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Abstract

This paper aims to look at Takahashi Toru’s perspective on Toegye Yi Hwang (退溪 李滉, 1501–1570), focusing on his lecture notes on the History of Joseon Confucianism. In general, Takahashi’s lecture notes are consistent with his academic quest to clarify the history of development of Joseon Confucianism under the premise of the Japanese colonial era and its concomitant spatial and temporal features. It is further clear that Takahashi’s interest in Toegye was absolute. In summary, Takahashi’s understanding of Toegye has the following characteristics. First, Takahashi reveals the transformation from an inductive method to a deductive method; that is, a change in the learning and performance of Toegye. Further, he emphasizes Toegye’s rendering of orthodox Joseon Confucianism within a framework of Pasa and Hyunjeong. In other words, the construction of Toegye’s study as the
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orthodoxy of Joseon Neo-Confucianism was the first task undertaken by Takahashi in his depiction of the history of Joseon Confucianism and, consequently, Takahashi collected the descriptions of the scholars who came before and after Toegye in his process of establishing the orthodox Neo-Confucianism proposed by Toegye. Second, Takahashi explains that the Yeongnam School and Kaeseong School were regional developments of the study of Neo-Confucianism in Joseon, while classifying the Sagong School, Daohak Seonsaeng School, and Kyeongje School based on the relevant scholars’ academic characteristics; furthermore, he breaks their theories down into the schools of Main Li and Main Ki and, ultimately, the school of Compromise. Hence, such an academic development of the history of Joseon Confucianism based on the classification of schools was first established by Takahashi. Third, an evaluation of Toegye’s study faithfully conveys the theory of Zhu Xi and thus succeeded in purifying the theory. This is sometimes cited as a proof of Joseon scholars’ dependence on China and is noted as a characteristic of Joseon Confucianism. The quest for answers to the issues inherent in Zhu Xi’s theory, which was started in earnest by Toegye, was taken up by later scholars, and this aspect forms the central point of Takahashi’s description of the history of Joseon Confucianism.
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1. Introduction: Takahashi Toru’s Study on Joseon Confucianism and Toegye

The study by Takahashi Toru (1878–2967, 高橋亨) on Korean Confucianism started with the publishing of “Seo Hwadam (徐花潭)” in *Tetsugaku Zasshi* (哲學雜誌, Journal of Philosophy), a magazine representing the interests of the Japanese philosophical community at the time, in 1911. In this article, he discussed the formation of the Gaeseong school (開城派) by Seo Hwadam and focused on the school’s unique philosophical theories. In the following year, 1912, he published a series titled “The Outline of Joseon Confucianism” (朝鮮儒學大観, K. Joseon Yuhak Daekwan) in

---

1) From this point I will use “Joseon Confucianism” or “Confucianism in the Joseon Dynasty” to refer to the Takahashi’s works on Korean Confucianism.


Joseon and Manchuria (朝鮮及滿洲, K. Joseon geup Manju), in which he outlined the historical development of Joseon Confucianism. Subsequently, 12 years later, Takahashi published a revised version of the series under the same title, “The Outline of Joseon Confucianism,” for his special lecture titled Joseon Sa Kangjwa (朝鮮史講座, Lecture on Joseon History).

In particular, the article titled “The Development of the School of Main Li and the School of Main Ki in the History of Joseon Confucianism (李朝儒学史における主理派主気派の発達), 4) which was published during Takahashi’s tenure as a professor of linguistics and literature after the opening of Keijo Imperial University in April 1929, describes the key aspects of his writings on the history of Joseon Confucianism. Further, in October 1929, Takahashi published one of his major works titled Yicho Bukkyō (李朝佛教, Buddhism in the Joseon Dynasty) and stated in the preface that “The Outline of The History of Joseon Idea (朝鮮思想史大系, K. Joseon Sasang Sa Daegye) is composed of three parts: Joseon Confucianism, Joseon Buddhism, and Joseon special religions.” However, it was not realized as his initial plan; instead, only parts of these topics are explained in his lecture notes of Keijo Imperial University.

I pointed out the problem of colonial modernity of the study on Toegye (退溪, 1501–1570) by revealing the so-called original prototype of Toegye’s philosophy, which was introduced and explained as the structure of Li-Qi (理気, Ultimate Principle and Material Force), Xing-Qing (性情, human nature and emotion), and self-cultivation (修養論), was formed during the process of the formation of Oriental philosophy in modern Japan. 5) Then I recently completed the typesetting of Takahashi’s lecture notes of Keijo Imperial University, a process that started in 2011, and I am currently

In this paper, to address the task given to me as ‘Takahashi’s view on Toegye,’ I explore the changes in Takahashi’s narrative and understanding of Toegye before and after Takahashi conducted his lectures on “The History of Joseon Confucianism.” While examining this aspect, I point out in advance that some of Takahashi’s statements and narrations discussed in this paper overlap with the points that I have already mentioned in my previous articles. 6)

2. Takahashi’s Perspective on Toegye Prior to the Lecture on the History of Joseon Confucianism

This chapter reviews Takahashi’s early perspective on Toegye by examining three of his articles: First, “The Outline of Joseon Confucianism (a),” which was published six times in Joseon and Manchuria from April to December 1912; second, “Confucianism in Joseon,” which was published in Shibun (斯文) in October 1923; and, finally, the special lecture note titled “The Outline of Joseon Confucianism (b),” which was published six times in Joseon Sa Kangiwa from May to October 1924. 7)

1) The Outline of Joseon Confucianism (a) (1912)

In his preface to “The Outline of Joseon Confucianism (a),” Takahashi asserts the following:

[1] Since the beginning of the reign of the Yi Dynasty, the thought of Joseon has been completely dominated by Confucianism. All other ideas, such as Buddhism and Lao-Zhuang philosophy, were rejected and, hence, their influence on Joseon declined. The domination of Confucianism over Joseon did not

---

6) Since some of lecture notes handwritten by Takahashi do not have page numbers, I will indicate the titles, rather than page numbers, of relevant notes.

7) In order to distinguish two notes, I put mark with (a) and (b) after the original title “The Outline of Joseon Confucianism (朝鮮儒學大觀)” respectively.
occur in a day; rather, the change occurred over a long period of time as the result of the academic efforts of many scholars and historical development”.

Following this point, beginning with the description of Confucianism in Silla, Takahashi noted that Confucian studies started in earnest in the Goryeo Dynasty by An Hyang (安珦, 1243–1306). He mentions, “It was A.D. 1289, the year of the fifth anniversary of the death of Hōjō Tokimune (北條時宗, 1251–1284) in Japan. This is a very significant year in which Confucianism, namely, Chinese philosophy, was introduced into Korea.” Further, he focused on the introduction of Confucianism in the Korean peninsula and described An Hyang’s study of Xing-Li (性理, Neo-Confucianism) as a “Chinese Hirosöhi (ひろそひい, philosophy).”

Moreover, Takahashi explained the historical transmission of Joseon Confucianism. According to him, the genealogy was passed down by Gwon Gukjae (權菊齋, dates unknown), Yi Ikjae (李益齊, dates unknown), and Yi Saek (李穡, 1328–1396) to Jeong Mongju (鄭夢周, 1337–1392) and Gweon Geun (權近, 1352–1409). Further, Gil Jae (吉再, 1353–1419), who is known as the ancestor of the Li-Xue (理學) in Joseon, learned the tenets of Joseon Confucianism from Chung Mongju and Gweon Geun. Subsequently, Takahashi introduced the genealogy from Kim Sukja (金叔滋, 1389–1456) to Kim Jongjik (金宗直, 1431–1492), Kim Goingpil (金宏弼, 1454–1504), Jeong Ildu (鄭一蠧, dates unknown), and Jo Gwangjo (趙光祖, 1482–1519). After performing these processes, Takahashi asserted that came to Jo Gwangjo, Joseon Confucianism settled into its shape; therefore, Jo Gwangjo is “the first true Confucian” and “the father of the Joseon Confucian restoration.” In addition, Takahashi opined that the Yeongnam School was formed by Yi Eonjeok (李彦迪, 1491–1553) and considered him a master of Confucianism who completely understood Zhu Xi’s metaphysical world by recognizing the debate between Jo Gwangjo and Yi Eonjeok on Taeguk Muguk (太極無極論辯, K. Taeguk Muguk Lonbyeon) as a significant philosophical argument.

Subsequently, Takahashi pointed out that it was Toegye who contributed to the attainment of greatness by the Yeongnam School and held the latter in high regard.
as “a representative of Joseon Confucianism and one of the greatest scholars in the Joseon Dynasty during the past thousand years.” Takahashi described the originality and historical characteristics of Toegye’s learning, as follows.

[2] From the historical perspective, the rise of Toegye to popularity marks a new era in the development of Joseon Confucianism. Namely, in the era of Kim Goingpil, Jeong Yeochang, and Jo Jeongam, Confucianism was considered an aspect of moral self-cultivation in everyday life; it was not considered different from the practical ethical perspectives such as Soe-So-Eung-Dae (灑掃應對, welcoming guests warmly by sprinkling water and sweeping the floor) and Hyo-Je-Chung-Shin (孝悌忠信, filial piety, fraternal devotion, loyalty, trust) … [However] by the time of Yi Eonjeok, due to its further advancement, eventually, Confucians started studying metaphysical realism, such as the theory of Taeguk (太極, The Great Ultimate) and Muguk (無極, The Ultimate of Non-being) … Then, later, Toegye went a step further and transformed the way of study of Confucianism from the conventional inductive research method to the deductive method. He encouraged people to first study the fundamental principles of moral teaching in Confucianism so that they can realize the morality inherent in humans and then come down to the reality to check and practice the good principles one by one as part of their ethics in daily life.

As described here, Takahashi clarified that ‘Neo-Confucianism as a philosophy’ was studied by the aforementioned Confucious, that is, Yi Eonjeok, Jo Hanpo, Yi Toegye, and so on, and, simultaneously, various schools were being formed. He considers the following examples: Seo Hwadam’s Gaeseong school and Roh Sushin (盧守愼, 1515–1590), whose ideas were influenced by Buddhism and Laozi, directly affected Toegye’s views. Later, Toegye’s pupils formed the Daoxue Seonsaeng school (道學先生派) and Sagong school (事功派), whereas the theory of Yulgok was transmitted to Kim Sagye, Sin Dukjae (慎德齊, ?–?), and Song Wuam (宋尤庵, 1607–
1689) and eventually became the basis of the Noron party (老論). While describing this point, Takahashi also created expressions such as the ‘Toegye school’ and ‘Yulgok school.’ Such a narrative by Takahashi indicates his efforts to classify the methods of Joseon scholars’ philosophical inquiry in terms of ‘formation of schools’ by applying modern Japanese academic trends, which consider Neo-Confucianism a part of the ‘philosophy’ of Confucianism.

2) Confucianism in Joseon

The essay titled “Confucianism in Joseon” (朝鮮の儒教) comprises Takahashi’s note on his memorial lecture at Shibunkai (斯文會), a Japanese representative Confucian group that existed at the time, held at Tokyo Imperial University in October 1922, and the essay was published in Shibun the following year. In this note, Takahashi discusses the historical trends and characteristics of Joseon Confucianism, in general. He particularly appreciates the philosophical value of Neo-Confucianism and emphasizes how Confucianism tended to be concentrated in Neo-Confucianism from the late Goryeo period to the early years of the Joseon dynasty. He noted that the development of scholarship during the Joseon period was completed during the reign of King Sejong (世宗, r.1418–1450) and subsequently reached maturity during the reign of King Seonjo (宣祖, r.1567–1608). According to him, scholarship in Joseon Confucianism reached its peak due to the efforts of three individuals, Yi Eonjeok, Yi Toegye, and Yi Yulgok.

[3] There are treatises on Confucianism written by these three people, which, even today, are impressive due to their moderateness, detailedness, and assertiveness of sentences. Nevertheless, Joseon Confucianism, which reached the pinnacle of its development as a result of their efforts, has not advanced or developed even a bit since then. Moreover, there was a slight difference between the doctrines of Toegye and Yulgok, which, in later years, became

entangled in the party struggle. To be more specific, one party believed that Toegye’s doctrine is right, whereas the other party believed in Yulgok’s doctrine. In other words, the Namin party believes in Toegye’s and the Noron party in Yulgok’s doctrines, respectively … However, in Joseon politics, since Noron ruled over most of the regime as the most powerful party since its founding by Song Siyeol (宋時烈), Yulgok’s theory became a so-called national school, namely, a court learning, whereas Toegye’s school occupied a somewhat superior position in the learning outside the office.

However, according to the aforementioned extract, Takahashi interpreted that the doctrine of Confucians, which climaxed during this period in terms of scholarship, ultimately became linked to the power struggle between two political parties, Namin and Noron. Moreover, these trends and ideas remain unchanged to this day.

In the final part of his essay, Takahashi summarizes his historical description of the development of Joseon Confucianism as follows: First, Joseon Confucianism is very religious. Second, to date, there has been no development in the diverse areas of this concept, such as evidential scholarship (考證學) or the formation of any other schools, because most of the Joseon scholars believed the study of any school other than Neo-Confucianism to be unnecessary. Therefore, they sought to establish the order of nation and society, politics, customs, and culture based on Confucian doctrine; consequently, as admitted by Takahashi, Joseon became a “Confucian nation, Confucian society.” Finally, in the final part of his lecture, Takahashi encouraged Japanese scholars to study Joseon Confucianism and emphasized the necessity of promoting this school of thought.

3) The Outline of Joseon Confucianism (b) (1924)

This article is a special lecture series that was published six times in Chōsen Shi Kōza (朝鮮史講座), a total of 15 issues of the magazine published by Chōsen
Shi Gakkai for public reading, from May to October 1924.9) Chōsen Shi Kōza comprised three parts: general history, classificational history, and special lecture. At the end of the lecture, it was published and circulated in book format. At the time, Takahashi was in charge of social history; however, due to reasons such as the duplication of other lectures and possible violation of time constraints, he published “The Outline of Joseon Confucianism (b)” instead. This article is a more detailed version of the aforementioned “The Outline of Joseon Confucianism (a)” published in 1912. In addition, in the 1924 version, he set the following table of contents, in which the contents are much clearer compared to the previous version (a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Table of Contents of “The Outline of Joseon Confucianism (b)” (1924)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction (緒言)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture I: Confucianism in the Goryeo Dynasty (第一講 高麗의 儒學)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. An Hyang (一 安珦)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yi Jaehyoun, Yi Saek, Jeong Mongju (二 李齊賢 李穡 鄭夢周)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jeong Dojeon, Gweon Gun (三 鄭道傳 權近)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture II: Confucianism in the Joseon Dynasty (第二講 李朝의 儒學)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Confucianism at the beginning of the nation (一 國初의 儒學)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Confucianism before Toegye (二 退溪以前의 儒學)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yi Toegye and Yi Yulgok (三 李退溪와 李栗谷)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Confucianism after Toegye and Yulgok (四 退溪栗谷 以後의 儒學)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that, as shown in Table 1, Toegye and Yulgok are located at the center of the description in “Lecture II: in the Joseon Dynasty.” Takahashi held both the individuals in high esteem and opined, “If you understand all the doctrines proposed by these two people, it is like knowing the two major points of Joseon Confucianism. Every scholar who came after these two is merely their offshoot or imitator.” In particular, Takahashi reveals that it was Toegye who established and completed philosophical Confucianism, which was mainstream at the time, as a unique aspect of Joseon Confucianism. However, at the same time, he stated, “It is undeniable that the responsibility of restricting scholars’ thoughts and monotonizing scholarship

---

by reducing diversity is also bound up with Toegye.”

Regarding Toegye’s aforementioned achievements in the field of Joseon Confucianism, Takahashi explains his learning using the concepts of *Pasa* (破邪, the extirpation of the error) and *Hyeongjeong* (顯正, the exposition of the correct).

[4] The achievement by Toegye in terms of Yi dynasty scholarship can be perceived in two aspects: *Pasa* and *Hyeonjeong*. *Pasa* means cleansing away heretical learning by defeating the doctrines of Chinese scholars like Lu, Wang, Zhen, La, and so on (陸, 王, 陳, 羅 諸氏), as well as by attacking the theories of Joseon scholars such as Roh Sojae, Yi Yeonbang (李蓮坊), and Seo Hwadam. Further, *Hyeonjeong* means that Toegye boosted the morale of the scholars who had become insecure after Jo Jeongam’s failure during the reign of King Jungjong (中宗, r.1506-1544), which encouraged them to pursue learning again. Furthermore, he transformed the method of learning based on the ascending order, from the low to the high, into the descending order, from the high to the low. Further, he changed the manner in which traditional Joseon scholars started their learning using practical self-cultivation books and stepped up one by one to philosophical principles, leading them to directly explore philosophical principles from the very beginning so that they could thoroughly understand Zhu Xi’s profound theories.

In addition, with respect to the four political factions (四色黨派, K. Sasaek Tangpa) that were formed after Toegye’s lifetime, Takahashi mentioned that the *Namin* respected Toegye, whereas *Noron* admired Yulgok, due to which each party called the two “Kongzi (孔子) of the East Sea (Joseon),” respectively. In particular, since *Namin* continued to honor Toegye and had continued following his teaching until the early 20th century, Takahashi considered Joseon Confucianism to be alive still and, consequently, believed that its investigation was his life’s mission.
[5] After the annexation of Korea-Japan, many resentful Confucian scholars (Seonbi, 士), who did not compromise on reality, time, and circumstances, appeared in the Namin party from the Yeungnam region. Among them, the old Confucian scholars invariably always had Toegye Jip (退溪集) on their desks, read it with reverence in the morning and evening, and considered it the best book in the world. Hence, the influence of Toegye’s leaning is felt to this day.

Along with the aforementioned statements, it is noted that, 12 years ago, in “The Outline of Joseon Confucianism (a)” (1912), Takahashi named Seo Hwadam as the Gaeseong school and described Roh Sushin as someone whose thought combined the principles of both Buddhism and Laozi. However, in the revised version of the article (b) (1924), Takahashi categorized and explained the learning by Seo and Roh as ‘heretical learning,’ which is the subject of Pasa (破邪) for Toegye. A similar classification is observed in his last lecture note on “The Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism” (朝鮮異學派之儒學) (1939), which is discussed in the next chapter (2-3). In this note, the two individuals appear as the heretical people in “The First Period of Joseon Confucianism.”

3. Overview of Takahashi’s Lecture Notes

Takahashi worked at the center of practical affairs as an assistant administrator of the Keijo Imperial University Foundation Committee in 1923.10) In the following year, Ye-kwa (豫科, a preparatory course) was established with the promulgation of government policy; further, a few years later, in 1926, the university was opened incorporating the system of the Faculty of Law and Literature (法文學部) and the

Faculty of Medical Sciences (醫學部). At the time, Takahashi started working at his new post as a professor of Korean language and literature, the first course (朝鮮語學文學, 第1講座), in the Faculty of Law and Literature, and assumed an important position in Joseon cultural studies. Ogura Shinpei (小倉進平, 1882–1944), an assistant professor, was in charge of the course on Korean Language and Linguistics, the second course, and Imanishi Ryu (今西龍 1875–1932), a professor in Kyoto University, took a lecture on Korean history. Accordingly, from the perspective of representing modern humanities using a system of literature, history, and philosophy, Korean studies at this university were initiated as a system lacking philosophy. Nevertheless, there was a lecture on the history of Joseon thought that was equivalent to a philosophy course, which existed because of Takahashi’s efforts.

However, the fact that Korean studies at Keijo University started in this manner indicates the university’s characteristic of linking Korean history, culture, and values to the period’s sociopolitical situation; Hence, even though the focus of such studies was on the pre-modern Joseon Dynasty’s culture and society, these studies reveal a consistent tendency to, in the end, embrace and link the subject on Joseon to the history and culture of the Japanese Empire. This was referred to as Joseon Hak (Korean studies) under the colonial imperial rule. Another noticeable tendency is that, in terms of the Joseon literature, Takahashi placed the Chinese literary works by Yangban (兩班) at the center and the popular literature, such as Gyubang-Gasa (閨房歌辭) and folk songs, at the periphery. For example, the folk song investigation by Toegye and Ogura, which was supported by the local government from 1934 to 1935, reveals that the authors’ interpretation was based on a contrastive, top-bottom structure of hierarchy and gender considering Yangban versus the common people, man versus woman, and Chinese characters versus Hangeul. Such a description is in line with Takahashi’s insistence on the ideological dependence of Joseon; that is, he interpreted Joseon thought as merely an imitation of Chinese thought by considering and describing it as mainly orthodox Neo-Confucianism.

Here, we find the fateful absurd aspect of colonial empire scholarship. Further,
regarding this issue, a critical task remains unaddressed, that is, to examine in detail the structural irrationalities of such academic trends and accurately and thoroughly reveal their research processes, methods, and contents that lead to such conclusions. In retrospect, after the liberation of August 1945, the Korean academia has been so preoccupied with the destructive criticism of the academic achievements that occurred during the colonial period that a thorough insight into the realities and facts is lacking, which we should reflect on.

To avoid digression from the subject, we now examine Takahashi’s lecture notes in more detail. In 2011, a collection of copies of Takahashi’s lecture notes at Keijo Imperial University, titled Takahashi Toru Joseon Sasang Jaryo (高橋亨朝鮮思想資料), was unveiled at the Institution of Korean-Joseon Culture Research (Jp. Kankoku-Chōsen Bunka Kenkyusitsu), University of Tokyo. While preparing for the publication of The Collection of Takahashi Toru’s Article on Joseon Confucianism (高橋亨朝鮮儒學論集) in the spring of 2010, I obtained an opportunity to read through the copies of lecture notes under the guidance of Professor Kawahara Hideki (川原秀城), who was the chief of the institution at the time. In the notes, I found a description of the ‘Heterodox school (異學派, or the School of the Heretics, K. Yihak-pa)’ that was not previously known to the academic community and immediately started investigating it. As a result, in September 2012, I presented a paper titled “The Heterodox School in Takahashi Toru’s Study on Joseon Confucianism: Focus on the lecture notes of Keijo Imperial University (高橋亨의 朝鮮儒學研究에 있어서 异學派: 京城帝大講義노트를 中心으로)” at “A Study on Korean Confucianism in East Asia” conference hosted by the Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Taiwan. It was the first study to introduce Takahashi’s lecture notes to the academic community.

Regarding these lecture notes, Professor Kawahara mentioned in the commentary part of the collection that, since he could not confidently interpret Takahashi’s handwriting (直筆) and grass character (草書), he did not further examine the lecture notes. Therefore, eventually, I had to perform the task of substantively investigating
these notes, and my relevant achievements to date have been published in *Saitama University Review* and released as PDF files on SUCRA.\(^{12}\)

Takahashi’s existing lecture notes on Joseon thought are divided into two subjects\(^{13}\):
1. the thought itself or the history of thought and faith, and
2. the history of Confucianism or Confucian philosophy. Apart from these notes, there are 44 lecture notes on Joseon literature, which are mentioned in Lee Yun-suk’s article titled “The Contents and Meaning of Takahashi’s Lecture Notes of Keijo Imperial University,”\(^{14}\) which was published in 2016.

In general, Takahashi’s lecture notes specify a title, volume number, and contribution date on the cover. Among his existing lecture notes, the one published in the year following the university’s opening is the earliest; however, due to some reason, a note

---


12) [Table 2] The Articles on Takahashi’s Lecture Notes published in *Saitama University Review*

13) [Table 3] Takahashi’s Existing Lecture Notes on Joseon Thought

published in the year of its opening is missing. We can only assume that “Confucianism in Joseon” (1923) and “The Outline of Joseon Confucianism” (1924), which was presented during the establishment of the preparatory course of the Keijo university, were used as course texts for the first year’s lecture. In addition, a booklet titled “The Characteristics of Faith in Religious History of Joseon” (1920) written by Takahashi is available.

1) Lecture on the History of Joseon Thought

First, regarding notes on “The History of Joseon Thought and Faith” (朝鮮思想及信仰史), an incomplete form of a total of six volumes, Vol.3–Vol.8, exists. Among these, the date of the contribution, including year and month, of only two volumes have been identified: Vol.6 is dated late June 1927 and Vol.7 early November 1927. The content is based on the chapters of “Buddhism in Silla” and “Buddhism in Goryeo,” as well as the chapter preceding “Third Periods of Silla Buddhism in the Three Kingdoms” and the chapter succeeding “The Edification and Politics in Joseon” (李朝의敎政). Most of the contents are mentioned in another of his lecture notes titled “A Summary of the History of Joseon Thought” (朝鮮思想史槪説).


[Table 4] The Date of Contribution for the Lecture Notes Series of “A Summary of the History of Joseon Thought”

(2) “A Summary of the History of Joseon Thought: Lecture Book” Vol.2-6: Unknown for the date of the contribution
(3) “A Summary of the History of Joseon Thought: Lecture Book (The latest edition)”: A revised version of (1) and (2) three years later.
V.1: 1933  
V.2: June 1933  
V.3: Unknown  
V.4: April 1934 and early winter 1934  
V.5: Damaged and imperfect state. Instead, it has two piles of paper describing the literature in the Goryeo Dynasty attached to it.  
In addition to the above five volumes, “A Summary of the History of Joseon Thought: Lecture Book” Vol.1 exists: This can be assumed to be the draft of the first volume of (3) the latest edition.

It is noted that Toegye is not in these lecture notes. The name and explanation of Toegye appear in the lecture note of “The History of Joseon Confucianism,” which discussed in the next section (2-2).

2) Lecture on the History of Joseon Confucianism

Overall, the composition of Takahashi’s lecture notes on the history of Joseon Confucianism is summarized as follows: (1) a total of 20 volumes of “The History of Joseon Confucianism” (朝鮮儒學史) and its special edition (朝鮮儒學史: 號外1), (2) 7 volumes of “The History of Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Book” (朝鮮儒學史: 講本) and its four supplementary volumes of “Yi Toegye and Yi Yulgok” (李退溪與李栗谷), and (3) “The History of China and Joseon Confucianism” (支那朝鮮儒學史). Most of the lecture notes by Takahashi on the history of Joseon Confucianism have been left incomplete.

First, the 20 volumes of “The History of Joseon Confucianism” are broadly divided into five sections: Lecture I: Confucianism in Ancient Korea, Lecture II: Confucianism in Goryeo Dynasty, (Chapter 1) Confucianism in Yi Dynasty, Lecture IV: The First Period of Confucianism in the Yi Dynasty, and (Chapter 2) The Second Period of Confucianism in the Yi Dynasty. Toward the middle of Vol.4, the theme changes from Goryeo Confucianism to Joseon Confucianism, and Lecture IV continues to Vol.5 and ends in Vol.10. Then, from Vol.11 to Vol.16, Takahashi writes about Toegye as a part of the lecture titled “The Second Period of Confucianism in the Yi Dynasty”: Vol.11 begins with “1. Yi Toegye,” and Vol.16 ends with “3. Toegye’s
Disciples.” Subsequently, the lecture on Yi Yulgok extends from Vol.17 to Vol.20, and Vol.20 provides an outline of “Yulgok’s Disciples” and concludes with the description of Jung Hwa titled “Jung Hwa, Kim Jangsaeng, Jo Heon” (鄭晫, 金長生, 趙憲). The note is incomplete.

In terms of the date of the contribution, the 20 volumes required eight years of writing, from April 1927 to the early winter of 1934. For the papers published after Vol.10, which concentrates on Toegye, the publication dates are depicted in Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>June 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>July 8th, 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>July 25th, 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>August 7th, 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>December 8th, 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Unknown (The lecture on Toegye ends in this Volume: Yi Toegye - 3. Toegye’s Disciples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>January 25th, 1930 (The lecture on Yulgok begins from this Volume)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this context, one may question what Takahashi did during the 13.5 months between the publication of Vol.15 (December 8, 1928) and that of Vol.17 (January 25, 1930). It is assumed that he wrote “The History of Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Book,” along with the “The History of Joseon Confucianism,” during this period. This assumption is evidenced by the fact that the second half of the “Lecture Book,” which does not specify a contribution period, indicates that it is a rewriting of “The History of Joseon Confucianism.” In addition, the “Lecture book” Vol.1 (1930) and Vol.3 (August 29, 1930) and its supplementary fourth volume titled “Yi Toegye and Yi Yulgok” are a rewriting of the last part of “The History of Joseon Confucianism.” Further, these two notes, “Lecture Book” and “Yi Toegye and Yi Yulgok,” were rewritten intermittently at the time Takahashi was writing the 20 volumes of “The

15) “Yi Toegye and Yi Yulgok,” Vol.4 is discontinued during the narrative of “2. Yulgok’s Theory of Li and Ki (栗谷의 理氣説)” of “1. The Succession of Yulgo’s Theory (栗谷의 學의 師承)” in the part of “Part 3 (⇒5) Yulgok’s Theory (第三[⇒五]栗谷의 學).”
History of Joseon Confucianism,” and both the notes were incomplete works contributed in 1930.

In addition, there are notes titled “Confucian Philosophy in China and Joseon (支那朝鮮儒學哲學)” Vol.3 and “The History of China and Joseon Confucianism (支那朝鮮儒學史)” Vol.4 and Vol.5, whose distribution dates remain unknown: Vol.3 comprises parts of “Kim Anguk Moje” (金安國慕齋), “Yi Eonjeok” (李彥迪), “Seo Kyongdeok” (徐敬德), “Roh Sojae” (盧蘇齋), and “Jo Namyeong” (曹南冥) as a part of “The Scholars Before Yi Toegye” (李退溪以前의 學者). Further, the lecture on ‘Yi Toegye and Yi Yulgok’ continues to Vol.4 and Vol.5. In the fifth book, Vol.5, in the lecture titled “7. Human Mind and the Moral Mind・The Four Sprout and Seven Emotions Debate” (7人心道心・四端七情批判) in the section of “Yi Yulgok,” the notes conclude with the following statement by Takahashi: “presenting Yulgok’s theory of Xing-Qing (性情論) of TapSeongHoWonSeo (答成浩原書) as an illustration (to be continued on “The History of Confucianism” (儒敎史) Vol.20).” In terms of the table of contents, the subdivisions “Yi Toegye” and “Yi Yulgok” are the same as those used in the four aforementioned books of “Yi Toegye and Yi Yulgok.”

Therefore, it is evident that “The History of Chinese and Joseon Confucianism” was written after March 1930, which is the distribution date of “The History of Joseon Confucianism” Vol.20. Provisionally, “The History of Chinese and Joseon Confucianism” is considered the latest lecture note written by Takahashi. In terms of its contents, it is noted that Takahashi included Jo Nammyeong and Roh Sojae, who were Toegye’s contemporaries, in the chapter titled “Scholars before Yi Toegye.”

Further, during this period, two major works by Takahashi, “The Development of the School of Main Li and the School of Main Ki in the History of Joseon Confucianism” (1929) and Yicho bukkyō (1929), were published. These are considered the results of the intensive research conducted by him while writing “The History of Joseon Confucianism” and “The History of Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Book.”
3) Lectures on The Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism

Takahashi’s “The Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism” (朝鮮異學派之儒學) was published in 1935, four years before his retirement in April 1939. It is the title of the lecture that he taught at the university and, to date, 11 volumes of relevant lecture notes exist. In this section, we observe a new characteristic of Takahashi, which manifested during his late-year tenure at Keijo Imperial University.

[Table 6] A Total of 11 Volumes of Notes in the Subject of the Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism

- “The Heterodoxy School in Confucianism (異學派の儒學)” Vol.1-4: Writing started in earnest from July to December 1935.
- “The Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism” Vol.5-6: 1 January 1936. (Being concluded).
- The rewritten version of “The Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism” Vol.1: July 1936 contributed.

In 1936, Takahashi lectured on “The Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism” at Keijo Imperial University. In the first note, which is an idea memo of the lecture, he excerpted and recorded miscellaneous data on Yun Baekho (尹白湖), Park Seogyo (朴西溪), Jeong Yakyong (丁若鏞), and Kim Jeonghee (金正喜), as well as describing “The Concept of Heterodoxy (異學의概念).” In the section on Jeong Hagok (鄭霞谷), Takahashi indicates, “Be described later, a separate volume exists”; further, for Sim Daeyun, Takahashi only records the list of Daeyun’s four books. In its rewritten version, in “Lecture Plan Note” Vol.6, Takahashi describes in detail the learnings and achievements of seven individuals, in the order Yun Baekho, Park Seogyo, Shim Daeyun, Lee Byungheon, Jeong Yakyong, Jung Jaedoo, and Kim Jeonghee. Takahashi seems to have written these details in the order in which he prepared them while editing the original idea note.

In the context of “The Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Book,” Takahashi describes the concept of Lixue (理學), spread of Zhuxixue in the East.
and national civil service examinations of Yuan (元) and the national study conducted in Ming (明) and Joseon, which were followed by the the three periods of Joseon Confucianism. Further, he completed the explanations of Yun Baekho, Park Sedang, and Jeong Hagok regarding the formation and development of the Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism; however, the explanation stops during the description of Jeong Yakyong. Nevertheless, this note reveals that Takahashi faithfully complemented the contents of “The Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Plan Note” (朝鮮異學派의 儒學: 講義案) by ensuring consistency. Hence, these notes added a new concept, ‘the heterodox school,’ and its historical development to the framework of Joseon Confucianism that had previously been built by Takahashi. This process enabled the crystallization of an overall perspective on Takahashi’s study of the history of Joseon Confucianism.

4. Description of Toegye in Takahashi’s Lecture Notes on the History of Joseon Confucianism

Although it is well-known in the academic community that Toegye and Yulgok, particularly Toegye, are located at the center of Takahashi’s perception of Joseon Confucianism, this is even more clearly depicted in Takahashi’s lecture notes on the history of Joseon Confucianism. Further, Takahashi attempted to organically and historically explain the regional and academic development of political strife within the Joseon dynasty. As discussed earlier, such an explanation framework became more defined with the progress of his research.

In particular, it cannot be overlooked that Takahashi believed that Toegye strived to purify the theory of liqixinxingqing 理氣心性情, which encompasses the vast and complicated theoretical core concept of Zhuxi, and practice and realize the theory. Considering the academic atmosphere at the time, his proposed framework to explain the history of Joseon Confucianism was a novel, pioneering, and high-level effort. In other words, while Japanese scholars were conducting oriental studies centered on the
Japanese empire, Takahashi was attempting to secure the importance of Korean studies.

Accordingly, how is Toegye’s status described in the lecture notes of Keijo University? The following subsections outline Takahashi’s description of Toegye. Further, the tables of contents depicted below, [Table 7, 8, 9], are limited to the part on Toegye, the symbol ( ) indicates the modifications and supplementations made by Takahashi, and the symbols [ ] and 【】 conveniently indicate my supplementations.

1) History of Joseon Confucianism

As shown in the following table, in the “The History of Joseon Confucianism,” Takahashi sets Yi Toegye as a central figure in the chapter titled “The Second Period of Joseon Confucianism” and emphasizes the legitimacy of Toegye’s scholarship by discussing (1) Toegye’s exclusion of heresy and (2) the works of the Confucian scholars who were Toegye’s contemporaries. He then clarifies the succession relation of Toegye’s scholarship by referring to (3) the achievements and learnings of Toegye’s disciples. The lectures on Toegye span 7, Vol.9–Vol.16, pp.259–417, of 20 books and, subsequently, the description of Yulgok following Toegye is concluded in Vol.20, which remains unfinished.

This note depicts an outline of Takahashi’s lecture on Toegye; although the following lecture notes contain corrections and supplements, and sometimes deletions, they do not specify any change to the basic framework, in general. Further, it is noted that this part, on Toegye, was written at a time when Takahashi started rewriting the “The History of Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Book” while reexamining “The History of Joseon Confucianism.” Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that this lecture note convincingly reflects Takahashi’s perspectives on the ideas and composition of “The History of Joseon Confucianism.”

[Table 7] Table of Contents of “The History of Joseon Confucianism”

Chapter 5 The Second Period of the Confucianism in Yi Dynasty (第五編 李朝의儒學第二期)
Section 1 Yi Toegye (第一章 李退溪)
Part 1 Life (第一節 彼의 生涯)
Part 2 Toegye’s Theory【Vol.10⇒Vol.11】(第二節 退溪的 學説【第十一冊⇒第十二冊】)
Part 3 The Four Sprout and Seven Emotions Debate (第三節 四端七情理氣發的 論爭)
Part 4 Exclusion of Heresy (第四節 異學的 斥揮)

1. Hwadam (一 花潭)
2. Soje and Chungam (二 蘇齋과 整菴)
3. Yi Iljae (三 李一齋)

(Part) 6 (5) Toegye’s writing skills (第六(五)節 退溪的 文藻)
Part 7 (6) Zhu Xi and Toegye (第七(六)節 朱子와 退溪)
Part 8 (7) The Disciples of Toegye (第八(七)節 退溪的 門人【第十二冊⇒第十三冊】)
Part 9 (8) Toegye’s Writings (第九(八)節 退溪的 著述)

Section2 Toegye and Contemporary Confucian Scholars (第二章 李退溪와 同時代的 儒學者)

Part 1 Yi Iljae (第一節 李一齋)
1. A Brief Biography (一 略傳)
2. Ilgye’s Theory (二 一齋의 學説)
3. Disciples: Kim Cheonil, Kin Jaemin, Pyeon Sajeong (三 彼의 門人 金千鎰 金齊閔 邊士貞)

Part 2 Ro Soje (第二節 盧蘇齋)
1. A Brief Biography (一 略傳)
2. Soje’s Theory (二 蘇齋의 學)
3. Disciples: Pack Kwanghun, Shim Huisu (三 彼의 門人 白光勲 沈喜壽)

Part 3 Jo Nammyeong (第三節 曹南冥)
1. Character (一 彼의 人物)
2. Nammyeong’s Learning (三 南冥의 學)
3. Nammyeong’s Disciples: Oh Deoggye, Kim Woowong, Kwak Jaewoo (四 南冥의 門人 呉德溪 金宇顒 郭再祐)

Section 3 The Disciples of Toegye (第三章 退溪門徒)

Part 1 Jo Jisan (第 一節 曹芝山)
Part 2 Kim Seongil (第二節 金誠一)
Part 3 Ryu Seongryong (第三節 柳成龍)
1. Achievements (一 事蹟)
2. Theory (二 彼의 學説【第十四冊⇒第十五冊】)

Part 4 Jo Wolcheon (第四節 趙月川)
1. Achievements (一 事蹟)
2. Theory (二 彼의 學問)

Part 5 Yi Kuam (第五節 李龜巖)
1. Achievements (一 事蹟)

Part 6 Ki Kobong (第六節 奇高峰)
1. Kobong’s heory (二 高峰의 學説)

Part 7 Jeong Hanpo (第七節 鄭寒岡)
1. Achievements (一 彼의 行蹟【第十五冊⇒第十六冊】)
2. [⇒2] Hanpo’s Theory (二 寒岡의 學)
2) History of Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Book

The contents of the “Lecture Book,” or the revised version of “The History of Joseon Confucianism,” did not include the chapter on “Yi Toegye.” As shown below, on comparing the contents of this version with those of [Table 7], the change in order is clearly noticed. For example, “Section (?): Toegye and Contemporary Confucian Scholars” is first lectured as a part of “Chapter 4: The Second Period of the Confucianism in Yi Dynasty,” which, in fact, corresponds to Section 1; however, Takahashi did not indicate the correct numbers here. Regarding this omission, we assume that Takahashi probably considered supplementing additional content in the beginning of this chapter.

(Table 8) Table of Contents of The History of Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Book

Chapter 4: The Second Period of the Confucianism in Yi Dynasty [(第四編) 李朝儒學史儒學第二期]
Section (?): Toegye and Contemporary Confucian Scholars (第 章 李退溪と同時代の儒学者)
Part 1: Yi Iljae (第一節 李一齋)
1. A Brief Biography (一 略歴)
2. Ilgye’s Theory (二 一齋の學説)
Section 2 Ro Sushin (第二節 盧守愼)
1. A Brief Biography (一 略傳)
2. Soje’s Theory (2 [⇒二] 蘇齋의學)
3. Disciples (三 彼의門人)
Section 3 Jo Nammyeong (第三節 東南冥)
Character (一 彼의人物)
Nammyeong’s Theory (二 南冥의學)

3) Yi Toegye and Yi Yulgok

The note “Yi Toegye and Yi Yulgok,” as evidenced by the title, centers on two characters. It is a sequel to “The History of Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Book”; this can be deduced from the continuation of the tables of contents of the books. Chapter 4 of “Yi Toegye and Yi Yulgok” is a revised version of “Chapter 4: Exclusion
of Heresy” of “The History of Joseon Confucianism.” On comparing the two, it is clear that Takahashi attempted to rewrite the relevant part of “The History of Joseon Confucianism” in a simpler manner and reduce the number of Chinese quotations to make it easier to read.

4) History of Chinese and Joseon Confucianism

On comparing the table of contents of “History of Chinese and Joseon Confucianism” with the table of contents depicted in [Table 7] and [Table 8], we note that they are similar, in general. However, in the note “The History of Chinese and Joseon Confucianism,” (1) the title “Scholars before Toegye” is a new addition. Further, Roh Sojae, who was considered in “Toegye and Contemporary Confucian Scholars” in previous books, is introduced in this chapter, along with Jo Nammyeong. (2) Although the chapter titled “Exclusion of Heresy” is the rewritten version of “The History of Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Book,” the section “2. Sojae, Jeongam” (二. 蘇齋, 整菴) was replaced with “2. Roh Sojae.” Further, regarding its contents, “History of Chinese and Joseon Confucianism” mostly copies the related parts in the “Lecture Book” almost verbatim. However, there is a new addition to the introduction to Roh Sushin, as follows:

[6] There are Roh Sojae in Kyeongsung and Jo Nammyeong in Yeongnam, who enhanced their academic reputation along with Toegye at the time. Over time, however, (their) status in Joseon Confucianism gradually fell and lost its significance; consequently, in the end, only Toegye remained shining like a star right in front of the moon.

This statement indicates Takahashi’s perspective on Joseon Confucianism, which mainly focuses on Toegye, and the same passage in [6] is quoted in “The Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Book,” as shown below. Overall, in this
note, we find sophisticated language, polished sentences, and traces of a detailed investigation.

5) The Heterodox School in Joseon Confucianism: Lecture Book

In this article, Takahashi considers Neo-Confucianism an orthodox concept and names the scholars who questioned the Neo-Confucianism theory as ‘a school of heterodoxy.’ Although the article does not contain any chapters on Toegye, it contains a part of the lecture referring to the existence of Toegye. Takahashi first lectured on Neo-Confucianism after the Introduction and then described heretical people in the chapter titled “The First Period of Joseon Confucianism.” He considered the existence and development of the heterodox school as an opposite side to the orthodox Neo-Confucianism in Joseon, which centered on Toegye, and set Seo Hwadam, Ro Sushin, the disciples of Hwadam, and Yi Ilje as the main characters in the “The First Period of the Heterodox School.”

In terms of the overall structure, there is no difference between this note and the part “Scholars before Toegye” in “The History of Chinese and Joseon Confucianism”; however, there are some changes in the contents. For example, Takahashi added the following single sentence to the preface [6]: “However, it is compelling to say that, unlike Toegye who is a pure Neo-Confucian scholar, among those who advocated a heretical doctrine, Sojae’s ethos and academic fruitfulness are particularly excellent.”

5. Takahashi’s Perspective on Toegye after the Lecture on the History of Joseon Confucianism

In this chapter, I discuss two articles that were published after Takahashi’s retirement from Keijo Imperial University in 1939. The first one is titled “Yi Toegye”16); it was serially published five times in the Sibun from November 1939

to March 1940. The second article is titled “From Royal Way Confucianism to Imperial Way Confucianism” (王道儒教から皇道儒教へ)”17; it was published in the Government General’s organ Chōsen (朝鮮) in December 1939.

1) Yi Toegye

“Yi Toegye” summarizes Takahashi’s lecture at Keijo Imperial University, the main features of which can be identified from the following table of contents:

[Table 9] Table of Contents of “Yi Toegye” (1939)

| Yi Toegye (李退溪)                                           |
| Introduction (序言)                                          |
| 1. Life (一 生涯)                                            |
| 2. Theory (二 學説)                                          |
| 3. The Four Sprout and Seven Emotions Debate (三 四端七情理氣論争) |
| 4. Exclusion of Heresy (四 异學的揮斥)                        |
|   1) Seo Hwadam (徐花譚)                                     |
|   2) Ro Soje (盧蘇齋)                                       |
|   3) Yi Iljae (李一齋)                                      |
|   4) Chi’en Paisha, Wang Yangming (陳白沙・王陽明)            |
| 5. Toegye’s Writing Skills (五 退溪的文藻)                    |
| 6. Zhu Xi and Toegye (六 朱子與退溪)                         |
| 7. The Disciples of Toegye (七 退溪的門人)                    |
| 8. Toegye’s Writings (八 退溪的著述)                         |
| 9. Toegye and Japanese Neo-Confucians (九 退溪與日本朱子學者) |

On comparing the aforementioned contents [Table 9] with those of the earlier lecture notes ([Table 1] to [Table 8]), we notice the addition of a new chapter titled “9. Toegye and Japanese Neo-Confucians.” Takahashi concludes this chapter with the following statement: “Here, I should explain and describe the relationship between Toegye and Japanese Neo-Confucians; in particular, the effect that Toegye had on them, but I omitted it due to my consideration that this work needs to be done by many Japanese scholars in this field.”

A related example to this content is seen in Toegye’s representative work titled “The Development of the School of Main Li and the School of Main Ki in the History of Joseon Confucianism”; the work has an addendum titled “Annex, The School of Abe and Yi Toegye” (附 崲門學派와 李退溪) in “Chapter 1: The Four-Seven Debate between Yi Toegye and Ki Kobong.”

Meanwhile, this paper depicts some statements and contents that are not included in earlier lecture notes, that is, while examining the corruption of the Joseon Dynasty’s ruling class, Takahashi implicitly highlighted the greatness of Toegye as follows: “While investigating Confucianism, by getting to know Toegye, I finally encountered a great Confucianist who combines intelligence and virtue.” This is discussed as follows:

Since its foundation, Joseon has accepted both the positive and negative aspects of the Chinese culture by imitating them. Since the country is small, the autocracy of the royal government thoroughly reached all parts of the country; thus, both intangible ideology and tangible lifestyle were controlled as one in accordance with the needs of the government. In other words, among the various constituents of human society, only politics had absolute superiority over the others, and it suppressed and prevented the development of other elements. Therefore, a privileged class that can participate in politics was created, and Confucianism became their exclusive property; consequently, Confucianism and the learning of government officials became unified and inseparable. As a result, as a scholar, there is no one who does not aim to obtain a position of public office. Once they become government officials, they leave the actual affairs to other officials; spend every day on empty political discussions under the name of ‘setting the king’s mind straight,’ ‘clearly defining one’s moral obligations,’ etc.; and use what they exploit from common people for their own benefit… The stuffy and despicable behaviors of the group called Joseon Yusaeng (儒生, Confucian scholars) are no less abhorrent than the behaviors of corrupt officials. One of the major causes of the depravity and corruption in Joseon politics is that Confucianism became the learning of fame and wealth (明理之學) and its scholars became the people who run after this fame and wealth.
Similarly, Takahashi reveals his demeaning perceptions on Joseon Confucianism by referring to those Joseon scholars who were focused on desk theory and self-interest as *Myeongri ji do* (名利之徒, a group of people who covet fame and gain), as well as referring to Joseon Confucianism itself as *Myung-Li-Zi-Hak* (名利之學). He pointed out the malady of Confucianism, which had become a means to acquire fame and wealth and incite political strife. Hence, Takahashi issued warnings regarding the politically oriented learning climate of the period. However, such an opinion is contrary to his evaluation of Toegye as “a great Confucian of learning and virtue,” and it even generates a paradoxical and cynical feeling among readers. He describes Toegye as one “who truly abandoned fame and gain and returned to the authentic Confucian duty” and one who “while living in the countryside, cultivated his inner mind, as well as learning scripts.” Furthermore, Takahashi emphasizes that Toegye was canonized in the National Academy, and hundreds of disciples highly respected his learning. In other words, Takahashi honored Toegye as a model Confucian who oriented himself toward morality through learning, in contrast to the intellectuals who followed the trend of Joseon Confucianism that aimed the realization of political purposes through learning.

2) From Royal Way Confucianism to Imperial Way Confucianism

The article titled “From Royal Way Confucianism to Imperial Way Confucianism” clearly depicts the ideology of the scholarship of Takahashi as a colonialist scholar. Even though the article does not contain any mention of Toegye, this article has significant implications toward understanding Takahashi’s academic ideology. The following is his statement in the preface:

Although Confucianism and Buddhism are not teachings that originated in our country (Japan), they were able to contribute to the cultivation and development of the national spirit and morality of our country for a long time, since they have long been handed down and harmonized with our national morals, as well as religion. Setting aside Buddhism for now, here, I will explain how Confucianism
has shifted its ideal from *Wang-Do* (王道, the principles of royalty) to *Hwang-Do* (皇道, the imperial way).

Subsequently, Takahashi stated,

> At this time, when the Confucian organizations in Joseon are trying to embody the spiritual movement to play an essential part in the great work of establishing a new order in the Great East Asia, by newly strengthening the solidarity under the recognition that they have been the ruling classes of this land, I would like to present my personal opinion on the goal of this movement by clarifying the supreme truth of Japanese Confucianism.

Moreover, Takahashi first clarified that “The introduction of Confucianism into our nation [Japan]” occurred when “Wang In (王仁), a civil official of Baekje, brought with him *The Thousand-Character Classic* and *The Analects of Confucius* and first taught them to the crown prince”; further, Takahashi evaluated this incident to have conveyed a new great teaching to traditional Japanese morality. Furthermore, he pointed out that “Japan and Korea are identical in that both countries have faced anti-Buddhist and anti-Christian persecutions; however, an anti-Confucianism movement has never occurred in either of the two countries.” Similarly, Takahashi emphasizes the similarity of acceptance of Confucianism between the two countries; however, he clarifies his point by stating that “The scholars of Japan and Joseon must be fully aware that there is a discrepancy between the traditional Confucianism in China, Joseon, and that in Japan in terms of fundamental political ideas.”

In other words, according to his explanation, “Joseon Confucianism is literally the same as Chinese Confucianism, whereby the ideas of each Chinese era always appear in Joseon during the subsequent era. Thus, when Joseon became the tributary of the Yuan (元) Dynasty, Neo-Confucianism was adopted [as the state ideology].” In addition, he pointed out that “After becoming the Republic of China (民國), China, which used to be a democratic state based on the family unit, formulated the idea
of ‘patriotism,’ which had not succeeded in developing the idea of ‘loyalty’ (to the ruler). The moral ideal of ‘loyalty’ has disappeared in China nowadays.” Therefore, based on the fact that Joseon has historically followed China, Takahashi accessed that “under these circumstances, even if we try to promulgate the traditional concepts of Chinese and Joseon Confucianism to affect the current National Spiritual Mobilization Movement by promoting Confucian teachings, it is extremely difficult to awaken the national spirit of the Joseon people and turn their national morality into the spirit of Naeseon Ilche (內鮮一體, Korea and Japan are one entity).”

Therefore, Takahashi concluded, “Confucianism, which should be strongly promoted in Joseon today, is not an ambiguous concept as in Joseon and China, but rather considered an Imperial Way Confucianism that has been completely assimilated into Japan’s unique characteristics and has cultivated national spirit and morality.” Further, his point is that “It is the Emperor Confucianism of the unbroken imperial line of Japan (万世一系, jp. Ban-Sei-Itt-Kei) that should be aimed by the Joseon Confucian group, rather than the Chinese Royal Way Confucianism, which condones a dynastic revolution.”

Here, the group that attempted to strengthen their solidarity refers to Joseon Yukyo Yunhaphoe (朝鮮儒道聯合會), which was proposed in September 1939. In 1938, several significant incidents occurred and the Korean people were subjected to the implementation of new systems, such as the (1) enactment of the volunteer Army Supporting Ordinance; (2) founding of the Joseon Federation of National Spiritual Mobilization; (3) establishment of the Oath of Subjects of the Japanese Empire (皇國臣民의 誓), which started with the line “we are subjects of Great Japanese Empire”; and (4) imposition of the impressment law and Name-Changing program.
6. Conclusions: Main Features of Takahashi’s Study on Toegye

In general, Takahashi’s lecture notes are consistent with his academic quest to clarify the history of development of Joseon Confucianism under the premise of the Japanese colonial era and its concomitant spatial and temporal features. It is further clear that Takahashi’s interest in Toegye was absolute. In summary, Takahashi’s understanding of Toegye has the following characteristics.

First, Takahashi reveals the transformation from an inductive method to a deductive method, that is, a change in the learning and performance of Toegye. Further, he emphasizes Toegye’s rendering of orthodox Joseon Confucianism within a framework of Pasa and Hyunjeong. In other words, the construction of Toegye’s study as the orthodoxy of Joseon Neo-Confucianism was the first task undertaken by Takahashi in his depiction of the history of Joseon Confucianism and, consequently, Takahashi collected the descriptions of the scholars who came before and after Toegye in his process of establishing the orthodox Neo-Confucianism proposed by Toegye.

Second, Takahashi explains that the Yeongnam School and Kaeseong School were regional developments of the study of Neo-Confucianism in Joseon, while classifying the Sagong School (事功派), Daohak Seonsaeng School (道學先生), and Kyeongje School (經濟派) based on the relevant scholars’ academic characteristics; furthermore, he breaks their theories down into the schools of Main Li (主理派) and Main Ki and (主氣派), ultimately, the school of Compromise (折衷派). Hence, such an academic development of the history of Joseon Confucianism based on the classification of schools was first established by Takahashi.

Third, an evaluation of Toegye’s study faithfully conveys the theory of Zhu xi and thus succeeded in purifying (醇化) the theory. This is sometimes cited as a proof of Joseon scholars’ dependence on China and is noted as a characteristic of Joseon Confucianism. The quest for answers to the issues inherent in Zhu Xi’s theory, which
was started in earnest by Toegye, was taken up by later scholars, and this aspect forms the central point of Takahashi’s description of the history of Joseon Confucianism.

Fourth, with respect to Japanese and Joseon Confucianism, Takahashi reveals the concepts’ influential relationship by emphasizing the historical significance of Toegye’s scholarship. Following the Meiji Restoration, Confucianism, and particularly Neo-Confucianism, was reused to formulate the idea of ‘Loyalty and Patriotism’ of the imperial system state; in this context, Toegye’s influence on Japanese Confucianism started attracting attention in the process of formation of the Oriental philosophy in modern Japan. Such academic achievements and awareness furthered and influenced Takahashi’s study on Toegye.

Fifth, Takahashi’s appreciation for Toegye’s personal qualities, which are reflected in his learnings, ‘from academic learning to moral,’ is reminiscent of the image of an exemplary intellectual in colonial Korea. Finally, I clarify that it is difficult to find any disparaging comments on Toegye in Takahashi’s descriptions.
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