

Kim Wŏn-haeng's Intellectual Influences on Hong Tae-yong: The Case of Relations between *Nakhak* and *Pukhak**

*Login Lok-yin Law***

Introduction

In the 17th century Chosŏn Dynasty (朝鮮, 1392-1910), the academic discussion over Neo-Confucianism greatly influenced different scholars.¹

* The first draft of this article was presented at the 2nd Annual Korea University Korean History Graduate Student conference (2nd May 2014). I would like to gratefully thank the arrangement of the conference organizing committee and the conference participants' comments on my paper. Also, I would also like to thank the three anonymous reviewers for their suggestions and comments. However, the author takes sole responsibility for his views.

** PhD Student, Division of Chinese, Nanyang Technological University

1 The rise of Neo-Confucianism in China was caused by the Confucianism scholars in the late Tang (618-907) and the early Northern Song Dynasty (960-1127) who wanted to reconstruct the leading status of Confucianism in the society of China and tried to reject the superstitious and mystical elements of Daoism and Buddhism because Daoism and Buddhism were the dominant ideologies of the Chinese and reducing the importance of Confucianism. Therefore, Zhuxi (朱熹, 1130-1200) and other Confucianism scholars tried to make use of the thought of Daoism and Buddhism to explain the Confucianism as a philosophical and intellectual way. His effort was accepted by the Song court and therefore his interpretation and

Near the end of the Koryŏ (918-1392) period, An Hyang (安珦, 1243-1306) brought the Complete Works of Zhuxi (朱子全書 *Zhuzi quanshu*) to the Korean Peninsula and Neo-Confucianism was introduced to the society and greatly affected the thought of Chosŏn scholars.² In 1388, Koryŏ general Yi Sŏng-kye (李成桂, 1335-1408, Chosŏn's T'aejo (朝鮮太祖), r. 1392-1398) swept his army from the Yalu River straight into the capital and dominated the power of Koryŏ court.³ After Yi established political power, he shortly after founded the new dynasty of Chosŏn to replace Koryŏ.⁴ Although his action was not supported by some Confucianism scholars, such as Chŏng Mong-ju (鄭夢周, 1337-1392), Yi Saek (李穡, 1328-1396) and Kil Chae (吉再, 1353-1419), he still encouraged Confucianism to be the dominant idea for the social structure, diplomatic policy and governance of the Chosŏn court.⁵ Chosŏn maintained the

elaboration dominated the ideology of Confucianism. Confucianism scholars in China needed to understand the thought of Zhuxi when they needed to get a pass for the imperial examination. Afterwards, this dominated ideology was learnt from the Korean scholars and made it to be the formation of the social structure. To understand the details on the development of Neo-Confucianism in China and its influences on Korea, see Martina Deuchler, *The Confucian Transformation of Korea: A Study of Society and Ideology*, (Cambridge, MA: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1992), 14-15.

- 2 In the 13th century, Koryŏ Korea was under the control of Yuan (1269-1368) and the political interaction between Korea and China became more frequent. After first contacted this idea, Korean intellectuals accepted this new world of thought gradually in the following decades. *Ibid*, 16-20.
- 3 See Andrew C. Nahm, *Korea: Tradition & Transformation*, (Seoul: Hollym International, 2004), 92-93.
- 4 Fan Yong Cong's book covered the reasons and the details about Yi Sŏng-kye replacing Koryŏ. See Fan Wing-chung 范永聰, *Shida yu baoguo: Yuan Ming zhiji de Zhong Han guanxi*, (事大與保國：元明之際中韓關係 *Serving the Great and Protecting the State: Sino-Korean Relations in Yuan-Ming Era*), (Hong Kong: Hong Kong Educational Publishing, 2009), 189-203.
- 5 The scholars of Chosŏn court believed that perish of Koryŏ was the result of Koryŏ court promotion of Buddhism for people at that time. It is because the economic

Koryŏ imperial examination policy (科舉, *Kwagŏ*) for selecting suitable court officers.⁶ Chosŏn's T'aejo dictated that Zhuxi's understanding on Neo-Confucian was the requirement of the imperial examination and therefore Confucian scholars needed to read Zhuxi's works and understand his elaboration.⁷

However, various Chosŏn scholars explained the ideas of Zhuxi in extremely different ways from each other and intellectual debates came to characterize the history of Korean Confucianism. Neo-Confucianism claimed that the principle of heaven was *li*(理) and the active principle formatting part of all living thing was *qi* (氣, material force). But Chosŏn Neo-Confucianism scholars had different points of view on the ordering and relationships between *li* and *qi*.⁸ These different perspectives on Neo-Confucianism among Chosŏn intellectuals caused a variety of debates. One of the significant Neo-Confucian debates was the "Four Seven Debates" (四七論辯, *Sach'il nonbyŏn*).⁹ But the four-seven debate did not bring about an absolute conclusion but it continued to influence Korean Neo-Confucianism for centuries afterward, so much so that most Neo-Confucian philosophy in the second half of the Chosŏn Dynasty can without much exaggeration be described as essentially nothing more than a series of footnotes to the two Yi.¹⁰ Besides that, it can manifest that the

power of Buddhism temples was greater than the Koryŏ court and it was one major cause of the financial crisis in the end of Koryŏ period. It was one of the important reasons that the Koryŏ perished in 14th century. Martina Deuchler, *The Confucian Transformation of Korea: A Study of Society and Ideology*, 22-24.

6 Yi Sŏng-mu, *Hankuk ūi kwakŏ cheto* (Civil Service Examination System of Korea), (Seoul: Chimuntang, 2000), 89.

7 Ibid, 93-94.

8 See Lyu Sŏng-kuk, Fu Jigong(傅濟功) trans. *Hanguo ruxue shi* (The History of Korean Confucianism), (Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press, 1989), 132.

9 As for the Details of the debate, see Jin Xi-de, "The 'Four-Seven Debate' and the School of Principle in Korea," *Philosophy East and West* 37-4(1987): 347-360.

10 Peter H. Lee and Wm. Theodore de Bary, eds. *Sources of Korean Tradition Vol.II*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 194.

different stances of the intellectuals' ideologies and understanding on Neo-Confucianism divided the intellectuals into two sides. The supporters of Yulgok were named *Sŏin* (西人, Westerners) or School of *Kiho* (畿湖學派) because of their place of origin. In the same way, supporters of T'oegye were called the *Namin* party (南人黨) and School of *Yŏngnam* (嶺南). However, political conflict caused the Westerners to be further divided into the *Noron* (老論) and *Soron* (少論), and the *Noron* eventually was split into *Hohak* and *Nakhak* because their points of view on the natures of humans and things distinctively.¹¹

The *Horak* debate was the second intellectual debate on Chosŏn Neo-Confucianism.¹² The debate began from the scholars in the *Noron* faction's conflicts on the understanding about the equivalent and difference of natures between human beings and things (人性物性異同).¹³ Han Won-chin (韓元震, 1682-1751) and his supporters insisted that human nature is very distinctive and it is not equal to animal nature. Those supporters were from the area of Ch'ungh'ŏng province and historians categorized the scholars who sharing the same idea with Kwon Sangha into

11 Mark Setton, "Factional Politics and Philosophical Development in the Late Chosŏn," *Journal of Korean Studies* 8(1992): 37-80.

12 Young-jin Choi, "The Horak Debate in Eighteenth-Century Joseon," *Korea Journal* 51.1(2011): 5-13; Also see Hong Jung Geun, "Horakronpyŏn-ŭi sŏngkwa-wa chŏnmang" (Horak Debate Research Outcome and Forecast), *Yukyo sasang yŏnku* 44(2011): 75-103.

13 A recent special edition of a Taiwanese Journal, *Universitas: Monthly Review of Philosophy and Culture* invited some articles to discuss the debates on the equivalent and difference of original natures between human beings and things and indicated its significance on the philosophical history of Korea. See Ko Che-ŭk, "Daolun: Renwuxing tongyi lunzheng zai Hanguo ruxueshi shang de yiyi: renwuxing tongyilun zhi fasheng, zhankai ji yiyi" (導論: 人性同異論爭在韓國儒學史上的意義——人性同異論之發生、展開及意義, The Origin, development, and significance of the theory of whether human nature and things nature are same or different in the History of Korean Confucianism), *Universitas: Monthly Review of Philosophy and Culture* 41-8(2014): 3-21

Ho-hak. On the other hand, Yi Kan (李柬, 1677-1727) and Kim Ch'ang-hyöp (金昌協, 1651-1708) disagreed on the view of Han and claimed that human nature is tantamount to animal nature (人物性同論 *Immul sōngtong non*).¹⁴ Most of the supporters of Yi Kan and Kim Ch'ang-hyöp were from the Kyönggi province before *Nakhak* became the historical term for this intellectual faction.

This paper will not address the issues about the discourses and evidences of *Hohak* and *Nakhak* but it will intensify the thought of *Nakhak* scholars on the equivalent of nature between human beings and other living things. The significance of this advocate acted as the source and origin of the school of *Pukhak* (北學 School of Learning from the North) which promoted new knowledge from China to reform the society of Chosŏn in the 18th century.¹⁵

Although the intellectual position of the *Nakhak* School is associated with the development of *Pukhak*, it has not been commonly discussed in current scholarship in the academia of Korean intellectual history because most of the scholars believed that the formation of the *Pukhak* School was affected by other external factors.¹⁶ For instance, some schol-

14 Han and Yi were actually classmates and they both were the students of a prominent master, Kwŏn Sang-ha (權尚夏, 1641-1721). See Lee and De Bary, *Sources of Korean Tradition Vol.II*, 195.

15 Actually, the thought of *Nakhak* was not only the origin of the school of *Pukhak*, but also the scholars applied it to a variety of social and political matters, supporting the idea of real landscape in paintings during the 17th and 18th century. See Lee Kyungku, "The Horak Debate from the Reign of King Sukjong to King Sunjo," *Korea Journal* 51-1 (2011): 14-41.

16 The below articles are good examples of the studies of *Nakhak* and *Pukhak* relations, see Yu Ponghak, "Pukhak sasang-üi hyöngsöng-kwa kü song-kyöng: tamhön Hong Tae-yong-kaw Yön-am Pak Chi-wön-ül chungsim ũ-ro" (The Shape and Characteristics of the Northern Learning's Thought: By the Case of Hong Tae-yong and Pak Chi-wön), *Hankuksaron* 8 (1982): 183-245; Yi Sang-ik, "Nakhak-esö Pukhak-üro üi sasangjöng palchön" (The Development of the Thought of Northern Learning in the Ideology of *Nakhak*), *Ch'ölhak* 46(1996): 5-34.

ars believed that *Pukhak* was influenced by the economic collapse in local Chosŏn society. *Pukhak* scholars suggested to learn the better ways from Qing China to reform the society and improve the quality of life.¹⁷ Besides that, some scholars argued that the scholars of *Pukhak* insisted to learn from Qing China because they had given up the hostile attitude to Qing China and found that Qing was a prosperous country and Chosŏn should learn from it. These analyses may provide a part of the background information for the rise of the *Pukhak* School. Unfortunately, that research neglected that the thought on nature's equivalent between human beings and things was the important intellectual source of the *Pukhak* scholars to develop the idea of the unity between the Chinese and the Barbarians(華夷無異).¹⁸ This idea affected those *Pukhak* scholars who believed that Chosŏn should learn from the society and culture of Qing to reform the society of Chosŏn. Although Nam-jin Huh mentioned that the *Silhak* (實學, Practical Learning) tradition was affected by *Nakhak*, *Silhak* was not equal to *Pukhak*.¹⁹ It was because scholars of Practical Learning might not agree that Chosŏn should learn from China but supporters of *Pukhak* were the advocate of learning new knowledge from Qing China even though the ideology of *Pukhak* was also shaped by the idea of *Nakhak*.²⁰

17 Li Yingshun, "Chaoxian beixuepai shixue sixiang yu zhu shixue liupai de guanxi" (The Relationships between Silhak School and the Thought of Chosŏn Pukhak School's Practical Learning), *Dongjiang Journal* 26-2 (2009): 13.

18 Those scholars in the late 18th century claimed that they were influenced by Hong Tae-yong, such as Pak Che-ka (朴齊家, 1750-1815) and Pak Chi-wŏn (朴趾源, 1737-1805). Those scholars tried to use the chance for traveling to Beijing for establishing their idea for *Pukhak*. See Law Lok-yin (羅樂然), "Qingdai Chaoxian ren xiyangguan de xingcheng (The Shaping of Joseon Views of the West during the Qing Dynasty: Based on Hong Tae-yong Mission to Beijing)," *Taiwan Journal of East Asian Studies* 10-1 (2013): 341-344.

19 *Silhak* was the social and philosophical thought of the 18th century Chosŏn society which proposed to learn the practical learning from the Confucianism classics as well as other origins. See Nam-jin Huh, "Two Aspects of Practical Learning (Shir-

This paper will mainly investigate the relationship between the leading scholar of *Pukhak* Hong Tae-yong and his teacher Kim Wŏn-haeng who was the successor of *Nakhak* school. Their writings showed that their relationship was very intimate and Kim's thought was inherited by Hong Tae-yong. It is well-known that Hong Tae-yong was one of the paramount representatives for *Pukhak* in the 18th century.²¹ During his participation in *Yŏnhaengsa* (燕行使, Diplomatic Envoys to Beijing), his intellectual background motivated his ambition to interact with the Chinese literati,²² and he visited the churches and talked with the Catholic missionaries.²³ These activities indicated that he kept an open mind on the culture and society in China and also inspired him to advocate the same nature between the Chinese and barbarians. He propagated his belief to motivate other scholars to participate in the mission to Beijing to grasp the new knowledge from Qing China and shaped the new development of the intellectual history of 18th century Chosŏn. A lot of scholars, such as Pak Che-ka (1750-1815) and Pak Chi-wŏn (1737-1805) were attracted to Hong Tae-yong's activities as well as his thought and became supporters of the *Pukhak* school.²⁴

Therefore, it is essential to grasp the intellectual relationships between Kim Wŏn-haeng and Hong Tae-yong to identify how the thought of *Na-*

hak; 實學), *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 14(2001): 204.

20 Li Yingshun, "Chaoxian beixue pai shixue sixiang," 16-18.

21 Pan Changhe潘暢和, "Bei xuepai de shixue sixiang ji qi qimeng yiyi" (北學派的實學思想及其啟蒙意義 The Practical Learning Thought of Pukhak and Its Significances of the Enlightenment), *Dongjiang Journal* 東疆學刊 1991.2 (1991): 45-46.

22 Gari Ledyard, "Hong Taeyong and His Peking Memoir," *Korean Studies* 6(1982): 63-103.

23 Ibid, 71-72. Also see Lee Hung-tae, "Hong Tae-yong's Beijing Travels and His Changing Perception of the West-Focusing on Eulbyeong yeonhangnok and Uisan mundap," *Review of Korean Studies* 9:4 (2006): 45-62.

24 Chung Chung-ho, "Practical Learning and Literature in the Eighteenth-century Chosun Korea: Pak Chega's Literary Appropriation of Northern Learning," *Pikyo*

khak became the significant intellectual origin of the formation of new knowledge by the school of *Pukhak* during the 18th century in Chosŏn.²⁵ To address this issue, this article will begin with the background of Kim Wŏn-haeng and his thought. Based on this background, it will attempt to examine the writings of Hong Tae-yong and Kim Wŏn-haeng to determine how Kim Wŏn-haeng was the linchpin which shaped the thought of Hong Tae-yong on accepting Qing China. Last but not the least, this article will finally explain how the idea of *Nakhak*, one of the Neo-Confucianism schools in Chosŏn, was transmitted to establish a new intellectual thought, *Pukhak* in the 18th century and modified intellectual thought on Qing China as well as Neo-Confucian knowledge.

The Structure of *Sŏksil Academy* and Kim Wŏn-haeng's Intellectual Background

Kim Wŏn-haeng was the inheritor and teacher of *Sŏksil Academy* and he was also considered to be one of the advocates of the *Nakhak* school. It is indispensable to explain how the philosophy of the founders of *Sŏksil Academy* and their influences on Kim Wŏn-haeng's thought on the nature of human-beings by the way of *Nakhak*.

Sŏksil Academy was founded by one of the leaders of *Noron* faction Kim Sang-yong (金尚容, *Sŏnwon Sŏnsaeng* 仙源先生, 1561-1637) in 1626 (朝鮮孝宗7年 the Seventh Year of Chosŏn Hyojong).²⁶ But he committed suicide after the Manchu Invasion of Korea in 1636.²⁷ So, his brother

munhak 47(2009): 51-63.

25 Other *Pukhak* scholars are also influenced by the scholars of *Nakhak*, such as Pak Chi-wŏn. See Yu Ponghak, "Pukhak sasang-ŭi hyŏngsŏng-kwa kŭ song-kyŏng," 188.

26 See Kim Sihan 金時翰, "Sŏnwon yuko nyŏnpo" (仙源遺稿年譜 The Chronicle of Kim Sangyang), in Kim Sangyong 金尚容, *Sŏnwon yuko* (仙源遺稿 Manuscripts of Kim Sangyang), Sequel, 1a.

Kim Sang-hön(金尚憲, 1570-1652, *Söksil Sönsaeng* (石室先生)), carried out his wishes to maintain the school. *Noron* was one of the divided factions of the Westerners and they conflicted with the *Soron* because of the punishment arrangement for the supporters of the *Namin*. The *Noron* insisted dealing with it harshly but the *Soron* disagreed. But both of them still shared the similar intellectual understanding on Neo-Confucianism which was the approach of *Yulgok*. Therefore, both the *Soron* and *Noron* of the Westerners agreed that all beings' *li* are the same and the *qi* shaped the divergence between human beings and things. Another characteristic of *Noron* was the propagation of the spirit of *Ch'unch'u taeüi* (春秋大義, Cardinal Principles of Righteousness during Period of Spring and Autumn).²⁸ The evidence of this advocate can be found from the objective of the establishment of *Söksil Academy*. The *Söksil Söwon Myochöng pi* (石室書院廟庭碑 Stele of *Söksil Academy's* Temple and Gardens) written by Song Si-yöl (宋時烈, 1607-1688) emphasized that Kim Sang-hön took on the greatest responsibility to maintain the rituals and righteousness and asserted an example in a disadvantaged era. (身任禮義之大宗, 以樹綱常於既壞。)²⁹

Kim Sang-hön's resulted in *Söksil Academy's* categorization as one of the academies of *Noron* and propagated the spirit of *Ch'unch'u taeüi*.³⁰ In 17th century Chosön, the mainstream and politically correct idea of the

27 Yun Kyöng-ho, "Söksilsöwon-üi Könnip-kwa Kyoyukpangpöp" (The Establishment of Söksil Academy and its Teaching Methods), *Toegyehak Nonchong* 22 (2013), 175.

28 Cho Hyun Keol, "Yuam Song Siyöl- üi Ch'unch'u taeüi sasang" (A Study on the Confucian Thought of Righteousness in U-Am Song Si-Yöl), *The Journal of International Relations* 14.2(2011), 285-306.

29 Song Si-yöl, "Söksil Söwon Mōpchōng pi," (Stele of Söksil Academy's Temple and Gardens), *Songja Daejeon*(宋子大全), (Seoul: Minjok Munhwa Ch'ujinhoe, 2001), 171, 20a-21b. Also see Yun Kyeong-ho, "Söksilsöwon-üi Könnip-kwa Kyoyukpangpöp," 165.

30 See Lyu Sŭng-kuk, *Hanguo ruxue shi*, 143-144.

intellectuals was to assume that the Qing dynasty was a Barbarian land and Chinese culture was forfeited after the subjugation of the Ming Dynasty. Chosŏn intellectuals should uphold the spirit of Confucianism to uphold Chinese and Confucian culture.³¹ However, this idea was replaced gradually because of the changes in the teachers of the academy and the teaching philosophy after a few decades.

In the late 17th century, new intellectuals such as, Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp and Kim Ch'ang-hŭp (金昌翕, 1653-1722) took over the academy and attempted to promote the new idea to teach the students.³² It is particularly important that the domination of Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp on the education of *Sŏksil Academy* was the turning point for the teaching philosophy of *Sŏksil Academy*.

Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp was one of the students of Song Si-yŏl but he did not totally succeed the idea of Song and he attempted to develop his own idea based on the concept of Song.³³ Especially, he agreed with the points of Yi Kan that human nature is the same with the nature of things,³⁴ which was the opposite opinion of Song Si-yŏl.³⁴

Therefore, *Sŏksil Academy* began to propagate the idea of *Immul sŏng-tong non*. Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp's ideology and his teaching philosophy at *Sŏksil Academy* took on a great role for the thought of Kim Wŏn-haeng.³⁵

31 Song Huijuan, *Qing dai Zhong Chao zongfan guanxi shanbian* (Transformation of Sino-Korean Tributary Relations in Qing Dynasty), Zhangchun: Jilin daxue chubanshe, 2007), 72-74.

32 See Yun Kyeong-ho, "Sŏksilsŏwon-ŭi Kŏllip-kwa Kyoyukpangpŏp," 176-177.

33 Lin Yuehui(林月惠), "Jin Ch'angxie lun zhijue"(金昌協論「知覺」Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp's Discussion on Consciousness), in *Chaoxian ruzhe dui rujia chuantong de jieshi* (The Chosŏn Confucians Explanation on Confucianism Tradition), Huang Junjie(黃俊傑) ed. (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2012), 92.

34 Yi Chŏn-sŭng, "Nongam Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp-ŭi sŏngnon-e taehan yŏn'gu" (A Study on Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp's Theory of Mind and Nature), (PhD Diss. Sungkyunkwan University, 2004), 141-174; Also see Kim Cheol-woon, "Nongyan Jin Changxie, Sanyuan Jin Changxi 'renxing yu wuxing tonglun zhi yanjiu" (A Study on the Theory of Whether Human Nature and Things Nature Are Same or

Kim Won Haeng was the grandson of Kim Ch'ang-hyöp and he was also educated at *Söksil Academy*. Their close relationship can be reflected by the postscript of Kim Ch'ang-hyöp's literature collection written by Kim Wön-haeng. In the postscript, Kim Wön-haeng mentioned how the teaching of Kim Ch'ang-hyöp had a great influence on his thought and teaching philosophy after he became a teacher of *Söksil Academy*.³⁶

The brief description of *Söksil Academy*'s background provided more information about how the *Nakhak* representative, Kim Wön-haeng's thought was shaped by the academy education and his family members' ideas. As a result, Kim Wön-haeng's ideas were closely related to his grandfather, Kim Ch'ang-hyöp', who was categorized as one of the early scholars of *Nakhak*. Especially, their thought on the elaboration for the same original nature for human beings and things are the same.³⁷ The background caused Kim Wön-haeng to utilize the same idea to teach the students at *Söksil Academy* and therefore the thought of his students, such as Hong Tae-yong, were influenced by the philosophy of *Söksil Academy*.

Kim Wön-haeng and His idea of *Nakhak*

The efforts of the *Söksil Academy* founders identified the educational background of Kim Wön-haeng and the origins of his idea on the

Different of Kim Ch'ang Hyöp and Kim Ch'ang Hüp), *Universitas: Monthly Review of Philosophy and Culture* 41-8(2014): 41-61.

35 Kwon Yo-yöng, "18 Sek Naknon-üi hakp'ung-kwa sasang-üi kyesüng yangsang" (The Intellectual Thought of *Nakhak* and the Intellectual Succession in the 18 Century), *Jindan Hakbo* 108(2008): 224-225.

36 Kim Wön-haeng, "Nyönbo pal"(Postscript of Biographical Chronicle), in *Nongamjip* (Literary Collection of Kim Ch'ang-hyöp), (Seoul: Minchok Munhwa Ch'uchinhoe, 2001), 36, 440-441.

37 Yi Tong-ku, "Kim Wonhang-üi silsim kangcho-wa Söksil söwon-esoüi kyoyuk hwaltong" (The Emphasize of Kim Wön-haeng's Silsim idea and Söksil Academy's Education Activities), *Chindan Hakpo* 88(1999): 232.

same nature between human beings and non-human beings. Evidence of his thought can be investigated by the writings on himself and his activities, such as his teaching and the discussion with other intellectuals about the ideology of Neo-Confucianism.

Firstly, the evidence of Kim's view on *Immul sŏngtongnon* can be identified by the Kim's response to Hyŏn Cha-kyŏng(玄子敬, about his points of views on *Sŏnghak sipto* (聖學十圖, Ten Diagrams of Sage-Learning).³⁸ A part of his elaboration on the diagram reflected his thought on the original nature of beings and inwardness as consistent with the idea of Yi Kan and Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp. He utilized the idea of Kim Ch'ang-hŭp to argue that all differences between different beings were shaped by *qi* but not *li*.³⁹ The *li* of all beings are still interchangeable and the same with each other.⁴⁰ It is a clear example to explain the argument of Kim Wŏn-haeng about the discussion of the difference in nature was similar with other *Nakhak* scholars' views.

In the literary collection of Kim Wŏn-haeng, it provided more evidence

38 To understand the significance of *The Ten Diagrams on Sage*, see Michael C. Kalton, *The Ten Diagrams on Sage Learning*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).

39 Kim Ch'ang-hŭp was one of the *Nakhak* scholars and he especially suggested to focus on the real landscape and sources for the paintings. His advocate influenced one of the famous artist, Chŏng Sŏn (鄭澈, 1676-1759). See Pak Ŭnsun, *Kŭmgang santo yŏnku* (Studies of Painting of Mountain), (Seoul: Ilchisa, 1997), 108-211.

40 "Master Kim Ch'ang-hŭp tried to elaborate it (*li* and *qi*) and said only apiece (各, *kak*) and one (一 *il*). Differences of *qi* were called as apiece and same *li* so it was called one. It is easy to understand. Today it do not discuss other issues and the main objective of the diagram is to exert the original kind of the nature. This nature can be applied to all beings in the world and all are same meaning and reasons." 「三淵從祖嘗論此，而曰只各一二字。氣異故曰各，理同故曰一，此言亦甚明白。今且未論其他，此圖全篇大意，只是發揮此性之本善，通天下萬物，皆是這一箇之義。」 See Kim Wŏn-haeng 金元行, "Tap Hyŏn Cha-gyŏng" (答玄子敬 Response to Hyŏn Cha-gyŏng), *Mihojip* (溪湖集 Literary Collection of Kim Wŏn-haeng), (Seoul: Minjok Munhwa Ch'ujinhoe, 2001), 7, 2b-3a.

to explain his thought on *Sōngbōm Simdongnon* (聖凡心同論, Ideology of Sage and Mortal Sharing the Same Inward Mind). He assumed that all human beings had the same inward mind and sages did not have the special inward mind to make them become a sage; and mortals had the opportunity to achieve sagehood because they shared the same inward mind.

Kim Wōn-haeng's statement to the *Sōksil Academy* students revealed Kim's argument that the inward mind of sages and mortals the same. The objective of this statement was to encourage the students to study hard because their efforts can make it possible to exhibit their original nature to become better and equal to a sage.

“Mencius said, ‘The sage and me are the same.’ Yan Hui said, ‘Who is Shun? Who is Yu? People who made significant contributions will also become such as Shun and Yu.’ Chengjian said, ‘They are men. I am a man. Why should I stand in awe of them?’ They had this discourse not just because they wanted to share their feelings but because they wanted to attract people to learn to be virtuous. It can be seen that the natures are the same and no different between each other, alas, my body is the same with a sage's. It is the most precious and significant idea in the world. So, how can we abandon ourselves to despair but not to learn to be a sage?” (孟子曰，聖人與我同類者。顏淵曰，舜何人也？予何人也？有爲者亦若是。成覲曰，彼丈夫也，我丈夫也，吾何畏彼哉。彼爲此說者，豈故爲是大談高論，以誘人而爲善也。誠有見乎此性之一同而無少差也，嗚呼，吾之身，既有與聖人同者。則天下之可貴可重，孰有大於此者，而尙可以安於暴棄而莫之反乎?)⁴¹

Therefore, Kim Wōn-haeng strongly emphasized the idea to learn from the inward mind of human beings because humans can exert their inward mind to become a sage. When he responded to Kim Tae-rae(金大來,

41 Kim Wōn-haeng, “Yu Sōksil sōnwon kangsaeng” (論石室書院講生 Decree to Students of Seoksil College), *Mihochip*, 14, 24b-25a.

1729-?), Kim Wŏn-haeng said that if you do not practice your inward mind to learn, you cannot get any good results. Practicing your inward mind is the most meaningful idea.⁴² It can be understood that Kim Wŏn-haeng believed that mortals had the same inward mind as a sage and they can practice their inward mind to become better.

But what is the exact way for people to practice their inward mind to learn? Kim's response to his student Yi Sŏngbo(李城輔, 1738-1811) revealed the answer to this question.⁴³ Kim said, "Authentically focusing on learning, respecting and practicing." (著實讀書, 兼實持敬, 著實力行。)⁴⁴

In the point of view of Kim Wŏn-haeng, intellectuals should sincerely learn knowledge from a practical perspective and also seek opportunities to practice making contributions to society. It is also revealed that Kim Wŏn-haeng's advocate succeeded the idea of leading scholars of *Nakhak*, such as Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp.⁴⁵

All in all, Kim Wŏn-haeng stood in a prominent role for elaborating the idea of earlier scholars of *Nakhak*, such as his grandfather Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp as well as Yi Kan and attempted to establish the system of *Nakhak* for identifying the original nature between human beings and things being the same.⁴⁶ He also based on those scholars the suggestion of practicing their inward mind to learn because that is the way for a mortal to become a sage. Although some current research debated that Kim Wŏn-haeng was not that different from other *Nakhak* scholars, this article aims to identify

42 「而顧學者, 不能實心實力, 未見其驗耳, 此實心二字, 最有味。」 Kim Wŏn-haeng, "Tap Kim Dae-nae" (答金大來 Response to Kim Tae-nae), *Mihochip*, 8, 11b.

43 Cho Sŏng-san, "18 seki nakronkye hakmaek-ŭi pyŏnmoyangsang yŏnku" (Study on Aspect of Transformation of Nak School in the 18th Century), *Yŏksa kyoyuk* 102(2007): 93.

44 Kim Wŏn-haeng, "Tap Yi Sŏngbo" (答李城輔, Response to I Sŏngbo), *Mihochip*, 11, 227-228.

45 Yi Ch'ŏn-sŭng, "Nongam Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp-ŭi simsŏngnon-e taehan yŏn'gu," 201-230.

46 Cho Sŏng-san 趙成山, "18 seki nakronkye hakmaek-ŭi pyŏnmoyangsang yŏnku," 68-69.

the relation between *Nakhak* and *Pukhak* and therefore his general knowledge about *Immul sōngtongnon* and *Sōngbōm Simdongnon* were still prominent because the knowledge inspired Hong Tae-yong and other *Pukhak* scholars to develop the ideas of the Northerners.

Hong Tae-yong's Acceptance of Kim Wōn-haeng's Viewpoints

It was clearly understood that Kim Wōn-haeng's thought was representative of *Nakhak* scholars. He tried to elaborate on the idea of *Immul sōngtongnon* and educated his students on *Immul sōngdong non* at *Sōksil Academy*. One of his students Hong Tae-yong was greatly influenced by Kim Wōn-haeng and based his thoughts to make a significant contribution to Chosōn intellectual history. The advocate shaped Hong and other scholars who shared the same thought to learn from Qing China, and became categorized as the school of *Pukhak*.

In this part, I will focus on the writing of Hong Tae-yong to trace how the thought of Kim Wōn-haeng affected Hong Tae-yong to form the ideology of *Pukhak*. The acceptance of Hong Tae-yong on the thought of Kim Wōn-haeng will help us to understand how *Nakhak* was one of the intellectual factors of the formation and establishment of the *Pukhak* School but this article does not aim to simplify the origins of *Pukhak*. It was not difficult to know the various factors that shaped the establishment of *Pukhak* during the 18th century in Chosōn and therefore I have only attempted to remind the academy that *Nakhak* ideas should not be ignored and it was one of the intellectual factors of the origin of the *Pukhak* School.

Hong was a student of Kim because the Hong family and Kim family had close relationships with each other and therefore Hong Tae-yong was sent to *Sōksil Academy*.⁴⁷ One of the elders of the Hong family, Hong Ku-jo(洪龜祚, 1683-?) was the father-in-law of Kim Wōn-haeng.⁴⁸ It should also be noted that Hong Tae-yong's grandfather, Hong Yong-jo(洪龍祚, 1686-1741) was one of the closest friends of Kim Wōn-haeng. Kim

Wŏn-haeng was the author of the eulogy of Hong Yong-jo. Therefore, this evidence explained that the relationship between the families was intimate. In the eulogy of Hong Yong-jo, Kim Wŏn-haeng cherished the memory of the life with Hong Yong-jo and appreciated him for the contribution of Hong Yong-jo on Chosŏn Court.⁴⁹

Due to this family background, it was arranged for Hong Tae-yong to study at *Sŏksil Academy* during his teen years and he learned the classics of Confucianism through the teachings of Kim Wŏn-haeng. Kim did not only focus on the civil service examination but focused on the practical learning at *Sŏksil College*. This education and training helped Hong to understand the classics of Neo-Confucianism as well as the adaptation of that knowledge in a practical way.⁵⁰ In the literary collection of Hong Tae-yong, it can be easily identified that Hong Tae-yong appreciated his studies and learning at *Sŏksil Academy* and he especially mentioned that it was not easy for him to meet his classmates and teachers at *Sŏksil Academy*.⁵¹ This evidence helps us to understand that Hong Tae-yong enjoyed his learning and appreciated his teachers and classmates at *Sŏksil Academy*.

Hong's appreciation of his teacher Kim Wŏn-haeng is reflected in his writings on Kim's eulogy. In this eulogy, Hong Tae-yong said, "Master Kim became my teacher. It was a precious opportunity in the past thou-

47 Cho Sŏng-san, "18seki hupan Sŏksil sŏwŏn-kwa chisik chisikin-ŭi chaesaengsan" (The Seokshil Seowon and Reproduction of Knowledge and Intellectual in the late 18th century), *Yŏksa-wa tamron* 66(2013): 168.

48 Law Lok-yin, "Qingdai Chaoxian ren xiyangguan de xingcheng," 314.

49 Kim Wŏn-haeng, "Che kamsa Honggong yongcho mun" (祭監司洪公龍祚文, Funeral Oration for Hong Yong-jo), *Mihochip*, 20, 8a-9a.

50 Cho Sŏng-san, "18seki hupan Sŏksil sŏwŏn-kwa chisik chisikin-ŭi chaesaengsan," 167-208.

51 See Hong Tae-yong(洪大容), "Misang kimun" (滄上記聞, Notes for Learning from Kim Wŏn-haeng), *Tamhŏnsŏ*(湛軒書), (Seoul: Minchok Munhwa Ch'uchinhoe, 2001), Internal Volume 1, 55a-58b.

sand years.”(得先生爲師，真是千載一遇)⁵² These examples provided evidences to identify that the thought of Hong Tae-yong and his origins for participating in the mission of *Yonhaengsa* (燕行使 Diplomatic Mission to Beijing) were related to the thought of Kim Wŏn-haeng.

If we compare the writings between Hong and Kim, it is not difficult to trace their points of view on the original natures between human beings and animals. Hong Tae-yong said,

“Five principal relationships and five human behaviors are human beings’ rituals and righteousness. Walking together and shouting loudly to find food are animals’ rituals and righteousness. Grove and Calyx growing luxuriantly are vegetation’s rituals and righteousness. People view on animals. People must be precious but animals are humble. Animals view on people. Animals must be precious but people are humble. Heaven view on them. They are equal.”(五倫五事，人之禮義也。群行呶哺，禽獸之禮義也。叢苞條暢，草木之禮義也。以人視物，人貴而物賤。以物視人，物貴而人賤。自天而視之，人與物均也。)⁵³

He agreed that human and animal natures are the same. This idea was definitely affected by Kim Wŏn-haeng who provided Hong a strong background for identifying the original natures of human beings and things.⁵⁴ Based on Kim Wŏn-haeng’s thought, Hong Tae-yong converted

52 See Hong Tae-yong, “Che Miho Kim sŏnsaeng mun”(祭漢湖金先生文, Funeral Oration for Kim Wŏn-haeng), *Tamhŏnsŏ*, Internal Volume 4, 3b-4a.

53 Hong Tae-yong, “Ŭisanmundap,” *Tamhŏnsŏ*, Internal Volume 4, 18b.

54 Lee Yun-Do(李演都), “Zhanxuan Hongdarong de 'renwujun' lun tanjiu: Chaoxian honqi renwu xingtongyi lunzheng de yanbian yu qi yiyi” (湛軒洪大容的「人物均」論探究—朝鮮後期人物性同異論爭的演變與其意義: A Study on Dam-Hun's Theory of "Equality of Human Being and the Other Living Things"—The Change of "Inmulŏngdongiron" and Its Significance in the Late Chosŏn Dynasty), *Universitas: Monthly Review of Philosophy and Culture* 41-8(2014): 99-113.

Kim's idea to establish his influential and significant viewpoint for original nature.⁵⁵

“What is human nature and how can we know human nature is kind? When a man sees a child fall into a well, he will without exception experience a feeling of alarm and distress. It can be said that this is conscience. If someone likes playing and benefits and this is also naturally reflected from heart and isn't planned, why is it is not conscience? Nature was the principle. Goodness and evil -- how can we achieve them? When we talked about human-heartedness and righteousness, propriety and reasonability will be inside it. When we talked about Human-heartedness, righteousness will be inside it. Human being has human principle and animal has their principle. What is principle? It is human-heartedness. In heaven, it is principle. In thing, it is nature. In heaven, there are four seasons, spring, summer, autumn and winter. (won, hyŏng, li, jŏng, 元亨利貞) Among things, there is human-heartedness, righteousness, propriety, reasonability. (in, ũi, lye, chi, 仁義禮智) Actually, they are the same. Trees and grass cannot be said that they don't have feelings. After the rain, buds sprout and there is a feeling of alarm and distress. After snowing, branches and leaves are defoliated and it is a feeling of shame. Human-heartedness is righteousness and righteousness is human-heartedness. Principle is the same. All the things are only human-heartedness and righteousness. The great world is only human-heartedness and righteousness. No need to make it greater or smaller.”(所謂性者，何以見其善乎？見孺子入井，有惻隱之心，則固可謂之本心。若見玩好而利心生，油然直遂，不暇安排，則何得謂之

55 Hong Jung-geun, “Chosŏn huki Sŏngnihakp'a-wa silhakpa-ŭi insŏngmul sŏngnon: Nokmun, Nosa, Tamhŏn, Tasan-ŭl chungsim-ŭro” (The Similarity and Difference of Natural Tendency between Humans and Things: among thoughts of Lim Sŏng-chu, Ki Chŏng-jin, Hong Tae-yong and Chŏng Yakyong), *Hankuk Sasang Sahak* 24(2005):79-87.

非本心乎。且性者，一身之理而理無聲臭矣。善惡二字，將何以着得耶，言仁義則禮智在其中，言仁則義亦在其中。仁者理也，人有人之理，物有物之理。所謂理者，仁而已矣。在天曰理，在物曰性。在天曰元亨利貞，在物曰仁義禮智，其實一也。草木不可謂全無知覺，雨露既零，萌芽發生者，惻隱之心也。霜雪既降，枝葉搖落者，羞惡之心也。仁即義義即仁，理也者，一而已矣，毫釐之微，只此仁義也。天地之大，只此仁義也。大而不加，小而不減，至矣乎。⁵⁶

Hong Tae-yong based the idea of human beings and things sharing the same original nature to develop a significant thought to accept the barbarians and Qing China even though other Chosŏn intellectuals still despised the culture of Qing China.⁵⁷ It is because Hong Tae-yong was inspired by Kim Wŏn-haeng and tried to explain that not only human beings, but also vegetation and animals had the inward mind and the same original natures. The same nature between human beings and things caused Hong Tae-yong to believe that different people can also have the same nature. He thought that intellectuals should not despise the culture of Qing China and suggested to learn from Qing China as well as observe the society of China. Therefore, he wrote about the culture of Qing in his *Yŏnhaengrok* instead of the visiting route or rituals.⁵⁸

It was the main idea which was shared by the scholars of the *Pukhak* school. It was not only because the high Qing era witnessed an improved economy and society of China,⁵⁹ but also Hong Tae-yong developed the idea of *Nakhak* to accept the Qing Chinese culture as well as suggested

56 Hong Tae-yong, "Simsŏngmun" (心性問, Questions about Mind and Nature), *Tamhŏnsŏ*, Internal Volume 1, 1b.

57 See Kim To-hwan, "Pukpŏron-kwa Hong Tae-yong-ŭi kwairon" (Discourse of Northern Expedition and Hong Tae-yong's Discourse on Chinese-Barbarians Relations), *Hankuk Sasang Sahak* 15(2000): 225-254.

58 Jung Jae-Hoon, "Meeting the World through Eighteenth-century Yŏnhaeng," *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies*, 23-1(2010): 51-69.

59 Song Huijuan, *Qing dai Zhong Chao zongfan guanxi shanbian*, 99-100.

visits to Beijing. How did the advocacy of *Nakhak* shape the idea of *Pukhak*? A dialogue created by Hong Tae-yong after his Beijing trip which was called *Questions and Answers at Ŭisan* (鑿山問答, *Ŭisanmuntap*) provided the answer to this question.⁶⁰ It was a dialogue between two people, Sirong (實翁) and Hŏja (虛子). Sirong who lived in a mountain named Ŭisan and Hŏja was a Chosŏn scholar. In the dialogue, Hŏja was the self-reflection of the early education life of Hong Tae-yong and Sirong reflected his thought after his Beijing visit. In the discussion, Hŏja asked Sirong a lot of questions and one of the significant and influential debates is the discussion about the differences and similarities between Hwa(華, Chinese) and Yi (夷, Barbarians).⁶¹

Hŏja asked Sirong about when Confucius wrote *Chunqiu*, and he focused on the division of Chinese and Barbarians in a clear and strict way. That means Chinese were on the inside, and the four barbarians were on the outside. (虛子曰: 「孔子作春秋, 內中國而外四夷, 夫華夷之分, 如是其嚴。」)⁶²

And then Sirong answered,

“All living and bleeding who are born from the heaven and cultivated by the ground, they all are human beings. No matter raising themselves above the crowd or managing one place, they all are emperors. No matter closing their gates or protecting their territories, they all are states. No matter wearing different crowns or putting dif-

60 The review of current researches of Questions and Answers at Ŭisan, see Kim Jung-ho, “Hong Tae-yong Ŭisanmundap- ũi chŏngch’isasangiŏk t’ŭksŏng-kwa ũiŭi” (Political Characteristics and Significances of Hong Tae Yong’s Ŭisanmundap), *Tongyang jŏngch’i sasangsa*, 6-1(2007): 111-133.

61 Woo Jee-young, “Mundapsik sanmun-ŭi ch’angjak chŏnt’ong-esŏ koch’alhan Hong Taeyong- ũi Ŭisanmundap” (Hong Daeyong’s Ŭisanmundap considering in interlocutory prose’s creation tradition), *Tongbanganmunhak*, 52(2012): 185-212.

62 See Hong Tae-yong, “Ŭisanmundap,” *Tamhŏnsŏ*, Internal Volume 4, 36b.

ferent tattoo, they all are customs. How can it be divided by inside and outside if looking at them from heaven's perspective? Everyone loved their people. Everyone respected their emperors. Everyone protected their states. Everyone maintained their customs. Chinese and Barbarians are the same.” (實翁曰：「天之所生，地之所養，凡有血氣，均是人也。出類拔華，制治一方，均是君王也。重門深濠，謹守封疆，均是邦國也。章甫委貌，文身雕題，均是習俗也。自天視之，豈有內外之分哉？是以各親其人，各尊其君，各守其國。各安其俗。華夷一也。」)⁶³

It was easy and clear to understand that Hong Tae-yong utilized the story of Silong and Hōcha to reconstruct the relationships between Chinese and Barbarians based on his original theory that the natures of human beings and things are the same. Human beings were Chinese and Barbarians were animals. In Hong Tae-yong's view, no differences were found and he based this on a new ideology for understanding Qing culture to encourage other Chosŏn intellectuals to visit Beijing, and he formed some intellectual theories about establishing the school of *Pukhak*.⁶⁴ Therefore, the above elaboration provided a clear context for identifying the intellectual background of Hong and it showed that his idea was greatly influenced by *Nakhak*.

During the 17th century in Chosŏn, many Korean intellectuals held prejudiced points of view on Manchu and Qing China. It was because they believed that the Qing rebelled against the Ming and it was a barbarian behavior. Those intellectuals assumed that it violated traditional thought for *Hwayi chilsŏ* (華夷秩序, Chinese-Barbarian Order).⁶⁵ They did not agree that traditional Chinese culture was still maintained during the Qing and they

63 Hong Tae-yong, “Ŭisanmundap” *Tamhŏnsŏ*, Internal Volume 4, 36b.

64 Hong never thought that he was one of the leading scholars of the intellectual school but a lot of scholars proved that his articles urged them to learn from the society of Qing China. One of the examples was Pak Che-ka. See Michael C. Kalton, “An Introduction to Silhak,” 37-38.

resisted learning any new idea and knowledge from Qing China because it was impossible to learn from barbarians.⁶⁶ However, Hong craved an opportunity to visit China to answer this question. In 1765, his uncle Hong Ōk, (洪億, 1722-1809) who was selected as the secretary of the mission to Beijing and Hong utilized this chance to visit Beijing.⁶⁷ The *Yŏnhaeng* activities of Hong Tae-yong can help to understand how Hong Tae-yong gradually accepted the culture of Qing.⁶⁸

Hong's ideas and his visit to Beijing established a new way for Chosŏn intellectuals to re-examine their understanding on Chineseness as well as the importance of Qing Chinese culture. In China, Hong not only learned new Western knowledge included religious culture and technologies from the European missionaries and other Chinese intellectuals in Beijing,⁶⁹ but also admired the wealthy and prosperous society of Beijing. Therefore, he believed that Chosŏn intellectuals should learn the ways of Qing China

65 Sun Weiguo (孫衛國), *Daming qihao yu xiao zhonghua yishi: Chaoxian wangchao zunzhou siming wenti yanjiu, 1637-1800* (大明旗號與小中華意識——朝鮮王朝尊周思明問題研究 (1637-1800) The Banner of the Great Ming and the Idea of Little China: The Chosŏn Dynasty's Admiration of China and Memory of the Ming, 1637-1800), (Beijing: Shangwu yishuguan, 2007).

66 Sun Weiguo, "An Analysis of the 'Little China' Ideology of Chosŏn Korea", *The Frontier History of China* 7.2(2012): 220-239.

67 "Sunŭikun Hwon (順義君坦, 1708-) will be the leader of envoy of appreciation and winter. Kim Sŏn-hang 金善行 will be the deputy envoy of mission and Hong Ōk will be the secretary of mission." See *Sŭngchŏngwon ilgi* (承政院日記, The Daily Records of Royal Secretariat of Chosŏn Dynasty), (Seoul: National Institute of Korean History, 1961), 69, 22-6-1765, 1244. Hong Tae-yong used the title of the private military officer of Hong Ōk to participate in this mission. See Law Lok-yin, "Qingdai Chaoxian ren xiyangguan de xingcheng, 321.

68 Ch'oe So-ja, "18 seki Kim Ch'ang-ŏp, Hong Tae-yong, Pak Chi-wŏn-ŭi Chunggukinsik" (Kim Ch'ang-ŏp, Hong Tae-yong, Pak Chi-wŏn's Understandings of the 18th Century China), *Journal of Ming-Qing Historical Studies* 32(2009): 1-37.

69 See Donald Baker, "Jesuit Science through Korean Eyes," *Journal of Korean Studies* 4 (1982), 207-239.

to reform society.⁷⁰ Hong's position converted the intellectual tradition of Neo-Confucianism in 18th century Chosŏn.

Kim Wŏn-haeng was the renowned scholar in Chosŏn intellectual history and he consolidated the influence of the idea of *Nakhak* in the early 18th century.⁷¹ However, his more significant contribution for history was teaching another significant intellectual, Hong Tae-yong, the prominent *Pukhak* scholars who suggested learning from Qing China because Chinese and Barbarians are the same. One should not discriminate or condemn Qing culture and society. Although Hong was affected by different factors to shape his ideology of *Hwayi ilya* (華夷一也, Chinese and Barbarians are one),⁷² one of the reasons for the formation of Hong Tae-yong's *Pukhak* thought was the influence of *Nakhak* ideas and Kim Wŏn-haeng's education. This article provided examples to reveal how the close relationship between Kim and Hong re-constructed the reasons of the formation of *Pukhak* School in Chosŏn intellectual history.

70 See Song Young-bae, "Countering Sinocentrism in Eighteenth Century Korea: Hong Tae-yong's Vision of 'Relativism' and Iconoclasm for Reform," *Philosophical East and West* 49-3 (1999): 278-297.

71 Kim's another prominent contribution for the development of Neo-Confucianism was suggesting the way of practical learning on knowledge of Confucianism classics. He believed that the knowledge of civil services examination was useless and scholars in Chosŏn should adopt and practice the knowledge to the society. See Yi Tong-ku, "Kim Wonhang-ŭi silsim kangcho-wa Sŏksil sŏwon-esoŭi kyoyuk hwal-tong," 231-248.

72 Some scholars mentioned that Kim Ch'ang-ŏp (金昌業, 1658-1721) also influenced Hong Tae-yong's thought and activities. See Liu Lin 劉琳, "Hongdarong yu Qinwangzi Lianghun de youqing ji Lianghun de zhenshi shenfen kao" (洪大容與清王子「兩渾」的友情及「兩渾」的真實身份考, Friendships between Hong Tae-yong and Qing Prince Lianghun and the Study of Real Identity of Lianghun), *The Journal of Chinese Historical Researches* 95(2015): 66.

Conclusion

According to much research, the *Pukhak* ideology of Hong Tae-yong was influenced by Na Kyŏng-jŏk (羅景績, 1690-1762) because Hong learned different kinds of practical technology and skills as well as Western knowledge from Na.⁷³ They also believed that Hong Tae-yong was influenced by his childhood interest on the six arts.⁷⁴ This idea was affected by Yi Song(李淞)'s writings for the grave marker of Hong Tae-yong. He mentioned that Hong Tae-yong was particularly interested in traditional learning of the six arts as well as some other practical learning, such as the knowledge of Yijing(易經) theory, music and astronomy, thus prompting Hong to accompany his uncle to Beijing.⁷⁵

However, the studies of Hong Tae-yong's life and thought indicate that his studying at *Sŏksil Academy* and the teaching of Kim Wŏn-haeng was one of the main origins of Hong's idea of *Hwayi ilya*, and of course this idea induced other *Pukhak* scholars to propagate the advantages to learn the new knowledge from China in the late 18th century.

Nakhak was the intellectual school of Neo-Confucianism and they had a variety of advocates for the society and politics of Chosŏn as well as the intellectual elaboration of Neo-Confucianism. *Immul sŏngtongnon* was only of the advocates of the Nakhak scholars. However, the *Immul sŏngtongnon* inspired the students of those Nakhak scholars, such as Hong

73 Na Kyŏng-jŏk was a scientist and interested in the manufacture of chime clocks and armillary spheres. Hong Tae-yong greatly emphasized his visit and learning experience to the workplace of Na Kyŏng-jŏk and it can be reflected by his records for conversation by writing with his Chinese friends. See Law Lok-yin, "Qingdai Chaoxian ren xiyangguan de xingcheng," 318.

74 Six arts were the skills that the traditional Confucianism purposed to learn which the basic skills were for the educated human beings. See Jin Changzheng (金常政). *Baike quanshu de gushi* (百科全書的故事, The Story of Encyclopedia), (Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 2005), 6.

75 See Yi Song, "Tamhŏn Hongtokpo myop'yo," (湛軒洪德保墓表, Hong Tae-yong's Grave List), *Tamhŏnsŏ*, Appendix, 2a-3a.

Tae-yong who based their ideas on Kim Wŏn-haeng's development of the idea of *Hwayi ilya*. Of course, there are different explanations for the origins of the rise of the Pukhak School but the discourses of Hong Tae-yong reveal that his intellectual and philosophical origin of *Hwayi ilya* should be related to Kim Wŏn-haeng's thought. Therefore, the intellectual influences of Nakhak scholars on Pukhak should not be overlooked.

Works Cited

1. Baker, Donald. "Jesuit Science through Korean Eyes." *Journal of Korean Studies*, 4(1982): 207-239.
2. Cho, Hyun Keol. "Yuam Song Siyŏl- ūi Ch'unch'u taeŭi sasang" (A Study on the Confucian Thought of Righteousness in U-Am Song Si-Yŏl). *The Journal of International Relations* 14.2(2011): 285-306.
3. Cho, Sŏng-san. "18 seki hupan Sŏksil sŏwŏn-kwa chisik chisikin- ūi chaesaengsan" (The Seokshil Seowon and Reproduction of Knowledge and Intellectual in the late 18th century). *Yŏksa-wa tamron* 66(2013): 167-208.
4. Cho, Sŏng-san. "18 seki nakronkye hakmaek-ŭi pyŏnmo yangsang yŏnku" (Study on Aspect of Transformation of Nak School in the 18th Century), *Yŏksa kyoyuk* 102(2007): 63-95.
5. Ch'oe, So-ja. "18 seki Kim Ch'ang--ŏp, Hong Tae-yong, Pak Chi-wŏn-ŭi Chunggukinsik" (Kim Ch'ang--ŏp, Hong Tae-yong, Pak Chi-wŏn's Understandings of the 18th Century China). *Journal of Ming-Qing Historical Studies* 32(2009): 1-37.
6. Choi, Young-jin. "The Horak Debate in Eighteenth-Century Joseon." *Korea Journal* 51.1(2011): 5-13.
7. Chung, Chung-ho. "Practical Learning and Literature in the Eighteenth-century Chosun Korea: Pak Chega's Literary Appropriation of Northern Learning." *Pikyo munhak* 47(2009): 51-63.
8. Deuchler, Martina. *The Confucian Transformation of Korea: A*

- Study of Society and Ideology*. Cambridge, MA: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1992.
9. Fan, Wing-chung (范永聰), *Shida yu baoguo: Yuan Ming zhiji de Zhong Han guanxi*, (Serving the Great and Protecting the State: Sino-Korean Relations in Yuan-Ming Era). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Educational Publishing, 2009.
 10. Hong, Jung-geun. "Chosŏn huki Sŏngnihakp'a-wa silhakpa-ŭi insŏngmulsŏngnon: Nokmun, Nosa, Tamhŏn, Tasan-ŭl chungsim-ŭro" (The Similarity and Difference of Natural Tendency between Humans and Things: among thoughts of Lim Sŏng-chu, Ki Chŏng-jin, Hong Tae-yong and Chŏng Yakyong). *Hankuk Sasang Sahak* 24(2005): 79-87.
 11. Hong, JungGeun. "Horakronpyŏn-ŭi sŏngkwa-wa chŏnmang" (Horak Debate Research Outcome and Forecast). *Yukyŏ sasang yŏnku* 儒教思想研究 44 (2011): 75-103.
 12. Hong, Tae-yong. *Tamhŏnsŏ* (湛軒書). Seoul: Minchok Munhwa Ch'uchinhoe, 2001.
 13. Huh, Nam-jin. "Two Aspects of Practical Learning (Shirhak; 實學)." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 14(2001): 203-231.
 14. Jin, Changzheng (金常政). *Baike quanshu de gushi* (The Story of Encyclopedia). Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 2005.
 15. Jin, Xi-de. "The 'Four-Seven Debate' and the School of Principle in Korea" *Philosophy East and West* 37-4(1987): 347-360.
 16. Jung, Jae-Hoon. "Meeting the World through Eighteenth-century Yŏnhaeng." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 23-1(2010): 51-69.
 17. Kalton, Michael C. *The Ten Diagrams on Sage Learning*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
 18. Kim, Ch'ang-hyŏp. *Nongamjip* (Literary Collection of Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp). Seoul: Minchok Munhwa Ch'uchinhoe, 2001.
 19. Kim, Cheol-woon. "Nongyan Jin Changxie, Sanyuan Jin Changxi 'renxing yu wuxing tonglun zhi yanjiu'" (A Study on the Theory of Whether Human Nature and Things Nature Are Same or Different of Kim Ch'ang Hyŏp and Kim Ch'ang Hŭp), *Universitas: Monthly*

Review of Philosophy and Culture 41-8(2014): 41-61.

20. Kim, Jung-ho. Hong Tae-yong Ŭisanmundap- ũi chŏngch'isasangjŏk t'ŭksŏng-kwa ũiŭi (Political Characteristics and Significances of Hong Tae Yong's Ŭisanmundap), *Tongyang jŏngch'i sasangsa* 6-1(2007): 111-133.
21. Kim, Sangyong. *Sŏnwon yuko* (Manuscripts of Kim Sangyang). Seoul: Minjok Munhwa Ch'ujinhoe, 2001.
22. Kim, To-hwan. "Pukpŏron-kwa Hong Tae-yong-ũi kwairon" (Discourse of Northern Expedition and Hong Tae-yong's Discourse on Chinese-Barbarians Relations). *Hankuk Sasang Sahak* 15(2000): 225-254.
23. Kim, Won-hang. *Mihojip* (漢湖集, Literary Collection of Kim Wŏn-haeng). Seoul: Minjok Munhwa Ch'ujinhoe, 2001.
24. Ko, Che-ŭk. "Daolun: Renwuxing tongyi lunzheng zai Hanguo ruxueshi shang de yiyi: renwuxing tongyilun zhi fasheng, zhankai ji yiyi" (The Origin, development, and significance of the theory of whether human nature and things nature are same or different in the History of Korean Confucianism). *Universitas: Monthly Review of Philosophy and Culture* 41.8(2014): 3-21.
25. Kwon, Yo-yŏng. "18 Sek Naknon-ũi hakt'ung-kwa sasang-ũi kyesŭng yangsang" (The Intellectual Thought of Nakhak and the Intellectual Succession in the 18 Century), *Jindan Hakbo*, 108(2008): 193-229.
26. Law, Lok-yin (羅樂然). "Qingdai Chaoxian ren xiyangguan de xingcheng" (The Shaping of Joseon Views of the West during the Qing Dynasty: Based on Hong Tae-yong Mission to Beijing). *Taiwan Journal of East Asian Studies* 10-1(2013): 299-345.
27. Ledyard, Gari. "Hong Taeyong and His Peking Memoir." *Korean Studies* 6 (1982): 63-103.
28. Lee, Hung-tae. "Hong Tae-yong's Beijing Travels and His Changing Perception of the West-Focusing on Eulbyeong yeonhangnok and Uisan mundap." *Review of Korean Studies* 9:4 (2006): 45-62.
29. Lee, Kyungku. "The Horak Debate from the Reign of King

- Sukjong to King Sunjo.” *Korea Journal* 51.1(2011): 14-41.
30. Lee, Peter H. and de Bary, Wm. Theodore. *Sources of Korean Tradition Vol.II*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
 31. Lee, Yun-Do. “Zhanxuan Hongdarong de 'renwujun' lun tanjiu: Chaoxian honqi renwu xingtongyi lunzheng de yanbian yu qi yiyi” (A Study on Dam-Hun's Theory of "Equality of Human Being and the Other Living Things"--The Change of "Inmulsŏngdongiron" and Its Significance in the Late Chosŏn Dynasty). *Universitas: Monthly Review of Philosophy and Culture* 41-8(2014): 99-113.
 32. Li, Yingshun. “Chaoxian beixuepai shixue sixiang yu zhu shixue liupai de guanxi” (The Relationships between Silhak School and the Thought of Chosŏn Pukhak School's Practical Learning). *Dongjiang Journal* 26-2 (2009): 13-20.
 33. Lin, Yuehui (林月惠). “Jin Ch'angxie lun zhijue” (Kim Ch'anghyŏp's Discussion on Consciousness). In *Chaoxian ruzhe dui rujia chuantong de jieshi* (The Chosŏn Confucians Explanation on Confucianism Tradition), Huang Junjie (黃俊傑) ed., 91-136. Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2012.
 34. Liu, Lin (劉琳). “Hongdarong yu Qinwangzi Lianghun de youqing ji Lianghun de zhenshi shenfen kao” (洪大容與清王子「兩渾」的友情及「兩渾」的真實身份考, Friendships between Hong Tae-yong and Qing Prince Lianghun and the Study of Real Identity of Lianghun). *The Journal of Chinese Historical Researches* 95(2015): 65-86.
 35. Lyu, Seung-kuk (柳承國). *Hanguo ruxue shi* (韓國儒學史, The History of Korean Confucianism). Fu Jigong (傅濟功) trans. Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press, 1989.
 36. Nahm, Andrew C. *Korea: Tradition & Transformation*. Seoul: Hollym International, 2004.
 37. Pak, Ŭn-sun, *Kŭmgangsanto yŏnku* (Studies of Painting of Mountain). Seoul: Ilchisa, 1997.
 38. Pan, Changhe. “Bei xuepai de shixue sixiang ji qi qimeng yiyi” (The Practical Learning Thought of Pukhak and Its Significances

- of the Enlightenment). *Dongjiang Journal* 1991.2(1991): 44-50.
39. Setton, Mark. "Factional Politics and Philosophical Development in the Late Chosŏn." *Journal of Korean Studies* 8(1992): 37-80.
40. Song, Huijuan (宋慧娟), *Qing dai Zhong Chao zongfan guanxi shanbian* (清代中朝宗藩關係嬗變, Transformation of Sino-Korean Tributary Relations in Qing Dynasty) Zhangchun: Jilin daxue chubanshe, 2007.
41. Song, Si-yŏl. *Songja Daejeon*. Seoul: Minjok Munhwa Ch'ujinhoe, 2001.
42. Song, Young-bae. "Countering Sinocentrism in Eighteenth Century Korea: Hong Tae-yong's Vision of 'Relativism' and Iconoclasm for Reform." *Philosophical East and West*. 49.3(1999): 278-297.
43. Sun, Weiguo. "An Analysis of the 'Little China' Ideology of Chosŏn Korea", *The Frontier History of China* 7.2(2012): 220-239.
44. Sun, Weiguo (孫衛國). *Daming qihao yu xiao zhonghua yishi: Chaoxian wangchao zunzhou siming wenti yanjiu, 1637-1800* (大明旗號與小中華意識——朝鮮王朝尊周思明問題研究[1637-1800] The Banner of the Great Ming and the Idea of Little China: The Chosŏn Dynasty's Admiration of China and Memory of the Ming, 1637-1800). Beijing: Shangwu yishuguan, 2007.
45. *Sŭngchŏngwon ilki* (The Daily Records of Royal Secretariat of Chosŏn Dynasty). Seoul: National Institute of Korean History, 1961.
46. Woo, Jee-young. "Mundapsik sanmun-ŭi ch'angjak chŏnt'ong-esŏ koch'alhan Hong Taeyong- ŭi Ŭisanmundap" (Hong Daeyong's Ŭisanmundap considering in interlocutory prose's creation tradition). *Tongbanghanmunhak*, 52(2012): 185-212.
47. Yi, Chŏn-sŭng. "Nongam Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp-ŭi simsŏngnon-e taehan yŏn'gu" (A Study on Kim Ch'ang-hyŏp's Theory of Mind and Nature). PhD Diss., Sungkyunkwan University, 2004.
48. Yi, Sang-ik. "Nakhak-esŏ Pukhak-ŭro ŭi sasangjŏng palchŏn" The Development of the Thought of Northern Learning in the Ideology

of Nakhak). *Ch'ŏlhak* 46(1996): 5-34.

49. Yi, Sŏng-mu. *Hankuk ūi kwakŏ cheto* (Civil Service Examination System of Korea. Seoul: Chimuntang, 2000.
50. Yi, Tong-ku. "Kim Wonhang-ŭi silsim kangcho-wa Sŏksil sŏwon-esoŭi kyoyuk hwaltong" (The Emphasize of Kim Won-hang's Silsim idea and Sŏksil Academy's Education Activities). *Chindan Hakpo* 88(1999): 231-248.
51. Yu, Ponghak, "Pukhak sasang-ŭi hyŏngsŏng-kwa kŭ song-kyŏng: tamhŏn Hong Tae-yong-kaw Yŏn-am Pak Chi-wŏn-ŭl chungsim ũ-ro" (The Shape and Characteristics of the Northern Learning's Thought: By the Case of Hong Tae-yong and Pak Chi-wŏn). *Hankuksaron*. 8(1982): 183-245.
52. Yun, Kyŏng-ho. "Sŏksilsŏwon-ŭi Kŏnnip-kwa Kyoyukpang pŏp"(The Establishment of *Sŏksil Academy* and its Teaching Methods). *Toegye-hak Nonchong* 22(2013): 163-186.

<Abstract>

Kim Wŏn-haeng's Intellectual Influences on Hong Tae-yong: The Case of Relations between *Nakhak* and *Pukhak*

Login Lok-yin Law

In the 18th century Chosŏn (1392-1910), some scholars, such as Hong Tae-yong (1731-1783) advocated that Chosŏn should learn the advantages of the Qing (1644-1912) society to reform the social structure and government of Chosŏn. The school of these advocates has been known as *Pukhak* by historians. The intellectual factors of the school of *Pukhak*'s formation and development have been overlooked by the academia of Chosŏn intellectual history. In fact, *Pukhak* was closely related to the idea of the school of *Nakhak* which believed that nature of things was equivalent to humans.

Kim Wŏn-haeng, was one of the supporters of *Nakhak* and Hong Tae-yong was one of the students of Kim. Hong's thought and writing exposed that his thought was profoundly influenced by Kim Wŏn-haeng. Hong was deemed to be the first prominent scholar of the *Pukhak* School during the 18th century Chosŏn. Hong and other scholars of *Pukhak* advocated learning the new knowledge from Qing China even though it was a barbarian society. Therefore, this paper will investigate the intellectual relationships between Hong Tae-yong and Kim Wŏn-haeng to reveal how intellectuals of *Nakhak* shaped the formation of *Pukhak* School and exposed the idea of learning from Qing China.

Keywords: *Pukhak*, History of Chosŏn Confucianism, Hong Tae-yong, Kim Wŏn-haeng, *Nakhak*

〈국문초록〉

홍대용에 대한 김원행의 지적영향: 낙학과 북학의 사례를 중심으로

나락연 (난양이공대학교 중문학부 박사과정)

18세기 조선(1392-1910), 홍대용(1731-1783)과 같은 몇몇의 학자들은 사회구조 및 조선정부를 개혁하는데에 청(1644-1912)의 장점을 배워야 한다고 주장하였다. 역사가들에 의해 이를 지지하는 학파는 북학파(北學派)로 알려졌고, 북학파의 형성과 전개에 대한 학술적 사실들은 조선사상사 학자들에 의해 검토되어왔다. 사실 북학은 사물의 본성은 인간과 같다고 믿는 낙학파(洛學派)의 사상과 긴밀하게 연결되어 있었다.

김원행은 낙학 지지자 중 한 명이었으며, 홍대용은 그의 제자 중 하나였다. 홍대용의 사상과 작문은 그의 생각이 근본적으로 김원행에 의해 영향을 받았음을 드러낸다. 홍대용은 18세기 조선의 유명한 북학파 학자로 여겨진다. 홍대용과 북학파는 청나라가 야만족이라고 생각하면서도 그들로부터 새로운 지식을 배워야 한다고 주장했다. 이에 따라 이 논문은 낙학의 지식인들이 어떻게 북학파의 형성을 주도했으며, 청으로부터 배워야 한다는 사상을 드러냈는지를 밝히기 위해 홍대용과 김원행의 지적관계를 분석한다.

주제어: 북학, 조선유교사, 홍대용, 김원행, 낙학