han from the center (Min 1990, 25-28; 37-43).

In Joseon, the argument that the tradition of the learning of Zhu Xi was the legitimate transmission of the Way (*dotong* 道統), asserted in no uncertain terms in face of the popularity of the learning of Wang Yangming, had already been applied to politics before the transition to Qing. Yi Hwang compiled the *Comprehensive Record of the Learning of Principle of Late Song, Yuan, and Ming* (*Songgye Won Myeong ihak tongnok* 宋季元明理學通錄), thus establishing the lineage of the learning of principle from Zhu Xi forward around the learning of Zhu Xi. In other words, it carried on what Zhu Xi had done in the *Origins of the Yi-Luo School* (*Yi Luo yuan yuan lu* 伊洛淵源錄) (Gang 2014). Yi I positioned the chapter of “The Transmission of the Way of the Sages” (Seonghyeon dotong 聖賢道統) at the end of *Essentials of the Learning of the Sages*, thus systematizing the school of study from Fuxi 伏羲 to Zhu Xi. Although he added Zhang Shi 張栻, Cai Yuanding 蔡元定, Huang Gan 黃榦, and Li Fan 李蕃 after Zhu Xi, he assessed that there was no legitimate successor after Zhu Xi and recommended to King Seonjo that Joseon must assume that role.¹⁷ Afterwards, in the 17th century, figures from the two Cheng brothers 二程 to Zhu Xi who had carried on the learning of principle, such as Yang Shi 楊時, Luo Congyan 羅從彥, and Li Tong 李侗, were enshrined in the State Shrine to Confucius.¹⁸

Among the scholars of Joseon, the consensus was that the study of ritual was relatively underdeveloped in the learning of Zhu Xi. Efforts to supplement insufficient parts of *Family Rites* in order to compile a more complete book on family rituals were undertaken throughout the Joseon dynasty. One example of the fruits of such efforts were the books on ritual compiled by Kim Jangsaeng 金長生, including *Collected Commentaries to Family Rites* (*Garye jimnam* 家禮輯覽). Song Siyeol 宋時烈 requested that Kim Jangsaeng be enshrined at the State Shrine of Confucius given that he had developed the study of ritual, which Zhu Xi had not been able to complete.¹⁹ In short, the Confucian scholars of Joseon during the 17th century established the learning of Zhu Xi as orthodoxy and sought to complete the study of ritual, which they perceived as insufficient in the learning of Zhu Xi, thus solidifying their position as the legitimate heir in the transmission of the Way (*dotong* 道統) of study and inquiry.

When Qing overthrew Ming and established a new dynasty, Joseon took this as civilization being overthrown by barbarianism. The queue and the change in costume clothes were in particular serious indications that all decorum had collapsed amidst the tumult.

During the beginning of Qing, when Ming's barely continued existence in the South was yet feeding faint hopes of restoration, there was a widespread sense of political responsibility in Joseon. This responsibility was that as the only legitimate heir to transmit and preserve the succession of the Way (*dotong* 道統), and since the Ming dynasty had enfeoffed the king of Joseon and provided help during its reconstruction after the Hideyoshi Invasions, Joseon needed to restore the now barbarian-controlled China. The Sino-barbarian dichotomy naturally became politically significant in terms of revering the emperor and expelling the barbarians (*jonwang yangi*). Politics in Joseon basically took the direction of well preserving the culture and learning of the civilized in preparation for when a legitimate dynasty was reestablished in China, while also arming itself with military force in order to eliminate the barbarians that had taken over China. The argument Zhu Xi had made to Emperor Xiaozong as the path Southern

17. Yi I, “Seonghyeon dotong” 聖賢道統, *Seonghak jipyo* 8 聖學輯要, in *Complete Works of Yulgok Yi I* (*Yulgok jeonseo* 栗谷全書), *gwon* 26, *je* 5, *dan* 1-*jang*: “今臣謹因先儒之說, 歷敘道統之傳, 始自伏羲, 終於朱子, 朱子之後, 又無的傳, 此臣所以長吁永歎, 深有望於殿下者也。”

18. *Sukjong sillok*, 22nd day of the 4th lunar month, 1682.

19. Song Siyeol 宋時烈, “Non munmyo jongsa so” 論文廟從祀疏, *Collected Works of Master Song Siyeol* (*Songja daejeon* 宋子大全), *gwon* 17: “文元公臣金長生, 得程朱之學於文成公李珣, 既盡受其說, 驗之心而體於身, 然後慨然於朱子之所恨者, 晚年專意於禮書, 蓋以勉齋之書尚猶有可憾, 而不無更商量者故也。其所纂喪禮備要家禮輯覽疑禮問解禮記記疑等書, 毫分縷析, 置水不漏, 使國朝典章, 私家經變, 皆有所折衷, 而一主於程朱之說, 雖趨向異塗之家, 無不遵用, 其功可謂盛矣。夫以鄭衆諸儒, 只以註釋周禮之文, 而尚且與於聖廡之享, 況文元公是東方禮家之大成耶!”

Song should take after being driven south by the Jin dynasty—to repel barbarians by stabilizing domestic affairs (*naesu oeyang* 內修外攘)—became an important foundation for the policies of late Joseon. Like Zhu Xi, late Joseon saw stabilizing the economy through strengthening the domestic situation as the urgent task if they were to equip themselves with forces to eliminate the barbarians. Bureaucrats and scholar-officials constantly emphasized that excessively building and strengthening military forces would cause taxes to rise, which would eventually threaten the livelihood of ordinary people. They criticized the private management of the royal finances and argued that the Royal Treasury be abolished. This was a policy focusing more on strengthening the domestic situation than dealing with the external barbarians.

As the Qing dynasty gradually stabilized, the intellectuals of Joseon judged that the new legitimate heir of Zhou 周 would not readily emerge in China. As it gradually became clear that hopes of expelling the barbarian were unrealistic, monarchy became reexamined as a task for Joseon not to transmit but to practice. Widespread among the scholars of Joseon during the 18th century was the geographically relativistic belief arguing that all countries could become the Middle Kingdom if where they stood were regarded as the center. Jeong Yak-yong made it clear that any place ruled as if by Emperor Yao, Shun, Yu, and Tang was none other than the Middle Kingdom and argued that Joseon should import technology from the barbarian-ruled Qing and not its learnings.²⁰ Jeong Yak-yong judged that Joseon possessed sufficient knowledge for a monarchy and did not need to receive it from Qing. Although he acknowledged that some problems existed in the learnings of the Song dynasty, he argued that they were right in placing the acquisition and practice of human imperatives as the basis of all learning. His view was that although the learning of the Han dynasty, which was popular in Qing, presented itself as the synthesis of the learnings of Song and Han, it was actually skewed toward the latter and was not helpful as the studies of a monarchy, which must establish rituals, music/performance, punishments,

and governance (*ye ak hyeong jeong* 禮樂刑政) based on human nature and fate (*seongmyong* 性命) and filial piety and brotherly respect (*hyo je* 孝弟).²¹

Hong Daeyong argued that if Confucius had been born and active in Joseon, he would have backed the argument of Spring and Autumn (*Chunchu ron* 春秋論), namely, that Joseon would have been designated as the Middle Kingdom and the surrounding areas as barbarians. Hong also saw civilization as flowing from advanced to lesser regardless of geography or ethnicity.²² This led to the conclusion that even without getting rid of the barbarians of China, the higher civilization of rule by monarchy, when realized in Joseon, could simply be spread to China. Hong Daeyong's opinion was shared widely among intellectuals, mainly the School of Northern Learning, including Park Jiwon and Park Jega.

King Jeongjo once asked his officials about the difference between revering the Confucian king (*jon wang* 尊王) and practicing the Confucian king (*haeng wang* 行王) as espoused by Confucius and Mencius. During his reign, King Jeongjo continued to conduct scholarly compilation projects that established the transmission of the Way (*dotong* 道統) of the learning of principle, including the compilation of the *Essentials from the Great Learning* (*Daehak yuui* 大學類義), *Illustrated Guide to the Virtues of the Five Human Relationships* (*Oryun haengsil do* 五倫行實圖), *Combined Edition of the Community Compact and Local (Wine-Drinking) Rite* (*Hyangnye happyeon* 鄉禮合編), *Elementary Learning*, and *Collected Writings on Revering Zhou* (*Jon Ju hwipyeon* 尊周彙編). The aforementioned question King Jeongjo posed reflected his will to realize a monarchy based on the understanding that the learning of principle of the Cheng-Zhu learning was the orthodox learning 正學 (Baek 2020, 24-26).

Jeong Yak-yong's view was that the practice of revering the emperor and expelling the barbarians, which defeated violators and usurpers of the throne, was not mutually exclusive with the individual practice of monarchy depending

20. Jeong Yak-yong 丁若鏞, *Corrected Edition of the Collected Works of Yeoyudang Jeong Yak-yong* (*Jeongbon Yeoyudang jeonso* 定本與猶堂全書), book 3, p. 45: “「送韓校理(致應)使燕序(時爲書狀官)」: 夫既得東西南北之中, 則無所往而非中國, 烏觀所謂東國哉? 夫既無所往而非中國, 烏觀所謂中國哉? 即所謂中國者, 何以稱焉? 有堯舜禹湯之治之謂中國, 有孔顏思孟之學之謂中國, 今所以謂中國者何存焉? 若聖人之治, 聖人之學, 東國既得而移之矣, 復何必求諸遠哉? 唯田疇種植之有便利之法, 而使五穀茁茂焉, 則是古良吏之遺惠也. 文詞藝術之有博雅之能, 而不爲鄙俚焉, 則是古名士之餘韻也. 今所宜取益於中國也者, 斯而已. 外是則強勅鷙悍之風, 淫巧奇詭之技, 夷禮俗蕩人心, 而非先王之所務也, 何觀焉?”

21. Jeong Yak-yong, *Corrected Edition of the Collected Works of Yeoyudang Jeong Yak-yong*, book 2, p. 298: “「五學論」2: 今之所謂詰訓之學, 名之曰折衷漢宋, 而其實宗漢而已. 詰宮室, 訓蟲魚, 以之通其字, 絕其句而已. 于性命之理, 孝悌之教, 禮樂刑政之文, 固味味也. 宋未必盡是, 而其必欲體行於心與身, 則是矣. 今也, 惟詰訓章句, 其異同沿革, 是考是察, 曾不欲辨是非別邪正, 以求其體行之術, 斯又何法也?”

22. Hong Daeyong 洪大容, *Uisan mundap* 壺山問答, in *Collected Works of Damheon Hong Daeyong* (*Damheon seo* 湛軒書), *naejip* 內集, *gwon* 4, *boyu*: “孔子周人也, 王室日卑, 諸侯衰弱, 吳楚滑夏, 寇賊無厭, 春秋者周書也. 內外之嚴, 不亦宜乎? 雖然, 使孔子浮于海, 居九夷, 用夏變夷, 興周道於域外, 則內外之分, 尊攘之義, 自當有域外春秋, 此孔子之所以爲聖人也.”

on the given conditions of the era; instead, his reinterpretation saw them as being carried out side by side if necessary. Regarding the traditional position that saw Confucius as arguing to revere the Confucian king while Mencius argued to practice the Confucian king, Jeong Yak-yong understood the former to be part of the latter from the latter's point of view. He pointed out that in the chapter "Aigong wenzheng" 哀公問政 of the *Doctrine of the Mean* (*Zhongyong* 中庸), the answer Confucius gave to Duke Ai of the state of Lu corresponded to items of a monarchy, not duties of revering the Confucian king, and persuaded King Jeongjo that practicing the Confucian king was a task that must be carried out regardless of the circumstances of the given times.²³ In sum, the Sino-barbarian dichotomy of revering the emperor and expelling the barbarian in the 17th century that had been common following expectations that the descendants of the Ming would stand again in China changed into the concept of practicing the Confucian king in the 18th century. The belief that Joseon realize rule by the Confucian king, thus becoming the Middle Kingdom ruled by a monarchy, determined the direction state affairs took in Joseon.

Conclusion

Joseon used *Family Rites* to perform the rites and rituals of the royal family before establishing the *Manual of the Five State Rites* and then as reference for the continuous revision of the established manual. It is rare in the history of East Asia for the documentation of the manuals of rites, such as the *Supplement to Sequel to Manual of the Five State Rite*, the *Compiled Supplement to Manual of Funerary State Rites*, and the *Comprehensive Collection of Manual of the Five State Rites* to continue until late Joseon. The use of *Family Rites* in revising the manuals was not to demote the rites and rituals of the king to the same level as those of the scholar-officials. Instead, it was to reinforce the public aspects of the rites of the king as an official state rite rather than a private rite of the royal household. It also aimed to make sure that the king sufficiently practiced

the duties of filial piety and veneration in the performance of ritual so that the ideology of the learning of principle was realized from the top, and in this process, naturally carrying out virtuous rule by observation of and absorption of the practices of rites and ritual (*gwangam* 觀感).

Royal lectures also continued throughout Joseon. Not only did the king actively lead the compilation of books used in the royal lectures, including *Exemplar for Efficient Government*, *Precious Mirror for Succeeding Reigns*, and *Essentials from the Great Learning*, but the scholar-officials also produced books for the royal lecture such as the *Ten Diagrams on the Learning of the Sages* and *Essentials of the Learning of the Sages* to substitute the *Extended Meaning of the Great Learning* and *Supplement to Extended Meaning of the Great Learning*. The *Classic of the Mind and Heart* was often used as a textbook during royal lectures in late Joseon, and, as a rule, renowned scholars of the learning of principle who were not in power and called rustic literati were to participate in royal lectures and express their opinions to the king regarding scholarly matters as well as the current state of things. Joseon was a country of royal-lecture politics given how these lectures were used politically. Practicing fostering and the perfection of knowledge side by side was presented as the way the king was to pursue the learning of the sages, and he was guided to appropriately control physiological and personal wants (*insim* 人心) in the sense of controlling, not abstaining from, desire. This reflected the view of the learning of principle during late Joseon that distinguished the human mind (*insim* 人心) from selfish and exclusionary desire (*inyok* 人欲) and instead saw it as a normal human desire which was also a moral mind when practiced appropriately according to the rules of propriety.

After Yi Hwang and Yi I, there was a sense of self-awareness among the scholars of the learning of principle that the legitimacy of the learning since Zhu Xi lay in Joseon. Thus, when the Qing dynasty proclaimed itself as the self-claimed virtuous being who received the mandate of the heavens and put forth the unifying principle of seeing the Han and barbarians as one family, Joseon saw them as barbarians causing disorder by replacing civilization, including attire, with barbaric practices. During early Qing, Joseon sought to preserve learning and civilization based on revering the emperor and expelling the barbarians on the one hand, while getting state affairs in order and also stabilizing the everyday lives of the people in order to ultimately arm itself and eliminate the barbarians. This was an application of repelling the barbarians by stabilizing domestic affairs, which the scholars of the learning of principle

23. Jeong Yak-yong, "Maengja chaek" 孟子策, *Corrected Edition of the Collected Works of Yeoyudang Jeong Yak-yong*, book 2, pp. 79-80: "勸行王政之異於春秋者, 臣以爲孔子之撤環天下, 其爲尊王歟? 抑爲行王歟? 嘗答哀公之問, 規模節目, 粲然一王之制, 而一言未及於尊王, 則夫子平日之志, 概可知也。『春秋』之大書特書, 誠以「其文則史」也。或以爲孟子之時, 周衰益甚, 故勸諸侯行王者, 臣未之信也。"

including Zhu Xi had presented as the course of action the court of Southern Song should take in face of the threat of the Jin dynasty. However, as the Qing dynasty became more stable, the understanding of the Sino-barbarian dichotomy changed from transmitting the system of rule by a Confucian king to realizing the Confucian king in Joseon so that it would spread to Qing this way. In other words, the practicing of Confucian King or using Sino-culture and civilization to transform barbarians (*yong Ha byeon i* 用夏變夷) became the prevailing belief among the scholars of Joseon. That King Jeongjo compiled projects that saw the learning of principle by the Cheng-Zhu learning as orthodox and sought to complete the records of protocols such as the *Comprehensive Study of the Board of Rites* and *Comprehensive National Code* were all outcomes of the will to realize rule by the Confucian King in Joseon.

With the Opium wars breaking out 4 years after Jeong Yak-yong's death in 1836, the Confucian societies of East Asia rapidly collapsed and shifted towards the modern system of the West. Since the Japanese Colonial period, researchers have argued that the Sino-barbarian dichotomy of Joseon was a conservative political theory that did not respond appropriately to the civilizational shift in history that was already taking place. This is true just by looking at the results. But the two World Wars humankind experienced after the late 19th century and Japan's invasion and plundering of its surrounding countries in East Asia largely stemmed from an imperialistic political theory that sought to create a rich country and a strong military. In the history of East Asia, to be a sovereign aiming for this rich nation and strong army was to take a completely different path from Confucian scholars, who pursued the politics of the comfort of people's lives. The revering of the Confucian king and the practice of the Confucian king was a development of the Kingly Way seeking the comfort of the people, which had been pursued ever since Mencius. The fall of Joseon meant the fall of Confucian political ruling based on the comfort of the people in a tumultuous world where the political theory of rich nation, strong military was leading world history. Looking back at the history of humankind, this Confucian political ideology and the specific ways of how it was practiced in Joseon are valuable assets that can guide us to move past the political theory of building a rich nation with strong military forces. It would be worth contemplating their significance.

Translated by Jong Woo PARK and Boram SEO

References

- An, Yugyeong. 2006. "Gukjo orye ui wa geu sokbopyeon ui pyeonchan gwajeong" [The Compilation Process of the *Manual of the Five State Rites* and its Sequel and Supplementary Texts]. *Yugyo munhwa yeongu* [Journal of Confucian Philosophy and Culture] 10 (16): 63-96.
- Baek, Minjeong. 2020. "Jeongjo ui gyeonghak ihae wa jeongchi ui munje" [King Jeongjo's Understanding of the Confucian Classics and Problems of Politics]. *Hanguk munhwa* [Korean Culture] 89: 3-38.
- Gang, Gyeonghyeon. 2014. "Songgye Won Myeong ihak tongnok ui guseong gwa uiui" [The Construction and Significance of *Songgye Won Myeong ihak tongnok*]. *Hangukhak yeongu* [The Journal of Korean Studies] 32: 491-530.
- Gang, Huimaeng 姜希孟. 1991. *Sasukje jip* 私淑齋集 [Collected Writings of Sasukje Gang Huimaeng]. Vol. 12 of the *Hanguk munjip chonggan* [Complete Collection of Collected Writings of Korea]. Seoul: Institute for the Translation of Korean Classics.
- Hong, Daeyong 洪大容. 1991. *Dambeon seo naejip* 湛軒書內集 [Inner Book of Collected Works of Damheon Hong Daeyong]. Vol. 12 of the *Hanguk munjip chonggan* [Complete Collection of Collected Writings of Korea]. Seoul: Institute for the Translation of Korean Classics.
- Hong, Seokdae. 2017. "Gukjo bogam ui ganhaeng gwa jewang gyoyuk" [The Publication of *Precious Mirror for Succeeding Reigns* and the Education of the King]. *Gyoyuksahak yeongu* [History of Education] 27 (2): 185-211.
- Jang, Dong-u. 2013a. "Gukjo oryeui e gyujeong doen daebu, sa, seomin ui sarye e daehan gochal" [A Study on the High Officials', Elites', and non-Elites' Four Rites Prescribed in the *Manual of the Five State Rites*]. *Hangukhak yeongu* [Korean Studies] 31:111-37.
- _____. 2013b. "Joseon sidae Garye yeongu ui jinjeon" [The Progress in Research of *Family Rites* during the Joseon Period]. *Taedong gojeon yeongu* [Taedong Studies of Eastern Classics] 31: 209-55.
- Jeong, Yak-yong 丁若鏞. 2012. *Jeongbon Yeoyudang jeonso* 定本與猶堂全書 [Corrected Edition of the Collected Works of Yeoyudang Jeong Yak-yong]. Edited by Tasan Cultural Foundation. Seoul: Saam
- Ji, Duhwan. 2009. "Joseon sidae gyeongyeongwan yeongu" [A Study on Royal Lecturers of Joseon]. *Hangukhak nonchong* [Korean Studies Journal] 31: 157-77.

- Joseon wangjo sillok* [Veritable Records of the Joseon Dynasty]. Seoul: Institute for the Translation of Korean Classics. <http://db.itkc.or.kr/>
- Kim, Jiyeong. 2004. "18-segi huban gukga jeolnye ui jeongbi wa *Chungwan tonggo*" [The Establishment of State Ritual in the Late 18th Century and the *Comprehensive Study of the Ministry of Rites*]. *Hanguk hakbo* [Journal of Korean Studies] 30 (1): 95-131.
- Kim, Munsik. 2007. "Gukjo orye tongpyeon ui jaryojeok teukjing" [Bibliographical Characteristics of *Gukjo orye tongpyeon*]. *Hanguk munhwa yeongu* [The Korean Cultural Studies] 12: 65-106.
- Lee, Bongkyoo. 1995. "Simgyeong buju e daehan Joseon seongnihak ui daeeung: Yi Hwang gwa Song Siyeol eul jungsim euro" [The Response of Neo-Confucianists of Joseon to the *Additional Explication of the Classic of the Mind and Heart*: Yi Hwang and Song Siyeol]. *Taedong gojeon yeongu* [Taedong Studies of Eastern Classics] 12: 67-107.
- _____. 2010. "Hamyangnon gwa gyoyuk gwajeong euro bon Joseon seongnihak ui gaeseong" [The Characteristics of Confucianism of Joseon as Seen Through the Theory of Self-Cultivation and the Education Curriculum]. *Toegye hakbo* [The Journal of Toegye Studies] 128: 89-128.
- Min, Dugi. 1990. "Cheongjo ui hwangje tongchi wa sasang tongje ui silje: jeungjeong yeongmo sageon gwa 'Daeuigak mirok' eul jungsim euro" [The Realities of the Rule of the Emperor and Ideological Suppression of the Qing Dynasty: The Treason of Zhengjing and the "Record of Righteous Principles to Awaken the Deluded"]. In *Jungguk geundaesa yeongu*, edited by Dugi Min, 37-43. Seoul: Iljogak.
- Ministry of Government Legislation, trans. with annotations. 1982. *Gugyeok Gukjo oryeui* 國朝五禮儀 [Translation of the *Manual of the Five State Rites*]. Seoul: Ministry of Government Legislation.
- Seong, Baekhyo, trans. with annotations. (1991) 2011. *Maengja jipju* 孟子集注 [Collected Commentaries on the *Mencius*]. Seoul: Jeontong munhwa yeonguhoe.
- Song, Siyeol 宋時烈. 1991. *Songja daejeon* 宋子大全 [Collected Works of Master Song Siyeol]. Vol. 12 of the *Hanguk munjip chonggan* [Complete Collection of Collected Writings of Korea]. Seoul: Institute for the Translation of Korean Classics.
- Yi, Hwang 李滉. 1991. *Toegye jip* 退溪集 [Collected Works of Toegye Yi Hwang]. Vols. 29-31 of the *Hanguk munjip chonggan* [Complete Collection of Collected Writings of Korea]. Seoul: Institute for the Translation of Korean Classics.
- Yi, I 李珣. 1991. *Yulgok jeonseo* 栗谷全書 [Complete Works of Yulgok Yi I]. Vols. 44-45 of the *Hanguk munjip chonggan* [Complete Collection of Collected Writings of Korea]. Seoul: Institute for the Translation of Korean Classics.
- Zhen, Dexiu 眞德秀. 2014. *Gugyeok Simgyeong jubae chongnam* [Annotation and Explication of the Korean Translation of the *Classic of the Mind and Heart*]. Translated by Gwangho Yi, Yeonseok Eom, Dong-u Jang, and Jeonggil Han. Seoul: Dong gwa seo
- _____. 2018. *Daehak yeonui: Rideoswip eul malhada* [Extended Meaning of the *Great Learning*: Talking about Leadership]. Translated and annotated by Jaehun Jeong, Hangnyeong O, Hohun Jeong, and Gwang-il Kim. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- Zhu Xi 朱熹. 2002. *Jiali* 家禮 [Family Rites], in *Complete Works of Zhu Xi*. Shanghai: Shanghai guiji.
- Zhu, Ziyang 朱子彥. 2007. *Duowei shijiao xia de huangquan zhengzhi* [Multifaceted View of Imperial Politics]. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe.

LEE Bongkyoo (lbkinha@inha.ac.kr) is Professor of the Department of Philosophy at Inha University. His research and teaching mainly cover the learning of principle 理學, the study of ritual 禮學, and practical learning 禮學 during the Joseon era. His publications on such topics and themes include "An Interweaving of Eastern and Western Thought: An Interpretation of *Li* 理 in *Tianzhushiyi* 天主實義 and Its Response" (2018), "The Academic Historical Meanings of Early Research on *Silhak*" (2020), "Confucian Rituals in the Writings for State Reform in the Late Joseon Dynasty—Focused on *Mu-Min-Xin-Shu* 牧民心書" (2018), and "Lee Hwang's Research on *Family Rituals* and Subsequent Transmission" (2020), etc.

Abstract

This article examined the characteristics of rule by culture, which Joseon established based on the learning of principle, from the following three aspects: the use of *Family Rites* in the enactment and revision of state rites and ritual; the education of the sovereign during royal lectures based on the ideology of the learning of principle; and the reliance on revering the Confucian king and practicing the Confucian king as the ideology guiding state affairs based on the Sino-barbarian dichotomy of the learning of principle after Qing was founded. The main findings include first, that the public aspect of the king's rites was strengthened through *Family Rites*, and the king was led to practice the duty of filial piety and veneration through the performance of rites to naturally carry out virtuous rule by observation of and absorption of ritual practices. Second, when educating the king on the learning of the sages, the appropriate control of the human mind and the simultaneous training of fostering and the perfection of knowledge based on learning of the sages according to the learning of principle were emphasized. The system included the inviting scholars that were not in power called rustic literati to royal lectures and having them teach the learning of the sages to the king and express their opinions regarding state affairs. In addition, using *Classic of the Mind and Heart* as a textbook of royal lectures was a unique characteristic of Joseon and shows that the royal lectures were an important space of political activity. Third, before the emergence of Qing, Joseon believed itself to be the legitimate heir of the learning of Zhu Xi. The initial policy towards Qing of repelling the barbarians by stabilizing domestic affairs based on revering the emperor and expelling the barbarian was the application of the policy of the learning of principle that had been taken in the past against the threat of the Jin dynasty. As things stabilized in Qing, practicing the Confucian king, or using Sino-culture and civilization to transform barbarians, and thereby realizing monarchy in Joseon so that it would spread to Qing became the basic direction of policy. King Jeongjo carried out compilation projects that saw the study of the principle of the Cheng-Zhu learning as orthodox, and the establishment of the manual of state ritual including *Comprehensive Study of the Board of Rites* and *Comprehensive National Code* were products of the will to realize a system of monarchy in Joseon.

(*gyeongyeon* 經筵), foster (*hamyang*) and perfection of knowledge (*chiji* 致知), Sino-barbarian dichotomy (*hwai* 華夷), revering the Confucian king (*jonwang* 尊王) and practicing the Confucian king (*haengwang* 行王)

Keywords: rule by culture (*munchi* 文治), family rites (*garye* 家禮), royal lecture