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Abstract

This study examines how Neo-Confucian scholars of the Chosŏn dynasty used diagrams, focusing on diagrams that depict the structure of the Doctrine of the Mean. Ever since it was extracted from the Record of Rites by Zhu Xi, the Doctrine of the Mean proved to be an important subject of scholarship. Debates about the division of the text were often related to other important issues at hand. Thus, the diagrams concerned with this problem can be seen as a nexus where various issues meet. This study provides detailed information of two particular diagrams: Kwŏn Kŭn’s late 14th century “Diagram of the Opening Section of Doctrine of the Mean,” and Yi Chin-sang’s late 19th century “Diagram of Four Branches and Six Sections of the Doctrine of the Mean.” With five centuries between them, the two diagrams are surprisingly similar, sharing both visual language and many pre-suppositions. However, a close comparison of the two can reveal their differences, and the advancements made in diagram-making during the Chosŏn dynasty. The common methodology used to analyze diagrams is to discuss the form and the content of the diagram, usually in the context of the attached text. In a similar way, the sorting of diagrams into categories is done according to their visual aspect and their topic. Useful as it may be, this form of analysis is limited when dealing with complicated diagrams. By using the philosophy of C.S. Peirce, this study attempts to show how a three-fold view of a diagram as a symbol, an object, and an interpretation, can lead to better understanding of the diagram and its function. Furthermore, by applying the Peircian typology, a new division of diagram emerges.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossary</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bagua (Ch.)</td>
<td>The eight symbols used in the Book of Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biao (Ch.)</td>
<td>Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch'e</td>
<td>Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch'e</td>
<td>Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chǒng</td>
<td>Proper, orthodox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi</td>
<td>Section; Limb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch‘i</td>
<td>To reach, Actualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chŏl</td>
<td>Segment; Body part or joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chŏn</td>
<td>Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chŏng</td>
<td>Emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chŏng mi</td>
<td>Subtle essence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chŏnsŏ</td>
<td>Seal script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chung</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chunghwa</td>
<td>Harmonious Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chungyong bunjŏlbyŏnŭi</td>
<td>Recognition and Commentary on the Segmentation of the Doctrine of the Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chungyong saji yukjŏl do</td>
<td>The diagram of Four Branches and Six Sections of the Zhongyong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>churiron</td>
<td>Supremacy of Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chuyŏk</td>
<td>The Book of Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dosim</td>
<td>The Way of the Mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dot‘ong</td>
<td>The Transmission of the Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gang ling (Ch.)</td>
<td>Single thread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu zhongyong ba (Ch.)</td>
<td>Colophon to the ancient Doctrine of the Mean (Wang Bo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haeng</td>
<td>Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han Shu (Ch.)</td>
<td>History of the Former Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heluo zhenshu (Ch.)</td>
<td>Real Criticism on the He-Luo (diagrams)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hetu (Ch.)</td>
<td>The River Diagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horak</td>
<td>The Honam school and the Gyŏnggi-do school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwa</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyŏng i sang-ha</td>
<td>Before and after things had shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyŏnggi</td>
<td>Physical condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>igi ilwŏn non</td>
<td>The theory that Material Force and Principle have one origin (Yulgok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>igi iwŏn non</td>
<td>The theory that Material Force and Principle have two origins (T’oegey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>igi simsŏngnon</td>
<td>Theory about the Principle-Material Force and the Mind-Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imsim</td>
<td>The Way of Humans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inmulsŏng-tongiron</td>
<td>The Debate Whether the Nature of Humans and Animals is Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iphak tosŏl</td>
<td>Diagrammatic Treatise for Entering upon Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jing (Ch.)</td>
<td>canon, classic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kēwén (Ch.)</td>
<td>Exegesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kibal isŭng ildosŏl</td>
<td>Explanations of the Theory that Material Force Leads and Principle Follows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiho hakp’a</td>
<td>Kiho School Faction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kunja</td>
<td>Exemplary person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kye ku</td>
<td>Cautious and watchful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kyekuam chip chungyongdo</td>
<td>The Kyekuam Collection of the Diagram of the Doctrine of the Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kyo</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kyŏng</td>
<td>Reverence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lihak chong-yo</td>
<td>The Essentials of Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liji (Ch.)</td>
<td>The Book of Rites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liushu benyi (Ch.)</td>
<td>The Source of Righteousness in the Six Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luoshu (Ch.)</td>
<td>Luo River Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mibal/ibal</td>
<td>Not yet issued/already issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ogyŏng ch’ŏn’gyŏnnok</td>
<td>A Record of my Opinion on the Five Classic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>osang</td>
<td>Five Virtues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p’ari changsŏ sagŏn</td>
<td>The 1919 Independence Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pi ŭn</td>
<td>“Wide and far, yet hidden”, Chapter 12 of the Doctrine of the Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulssi chappyŏn</td>
<td>Arguments Against Mr. Buddha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renshtuo (Ch.)</td>
<td>Explanations of Humaneness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>zhongyong lun</th>
<th>Discussions on the Doctrine of the mean</th>
<th>中庸論</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zhongyong zhangju</td>
<td>the Doctrine of the Mean by Chapter and Phrase</td>
<td>中庸章句</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhongyong zhangju daquan</td>
<td>Collection of Commentaries on the Doctrine of the Mean</td>
<td>中庸章句大全</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuàn</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>傅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1: The Doctrine of the Mean

1.1 Introduction

Diagrams are a key characteristic of Korean Neo-Confucian thought during the Chosŏn dynasty (1392–1897). Kwŏn Kŭn wrote his *Diagrammatic Treatise for Entering Upon Learning (iphak tosŏl)* in 1390 to summarize Cheng-Zhu Neo Confucianism in diagrams. Following him, diagrams continued to have a central place in the scholarship of every important scholar. In the case of Yi Hwang, for example, a single comment on a diagram (The Diagram of Heaven’s Mandate or *ch’ŏnmyŏng tosŏl*) resulted in the eight year-long debate, the so called “Four-Seven Debate” (*sach’il nonbyŏn*).\(^1\) He himself presented the summery of his teaching to King Sŏnjo (r. 1567-1608) in the form of diagrams in his famous *Ten Diagrams of Sage Learning* (*Sŏnghak Sipto*).\(^2\) Unlike China, where this particular intellectual trend disappeared in the Yuan dynasty (1271–1368), Chosŏn scholars (such as Yi Chin-sang discussed later in chapter 3) continued to create new diagrams even late in the 19th century.

This work attempts to ask questions about the usage of diagrams in Chosŏn scholarship in a limited way. By using particular diagrams made to answer a specific question, I attempt to

---


highlight the changes that occurred over time, as well as the different ways in which a diagram can be utilized. Specifically, I will focus on two diagrams that breakdown the various components of *The Doctrine of the Mean* (Zhongyong in Chinese, Chungyong in Korean). When Zhu Xi extracted this text from the *Record of Rites* (*Liji* in Chinese) as one of the Four Books, he placed it on a pedestal to become a special text in the Neo-Confucian curriculum. Though, as the most difficult of the four books to understand, it was the last of those Four Books in the curriculum, it nonetheless occupied a special place in Neo-Confucian education.  

When we examine the issues that surrounded the scholarship dealing with this text, we can single out three important topics of concern that continued to be the focus of Neo-Confucian thinkers throughout the ages: The identity of the author of the text, the breakdown of the text into sections, and the understanding of key terms used in the text in the broader context of Neo-Confucian metaphysics. Thus, through the mapping of the range of opinions on these issues, we can map and track the currents of Neo-Confucian thought.

In the following chapters I will introduce works of two Chosŏn dynasty scholars who wrote about *The Doctrine of the Mean* and provided their own interpretation in the form of a diagram. The work of both scholars is heavily dependent on the works of other Neo-Confucian scholars both in China and in Korea, either as a source of justification or as a

---

3 The exact translation of the title into European languages poses many problems that will not be discussed here. The title *Doctrine of the Mean* is the most known translation, and will be used here in spite of its problems. For a discussion on the problems of this title see Roger T. Ames and David L. Hall, “Why Zhongyong is not “Doctrine of the Mean”,” in *Focusing on the Familiar* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002), 150-2.

4 Ames and Hall, 1-3.
target of critique. Thus, the diagrams provide a means to investigate the networks of knowledge in which Choson scholars participated. Finally, I will discuss the Neo-Confucian diagrams in the wider context of definitions, typology and evolution. By using the theoretical framework provided by Charles Sanders Peirce, I wish to introduce a simple and powerful tool to analyze diagrams. Peirce’s theory of diagrams allows me to categorize diagrams according to the Object that they refer to as well as their Function. Using these categories provides me with a dichotomy that is not based on topic or visual form (e.g., Diagrams of the Book of Changes, etc’) and thus provides more insights. This chapter will supply some essential data on the trends and issues related to *The Doctrine of the Mean* to allow the discussion in the following chapters.

### 1.2 About the Doctrine of the Mean

*The Doctrine of the Mean* is a short text of slightly more than four thousand characters that was originally embedded into *The Records of Rites* (Liji), sometime around the Later Han dynasty (25–220 CE). Although the origins of the text are debatable, following a statement in *The Records of the Historian* (Shiji) it was traditionally attributed to Kong Ji (孔伋; Pen name Zixi 子思), the grandson of Confucius from his son Bo Yu (伯魚). The *Records of Rites* included three other texts attributed to Zisi, the most famous of which is *The Great Learning* (Daxue in Chinese, Daehak in Korean) Those texts have a lot in common, and in

---

5 Ames and Hall, Ibid.
6 Ibid.
the 12th century they were extracted by Zhu Xi to become separate books, and part of his new educational system. In 1313, about a century after the death of Zhu Xi, the Yuan Emperor Renzong (r. 1311–1320) canonized his Four Books and made them part of the state examinations system, a status these books retained until the abolition of the system in 1905.

Chinese scholars paid attention to the fact that both books deal with the issue of self-cultivation from two different approaches. For example, Ming scholar Wang Wenlu (王文祿, 1503-1586) thinks that “The Great Learning serves as the outline for The Doctrine of the Mean, and The Doctrine of the Mean provides the details of The Great Learning”.

One of the major differences between the two books is in the issue of editing and editions. The Great Learning had more than twenty versions, whereas The Doctrine of the Mean has one almost undisputed version. Nevertheless, The Doctrine of the Mean has also been the subject of editing. The dramatic findings of the Mawangdui excavations in 1973, and in Guodian in 1993, did not reveal significant changes in The Doctrine of the Mean. However, based on variations in other texts associated with Zisi, Ames and Hall have concluded that those texts were compiled by a school rather than one person, and consist of heterogeneous scholarships. Jeffrey Riegel concludes that the document we have now is the result of an

---

7 There are several common phrases in both books, such as “Therefore the Superior Man is cautious when he is alone” (故君子慎其獨也) that appears in the first chapter of the Doctrine of the Mean and twice in the third chapter of the Great Learning. Both books also share similar expressions (親親, 育身 and 治國 to name few). Finally the stylistic usage of “chain arguments” in some of the chapters of the Doctrine of the Mean (ch. 20, 22, 23, 26 and 29) closely resemble the opening statement of the Great Learning.
10 Ames and Hall, 140-2.
extensive editing on a previous Zisi text, probably as a result of the debates conducted by the Ritualists of the Han dynasty.\textsuperscript{11} In the *Zhongyong zhangju* Zhu Xi asserts that the text is coherent and that the book is bound by a single thread (\textit{Gang ling} in Chinese), but admits changes in language.\textsuperscript{12} Zhu Xi does break *The Doctrine of the Mean* into four sections.\textsuperscript{13} His contemporary Wang Bo (王柏, 1197-1274) starts by acknowledging Zixi as the originator of the text,\textsuperscript{14} but later claims that the text is fragmented and that there are flows in its structure.\textsuperscript{15} He assumes that the mistakes occurred due to misplacement of the original bamboo strips.\textsuperscript{16} In a work titled *Colophon on the Ancient Zhongyong* (\textit{Gu Zhongyong ba}), he points to the usage of several key terms, in two distinctive different ways, concluding that two distinct chapters have been conflated together.\textsuperscript{17}

Modern scholars have connected this question to the identity of the author or editor of the book. In this regard the entire spectrum of opinions has been provided in various scholarly works.\textsuperscript{18} The traditionalist position is that Zisi is the author of the text. This position appeared first in *The Records of the Historian*,\textsuperscript{19} and was acknowledged by the famous

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Jeffrey Riegel, The Four ‘Tsu Ssu’ Chapters, 75-6.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Zhu Xi, \textit{Zhong Yong Zhang Ju} [Zhong Yong by Chapter and Phrase] p. 1a. SKQS.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Wang bo, Zhong Yong Lun 〈中庸論〉[discussion on the Doctrine of the Mean] in Luzhai Wang Wenzhan gong wen ji 〈魯齋王文憲公文集〉, (Taipei: Taiwan Xxueshang shuju 1970), 435-7.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Wang bo, Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Wang bo, Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Jeffrey Riegel, The Four ‘Tsu Ssu’ Chapters, 79.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Wang Xiaowei, Songdai Zhongyong xueyanjiu [A Study on “The Doctrine of the Mean” of the Song Dynasty], PhD diss., Hebei University, 2005), 5-9.
\item \textsuperscript{19} \textit{Shiji} 47, 104. [Kongzi Shijia]\
\end{itemize}
Eastern Han commentator Zheng Xuan (鄭玄, 127–200; Penname Kangcheng 康成).\textsuperscript{20} Following him, Li Ao (李翱, 772–841; Penname Xizhi 习之), the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi all took Zixi to be the author of the text. Wang Bo states that the text was written by Zixi, but at the same time points to Ban Gu’s History of the Former Han (Hanshu), that provided a reference to the now extinct Explanations on The Doctrine of the Mean (Zhongyong shuo),\textsuperscript{21} a possible source for at least part of the text.

The opposite opinion is that The Doctrine of the Mean had nothing to do with Zixi, and was a later creation. This opinion was first stated by Ouyang Xiu (歐陽修, 1007-1072), a Song dynasty statesman, poet and scholar, who decided that the text was a far later compilation. His decision was based, among other facts, on the visible difference in style and content from Mencius, who was a student of Zisi according to tradition.\textsuperscript{22} Finally, there is a third middle ground opinion that correlates some chapters to Zisi. This opinion was stated by the modern historian Fung Yu-lan (馮友蘭) who claimed that only the opening and closing sections of the book originated with Zisi.\textsuperscript{23} Modern scholars have also debated the question of the book’s origin. As mentioned before, Roger Ames and David Hall seem to attribute the book to Zisi,\textsuperscript{24} while Takeuchi Yoshio claimed that the book is a composition of various works.\textsuperscript{25} Finally, Du Wei-ming argues for the text’s overall integrity but advocates for a different

\textsuperscript{20} Wang Wiaowei, 5.
\textsuperscript{21} Wang bo, Zhong Yong Lun, 353.
\textsuperscript{22} Wang Wiaowei, 5-6.
\textsuperscript{23} Wang Wiaowei, 6-7. See also Jeffrey Riegel, The Four ‘Tsu Ssu’ Chapters, 80.
\textsuperscript{24} Ames and Hall, p. 131.
\textsuperscript{25} Ames and Hall, p. 143.
sectioning.  

1.3 The Division of the Text

The question of sectioning is another major issue discussed by virtually all commentators on the text, starting from Zhu Xi. Zhu Xi broke the text into four main sections, each with a different key term as its main focus. He details his division and reasoning in the Zhongyong zhangju as follows.

Chapters 1 to 11 deal with the traditional teaching of Zisi. Zhu Xi notes that the language of the opening chapter is different from the language used in the next ten chapters, but asserts that “their thought is consistent”. According to Zhu Xi, these chapters deal with three virtues – Wisdom (chì), Humanity (in) and Courage (yong). Chapters 12 to 20 consist of citations of the traditional Confucian λογια. From chapter 13 to 15 the text talks about the smallness of the way of the exemplary person (Junzi), from chapters 16 to 19 it deals with the greatness of the way of the exemplary person, and finally in chapter 20 combines both of them. Chapter 20 is particularly important to Zhu Xi, since it introduces the idea of

27 Kim You-Gon, Han’guk ’chungyongdosŏl’ üi chujewa t’üksŏng [The Main Subject and Characteristic of the Illustration on the Doctrine of the Mean in Korea], Yugyo sasang yŏn’gu 29 No.0 (2007) 303-335.
29 Jeffrey Riegel, 75.
30 The three are described together in chapter 20.
31 A term coined in this context by the late Gustav Haloun, as opposed to σχόλιον - commentary. His annotated translation of the text was kept in the Cambridge University Library but was lost. See Jeffrey Riegel, 85-100.
32 Jeffrey Riegel, 76.
Sincerity (sŏng) for the first time. Chapters 21 to 32 are considered the third section, which elaborates on the previous ideas and presents the way of humans (indo) vs. the way of heaven (chŏndo), and use the term Sincerity extensively. Finally, Chapter 33 is considered as a separate chapter, due to its different style of writing.

Following Zhu Xi, other scholars have attempted to come up with their ways to break the text into sections, and their own commentaries. The most influential of these commentators is probably Yao Lu. Yao Lu (魯饒, Penname Shuang-feng 雙峰), was a 13th century scholar, and a prominent student of Zhu Xi’s son-in-law.33 His writings were influential in Korea since the early days of the Chosŏn dynasty. His breakdown of the text included six sections with three main changes from Zhu Xi. First, he made the first chapter stand alone as a separate section. Second, he moved chapter 20 to the next chapter. Finally, he separated that chapter into two sections: From chapter 20 to 26 was a section dealing with the Way (do), and from chapter 27 to 32 was a section dealing with Virtue (tŏk). In the Ming dynasty Hu Guang provided a division of the text by a Mr. Wang.34 This four-fold division is similar to Zhu Xi’s division, with the major changes being changes in the naming of the sections, and slight variation in the exact location each section began and ended. For example, he titles the first section the Mean and Harmony Branch.

When inspecting the different divisions of the text, it is clear the authors all agree on the core


divisions of the text. Nevertheless, the various divisions bring forward various interpretations of the text, and particularly key phrases. Zhu Xi’s division focuses on Sincerity and Righteousness (うい) as key terms. Yao Lu, on the other hand, shifted the focus from Sincerity by joining chapter 20 with the next section, but gave additional attention to Virtue. Hu Guang focused attention on Harmony (hwā) as an equivalent to the Mean. It is no wonder then that the question of the textual division became important to Korean scholars. By choosing one division over the other, or by consolidating two divisions, a scholar could focus on his interpretation to the text, and his terminology, while keeping well within the boundaries of Orthodoxy.

Among Korean scholars, we can find many who dealt with the question of division. The first is probably Kwŏn Kŭn (權近), who dealt directly with the issue in the iphak tosŏl. As described in detail in the following chapter, he created two divisions – one of three parts, and a finer one of five parts. Following him, various scholars throughout the Chosŏn dynasty continued to provide their own interpretations. Yun Hyŏng-no (尹衡老), a contemporary of Kwŏn Kŭn, suggested another division in a diagram titled the “Diagram of The Doctrine of the Mean in the Collection of the work of Kyekuam (kyekuam chip chungyongdo).” He divided the text into two big sections, with the first twenty chapters dealing with the Way, and the rest with Virtue. He also acknowledged Zhu Xi’s division, and matched it with his own. Pak Kinyŏng (朴箕寧, 1779-1857; Pen name Ha-su 荷叟), suggested again two divisions in his Chungyong tosŏl, with a broad division of three and a finer division of five.

35 Kim You-Gon, 310. See also Kwŏn Kŭn, iphak tosŏl, 170.
36 Kim You-Gon, 315-317.
His main change was to include chapters 12 to 21 in the third section, making it bigger and more important. Toward the final days of the dynasty Kim Yŏng-sam (金永三 1834-1906) provided a division into four and six sections in a work titled Chungyongbun tosŏl (中庸分節圖). A similar division was suggested by Yi Chin-sang (1818-1886, 李震相; Pen name Han-chu 寒洲) and will be described in detail in a separate chapter.

1.4 Continual Re-Interpretation

In Chosŏn dynasty Korea, The Doctrine of the Mean continued to be an important part of scholarship. Scholars attempted to understand the text and reinterpret it according to the problems of their age. Toward the middle of the dynasty, various interpretations were developed by major thinkers, in an innovative manner that exceeded the boundaries of the traditional learning borrowed from China. Yi Hwang (李滉, 1501-1570; Penname T’oegye 退溪) offered his own interpretation that was a combination of both Zhu Xi’s Chapter and Phrase and his own metaphysical theories. For example, his theory about the relations between metaphysics and human psychology (igisimsonsŏngnon) made him interpret the terms Nature (sŏng), Way (do) and Education (kyo) all in terms of education. Like Zhu Xi, T’eogye held the terms Wide and Far (pî) and Hidden (ŭn) to be principal to the section that starts in chapter 12. However, he explains these expressions in terms of the Way (do) and Principle

37 Kim You-Gon, 319.
39 Eom Yeon Seok, 166.
(li) of before and after things had shape (Hyŏng isang-ha). Specifically, he connects the term Wide and Far (pi) with the state of things before shape emerged, and Hidden (ŭn) with the state of things after things took shape.

In this context, T’oegye explains that Principle is always equipped with a shape provided by Material Force, and that the distinction between them is analytical rather than ontological. T’oegye’s metaphysical theory relays heavily on Zhu Xi, and is seemingly dualistic. He interprets The Doctrine of the Mean in a way that reflects this dualism, and responds to it. A good example for this kind of interpretation can be given in his understanding of the terms Wide and Far (pi) and Hidden (ŭn), in the 12th chapter:

費隱，以道言，乃形而上之理也。以其顯而言，則謂之費。以其微而言，則謂之隱。非有二也。故曰。體用一源，顯微無間。若以形而下者為費，則豈一源無間之謂乎？

Both the Far and Wide and the Hidden (pi ŭm), when talked about in terms of the Way, are Principle before it has taken concrete form (hyŏng išang). When we are talking about its manifestations, then we call them ‘Far and Wide (pi). When we are talking about them as hard to see we call them ‘hidden’ (ŭm). These are not two different things. Therefore it is said: Potential (ch’e) and Realization (yong) have one source. However, if we take “Far and Wide” as referring only to principle before it has become manifest in material form, then how can we say that Potential and Realization have one source and that there is no gap between the manifest and the hard to see?.

40 Eom Yeon Seok, 183-4.
41 Ibid.
42 T’oegye Chŏnsŏ 26-27, p. 34. See also Eom Yeon Seok, 184.
The apparent contradiction that T’oegye is struggling to solve can be traced to the famous “Four/Seven Debate”, but on a larger scale to his attempt to show that the metaphysical framework he is using does not have internal contradictions. He is connecting the seemingly contradicting words of the text, to the seemingly contradictory claim of his theory (i.e., that the two modes of reality answer to the same rules). In a similar way, T’oegye describes the expressions ‘cautious and watchful’ (kye ku) and ‘careful when Alone’ (sin tok) that appear in the first chapter, with Reverence (kyŏng) and Sincerity (sŏng), respectively. Again, he is doing so to promote the dualistic terminology of things not yet issued and already issued (mibal and ibal respectively).  

Other prominent scholars have interpreted The Doctrine of the Mean according to their own scholarship. Yulgok for example, did not agree with T’oegye on his dualistic interpretation, and specifically did not agree with the internal/external division. In a text called sang t’oegye sŏnsaeng munmok (About “Questions to Master T’oegye”) he writes:

蓋以性情言之, 則謂之中和。以德行言之, 則謂之中庸。游氏之說精當矣。然而致中和云者。以性情包德行而為言也。中庸之中費兼中和之義者。以德行兼性情而為言也。非若饒氏之說。以致中和踐中庸分內外工夫如是之支離也。

Generally, when we talk about the psychological aspect. We call it Chunghwa [maintaining harmonious emotions], and when we talk about moral aspects. We call it Chungyong [acting

---

43 Eom Yeon Seok, 186.
44 Nature 性 and Emotions 情
45 Virtue 德 and Conduct 行
appropriately, neither going too far nor not far enough). This explanation of Mr. Yu (Yu ssi)\(^46\) is essentially correct. But those who focus on Chunghwa take the psychological aspects as embracing morality. Those who take the meaning of the chung of chungyong as generally the same as the meaning of chung in chunghwa conflate morality with psychology. These interpretations both appear to be inconsistent with what Yao Lu wrote. Whether you focus on harmonizing the emotions or emphasize acting appropriately, you end up separating the inner and outer dimensions of the unified moral efforts Mr. Yao and the Doctrine of the Mean tell us to make.\(^47\)

Yulgok criticized T’oegye’s division as one that does not come to terms with the theories of past masters, and more importantly as one that confuses the meanings of the word Mean (chung) in its different contexts. The focus is relevant to his theories, as he wishes to promote his theory that the Material Force (ki) and the Principle (Yi) have just one source (igi ilwŏn non). Toegye, on the other hand, promoted the theory that they have two sources (igi iwŏn non), a theory that had immense implication on the results of his metaphysical debate with Ki Tae-sŭng (奇大升, 1527-1572; Penname Kobong 高峰).

The scholarship of T’oegye and Yulgok has contributed directly to the creation of the two prominent factions in the 17\(^{th}\) century – the Yŏngnam School and the Kiho School. Thus, their commentaries on The Doctrine of the Mean became important to scholars of future generations. The commentaries and new interpretation of the text did not cease with them, and each new generation tried to adapt the terminology and structure of the text to its own needs.

\(^{46}\) Yu ssi is Yu chak or You Zuo (游酢, 1053-1123; Pen name Zhi Shan 豒山), a Song dynasty scholar and a famous student of the Cheng brothers.

\(^{47}\) Eom Yeon Seok, 192.
1.5 Conclusion

*The Doctrine of the Mean* was the last of the Four Books to be learned and therefore had a special place in the Neo-Confucian scholarship. Scholars in China and Korea used the text to support their philosophical claims. We can see three major aspects of exegesis that were used in this fashion: The question of the origin of the text, the question of its structure, and the emphasis and interpretation of key phrases and terminology. Through the examinations of the textual exegesis provided for the text, we can trace back factional currents and metaphysical ideologies.

This tendency did not stop in modern times. As *The Doctrine of the Mean* remains relevant for the understanding of Neo-Confucian societies, various scholars in China as well as in the West, provided their own insights into the meaning and structure of the text, and many translators put a lot of effort into providing a new set of translations for the terminology used in the text. In this context, it is worth mentioning that Tu Weiming divided the text into three parts in his translation titled *Centrality and Commonality*; the translation by Ames and Hell treats the text as one unit; and the translation by Charles Muller breaks the text into a text

---

48 For example, in the 1950s Qian Mu and Tang Junyi had a long standing controversy about the Zhongyong in the pages of a Hong Kong newspaper. Tu Weiming uses this debate to extract ecological meanings from the text. See Tu Weiming, "The Ecological Turn in New Confucian Humanism: Implication for China and the World" in *Daedalus* (Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Fall 2001).

(the first chapter) and Commentary. Each of the translations presents a new way to read the text as well as a matching terminology and division.

The following chapters will trace the scholarship of two Chosŏn dynasty scholars who used diagrams to analyze the text in a significant way, while providing their own interpretations. Both scholars demonstrate a way to understand the text, but at the same time demonstrated a way to utilize diagrams. Through the examination of these diagrams I hope to explore some of the issues that surrounded the usage of diagrams, and raise questions about the utilization of diagrams for Chosŏn scholars.

---

Chapter 2: Kwŏn Kŭn

2.1 Introduction

Living through the transition period from the Koryŏ dynasty (918-1392) to the Chosŏn dynasty (1392 – 1897), the prominent Neo-Confucian scholar Kwŏn Kŭn (權近, 1352-1409; Pen name Yangch’on 阳村) provides us with a rare opportunity to study this change.51 Specifically, Kwŏn Kŭn served as one of the architects of the Neo-Confucian ideology that provided both reasoning for the dynastic change, and ideological framework for the Chosŏn literati. In 1390, while in exile, Kwŏn Kŭn responded to the questions of his students by compiling the iphak tosŏl or Diagrammatic Treatise for Entering upon Learning. This document consist of various diagrams, most notably Kwŏn Kŭn’s own diagram in the opening chapter, along with explanations and details. Each chapter also contains a section for questions and answers, supposedly asked by Kwŏn Kŭn’s students.52

This chapter will investigate the diagram titled Chungyong sujang punsŏkdo (The Diagram of the Opening Section of the Chungyong). The Chungyong or Doctrine of the Mean 53 (Zhongyong in Chinese) is the last of Zhu Xi’s Four Books, and as such it provides the final

---

52 Some of these diagrams have been studied thoroughly in the past. Michael K Ralston, “Ideas of Self and Self Cultivation in Korean Neo-Confucianism,” PhD diss., UBC, 2001.
53 Throughout this paper I will use the name The Doctrine of the Mean for the title of the work. A detailed description of the debate on the English translation of the title is provided in: Andrew Plaks, introduction to ZHONG YONG (The Doctrine of the Mean), tr. Andrew Plaks (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2004), xix–lxi.
layer in Zhu Xi’s education plan\textsuperscript{54}. Using the diagram as the base for his text, Kwŏn Kŭn discussed some of the key issues in the understanding of the Chungyong, and particularly the questions of its sectioning.

The diagram allows us to investigate how Kwŏn Kŭn uses a diagram as a tool of education, to render meaning from a secondary source and to make a coherent worldview from his primary source (the Doctrine of the Mean). Since the iphak tosŏl was one of the first Neo-Confucian books produced during the Chosŏn dynasty, I will describe the visual language used in this diagram. Through his diagram and comments I will try to show that he uses the diagram to enhance the text, and why it became a prominent means of education in Korea and an identifying feature of the Korean scholarship.

2.2 Background

Kwŏn Kŭn (權近, 1352-1409) was born to the Andong Kwŏn clan that was very influential in the Koryŏ (918-1392) court.\textsuperscript{55} He took the pen name Yangch’on (陽村) after the place of his exile, and his courtesy names were Kawŏn (可遠) and Sasuk (思叔). Kwŏn Kŭn was a student of Yi Saek (李穡, 1328 – 1396). In 1368, at the age of 17, he passed the lower-level civil service exams of the Koryŏ dynasty. In the following two years he passed the next two exams and joined the Office of the Royal Secretariat, although under the rules of the Ming

\textsuperscript{54} As stated earlier, one way to view the relationship between the two books is that the Great Learning provides general rules for the Doctrine of the Mean, and the Doctrine of the Mean provides details for the Great Learning. See Wang Wenlu, Zhong yong gu ben pang shi, 6.

\textsuperscript{55} Michael C. Kalton, The Writings of Kwon Kun, 219-221.
Dynasty (1368 – 1644) scholars under the age of 25 could not take the third exam.\(^5^6\)

In 1389 he went to China on a formal mission. Upon his return, he was exiled for his defense of the loyalist minister Yi Sungin (1349-92). While in exile he got involved in the faction’s attempt to prevent the rise of Yi Sŏnggye (李成桂), future king T’aeho (太祖, r. 1392-1398), by alerting the Ming dynasty. He was sent to exile in Y’angch’on in the Ch’ungju district, where he compiled the *Diagrammatic Treatise for Entering upon Learning* (*iphak tosŏl*) for some students who came with him. In 1393 King T’aeho convinced him to become one of his officials, and he became an important policy maker for the new dynasty, alongside Chŏng To-jŏn. Although he developed a close relationship with the king, the rivalry between him and Chŏng To-jŏn meant that only after Chŏng’s death in 1398 could he move into political power.\(^5^7\)

Among his works, the *iphak tosŏl* is probably the most famous. In 1391 he started to write a commentary on the Five Classics (*Ogyŏng ch’ŏn ‘gyŏn’gnok*), from which only his commentary on the *Book of Rites* (*Yegi*) survives. In 1403 he edited the Histories of the Three Kingdoms (*Samguk sagi*), and in 1405 he added notations to the *Records of Filial Behavior* (*Hyohaeng-nok*). He wrote a preface to Chŏng To-jŏn’s *Arguments Against Buddhism* (*Pulssi chappyŏn*), and regulated the sacrifices to pacify restless spirits (*Yŏgwi*).\(^5^8\)


2.3 The Diagram

Kwŏn Kŭn’s diagram titled *Chungyong sujang punsŏkdo* (中庸首章分釋圖) or *Diagram of the Opening Section of the Chungyong* appears in the *Iphak tosŏl* right after a matching diagram dedicated for the *daehak*.\(^{59}\) On first sight, it seems that the diagram deals only with the opening chapter of the book, and the one usually recognized as the core of the text. In reality the diagram deals with one of Zhu Xi’s commentaries on the text, the *Zhongyong Zhang Ju* (中庸章句) or *Zhongyong by Chapter and Phrase* in English.\(^{60}\)

The diagram (Figure 1) provides a distinctive spatial arrangement, with noticeable vertical and horizontal layers. Vertically, the diagram is divided into three sections: The middle section introduces major terms from the text, with the right wing focusing on the Mean, and the left on wisdom. The right side connects the Mean with mind-cultivation and the left side connects Wisdom with self-examination, both major terms in Neo-Confucian thought. Each side introduces different terms from Zhu Xi’s theory.

Horizontally, the diagram is also divided into three major components, roughly following the division of the first chapter. The first layer is titled “Mandate of Heaven”, and deals with the opening statement of the book. The second level, titled “Mindfulness” (*kyŏng*), deals with the second half of the opening chapter, and with Zhu Xi’s application of the term as it appears in

---

\(^{59}\) *Iphak tosŏl* A.7.3a, p. 164.

\(^{60}\) Zhu Xi provided other commentaries on the book, the most famous of which appears in the *Miscellaneous Questions* (或問), which is referred to in the body of the text itself.
his Zhongyong by Chapter and Phrase. This section also presents the important distinction between two states, before and after the emergence of emotions. The last level is titled “Reach” or “Actualization” (ch’i) and describes the end result of the process, again in terms borrowed from the text and from Zhu Xi.

As mentioned in the title of the diagram, it concentrates on the opening chapter of the text alone. Moreover, it concentrates mostly on Zhu Xi’s text. Kwŏn Kŭn presents key terms from the text, and the relevant citation from Zhu Xi. These terms include Study (kyo), the Way (do), Nature (sŏng), Mindfulness (kyŏng), Actualization (ch’i), Wisdom (chi), The Mean (chung) and finally Effectiveness (hyo). All these terms appear in the first chapter of the book, except chi which appears from the second chapter on, and ch’i which appears in Zhu Xi’s commentary on the text but not in the original text. It is easy to notice that the diagram does not attempt to introduce the entire scheme developed by Zhu Xi. It is worth noticing that the term Sincerity (sŏng) is missing.

The layout of Kwŏn Kŭn’s diagram belongs to typological group of diagrams designed to provide textual exegesis. It has a striking resemblance to the diagrams provided in the Buddhist kewen. The diagram presents ideas and quotes from the text, arranged graphically (usually in a tree shape), when both spatial arrangement and connectors are used to provide additional ideas.

61 See Figure 2 for the sources of each element in the diagram.
This diagram is significantly more complicated than a diagram with the same name provided by Wang Bo (Figure 6). Kwŏn Kŭn’s diagram contains more terms, and the layout of the diagram is far more detailed and complicated. Wang Bo does have a diagram that describes Zhu Xi’s text directly (Figure 4). Again, comparison of the two diagrams reveals that Kwŏn Kŭn’s version is richer in details and connections. Wang Bo’s correlates key terminology to chapters, in a way that resembles a table of contents. It is nothing like the hierarchal tree-like structure of Kwŏn Kŭn’s diagram.

2.4 Analysis of the Diagram

When inspecting the diagram, one must ask - what did Kwŏn Kŭn exactly hope to achieve by using a diagram instead of a text? The first clue is provided by the introductory text that accompanies the diagram:

愚按中庸傳道之書。教者之事而學在其中。道本乎天而偹於我之所受。教修乎道而因其我之所有。故章首備舉性命道教而歴言之然。後單提道字以明道體，無所不在雖不睹不聞，暫時之頃幽隱细微獨知之地。皆此道之存而不可忽之意而言君子存養。省察之學所以教。學者戒懼而存天理。以致其中謹獨而遏人欲。以致其和不使須臾之離也。故此章大旨道無不包而教行乎其間教之所行即學之所在也。學者苟能因是教而致其為學之功則。教將由我而位育之極效庶可以験致矣。63

Here are my humble comments on the Chungyong, a book that transmits the Dao. The task of a teacher involves learning as well. The foundation of the Dao is heaven, yet it is complete within what Heaven has endowed in me. Through training I cultivate the Dao within me. Therefore I possess the Dao. This is why in the beginning of the chapter I explicate one by one the Mandate (命), Nature (性), Way (道), and Training (教). After that I take the single character “Dao” to shine light on the core of the Way. There is no place without it, although it is not seen or heard. It can be known in the shortest moment of time, and even when it is very faint or minuscule. Wherever the Way is present, it cannot be neglected. Therefore an exemplary person\(^64\) (君子) cultivates it. It is through the practice of self-examination that the Dao is internalized. The practice of self-examination means maintaining an attitude of caution and apprehension and preserving the Principle of heaven within. In order to act appropriately, I must be watchful over myself when alone and must restrain any selfish desires. I must always maintain a harmonious state of mind, never deviating from it for a single instance.\(^65\) The main point of the chapter is that there is nothing that the Way does not embrace. The Way includes both training and acting in accordance with what is learned in that training. Engaging in training is nothing other than practicing what is taught. If a student is able to act in accordance with what he has been taught, then he has learned what he was supposed to learn. Such an education really comes from within. When you exert your best efforts at training yourself, you will gradually be able to participate in the transforming and nourishing powers of heaven and earth.

The answer that emerges from this text is that Kwŏn Kŭn sees the process of education as the cornerstone of the Confucian project. The process of self-examination and education allows for the student to develop emotional equilibrium. This is, in short, the essence of the Neo-

\(^{64}\) In this context the Kuncha (Junzi in Chinese), literally the son of the prince, refers to a person of unique ethical qualities, and was translated as such.

\(^{65}\) The last two sentences are almost a direct quote of a parallel sentence in the first chapter of the Chungyong.
Confucian teaching, and Kwŏn Kŭn sees the Chungyong as the authority that transmits this teaching from the sages. The nature of education (kyo) and teaching (hak) is interdependent, and follows a recursive definition in the text (e.g., “The Way includes both training and acting in accordance with what is learned in that training. Engaging in training is nothing other than practicing what is taught.”). This recursive element gets a representation in the diagram itself, by the repeated occurrences of the terms in it. Kwŏn Kŭn provides this diagram to teach about teaching, and this teaching is the essence of Neo-Confucianism in a way.

In short, Kwŏn Kŭn is worried about the Transmission of the Way (dot’ong), and sees education as a crucial part of it. He is not trying to teach the student about The Doctrine of the Mean alone, but rather, he is showing him Zhu Xi’s Zhongyong Zhang Ju. The diagram allows him to incorporate elements from both books, and restructure them in a meaningful way. Since Zhu Xi’s book provides both the original sentences and Zhu Xi’s comment, we can see both in the diagram, with the additional information provided by Kwŏn Kŭn in the form of the spatial arrangement.

I claim that Kwŏn Kŭn’s innovation is revealed in this diagram in the way that he uses several methods at once. That is, the diagram does not belong to any “pure” type. In this case the diagram refers to the opening chapter of Zhu Xi’s Zhongyong Zhongyong in Chapters and Verses, and the matching sentences from the Zhongyong itself. The main objects in the diagram are key-terms from the text, enlarged and placed in a way that forms the main “skeleton” of the diagram. This feature is similar to the “exegesis” type of diagrams. Quotes
from Zhu Xi’s text are placed along the “branches” of the diagram, in a way that forms parallels that contrast and link terms and issues in couplets. This feature is similar to the second type of diagrams (parallelisms make it easier to memorize the text). However, the diagram forms a tree that breaks down the texts as a stemmatic genealogy of terms and ideas. This feature is relevant for the third type of diagrams.

The reconstruction of the text in space allows a reconstruction of the text in a non-linear way. For example, the key term chi (Wisdom) from the second chapter of The Doctrine of the Mean was included in the group of three primary sources located at the top of the diagram, and so is the term ch‘i (Actualization) which appears later in Zhu Xi’s text (but not in the original work). Most notably, some words (like kyo or Education) are used several times in the diagram, whereas elements that do appear in the text several times may appear in the diagram only once. For comparison, the diagrams that Wang Bo provides on the same matter in the tupulüe (Figure 4 and Figure 5) all break the text and make it more concise by removing redundant phrases, but never to this extent, and never by doubling or removing key phrases. This structure suggests that the diagram was not meant to be read in a linear fashion. A student’s question reveals just how distinctive this feature is:

學者問曰：朱子章句於戒懼慎獨兩節。但言君子敬謹之心而不以教言。今子之圖兼以教言者得無贅乎？章句直釋本文其言簡切雖不及言乃於或問‘中言之曰’以明由教而入者始當如此”學者或不之察。故愚敢揭而示之也。此書傳道之書首以教言。故凡言學者之事無非所以教也。且慎獨

66 Compare with Figure 2 below.
67 Michael Lackner, 350-1.
A student asked: Master Zhu’s *Chapters and Verses* (章句) is divided into two sections, one on “Fear and Caution” and another on “Watchful when Alone.” However, he never uses the words “the mind of the exemplary person is watchful and cautious.” Yet you, master, use those words in your diagram. Isn’t that unnecessary?

Answer:

The *Chapters and Verses* is straightforward and explains the foundations of the text. It is quite concise, so it doesn’t explain as much as the *Miscellaneous Questions* (或問) does. The *Miscellaneous Questions* states that “clearly, those who have just begun to learn need to start here.” You students haven’t paid enough attention to this. Therefore I have dared to add to what Zhu Xi wrote in that text.”

At the beginning of this book, it uses the word “education” (教). Therefore the learner’s work is not unlike that which educates. Moreover, “Fear and Caution” is also mentioned in the *Great Learning* (daehak) when it talks about the work of learner. Thus, the word was specifically added on top as an admonition. *The Doctrine of the Mean* says bluntly that the task of the Exemplary Person (君子) is education. Therefore I did not write these characters down carelessly.

Obviously, the main problem that the student has here is that the book’s double admonition to act with fear and caution and to be watchful when alone are reduced here into the observation that the exemplary person (kunja) “guards against what cannot be seen and dreads what cannot be heard”. The reference to those who are at the beginning stages of studying is not accidental, and matches the title of the work: His diagram is not a general rendering of the text, but rather “unmasking” of the text as something tailored specifically to

---


69 This appears to be a quote: “以明由教而入者其始當如此” (분명히 처음 교로부터 들어가는 자가 그 만이 시작은 마땅히 이리해야 된다).
the beginning student, his students.

2.5 The Division of the Text

In the questions and answers part of the text Kwŏn Kŭn brings up a question on the division of the text. The question focuses on Kwŏn Kŭn’s own division of the text, in view of the various other divisions, notably Zhu Xi’s own division. He provides a pretext to discuss the structure of the text in the form a student’s question:

A student asked: This one book, the Zhongyong, is divided by Zhu Xi into four sections and by Yau into six sections, but you, master make the argument that it should be divided into three main sections according to its main points but could also be divided into five sections with a more detailed division. Can you explain these differences in detail?

Answer:

70 Kwŏn Kŭn. Iphak tosŏl, 170.
71 Yau Lu (fl. 1256), pen name Rao Shi, honorific name Shuang-feng, and courtesy name Chuang- yüan was a leading disciple of Chu Hsi’s son-in-law, Huang Kan. (Kalton), 229.
72 Lit. “this master”
I don’t dare juxtapose my own opinions to the opinions of the wise men who have preceded me just in order to be different. What I am doing is taking the best points from both of them. From the first chapter through the eleventh chapter is one section. From the chapter on “far and wide”73 to the chapter in which Duke Ai asks about government is the second section.74 The chapters on sincerity and clearly understanding make up the third section.75 If we follow Zhu Xi, then from the discussion on the way of heaven and the way of man to chapter 26 is one section, and from chapter 27, with its line “How great is the path proper to the sage,”76 is a separate section. I have already discussed earlier the way Yao divided up this text.

I would like to humbly suggest that the two earlier sections that discuss the Way all revolve around the practical learning of Confucius for sagely rulers. Therefore all I am doing is following in the footsteps of my predecessors. All I am doing is trying to clarify it a bit.

The student is concerned about discrepancies with the known divisions by Zhu Xi and others. Specifically, we have three possible divisions at hand. Although Zhu-xi praised the structure of the text,77 he does divide it into four sections,78 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>Discussing the doctrine of the mean by explaining the meaning of the head chapter (論中庸以釋首章之義)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>Wide yet Secret, Small and Great (費隱小大)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

73 According to the James Legge translation; The original text uses 費隱 (Wide, Far) as a shorthand. The reference points to the first sentence in chapter 12 (費而隱).
74 The beginning of chapter 20 (哀公問政).
75 This begins at Chapter 20, section 17.
76 Legge’s translation of the beginning of chapter 27.
78 This table reflects Kwŏn Kŭn’s explanation. For another possible division of the text, see Kim You-gon, Hanguk Chungyongdosŏl ŭi chujeowa t’ŭksŏng [The Main Subject and Characteristic of the Illustration on the Doctrine of the Mean in Korea], Yugyo sasang yŏn’gu, Vol.29, (2007). 308.
At the same time, Yao provides a finer division into six sections. His division, separates the first chapter from the rest of the document, and breaks Zhu Xi’s third part into two sections (placing the break at the end of chapter 26). The first is dealing with the Heavenly Way and the Human Way, and the second chapter with the great and little virtues. He also breaks his second section at chapter 19 instead of 20, as follows:

Table 2  Yao's Division of the Doctrine of the Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>Opening chapter (separated from the rest of the first section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-19</td>
<td>Wide yet Secret, Small and Great (費隱小大)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-26</td>
<td>The Heavenly Way and the Human Way (天道人道)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-32</td>
<td>The Great Virtue and the Little Virtue (大德小德)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the confusion of the student, Kwŏn Kŭn is offering two divisions - A simple breakdown of the text into three big sections, and a finer division of five. His basic structure follows Zhu Xi’s division. However, when offering the finer five-fold division of the text, he accepts Yao’s topical break after chapter 26. However, he does not separate the opening chapter from the rest of the text. The final result is as follows:

Table 3 Kwŏn Kŭn's Divisions of the Doctrine of the Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Big Division</th>
<th>Fine Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>The Way of the</td>
<td>Talking about the Mandate, Nature, Way and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In essence, both Kwŏn Kŭn and the student seem to be more concerned with issues of orthodoxy than with the typology of the text. Kwŏn Kŭn’s answer dwells on explaining how this new division is a refined version of Zhu Xi’s division. The actual themes of each section are suggested only as a title.

2.6 Conclusion

Kwŏn Kŭn’s model of Confucian enlightenment is complicated and somewhat recursive: It assumes that teaching is part of learning, and that scholarship is part of education. Furthermore, Zhu Xi’s theory is complicated and attempts to integrate terms from various sources into one comprehensive scheme. One possible reading of Kwŏn’s foreword to the diagram is that by teaching his students he is educating himself and allows himself to reach the goal (i.e., the Way). To do so, a simple rendering of the text is not enough. Kwŏn Kŭn understands the text, and as part of this understanding he is able to link the text with theory, to rearrange it in a form that matches the understanding of his student.

In order to understand Kwŏn Kŭn’s reasons for drawing a diagram, we need to search for the benefits the diagram provides over text. One such benefit might come from the fact that the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12-20</th>
<th>Exemplary Person (君子之道)</th>
<th>Education according to Confucius (言性道教中庸以孔子之事終)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-26</td>
<td>The Virtue of the Sage (聖人之德)</td>
<td>The Heavenly Way and the Human Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-32</td>
<td>The Way of the Sage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The Product</td>
<td>自下學立心之初推之以至於極</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The diagram contains additional information in the form of its hierarchical arrangement. For example, we can easily see that Education is placed higher in the hierarchy than Mindfulness, or that both Wisdom and the Mean are located at the third tier of the diagram, as the end result of the process.

Finally, Kwŏn Kŭn is using the diagram tool in an innovative way. The diagram that he drew incorporates two different texts, both primary and secondary sources, as well as his own ideas. By doing so he showed a greater level of textual analysis. Placing the text in the space and connecting sentences allows him to break up the text and reconstruct it in a non-linear way. By doing so Kwŏn Kŭn achieves something that resembles modern scholarship in a way: He is able to show connections between a primary text, a secondary source and his own ideas, while differentiating between them.
Chapter 3: Yi Chin-sang

3.1 Introduction

The nineteenth century presented Neo-Confucian scholars with serious challenges, including ideological challenges in the form of Christianity and later also Tonghak, increasing threats of invasion from colonial powers, opening to the west, peasant rebellions, and the growth in the power of rich landowners on expense of both peasants and centralized government. Specifically, for the decade between 1863 and 1873, the regent or Taewongun (Yi Ha-ŭng) executed a series of reforms that damaged the status of literati elite.

The scholarship of Yangban literati at that period reacted accordingly and used various mechanisms to manage the change. For most part, the literati elite were dedicated to a sino-centric world view and some defended it by developing a radical purist take on Neo-Confucian scholarship. Prominent scholars of the time, such as Yi Hang-no (李恒老, 1799-1868; Pen name Hwa-sŏ 華西), held an extreme position that saw any negotiation with Western ideology and foreign powers as a form of betrayal. With no exception, the diagrammatic scholarship of the time reveals this trend of thought. The diagrams produced by the thinkers of the time are surprisingly similar to the diagrams produced throughout the Chosŏn period, both in content and form. On a closer inspection, however, one can find the

---

80 James B. Palais, Politics and policy, 2-23.
effects of nineteenth century debates in the diagrams, as well as new techniques to represent knowledge. This chapter will investigate the scholarship of Yi Chin-sang (1818-1886, 李震相; Pen name Han-chu 寒洲), and specifically his take on the issue of the Chungyong and its division. Through the diagram, I will demonstrate how Yi Chin-sang was able to remain loyal to the diagrammatic tradition that began with Kwŏn Kŭn, while innovating and incorporating the ideologies of his time into the diagram.

3.2 Yi Chin-sang

Yi Chin-sang represents 19th-century Confucian scholarship well.\(^{81}\) He was born in Taep‘o-ri, in the Seongju county of north Gyeongsang province.\(^{82}\) Although he never held an official position, he became associated with various Namin scholars such as Yu Chŏng-che (柳定齋, 1777-1861; Pen name 致明 ch’i-myŏng), with whom he corresponded lengthily on philosophical issues. His son and one of his main disciples Yi Sŭng-hŭi (1847-1916, 李承熙; Pen name Kang-che 剛齋) belonged to the movement that wanted to tackle Western power through Confucian Studies. Other prominent students include Kwak Chong-sŏk (1846 - 1919, 郭鍾錫; Pen name Myŏng-u 俛宇), who was one of the leaders of the 1919 Independence Movement (P’ari changsŏ sagŏn), and Yi In-che (李寅梓 1870-1929; Pen name Sŏng-wa

\(^{81}\) Kim Hyoung-chan, “Yi Chin-sang ŭi Simdo mit Chujaedo kit’a (Yi Chinsang’s Diagrams of the Mind and Other Principle Diagrams),” in Tosŏlo ponŭn han’guk yuhak (The Philosophical Thought of Neo-Confucianism through Diagrams), (Seoul: Yemoonseowon, 2000), 373-391.

<db.itkc.or.kr/index.jsp?bizName=MH&url=/tkcdb/text/nodeViewframe.jsp?bizName=MH&seojiId=kc_mh_a640&gunchaId=&munchaId=&finId=&NodeId=&setid=588668&Pos=0&TotalCount=1&searchUrl=ok>.
Although an open-minded scholar with a personal interest in Western Civilization, philosophically speaking he was a purist who is usually identified with the idea of Principle Supremacy (*Churiron*), and was considered part of the group that advocated for the protection of orthodoxy and rejection of evil heterodoxy or *Wijongch’oksap’a* in Korean. His most famous work is an effort to systemize the Principle philosophy of Zhu Xi, titled *Lihak Chong-yo* or *The Essentials of the Study of Principle*. This 22-volume work attempted to exclude polluting influences such as *Sŏn* (Zen) and Taoist writings, as well as ideas that advocated the supremacy of Material Force (*Ki*).

Yi Chin-sang considered the approach that advocated duality of Principle and Material Force problematic, and worked to correct the theories of contemporaries such as Yi Hang-no and Ki Chŏng-chin (奇正鎭, 1798-1876; Pen name No-sa 蘆沙). Following T’oegye, both scholars advocated Principle and Material Force duality.\(^83\) Yi Chin-sang’s epistemology was idealistic, and he advocated that the mind and the principle are the same thing (*心卽理說*). He supported Zhu Xi’s Investigation of Things (*格物窮理*), *Kyŏngmul Kungli* in Korean, and thought that mind cultivation was more important than practical matters.\(^84\)

Yi Chin-sang was interested in the process that imbued humans with the Heavenly Principle. The effort to explain how principle was actualized in humanity left more than 200

---

\(^{84}\) Choi Min-hong, 203.
diagrams. Among his diagrams we can find diagrams that deal with certain philosophical issues (e.g., the rites or ye) and diagrams that deal with some of the classics (e.g., the Book of Changes, Yŏkkyŏng or Chuyŏk in Korean), but also diagrams that depict the ritual garments, utensils and positions utilized in the Four Rites (sarye).

Yi Chin-sang’s works were collected by his son and some of his students, and the woodblock for the original version were finalized in 1895. However, in 1907 he was declared heretic by the some members of Yŏngnam faction, and the woodblocks were burned by a decision of the Tosan Sŏwŏn association. A second version was reconstructed by his son and disciple Yi Sŏng-hŭi (李承熙, 1847-1916) and by Kwak Chong-sŏk (1846 - 1919, 郭鍾錫; Pen name Myŏng-u 俛宇). The compilation was done at the Sambong sŏdang (三峯書堂) in the vicinity of Yi Chinsang’s hometown. The second version was slightly extended, and more accurate than the first one. This version is usually referred to as the Hanju-jib. Finally, a third compilation was collected in the 1970’s by a request of his descendents, and was published in

---

85 Kim Hyoung-chan breaks down the diagrams into four categories: 1) Diagrams of the Mind (心圖); 2) Diagrams of the Book of Changes (易經圖); 3) Diagrams dealing with the Rites (禮圖); and 4) Diagrams that discuss both the Book of Changes and the Rites (易禮圖). However, this division is too simplistic to be useful, and leaves out some diagrams. See Kim Hyoung-chan, Yi Chin-sang ŭi Simdo mit Chujae do k’ita, 373.

86 See for example Sarye chibyo [A Summary of the Four Rites] in Hanju chŏnsŏ, 2.273.


88 Ibid. One possible reason could be his views on Wang Yang-ming: Lee Hyung-sung notes that Yi Chin-sang is sympathetic to Wang Yang-ming to the extent that was possible in his time. He openly considers Wang Yang-ming’s criticism of the Cheng-Zhu school. See Lee Hyung-sung, Hanju Yijinsang ŭi Ch’ŏrak sasang [The philosophical thought of Hanchu Yi Chin-sang], Sŏul-si : Simsan. 2006. 175-178. Yi Chin-sang met with the Soron scholar Yi Kŏn-ch’ang who was also associated with the (pro-Wang Yangming) School, and therefore with Wang Yang-ming studies, and they discussed a work titled Chuja taejŏng-u’i ‘朱子大全考疑’ by Chu’ung Chaejib (沖齋集). Yi Chin-sang himself wrote a text named Chuja taejŏn’go’üi husŏl ‘朱子大全考疑後說’ where he states a bold opinion about Wang Yang-ming’s scholarship. See Hanjujib, A 33.706. In his detailed analysis of Yi Hang-no, Chung Chai-sik links this sudden interest in Wang Yang-ming with social discomfort. See Chung Chai-sik, A Korean Confucian Encounter with the Modern World: Yi Hang-no and the West, Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1995. 112-3.

89 Kwak Chong-sŏk led the Independence Movement.
1980. This last version, titled *Hanju chŏnsŏ*, is the sources for the diagram and text presented in this work.

### 3.3 The Diagram of Four Branches and Six Sections of the Zhongyong

This diagram, titled “Four Branches and Six Sections of the Doctrine of the Mean,” is one of several of Yi Chin-sang’s diagrams dealing with this text. It is, however, more complicated than any of the other diagrams. The diagram is dedicated to the breakdown and sectioning of the book, but unlike previous diagrams on the subject, Yi Chin-sang’s was an attempt to achieve several goals in this one diagram. The most immediate goal of the diagram is to explain and detail the breakdown of the book into major chunks. Like Kwŏn Kŭn’s diagram, this diagram also provides a breakdown of the book by two prominent scholars, and attempts to consolidate the two. The first system mentioned breaks the text into four big “branches”, and it is attributed to an anonymous Mr. Wang or *Wang ssi* (王氏). The character used in this case (chi) means branch but also limbs. The division of the text suggested by *Wang ssi* is detailed immediately after the opening words, and consists of the following sections:

1) The first section from the head chapter down to chapter eleven and it is titled the Mean and Harmony Branch (*chung hwa tae chi*).

2) The second part covers chapters twelve to twenty and it is titled the Wide yet Secret Branch (*pi ŭn tae chi*).

---

90 *Hanju chŏnsŏ* 4:120a; The character used is chi (支) meaning branch but also limbs.
3) The third section covers all the chapters from twenty one until the beginning of chapter thirty two, and it is called the Heaven and Humanity Branch (ch’ŏn in tae chi)

4) Finally, the last big section covers only chapter thirty three, and it is called the Generosity and Respectfulness Branch (tok kong tae chi)

Although the authority behind this division is not detailed in the text itself, both the division and the exact wording quoted match the ones attributed to Mr. Wang in the preface for Hu Guang (胡廣1369－1418; Pen name Huang-an 晃菴) in his Great Collection of Commentary on the Zongyong (Zhongyong zhangju daquan in Chinese). The identity of Mr. Wang is not clear, but following the list of names quoted (sŏng ssi), a good guess will be Wang Bo, mentioned earlier. Wang Bo did call for a fourfold division of the text, and even issued a diagram around this topic. The second division is more detailed, and is described as six joints or segments (chŏl in Korean). This division is attributed to the same Yao (饒氏) quoted by Kwŏn Kŭn previously. The following table depicts the two divisions side by side:

Table 4 Two Divisions of the Doctrine of the Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Four Branches</th>
<th>Main Branches</th>
<th>Six Sections</th>
<th>Main Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>道</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>中和</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>中庸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>費隱</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>費隱</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

91 Hanju chŏnsŏ 4:120a; The character used is a variant of chŏl (節) meaning section or joint
The two characters used to mark the two division systems can also interpret as limbs and joints (or body parts), and not by accident. This is a concept metaphor\(^\text{92}\) that uses the body as its source, and indeed Yi Chin-sang opens his text by saying:\(^\text{93}\)

> 人有四支必有六節。支者節之合也。節者支之分也。支節具而血脉通焉。血脉通而性命全焉。

People have four limbs (chi) and therefore by necessity must have six joints (chŏl). The limbs are what connect the joints. The joints are what introduce divisions into the limbs. When limbs and joints are complete and operating properly the blood may circulate thoroughly; if the blood circulates thoroughly, then we have what we need to stay alive.

This opening describes concepts that relate to human morality in purely fleshly terms demonstrating that at least in the case of Yi Chin-sang, we cannot divide Principle and Material Force into the spiritual and material world. Moreover, spiritual and physical integrity are connected. But Yi Chin-sang had another reason for this choice of words. As

\(^{92}\) For a complete discussion on concept metaphors that draw on the body see Edward G. Slingerland, *What science offers the humanities: integrating body and culture* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008). 166-169.

\(^{93}\) Hanju chŏnsŏ 4:119b
mentioned, he uses chŏl and chi to describe the divisions of the text that he is trying to consolidate. As these two systems are hard to match, the cause for the metaphor becomes clear. The metaphor seems to indicate an intention to view the text as a coherent whole, instead of as a composite of various texts combined. The body is one complete whole, even if it consists of different organs. Yi Chin-sang was not the only one who attempted to consolidate these specific divisions of the text. His contemporary, Kim Yŏng-san (金永三, 1834-1906; Pen name 丹邱) dealt with this specific problem in a diagram with a similar name. 94

The second issue that the diagram deals with is defining the core context of each of the seven sections that were created from combining the two systems. Yi Chin-sang draws on key chapters of the text to provide the main issues and arguments of each section. To achieve this task, he uses the same exegesis method that was used by Kwŏn Kŭn. Yi Chin-sang focuses on the head chapter, but also on key elements in many of the other chapters, and in particular chapters 12, 13, 20, 21, 24 and 33.

3.4 Structure and Content of the Diagram

The complicated structure of the diagram is directly linked to the various tasks it was meant

94金永三,「中庸分節圖*」 (16권, 286-287쪽), 丹邱遺稿 의 經義問答-中庸. See also Kim You-gon, “Hanguk ‘Chungyong Tosŏl’ ui chujewa t’ŭksŏng” [The Main Subject and Characteristic of the Illustration on the Doctrine of the Mean in Korea], Yugo sasang yŏn’gu 29 (2008): 303-335.
to perform. The diagram is divided into frames, with three frames on the top layer and four on the bottom layer. With each frame representing a section, this division creates a complicated breakdown of seven new sections. The general scheme and sections presented in the diagram can be seen in Figure 13. As with Kwŏn Kŭn’s diagram, key terms from the text are distinguished by a cartouche in heavier lines, and additional explanatory text is slightly smaller. All other texts in the diagram are direct quotes, although sometimes truncated. Connectors are used to show the context and the flow of ideas. The content of each separate section-frame form an exegesis-style tree. In some cases, the line dividing two boxes has additional information, such as “one branch, two sections” (一支兩節).

Yi Chin-sang divided his diagram vertically, following the traditional division between the canon (jing in Chinese) and the commentaries (Zhuan in Chinese). The top layer covers the first twelve chapters, as well as chapter thirty-three. These chapters are attributes to Zi Si himself in Hu Guang’s introduction⁹⁵. The textual exegesis of all three sections in this layer is derived directly from the word “Heaven” on top of the entire diagram. The four frames on the second layer provide the intermediate “explanatory” text. The separate trees in each of the four sections all emerge from the word “Way” (Do in Korean) and terminate in Heaven. Thus, a unity of structure is implied. The bottom layer covers the rest of the book. In this part, each section begins from the “Way”, and concludes in “Heaven”. The path between the two arranges the core terms used, with matching quotes from the text.

⁹⁵ Hu Guang, ibid.
3.5 Nature

In 1861, Yi Chin-sang became involved in one of the big academic controversies of his day, when he wrote A Discussion of the Mind and Principle being identical or simjŭngnisŏl in Korean. Starting from the 16th century, the Confucian world of Chosŏn was divided between two schools of thought over a metaphysical issue related to the precedence of Material Force (Ki) and Principle (Li). Following Yi Hwang, the Yŏngnam School (Yŏngnam hakp’a) believed in the supremacy of Principle. In a similar way, the Kiho School (Kiho hakp’a) followed Yi I and advocated the supremacy of Material Force. In the 19th century this debate was the dividing line between the two schools of thoughts, as well as the factions associated with them.

Yi Chin-sang’s take on the debate argued against the interpretations made in Yulgok’s Kibal isŭng ildosŏl (Explaining why Material Force leads and Principle Rides Along is the Only Possibility). According to Yi Chin-sang’s theory, the Heavenly Principle (ch’ŏn-li) is present in the human Mind (sim), which incorporates Nature (sŏng) and Emotions (chŏng). He stressed the importance of the Mind. In a communication from 1865 he writes:

97 Hanju chŏnsŏ 1:684b – 685a
難著。惟察之精而守之一。然後實相昭著。而形氣反為之助矣。夫人有形氣。不能無所私。耳之私聲也。目之私色也。鼻之私臭也。口之私味也。四體之私安佚。而飢寒痛痒。舉切吾身。故外物之來。其為聲色臭味宮室輿馬服用之具而屬乎吾之形氣者。則此心之靈。便為之動焉。而知覺從形氣上去。

Human nature is Principle when it has not yet been activated. The Feelings are Principle when it has been activated. Nature generates as emotions when activated, but there is only one Principle. This is like when a master of a house goes somewhere else and he becomes a visitor, but still they are one person. If one inspects the actual relationship between Nature and Emotion, then there are those that are generated by Principle but none that are generated by Material Force. It’s just that Principle is inseparable from Material Force, and material force always appears in material form. Hence, the forms of Material Force are visible, yet Nature and Principle are difficult to see. Only when we examine Material Force in all its particulars while grasping the underlying unity can the true relationship between Principle and Material Force become clear. However, Material Force that takes a material form gets in the way.

Now, people have material form, so they cannot not have that which is selfish (self-centered). Sound is what the ear delights in, and that creates a self-centered attitude. That which makes the ear contribute to such selfishness is sound, that which makes the eye contribute to such selfishness is color, that which makes the nose contribute to such selfishness is smell, and that which makes the mouth contribute to such selfishness is taste. That which makes the four parts of the human body contribute to such selfishness is feeling relaxed and comfortable. So when we are hungry, cold, in pain, or afflicted with itching, then that all comes from our body.

Therefore when external objects impinge on our minds, they use sound, color, smell, and taste. Such things as the furniture in a palace room, a horse and carriage, and fine clothes all are things for our material bodies. But the spiritual power of the heart-and-mind that is what moves through knowledge
and awareness, comes from Material Force, that which takes material form.

From the first text it becomes apparent that Yi Chin-sang held Principle as the primary force in term of ontological or casual precedence. His argument is that, although Principle and Material are inseparable, only Principle has motive power, causal precedence in metaphysical terms. Although we cannot deny the experience of the world, the mind (which correlates with Principle) determines our reaction to this experience. Moreover, the meta-terms Nature and Emotion are an expression of the same basic Principle, in the two modes of existence that are described in the Doctrine of the Mean. Material Force in this case provides shape to the content of Principle. The direct result of this opinion is of course advocating the relative importance of Nature for the self-cultivation process.

This issue in turn, relates to another aspect of the same debate, namely the question whether people and the natural world (animals) had the same nature or not, or Inmulsŏng-tongiron in Korean. This debate sprang up in the eighteenth century between two prominent schools of thought at the time, and it is sometimes called the Horak debate after those schools. Originally the debaters were Yi Kan (李侃; Pen name Ŭ-am 漁庵) who advocated that the nature of people and animals are basically the same, and Han Wonjin (1682–1750, 韓元震; Pen name Namdang 南塘) who advocated the opposite. The debate had both metaphysical and moral implications, and it was originally related to the question regarding the mind of the

---

noble and of the inferior person.99 A similar nature to all things in the universe implies the universality of Principle, and at the same time it implies that this Principle is immanent in Nature. This debate had also implications for the nature of barbarians, and therefore played a part in the debate over opening to the West that became a major issue in the second half of the nineteenth century. In a text with the same name (*Inmulsŏng-tongiron*), Yi Chin-sang explains his take on this debate in the following words:

世之論性者。或曰人物性同。性則理也。理無不同。其有偏全之異者。氣質之性也。或曰人物性異。在天為理。在物為性。性只是氣質上標名。其言本原之同者。太極之理也。兩說皆有可據。而其實則皆偏。蓋所謂氣質之性者。實指那善惡不齊之機。而初無與於本體純粹之實。則謂偏全卽善惡。殆似認人心爲人欲也。所謂太極之理。雖云高出於萬物之表。而亦自分俵於萬物之中。則謂五常非太極者。殆是謂仁義爲非性也。100

This main discussion of our days is on Nature. Some say that the Nature of people and things (animals) is the same, because Nature is Principle, and the Principle does not vary. When we see something that is not exactly as it should be, it is because of the Nature of its physical endowment. Others say that the nature of human beings and animals is different. Principle is in heaven. In material entities there is that which is nature. According to them, Nature is nothing other than a way of designating tangible manifestations of Material Force.

Fundamentally the roots (foundation, ground) of these two arguments are the same. You can find support for both these positions in the fact that the Supreme Ultimate is Principle. However, when we see how they are applied to the real world, we can see that those two positions are quite different.

99 Choi Youngjin, 134-6.
100 Hanju chŏnsŏ 1:682b-683b
Generally speaking, those who talk about the physical endowment as being Nature are pointing to the fact that in the real world good and bad are not balanced. But this has nothing to do with the reality that the original essence is pure and unadulterated. When they talk about something not being exactly what is should be as the difference between good and evil, I’m afraid that’s as if they are equating the human mind with selfish desires.

As for the Principle of the Supreme Ultimate, although it is said to be far above the realm of material things, yet it also divides itself so that it distributed within all living things. So if you say that the Five Constants are not the Supreme Ultimate, I’m afraid that is about the same as saying that humanity and righteousness are not human nature.

In this case Yi Chin-sang uses a powerful metaphor to explain his assertion that the precedence of Principle means that it applies to all things, including the animal world. He rejects the opinion that gave precedence to Material Force and saw people as essentially different from any other creature. The second opinion was popular among the Kiho School for example, and advocated by contemporaries such as Yi Hangno (李恒老, 1792-1868; Pen name Hwa-sŏ 华西).

The other option means that all things are objects, made from Material Force, and Principle becomes a theoretical construct. When stating that the Supreme Ultimate (Tʻaeģŭk) is Principle, Yi Chin-sang refers directly to Zhou Dun-yi (周敦頤, 1017–1073; Pen name Lianxi 濂溪) and his Explanations on the Supreme Ultimate (Taiji Tushuo in Chinese), and to Zhu Xi’s take on that text.

One can easily note that the terminology used in both discussions is basically taken from the
Doctrine of the Mean. Pairing the Nature with the state where feelings have not yet arisen is a direct quote from the opening statement of the book. Yi Chin-sang’s understanding is implied in the diagram, in a way that becomes apparent only when actively seeking for it. In the first section that covers the head chapter (top middle in the diagram), he positions Nature as flowing directly from heaven, as per the opening of the text that “What Heaven confers is called ‘nature’”. In this way, it becomes evident that although the Way mentioned in the top tier of diagrams is derived directly from Heaven, all four major terms that appear in the opening chapter (namely the Mean, Harmony, Education and the Way) flow from Nature.

This position is not mandatory, and we have many opposite examples. In his original diagram on the topic, Kwŏn Gŭn positioned Nature in balance with Education (Kyo), and in correlation with Reverence (kyŏng). On his diagrams Kwŏn Gŭn is also commenting on Nature, that the nature of human beings and animals are both Principle. Some of Yi Chin-sang’s contemporaries, such as Ha U-myŏng (河友明, 1768 ~ 1799; Pen name Yŏndang 蓮塘), followed Kwŏn Gŭn in their analysis, balancing Nature with Education side by side (Figure 16). On a different diagram Ha U-myŏng places the active and passive movements (ŭm and yang) as issuing from Heaven’s Mandate, where Nature is positioned in a lower level altogether. Through the repositioning of Nature in regard to other diagrams on the same


102 Yi Chin-sang thought about different types of “Nature”, and per this distinction also different answers to the question about the similarity or difference in the Nature of people and animals. The Nature that appears in the Doctrine of the Mean, he claims, is the Nature of Heaven’s Mandate (天命之性). In the scope of the Doctrine of the Mean, one can talk about Nature as a universal phenomenon, and therefore in this context the nature of people and animals is the same. Mencius, for example, talks about Nature in a physical sense (just like the nature of species) and in that sense people or animals may have a similar Nature, but the Nature of people and animals is not the same. See Lee Hyung-sung, Hanju Yijinsang ǔi Chʻŏrhak sasang, 197-206.
topic, and moving it to a central location in the diagram, Yi Chin-sang is demonstrating his philosophical worldview, without compromising the interpretation or the breakdown of the book.

Nature appears again as a key term in the frame that deals with chapters 21 to 26. These chapters deal with the Way of Humans (*imdo*) as opposed to the Way of Heaven (*chŏndo*), and the diagram parallels both by using two parallel columns. The ‘Way of Humans’ column is labeled Education while the ‘Way of Heaven’ column is labeled Nature, in a way that is similar to the diagram made by Kwŏn Gŭn. Accompanying the cartouche is the text ‘The Enlightenment [that comes from] Sincerity’, as per the opening of chapter 21. In this context he affirms that nature and education are two appearances of the same phenomena.

### 3.6 The Role of Heaven

Heaven (*chŏn*) appears in an interesting role in the diagram. On the upper tier, the term Heaven is linked to each of the three frames, and all other occurrences within the boxes are derived from it. On the bottom tier all framed elements start from the Way (Do) and terminate in a word combination that contain the word ‘Heaven’ – an aspect of heaven.

As mentioned before, Yi Chin-sang asked about the way that Principle moved from the cosmos to particular people, and affected the mind. In other words, he was interested exactly in this point of interface between Heaven and Mind. Yi Chin-sang’s understanding was an extreme one even within his school. Although he thought of Nature as the implementation of
Principle within the Mind, the Mind itself consists of Nature and Emotion, which is the realization of the Principle.\textsuperscript{103} So although both Principle and Material Force exist in the universe, they are best actualized in the Mind itself.

The complicated relationship between the Way and Heaven is revealed in the diagram. The general “frame” chapters described on the top tier of the diagrams show how the Way is derived from Heaven, while the concrete “internal” chapters described in the bottom of the text are derived from the Way and conclude, through a series of metaphors from the text itself, in a specific description of Heaven.

3.7 Innovation and Changes

The diagram produced by Yi Chin-sang resembles many other diagrams on the same topic. As mentioned above, it uses the same basic patterns to convey meaning. For example, circled or cartouche characters are key terms derived from the text, and connectors (straight lines used to connect two phrases) indicate a logical flow. However, within the scope of this graphic language, the diagram is innovative in several ways.

On the structural level, this is one of the few diagrams that actually tried to bring elements from the entire text. The Iphak Tosŏl diagram (Figure 1) attempts to describe only the head chapter, while dealing with issues of structure in the text itself. The quotes are provided from

\textsuperscript{103} Kim Hyoung Chan, 373-4.
the entire text, but the issue of structure is not depicted in the diagram. On the other hand, Yi Chin-sang has incorporated the issue of structure into the diagram itself. The ability to deal with this issue, as well as content, at the same time is innovative.

This diagram is also innovative in those things that are missing from this it. In contrast to the other diagrams provided here, it avoids Zhu Xi’s metaphysical terminology. Terms like Material Force (Ki) and Principle (Li) do not appear in the diagram at all. In the Iphak Tosŏl diagram (Figure 1) the entire lower layer of the diagram is dedicated to placing the matching pairs of terms in their contexts. In the same way, both diagrams provided by Ha U-myŏng on the topic use Zhu Xi’s terminology extensively. Instead, what Yi Chin-sang is doing is a close reading of the text itself, followed by a careful textual analysis. Although never stated in the text directly, this sort of approach seems to be openly associated with the scholarship influenced by the bibliographic philological tendencies of the Qing scholarship.

### 3.8 Conclusion

All of the diagrams drawn by Yi Chin-sang are traditional, in several senses. The diagrams deal with traditional issues, such as the Book of Changes, as well as the one explored here. The diagrams also use a visual language that had become a convention, and thus are easily recognized. To a larger extent Yi Chin-sang is not an innovator. However, a detailed scrutiny of the diagrams reveals the Yi Chin-sang was novel in the way he covered the problem at

---

104 See for example the various processes attached to the Principle (Li) in Figure 15, and the careful placement of the terms Potential and Actualization (Ch’e and Yong in Korean) in Figure 16.
hand: He preferred to go directly to the text, and when dealing with the text as a whole to use a close reading of the Chungyong itself, rather than interpretations. It is a methodological approach that covers the entire book, aiming to give a precise detail of the Chungyong as a whole. Moreover, Yi Chin-sang relies on the anonymous Mr. Wang in his breakdown of the text. Finally, Yi Chin-sang is concerned with the issues of his time, and his complicated metaphysical world-view is well integrated into the diagram.
Chapter 4: On Diagrams

4.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters I have described the diagrams that two scholars have created in order to deal with a particular problem – the division of the Doctrine of the Mean into sub-sections. By comparing the diagram that Kwŏn Kŭn created in the early days of the dynasty with the diagram that Yi Chin-sang created five centuries later we can learn something about the process and evolution of diagrams and their usage. However, Korean diagrams did not exist in a void – they were based on a long and complicated tradition of diagram-making for philosophical and religious needs. This chapter will provide a broad survey of the etymology and evolution of diagrams. By showing the religious symbolic context of diagram-making as well as the character of the diagram itself, I wish to argue that a diagram can only be discussed as a symbol. Finally, I will introduce tools borrowed from the philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce in order to elaborate on the differences between the diagrams, and suggest a methodology to discuss diagrams in the future.

4.2 The Etymology of a Diagram

The character tú (図) has been studied in the past as part of the scholarship that surveyed early Chinese thought, from the Warring States period (475 – 221 BCE) and onward. Those research efforts tend to stress the gradual growth of that word, and its opposition to shū (書),
and go hand in hand with theories that contrast the “River Chart” (河圖) with the “Lou River Writing” (洛書).\textsuperscript{105} The cosmological and instrumental usage of these two led to a large body of scholarly work in the Eastern Han period (25 – 220 CE) which no doubted influenced later Confucian and Neo-Confucian works. The third vertex of this triangle is of course xiàng (象) which takes the meaning of image, icon and representation. These three characters are terminology used for the discussion on image representation.

Not identified so far in the Oracle Bones, the first usage of tú is found in a bronze vessel inscription of a nobleman, dated from late Yin or Early Zhou period.\textsuperscript{106} In the inscription, the word appears as a modifier of the word shì (室), a sacred chamber; as a direct Transfer object of the verb shòu (受), to give; and as the personal name of a high official supervising the building of the armoury. The readings for those sentences are quite diverse. While some scholars understand the word as artistic or any kind of drawing,\textsuperscript{107} others think that it means a map.\textsuperscript{108} However, both explanations refer to findings that are attested as late as the Qin and Han periods. Other scholars have noted the fact that late Han commentaries sometimes replace the content enclosed within the frame wéi (囗). The enclosed element can be bǐ (雚) denoting a name, sometimes followed by yì (邑) to form bǐ (雚) – military base, garrison or fortified town\textsuperscript{109}. If the geographic-symbolic sense of this is not strong enough, we can see


\textsuperscript{106} Wolfwang Behr, 111.

\textsuperscript{107} Guo Murou sees the character tú as representing mural paintings on tombs. See Wolfwang Behr, 112.

\textsuperscript{108} Huang Shengzhang.

\textsuperscript{109} Wolfwang Behr, 114-115.
similar behaviour in the case of the character yù (或~域) territory, which forms along with yì (邑) the character chéng (鄣), and framed it yields guó (國), state. We may even speculate about the mental link between this framing of a radical and the cartouche boxed names that appear first in the Mawangdui ink maps.

Wolfwang Behr, quoted above, speculates that the character first denoted a token that was used in feudal and military exchange, as a visualisation of a given territory, intended to indicate the affiliated territory or rank in court ritual\textsuperscript{110}. This meaning further evolved later on to the magico-religious and then to a proto-scientific map. By the time of the early Han period (206 – 9 CE) it received the meaning of a geographical map, with a secondary usage as the verb “to plan”.

The etymology of the word “diagram” reveals a sense of a triadic connection between the symbol, the object and the actual meaning attached, that is to say, a triadic link between the character, the physical diagram, and the real object that this map represents. The word “diagram,” as the diagram itself, is a sign in the sense that Charles Sanders Peirce saw in the word and the secondary division of the specific sign into Icon, Index or Symbol can be determined using the relationship between the sign and its object.\textsuperscript{111} This triadic connection is related to the secondary triadic link between the diagram, the mental representation, and the actual act of ownership. Diagrams, as well as their textual representation in Chinese characters, evoke a strong metaphor for conceptual mapping. The ritualistic meaning of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[110] Ibid., 120
\end{footnotes}
diagrams did not disappear, and by the time of the Han dynasty (206 BCE – 220 CE) several diagrams became an important part of Daoist ritual.

4.3 Proto Diagrams

Before their role in the realm of Neo-Confucian thought, diagrams served Daoist religion practitioners from the time of the Han Dynasty in China. Catherine Despeux lists three types of diagrams that were used this way by Daoist practitioners: Diagrams representing or depicting sacred or mythical geography, like the five sacred mountains; Diagrams of cosmology that draw from the *Book of Changes*, and other sources; and diagrams that represent the body. Among the many diagrams that served the Daoist religion, some diagrams became an important part of the Neo-Confucian repertoire, and the base for many diagrams. Indeed, these diagrams generally have the status of revealed texts in later texts.

The most famous of these diagrams are probably the *River Diagram* (*hetu* in Chinese) and the *Luo River Writing* (*Luoshu*), whose origin is unknown, which are the ancestors of many if not all Daoist diagrams. Both diagrams deal with numbers. They are basic forms of magic squares, and are correlated with the cardinal directions, and with the Eight Triagrams (*Bagua*). In the case of the River Diagram, a Song dynasty scholar named Shao Yong (邵雍, 1011-1077) created the graphic representation we know today. Combined with elements

113 Ibid.
114 See Figure 7
from the Book of Changes, this form became popular in the works of Neo-Confucian scholars during the Song and Yuan dynasties.  

Another diagram that became a foundation of the Neo-Confucianism is the Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate (taijitu), created by the Song scholar Zhou Dun-yi (周敦颐, 1017-1073). In a short text titled Explanations on the Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate (taijitu shuo), he presented the diagram for the first time. This text reached the hands of Zhu Xi through the hands of the Cheng Brothers. To create this diagram, Zhou Dun-yi adapted an already existing Daoist diagram titled the Diagram of the Supreme Non-Polarity (wujitu), attributed to Chen Tuan. In the Daoist version of the diagram, a series of circles describe the advancement from the concrete world to Ultimate Nothingness. In Zhou Dun-yi’s text the order of things is reversed and the diagram moves from the Ultimate Nothingness to the human world, finally resulting in the Sage as the epitome of the process.

One may note that the symbol (and a diagram in its own right) related to, and usually identified with, the Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate is missing from it: The iconic image of a circle made from black and white drop shapes, each containing a dot in the opposite direction, is non-existent in all early versions of the diagram. Ming scholars believed this text to be a revealed text that was passed down from antiquity, and emerged through Daoist

---

116 Catherine Despeux, 517-518.
117 Joseph A. Adler," The Place and Meaning of the Notion of Taiji in Taoist Sources Prior to the Ming Dynasty" History of Religions 23, no. 4 (1990), pp. 373-411.
circles in the 10th century. The first appearance of the symbol is in an etymological work titled the Source of Righteousness in the Six Books (liushu benyi) by Zhao Huiqian (趙撝謙, 1351-1395). This 12-volume work was first printed in the Hongwu era (1351-1395). In this work the full symbol is presented for the first time, with the eight Trigrams (bagua), the teardrop shapes and the inner dots (Figure 8). Zhao Huiqian attributes the diagram to Cai Yuanding (蔡元定, 1135-1198), a friend and pupil of Zhu Xi who allegedly went to Sichuan province to look for Chen Tuan’s diagrams. In his survey of the evidence we have today, Franços Louis notes that a circular pattern divided by a curved S-line was used between the 9th and the 14th centuries, but did not have the other common characteristics. Flaming spheres divided into two (or three) curved sections were used in the Liao Empire (907-1125), for what seems to be Buddhist artifacts, most probably belonging to Esoteric Buddhist sects.

It is interesting to note that the Daoist Na-Jia diagram (literally receiving the first heavenly stem) from Chen Tuan’s Real Criticism of the He-Luo (heluo zhenshu) connects the bagua to the phases of the moon (Figure 9). The black and white phases of the moon do resemble the iconographic image of the Taijitu to some extent. Both images try to convey the dynamic sense of change, and are closely related to the Book of Changes itself, which forms a separate type of diagram. When the Neo-Confucian scholars of the Song dynasty started to use

119 Franços Louis, 169.
120 Franços Louis, 173.
121 Franços Louis, 178.
122 Franços Louis, 183.
diagrams, they had an existing example of diagrams that were used to depict cosmology or metaphysical theory.

### 4.4 Song Dynasty Neo-Confucian Diagrams

For a period between mid Song and until Yuan, Neo-Confucian scholars made extensive usage of diagrams for multiple purposes.\(^{123}\) Zhu Xi presented Zou Dun-yi’s *Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate*, and made it as the founding stone of his theory.\(^{124}\) Since the Book of Changes took an important position in the creation of Neo-Confucian metaphysics, diagrams representing the *bagua* or other elements of the book were used extensively. In addition, other forms of diagrams were used to represent and manipulate data.\(^{125}\) Michael Lackner provides a useful topology of diagrammatic works, and roughly divides them into several groups, where each groups uses the diagrams for specific means and has recognizable visual traits:\(^{126}\)

a) Following the Buddhist *kewen* (科文) tradition, diagrams were used to analyse a text. The earliest *kewen* text is usually attributed to the 4\(^{th}\) century Dao’an (道安). Of the Neo-Confucian works that used this technique, Zhu Xi’s *Diagram of the Explanations of Humaneness (renshuotu)* follows this pattern\(^{127}\) (see Figure 3). It includes the

---


\(^{124}\) In his ten diagrams, T’oegye used the term “fundamental well-springs” to describe this diagram. See Michael C. Kalton, *To Become a Sage: The Ten Diagrams on Sage Learning* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 43.

\(^{125}\) Michael Lackner, 241-2.

\(^{126}\) Michael Lackner, 342-6.

\(^{127}\) This diagram also appears as the 7\(^{th}\) diagram in T’oegye’s *sŏnghak sipto*. 
parallelism that is usually used in the Buddhist exegesis, as well as the typical visual aspects. Unlike the Buddhist texts, Zhu Xi’s diagram stresses key terms in the diagram, as well as other complications of the original scheme. For comparison, a similar (visually) diagram is provided by the Tang dynasty’s monk Zongmi (宗密; 780-841) in a work titled *Various Understandings of the Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment*.128

b) A second kind of diagrams is used for memory and meditation, and is usually called *xinfa* (*simfa* in Korean). The parallelism here is not used to discover hidden parallels in the text, but rather as a decorative device that helps meditation. In one case, for example, an entire phrase from the Zhongyong was rewritten in the form of the character ‘zong’ (宗).129 For example, T’oegye used similar diagrams to build the words *Mean* (*chung*), *One* (*yi*) and *Mind* (*sim*) in archaic script in a diagram that was designed to help meditating on the idea of a single mind (See Figure 11). He aptly warns that it is difficult to keep the Mean (*chung*) because the Upright Nature (*cheng sŏng*) is related to the Subtle Essence (*chŏng mi*) and our physical constitution (*hyŏnggi*) is put in danger (*wi*) by selfishness (*sa*). It is interesting to note that in this case the characters are written in Seal Script (*Chŏnsŏ*), with two different brushes. This calligraphy style is less readable but highly decorative, and requires some skill to manufacture130. This type of diagram has a visual aspect that transcends the technical
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128 Michael Lackner, 343.
129 Michael Lackner, 343.
130 Calligraphy (*書*) is one of the Six Arts (六藝) of Zhu Xi, or the earlier Four Skills (四術), a term coined in the 9th century by Zhang Yanyuan (張彥遠, 815—907) in a calligraphic manual called *fashu yao lu* (法書要錄). T’oegye briefly mentions that in his *sŏnghak sipto*. See Michael C. Kalton, *To Become a Sage*, 70.
requirements, and addresses issues of culture and skill as well.

c) A third type of diagram attempts to create a visual map of genealogical or hierarchical dependencies. Such dependencies can be of family relations (i.e., family tree), or the various interpretations of a text. Wang Bo, for example, presents a map of the various divisions of the Zhongyong in his tupulüe. (See Figure 5 and Figure 6). In this case the actual type of the diagram is not far from being a table (biao), in the same context that this word is used by Sima Qian.\(^\text{131}\)

The exegesis style of diagram was extremely influential during the Song and Yuan dynasties. As mentioned, both Zhu Xi and some of his prominent students used diagrams extensively.\(^\text{132}\) In this context, it is worth to mention Wang Bo, Li Yuan-gang (李元綱, fl. 1172) and Xu Qian (許謙, 1270–1337) as some of the influential scholars. Although this type of diagram was popular for a relatively short time, it was extremely influential among Korean scholars. The network of influence by Song scholars on Chosŏn scholarship is too vast to provide an exhaustive list, but some famous references show the extent of that influence. T’oegye, for example, in his Ten Diagram of Sage Learning (sŏnghak sipto) provides diagrams from Zhu Xi (such as the Diagram of the Explanations of Humaneness or the Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate and the Diagram of the Rules of the White Deer Hollow Academy), from Cheng Lin-yin (程林隱, the original creator of the Diagram of “The Mind Combines and Governs the Nature and the Feelings”), and from Zhen De-xiu (真德秀, author of the Diagram of the

\(^{131}\) Francesca Bray, Introduction, 24.
\(^{132}\) Francesca Bray, Introduction, 24.
4.5 Theory of Diagrams

Evidently, Korean scholars used diagram copiously, throughout the dynasty, and even (as we can clearly see from Yi Chin-sang) in the last days of the 19th century. Diagrams came in addition to text, and in some cases instead of a text, and were the product of an elaborated production process. We must assume, therefore, that diagrams provided some benefits over writing and discussions. In addition to the question of the benefits derived from diagrams, it must assume that some changes occurred in five centuries of scholarship. These are the two main problems that diagrams evoke. To facilitate a useful device for the discussion, I will use the theories of Charles Sanders Peirce (1839 – 1914). Starting from the 1860s, Peirce developed his own semiotic theory, one which focused on the idea of a sign. Early in the 20th century he included diagrams in his detailed work on reasoning and evidence. His vocabulary and some of his ideas will be used here to understand Korean diagrams.

In the base of Peirce’s semiotics stood the notion that in the activity of a sign there are three players. The sign, the object that the sign refers to, and the interpreter who pours sense into the symbolic system. He used several trichotomies to distinguish between different types of signs, by sorting each of the three players into groups. In this way he created types of

133 Michael C. Kalton, To Become a Sage, 37, 124, 146, and 159.
135 Compare with the Binary dichotomy of Ferdinand de Saussure. See Thomas L. Short, 16-7.
signs. His second trichotomy is probably the most important one. It differentiates signs by the
relation that they have to the object. An *Icon* shows similarity to the object by means of
shared characteristics. An *Index* is said to have actual or casual connection to the object,
much like the link between a footprint and the foot that caused it. Finally, a *Symbol* is
connected to the object by a rule, arbitrary decision or a habit. Many of the traffic signs we
know belong to this group.

To further differentiate the definition of an Icon, Peirce distinguished between three
subtypes, namely images, diagrams and metaphor.\(^{136}\) The differentiation here is a matter of
functionality.\(^{137}\) An image shows similarity to the object by means of simple qualities (color,
shape, etc’). In contrast, Diagrams relate to the object by analyzing it and presenting rational
relations that can be implicit or explicit. In other words, any icon with parts that relates in
some way to parts in the object is a diagram. Whereas images are accepted by Peirce in a
very narrow sense, diagrams have a wider range. Finally, Metaphors are icons that use a third
party to mediate with the object.

As a logician and mathematician, Peirce was interested in the notion of proof and evidence.
Specifically, he was interested in the process that helps a certain conclusion be perceived. In
a paper from 1906 titled *Prologomena to an Apology for Pragmaticism* (PAP) he argues that

\(^{136}\) Note the correlation with xiàng (象), tú (圖) and shū (書) mentioned in the beginning of the chapter.
\(^{137}\) Frederik Stjernfelt, “Two Iconicity Notions in Peirce’s Diagrammatology” in Conceptual Structures:
only the class of Signs can communicate the evidence.\textsuperscript{138} He states there that:

\begin{quote}
It is, therefore, a very extraordinary feature of Diagrams that they \textit{show}, - as literally \textit{show} as a Percept shows the Perceptual Judgment to be true, - that a consequence does follow, and more marvelous yet, that it \textit{would} follow under all varieties of circumstances accompanying the premisses.\textsuperscript{139}
\end{quote}

In the wider sense of the term, Peirce thinks about a diagram as a type of syllogism. When viewed this way, the diagram almost loses its original meaning. But when applied in a limited sense, the concept of a diagram as a sign that shows evidence is useful to discuss the diagrams provided here. When I apply the Peircian notions to the diagrams provided earlier, I can see that both diagrams show strong characteristics of being an \textit{Icon}. The shared characteristics are, in this case, shared citations and terms. Both diagrams attempt to show relationships (within the text or between texts) in the form of spatial arrangement and connecting lines. In this sense, both diagrams count as a \textit{Diagram} in the Peircian sense. However, the diagrams differ in quality and purity.

When conceived as \textit{Signs}, the two diagrams refer to two different objects. Kwŏn Kŭn’s diagram refers to a text, and specifically to Zhu Xi’s \textit{Zhongyong zhangju}. The elements of the diagram are terms and citations from Zhu Xi as well as the original text, and as such the relationship between elements in the diagram conveys the complicated relationship between the original text (i.e., the Doctrine of the Mean) and the commentary. In addition to that, the diagram also shows how Kwŏn Kŭn places his own ideas within this structure. The famous

\textsuperscript{138} Frederik Stjernfelt, 72-3.
\textsuperscript{139} Qtd. in Frederik Stjernfelt, 73.
diagrams provided by Song dynasty scholars provided a much simpler relationship, usually between key terms and chapters (See Figure 5 for example). In this sense, Kwŏn Kŭn’s diagram is much more complicated, and assumes some background knowledge.

In the case of Yi Chin-sang, the object of the diagram is not a text at all. Yi Chin-sang’s diagram attempts to show several things at once, but the most obvious layer is that it tries to explicate a theory about the proper division of the original text into sections, and that the consolidation of several theories provides an accurate rendering of the text. In short Yi Chin-sang is using his diagram to literally “show” evidence for his theory, and as such it is a Diagram in the wider sense that Peirce perceives. A second debate illustrated by the diagram is the Inmulsŏng-tongiron. In this case, Yi Chin-sang demonstrates his opinion by placing Nature in a key position, in a way that shows the importance he sees in this term. By drawing the Mean (chung), Wisdom (chī) and Reverence (kyŏng) as derived from Nature, he is able to show his argument and demonstrate the correlation with the text at the same time.

One aspect of diagrams that provide a considerable benefit over text lies in the concept of vagueness. When we use this word in the logical-philosophical context we can talk about two forms of vagueness.\(^\text{140}\) One form of vagueness means being in a state where neither true nor false are applicable (the technical term is “fuzzy”). In this case, the truth value of a predicate lies in the borderline. Another meaning of vagueness is not being specific (which differs

\(^{140}\) Cf. Thomas L. Short, 274.
from not being accurate). Among the two meanings of the term, the second meaning is inherently embedded in the exegesis type of diagram: it is the one providing the diagram with additional flexibility. Because it is sufficient for most practical purposes, it enables us to make observations on specific ideas and finally it makes it possible to overcome the limited nature of words alone.

In the case of the two diagrams mentioned here, a connecting line depicts a relation between terms and citations, and the relative position within the scheme describes importance and primacy, but the nature of the relationship is not specified. For example, in the case of Yi Chin-sang it can mean that the Nature causes the Mean, but can also mean that Nature existed before the Mean, or that the idea of the Mean is logically derived from Nature. A student can apply the diagram for a specific need, and apply the specific relation in question. At the same time, an academic opponent may attack the relationship depicted without being specific about the type of relationship attacked. In short, it facilitates common grounds for debate.

4.6 Conclusion

Diagrams have been important for Neo-Confucian scholars in Korea, since the beginning of the dynasty. The quantity of diagrams in question, the references made to some diagrams, and the fact that diagrams are used throughout the dynasty, testify to the importance of diagrams as a practice.

141 See the example in comment 6 in Thomas L. Short, 274.
142 Thomas L. Short, 275-6.
In this work I have attempted to inspect a narrow subgroup of diagrams from a specific genre. Namely, I have inspected several diagrams dealing with the structure of the Doctrine of the Mean, in order to hypothesize about the nature and reasons of diagram writing, and to find whether or not diagrams changed over time. In this sense, this work is hypothesis-generating rather than hypothesis-testing. In this context, the selection of the Doctrine of the Mean is important: As the last of the *Four Books* studied, the debates about this book are designed for the most senior students, and assumed to be more complicated. As I have shown in the first chapter, the problem of the division of the text is related to the overall message that each scholar sees in the book, and was part of an ongoing internal debate.

Diagrams prove to be useful and multipurpose tools. In many cases the diagram is complementary to the text, but it can usually stand on its own. Besides the obvious cognitive aspects that make the diagram useful for educational purposes, diagrams are also useful to facilitate a debate. I have used the theory of Charles Sanders Peirce to provide a useful technical approach to diagram study. When seen this way, the triadic nature of Pierce sign theory forces us to pay attention to the changing object of the sign (i.g., the diagram), but also to the function of interpretation. As a sign, the diagram assumes a certain viewer-reader, and provides a sense of dialog. As I have show, the usage of diagrams allows that writer to show evidence for a theory, in a way that is akin to the role of diagrams in geometry. The diagram is general enough to be useful, but still allow dispute.

The Peircian terminology also brings to mind possible tools to sort and classify diagrams. Instead of talking about diagrams per topic (e.g., Diagram of the Changes), we can talk about
diagram per object, translation or subtype. When viewed this way, the Peircian methodology shows us the evolution of diagrams throughout the dynasty. Whereas Kwŏn Kŭn’s diagram served as a complicated index to a textual body of works, Yi Chin-sang used a diagram to facilitate an argument. Kwŏn Kŭn’s diagram is not simple. He is able to integrate and merge text and commentary in a way that a future student might find useful. Coupled with the actual texts, it makes a powerful cognitive tool. In itself Kwŏn Kŭn’s diagram represents a huge leap from the simple diagrams of early Song scholars. Nevertheless, Yi Chin-sang created a diagram that is significantly more complicated than previous diagrams on the same topic. He is addressing many issues in the same diagram, and the diagram work in many levels. Ultimately the diagram serves as a proof for a claim that he is making about the original text. This development places his diagram well within the class of real Diagrams per Peirce’s classification. This latest evolution of diagrams correspond well with the general change in Chosŏn scholarship from one that attempts to reflect accurately the Cheng-Zhu school, into an innovative scholarship that stood independently of the Chinese sphere.

Finally, to fully understand the role of diagrams in the Chosŏn scholarship we also need to inspect the third aspect of the Peircian triadic explanation of signs: We need to figure out the role of the interpreter. In other words, who is exactly the audience of these diagrams? To partially answer this question, we can inspect the range of diagrams proposed on this topic: Out of more than 50 diagrams inspected (see Appendix A for details), only one diagram, the

143 One might note the resemblance to modern tools and diagrams designed to do the same. In this short scope it might be useful to mention Charles Peirce’s own “Existential Graphs” that were developed into “Semantic Networks” in the 1960s, “Concept Maps” in the 1970s and in their latest reincarnation were called “Mind Maps” by Tony Buzan.
one on the *iphak tosŏl*, was created before the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. All other diagrams in the list (52 diagrams in total) were created after the middle of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. Another hint may come from the fact that many of the diagrams are generally similar, and differ in minute details (like the position of the word Nature or *sŏng* in Korean). Starting from the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, Korean scholarship diverged into many different ideological factions within a very narrow range. I claim that this growth in wealth and complexity is the result of a tough intellectual competition that followed factionalism. Korean Neo-Confucian scholars had to put a lot more work into showing the uniqueness and superiority of their own scholarship. If so, the audience of diagrams was members of the same faction and opponents from rival factions. I believe that this view on diagram-making opens the door to a much greater understanding of the unique nature of Korean scholarship in general.
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Appendix

Appendix A

The table provides the details of 52 diagrams of the Doctrine of the Mean, made by 28 different scholars, and arranged by the order of birth of their authors.\(^\text{144}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Work Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>權近(1352~1409)</td>
<td>「中庸首章分釋之圖」</td>
<td>入學圖說</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>高汝興(1617~1678)</td>
<td>「中庸之圖」</td>
<td>鬧隱集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>金萬英(1624-1671)</td>
<td>「中庸首章之圖」</td>
<td>南圃先生文集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>金萬烋(1625~1694)</td>
<td>「中庸人心道心圖」</td>
<td>老奴齋集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>金萬烋(1625 ~ 1694)</td>
<td>「中庸人心道心圖」</td>
<td>老奴齋集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>金幹(1646~1732)</td>
<td>「人心道心圖」</td>
<td>厚齋集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>李泰壽(1658~1724)</td>
<td>「中庸七圖」</td>
<td>止谷遺稿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>李泰壽(1658 ~ 1724)</td>
<td>「中庸七圖」*</td>
<td>止谷遺稿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>李煥模(1675~?)</td>
<td>「天命之謂性圖」</td>
<td>斗室寤言(^\text{145})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{144}\) Sources: Kim You-Gon, Han'guk 'chungyongdosŏl' ūi chujewa t'aksōng, 305-7; Han'guk Sasangsas Yŏ n'guhoe, Tosŏl-ro ponün Han'guk yuhak.

\(^{145}\) 3 diagrams
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Work Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>李顯益(1678~1717)</td>
<td>「中庸圖」</td>
<td>正菴集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>韓元震(1682~1751)</td>
<td>「中庸圖」</td>
<td>經義記聞錄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>尹衡老(1702-1782)</td>
<td>「圖說」</td>
<td>戒懼菴集 의中庸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>金謹行(1712~1782)</td>
<td>「序分節圖」</td>
<td>廬齋集146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>白鳳來(1717~1799)</td>
<td>「中庸為學微妙之圖」</td>
<td>九龍齋集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>金相逢(1736~1811)</td>
<td>「人心道心圖」</td>
<td>澗溪集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>金履九(1746~1812)</td>
<td>「為學圖說」147</td>
<td>自然窩遺稿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>褙相說(1759~1789)</td>
<td>「中庸圖」</td>
<td>四書纂要</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>河友賢(1768~1799)</td>
<td>「改定中庸命性圖」</td>
<td>豫菴集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>朴箕寧(1779~1857)</td>
<td>「中庸圖說」148</td>
<td>荷叟集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>柳懿睦(1785~1833)</td>
<td>「尊德性道問學圖」</td>
<td>守軒集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>李震相(1818-1886)</td>
<td>「中庸四支六節圖」</td>
<td>寒州全書</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

146 10 diagrams
147 2 diagrams
148 7 diagrams
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Work Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>徐基德(1832~?)</td>
<td>「中庸首章圖」</td>
<td>石南居士私稿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>金永三(1834~1906)</td>
<td>「中庸分節圖」</td>
<td>丹邱遺稿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>洪在英(1842~1905)</td>
<td>「天人心性情圖」</td>
<td>芝坡集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>李嶔(1842~1928)</td>
<td>「始言中散末合之圖」</td>
<td>桂陽遺稿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>安泰國(1843~1913)</td>
<td>「中庸圖」</td>
<td>暢谷集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>郭鍾錫(1846~1919)</td>
<td>「中庸支節圖」</td>
<td>茶田經義答問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>金鳳煥(1873~1915)</td>
<td>「首章圖」</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

149 6 diagrams
150 3 diagrams
Figure 1 Iphak Tosŏl - Chungyong Sujang Punsŏkdo (中庸首章分釋圖)

Diagram of the Head Chapter of the Chungyong
[Iphak tosŏl A,7.3a, p. 164]
Figure 2 Analyzed Diagram

Continuous lines indicate that the origin of the text is the Zhongyong; Breaking lines indicate that the text originated in Zhu Xi’s commentary; Double line of each kind indicates a reference to one of other chapters in each work; No Border indicates Kwŏn Kŭn’s own words.
Figure 3 Sŏnghak Sipto - Insŏldo (仁說圖)

Diagram of Zhu Xi's Explanation of Humanity
[T'oegye kŭngsaeng munjipji ch'il A,29.197d; The diagram appears in Zhu Xi's Ya-lei, 105.71a]
Figure 4 Wang Bo – Zhongyong zhang ju tu (中庸章句圖)

Diagram of Zhu Xi’s Zhongyong by Chapter and Phrase [tupulüe, 6-7a]
Figure 5 Wang Bo – Schematic Breakdown of the Zhongyong (Right) and Zhang Zai’s Western Inscription (Left)

[tupulüe, 6-23b]
Figure 6 Wang Bo – Diagram of the Opening of the Zhongyong (left)

[tupulüe, 6-8a]
Figure 7 The River Diagram and the Luo Writing

Lai Zhide (來知德), Qutangrilu (瞿塘日錄) as taken from Zhao Huiqian (趙撝謙), liushu benyi shier juan (六書本義十二卷). [SKQS].
Figure 8 The River Diagram Spontaneous Process of Heaven and Earth

Lai Zhide (來知德), Qutangrilu (瞿塘日錄) as taken from Zhao Huiqian (趙撝謙), liushu benyi shier juan (六書本義十二卷). [SKQS].
Figure 9 The Diagram of the Na Jia (納甲圖)

Chen Tuan (陳摶) Hé luò zhēn shù shí juǎn (河洛眞數十卷)
Figure 10 Diagram of Zhu Xi’s Explanation of Humanity

Sŏnghak sipto - Insŏldo (仁說圖)
[T’oegye kŭngsaeng munjipji ch’il A,29.197d; The diagram appears in Zhu Xi’s Yü-lei, 105.71a]
Combining the Mind of Humans, Mind of the Way and Essence to Grasp the Mean
[T'oegye Chônsô B, 31.266]
Figure 12 Hanju Chōnsŏ – Chungyong Saji Yukchŏl Do (中庸四支六節圖)

The Diagram of Four Branches and Six Sections of the Zhongyong

[hanchu chōnsŏ 4:120a]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(一) 中和大支</th>
<th>(四) 篤恭大支</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>第一大節</td>
<td>第六大節</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(二) 費隱大支</th>
<th>(三) 天人大支</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>第三大節</td>
<td>第五大節</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-26</td>
<td>27-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13 Yi Chinsang – Diagram Scheme and Sections
Figure 14 Yi Chinsang – Rendered Diagram
Figure 15  Ha Muhyón (河友賢, 1768 ~ 1799; Pen name Ye-am 豫菴) – Kaejong

Chungyongmyōngsōndo (改定中庸命性圖)
Diagram of the Reform of Chungyong’s Mandate and Nature
[Yeam-jib 3_9]
Figure 16 Ha Muhyŏn – Chungyong Chŏndo (中庸全圖)

The Complete Diagram of the Chungyong
[Yeam-jib 3_23]