

Reading Traditional Korean Artistic Sensibilities through the Concept of *Jin-gyeong*

Kim Jae Sook

Kim Jae Sook (Kim, Jae-suk) is a lecturer at Korea National University of Arts and Researcher at the Institute of Philosophical Studies at Korea University. She received her Ph.D. from Korea University in 1998. Her publications include “Simmul habil-ui yesul ron yeon-gy” (Theory of Art on the Unity of Mind and Object) (2000) and “Joseon sidae: yesul-eul tonghan isangjeok in-gyeokmi-ui chugu” (The Pursuit of an Ideal Type of Human Beauty through the Arts During the Yi Dynasty) (2000). E- mail: arspisees@hanmail.net.

Korean Aesthetics and the Deconstruction of the Modern System of Aesthetics

The concept of “art” in operation in the modern system of aesthetics is currently under deconstruction. An infinite range of new arts, such as photography and film, have been introduced, accompanied by new art forms that utilize a diverse range of media, such as installation, video, performance and technological works. As the number of people enjoying this cascade of new arts increases, interest in **modern (older/traditional) art forms** is now waning. Art no longer possesses the same meanings of old, and people no longer expect the same things from art that they did in the past. The concept of art as fine art supportive of the modern aesthetic system developed in conjunction with the ascendancy of painting after the 18th century is now in crisis:¹ it can no longer explain the artistic developments of the 21st century, nor fulfill popular demands for beauty and art in the postmodern age.

Under these circumstances, there has been a search for a new means to conceptualize the modern understanding of “art.” The concept of fine art was founded on the assumption of the “autonomy of art”--the distinction between pure and applied art, between science and art, and between politics and ethics and art. In contrast, the art of the postmodern era blurs the border that demarcates pure art from applied art, and technological developments are inciting an intricate connection between science and art. Art has so deeply penetrated our daily lives that it is no longer a small number of individuals endowed with talent who become the creators of art, with the majority of the populace assuming only the position of the art appreciating audience. Anyone can now undertake artistic activities, and search for artistic expression in their daily lives. People are now beginning to think about art as artistic creators. In addition, art can no

longer claim an autonomous existence independent of political, social and economic concerns. Greater interest is now expressed in the themes rather than in the forms of artwork, and art is more intimately related to social issues such as the environment, bio-engineering, technology and politics. People no longer search for “beauty” in modern artistic works from a position of aesthetic pleasure, or with a psychologically aesthetic attitude. Developments in the mass culture industry long ago brought the collapse of the boundaries between art and popular culture. From the perspective of these cultural industries, art can no longer remain peacefully in an aloof realm. From here springs the demand for a new concept of art that can meet these new artistic developments of the postmodern era.

Within this context of change, this paper aims to examine how traditional Korean aesthetics, within the realm of East Asian aesthetics, can offer an alternative to the limitations posed by the modern concept of art. East Asian art, in particular Korean art, has not been regarded properly as an art form within the system of Western aesthetics, and has only been considered as a practice undertaken in an era prior to the existence of aesthetics. East Asian concepts of beauty and arts were measured by the standards of the modern definitions of fine art. It is now imperative that these standards be reset in this postmodern era in which the modern system of fine art is being deconstructed.

Korean aesthetic concepts have predominantly been borrowed from China. As there was no clear position concerning the subjectivity of Korean art, Korean art theory has been considered poor in substance, and even more so when compared with China. However, it is a mistake to view Korean art theory to be under unilateral Chinese influence. That is, Koreans should not assume their art theories to be of Chinese origin without an examination of the elements specific to Korea and a localized sense of aesthetics.² Among the Korean people there already existed a national sense of aesthetics. Though aesthetic concepts were borrowed from China, a uniquely Korean aesthetic sense was well established within the Korean aesthetic sensitivity prior to the adoption of formalized theories. Although the general content of these theories of art was predominantly adopted from Chinese sources, it cannot be denied that they were articulated from Koreans’ perspective. Korean theories of art were not simply an imitation of their Chinese counterparts, but developed with a specifically Korean aesthetic subjectivity, centered on Koreans.

Nevertheless, Korean aesthetics were broadly established within the universality of the East Asian aesthetic system. The lack of development of an aesthetic theory in Korea is not an indication of the absence of art, or the inferiority of local artistic practices, sensibilities, and artworks. Broadly, on the premise subscribing to Chinese artistic sentiments, art theories uniquely Korean in character did not develop due to the focus on creation, appreciation, and critique.

The *Jin-gyeong* Art of the Late Joseon Dynasty

This paper examines the *Jin-gyeong* (true view) period around the time of the reigns of Kings Yeongjo and Jeongjo in the eighteenth century, considered to be the zenith of Korean traditional art. The era is characterized by waves of modernization, the pluralization of values, the rise of the Silhak (practical learning) ideology, and contact with Western civilizations. Consequently, a number of developments emerged that had not been present in the early or mid-Joseon appeared in the realm of art: the increased participation of commoners in the arts, the transition in landscape painting (*sansuhwa*) from featuring idealized natural forms to representations of actual nature, the rise in popularity of *pungsokhwa* (genre paintings), the development of *sogak* (folk music), and the production of poetry that engaged social issues. These developments coincided with the evolution of an understanding of the individual as a distinct entity, no longer submerged within the collective value system, and this consciousness of the self slowly spread throughout society.

At the onset of the later period of the Joseon dynasty, Korean art shifted from the traditionally preponderant Chinese style to assume its own unique characteristics. Although founded on the traditions of East Asia, the *Jin-gyeong* era in late Joseon disbanded with Chinese influences, and the golden age of the Korean arts emerged. This was not simply an outcome of the political and economic security and prosperity of the period. It was also definitely not merely a consequence of the move away from the China-centered worldview, nor did it depend on the genius of painters such as Jeong Seon alone. It was an expression of a subjectivity specific to the Korean people. The rise of the cultural and artistic renaissance of the *Jin-gyeong* era was the fruit of Korean thought, made possible by the existence of a mature ideological foundation. On these grounds, the *jin-gyeong* can be examined as an aesthetic concept.

Jin-gyeong is not referred to in this paper merely as the temporal marker to designate the *jin-gyeong* era, nor as a technical concept to describe *jin-gyeong sansuhwa* (true view landscape paintings), but rather as a philosophical and aesthetic concept. *Jin-gyeong* is widely used throughout Korea to refer to the specific style of the painter Jeong Seon and his *jin-gyeong sansuhwa*. It is also a referent for the technique by which the images of real nature as directly witnessed by the artists were painted. This style of rendering nature departs from the Chinese style, and better suits the Korean natural landscape. Although Jeong Seon contributed greatly to the establishment of *jin-gyeong sansuhwa* in late Joseon, the growing awareness of this new subject matter and the style of *jin-gyeong sansuhwa* was not an inclination unique to painting circles, nor was it the contribution of Jeong Seon alone.³ The concept of *jin-gyeong* does not refer only to representations of natural scenery, painting techniques, Jeong Seon, or the

paintings themselves. It can also be found in the music and literary theories of this period.

The term *jin-gyeong* was not used as an aesthetic concept in Chinese painting or art theory, nor was it a commonly used concept during the Joseon dynasty. However, *jin-gyeong* is a foundational concept for all arts in this period.

This paper will refer to the term *jin-gyeong* as the fundamental concept that led the development of the arts, including music and literature, though centered on paintings in this period, and not as one limited to *sansuhwa* alone. The consideration of *jin-gyeong* as an aesthetic concept may render contemporary meanings that provide an alternative to the deconstruction of art in the postmodern era.

The Background to the Emergence of the Concept of *Jin-gyeong*

Following the Japanese Invasion of 1592 and the Manchu Invasion of 1636, late Joseon society experienced significant qualitative and quantitative changes. The composition of the class structure changed due to the swelling of the rank of *yangban*, who became the largest class forming an inverted social pyramid, collapsing and deconstructing the class system. The commercial market and economy also experienced growth due to the agricultural innovations and the expansion of commercial activities. **Art works were exchanged in the open market. Through the patronage of artists, artistic practices expanded greatly with various new forms developed.**⁴ During this period, a unique cultural class, called *Gyeonghwasajok* (*yangban* families resident in Seoul for generations), appeared boasting its own unique aesthetic tastes. Independent of the *jung-in* (middle people) and the commoner class, the *Gyeonghwasajok* enjoyed various *siseo hwageum* (poetry, calligraphy, painting, and playing musical instruments) hobbies and refinements differing from those of the earlier periods, and acquired their own class consciousness and cultural lifestyle. Interest in the arts among the scholar-officials of the *Gyeonghwasajok* reached a level not hindered by *wanmulsangji*.⁵ This was accompanied by changes in the artistic environment and related communication structures. The previously state-controlled lower class artists gained independence, the demand for art traders grew and the number of civilian professional artists increased. These and other overall developments and growth in the cities and markets were complemented by improvements in the commercial and economic communication structures related to the arts.⁶

During these significant social changes, Neo-Confucianism lost its power as the dominant ideology to bring about social change and gradually became more rigid. *Jaedoron* (the theory imposing that art embody the *dao*), the Neo-Confucian view of the arts, could no longer satisfy the demands now arising in this new artistic environment. Advancements in the arts led to the demand for a new theory of art.

The theoretical pursuit of new art forms first began actively in the field of literature. Under the Neo-Confucian perspective of literature of the dominant *sarim* (Neo-Confucian literati), the literary circles of the sixteenth-seventeenth century, which had become stagnant due to the loss of individuality, reached a new level under the leadership of the members of the Baegak Group of the *Gyeonghwasajok*. In seventeenth century *hansi* (poetry written in Chinese) there was a revival of interest in Tang poetry. During this era, the quality of poetic works was judged by how closely they conformed to the Tang style, resulting in a loss of individuality due to replication and imitation. Poets of this period read only poetry from periods to the Tang dynasty and rarely read poetry of the later periods. Although this trend succeeded in achieving a poetic sense of rhythm and sound, the content of the works became vacuous and unrealistic.⁷ The eighteenth century *hansi* aimed to overcome these weaknesses as exposed in the works of the seventeenth century.

Poets leading this transformation of poetry in the eighteenth century rejected the existence of models and rules to be learnt and followed, and refused to establish any idealized models. Following Kim Chang-heup, many poets publicly denounced the existing norms. They abandoned the simple replication of classical works through imitation, and pursued direct experiences with real Korean people and nature to enhance the production of original works. Arguing for the imitation of nature itself, rather than classics, these poets turned their eyes away from idealized natural forms to the typical natural features of Joseon. Eighteenth century poets no longer expressed interest in the subject matters of the Tang poetry, but rather in the nature and the people of Joseon that could be experienced directly.

In the field of music, Chinese music theory was discarded and the importance of expressing *jeong* (feelings) in songs was stressed. The existing standards of classical court music (*a-ak*) lost their dominance and diverging musical forms such as musical variations, the transposition of vocal pieces to instrumental pieces, fast rhythms and beats, and the introduction of higher notes and pitches appeared. The development of *sogak* such as *pansori* (long dramatic epic songs), *sanjo* (solo music with percussion accompaniment), and *sinawi* (improvised ensemble music) also led to the reconsideration of existing music theories.

Looking at it anew, lyrics that are sung in the streets are derived from the sounds and rhythms of nature. There may be difference in melody and beat between China and the neighboring regions, but what is right and wrong is predominantly decided by customs. Each verse and rhyme are felt from nature and described in words which indicate that though the melodies may differ, the spirit remains the same. This is why “the music of today is the same as the music of the past.”⁸

Though the music culture of Joseon was influenced by China, it was not purely in imitation, but also had the distinct characteristics. While he refers to the *Shijing* (the Book of Songs) and *Mencius*, in the above passage Hong Dae-yong affirms the developments in the contemporary music scene.

In the field of painting, the simple replication of existing Chinese paintings was considered not able to arouse any emotion. Yi Ik was critical of traditional works, claiming that “The landscape paintings of olden times and now are filled with oddities and lies. In order to make people happy, strange and curious scenes were drawn, empty words were fabricated and ornamented to deceive people.” Jo Yeong-seok offered the following critique in his postscript to Jeong Seon’s *Guhakcheop* (Album of Hills and Vallies).

During this period, Korean landscape painters used the techniques featured in Chinese painting books when drawing the outlines and general composition. They depicted the many ways water flows through the valley in the same way yet nobody understood why. This is why numerous mountain peaks were painted yet they were drawn in only one way, unable to depict the front and back, the far and near, the high and low, the deep and shallow, and the flat and rugged stones. Even when painting water, they used two brushes entwined together like a rope without distinguishing between the calm and swift. How can the mountains and water exist there?⁹

All of these theories argued that artists should discard existing methods of writing poetry, composing music, and painting, and turn to individually describing their experiences of living nature, while recognizing the purity of the emotions arising from within in response and express those without pretense. The most significant aspect of this change was that detailed and true description of the nature, people, and society of Joseon led to the novel recognition of the aesthetic value of typically Korean scenery. These changes in the eighteenth century are attributed largely to the internal maturity of the Joseon people.¹⁰

Recognition of the subjective appreciation of art expressed itself in criticisms of the imitation of Chinese theories of art. The theoretical basis for these arguments was the concept of “*jin*” (Truth). Within the general trend away from the domination of moral philosophy, *wanmulsangji*, which was emphasized in a theory of “*dao* as the ends, art as the means” (*bonmalron*), weakened.¹¹ As a part of the theoretical search for the establishment of a new theory of art, words beginning with the character of *jin* (眞) were often used in terminology related to the field of art by the end of the seventeenth century, and during the eighteenth century. These can be largely divided into two categories, and examples such as “true poetry” (*jinsi*), “true writing” (*jimmun*), “true taste” (*jincwi*) and “true action(작용의 의미로 바꿔주세요)” (*jin-gi*) imply

the ideal state pursued by art, and examples such as “true scenery(경치가 아니라 이상적 경치의 뜻으로 바꿔주세요)” (*jin-gyeong*, 眞境), “true form” (*jinhyeong*) and “true aspect” (*jinmyeonmok*) refer to actual appearances and circumstances. The former is a concept of “*jin*” with the theory of *cheon-gi* as its philosophical basis, and the latter is a concept of *jin* with *silhak* as its ideological basis. They both move away from Neo-Confucian thought, but do not reject it entirely.

The Concept of *Jin-gyeong* within *Cheon-gi* Theory

Cheon-gi (working of Heaven) was a term that came into usage in the theories of art and literature of the Joseon dynasty. It arose as an important key theoretical concept dealing with new art, presenting a different understanding of art from that of earlier periods. This connotes an important change in the epistemology of the period, and is unique as a development relating to the criticism that opposed the tendency toward the imitation of the ancient styles.¹² *Cheon-gi* is not only a philosophical concept, but at the same time an important aesthetic concept that is used to reveal the essence and increase the utility of art in literature, music and painting.

Under the previous Neo-Confucian artistic perspective, as the ultimate goal was *jeongsim* (moral righteousness) and the cultivation of the mind through art, artists who were influenced by the moralists’ point of view, consistently questioned themselves in a form of self-censorship in order to make up for the shortcomings of poetry. Even if this act was considered to have been sincere, they had to further modify their poetry after reflexively asking whether they had attained the standards of Confucian moral philosophy. Creative activity undertaken with a strong goal orientation feeds only from those characteristics specific to human moral sensibilities from among the various human emotions, and also leads to the weakening of individuality and originality. During the *jin-gyeong* period a point of view emerged that gave serious consideration to the sincere emotions of the artist, and was skeptical of the absoluteness of *Dao*. Art no longer had to be an expression of the cultivation of one’s nature or the accompanying sentiment *seongjeong jijeong* (the attainment of moral perfection and righteousness in one’s nature and feelings).¹³ The very foundation of this theory is the concept of *cheon-gi*.

The term *cheon-gi* is originally derived from the *Zhuangzi*. *Cheon-gi* means on the one hand *cheonseong* (innate nature), the innocent and pure heart one is innate and inherent, creative powers not yet polluted by social institutions or artifice. On the other it has also been interpreted as the creative secret of all things in the universe, and the hidden laws and creative power of nature.¹⁴ As can be seen in the following passage, these two interpretations of the concept of *cheon-gi*, are not actually different, but rather closely related to one another.

Night and day rotate alternatively, and the sun and moon illuminate the world in turns,

the rotation of the four seasons, the change in the winds and the clouds, and the plant-life in bloom are things that everyone can see if they are not blind. However, why is it that only sages can [claim these pleasures](#) while ordinary people cannot? Externally, this is due to a scattering of will and integrity in the temptation for profit and power, and internally, this is due to the clouding of sight and hearing through the manifestation of personal preferences and desires. These kinds of people are dizzy and confused and they do not even know where they are, so how can they find the leisure to “experience the pleasure in the appreciation of things”? Only when one can transcend [the society of honor and contempt](#) and let the soul roam freely beyond worldly matters, and when one’s hearts becomes [empty of tainted emotions and restore its pure naivete](#), then the eyes and ears are no longer clouded over, enabling one to see the depths of all matter, and the souls to meet with *cheon-gi* as one. Thus, how can this pleasure be shared among the common people?¹⁵

Here, *wanmul deukrak* is made possible through the discernment of the essence of external matters which arises from the spiritual state that is result of [emptying oneself of tainted emotions, restoring pure naivete](#), and dispensing with the desires and tastes of the mundane world. *Wanmul sangji disappears and becomes wanmul deukrak which arises from this direct personal aesthetic experience*. Here, the two concepts of *cheon-gi* within the Zhuangzi meet. This “mysterious power of heaven” can be felt for the first time when approached with “an innocent and naive heart.” At the same time, the emphasis on the importance of a clean heart resembles the Neo-Confucian artistic perspective that emphasized the cultivation of the mind.

However, it is notable that “*cheon-gi*” is used rather than the Neo Confucian concept of *cheonli* (heavenly principle). Kim Chang-heup distinguishes between the two as follows: “*cheon-gi* is the vitality of life drawn from a perspective committed to the notion of external form and internal energy (*hyeonggi*), and *cheonli* is the moral principle (*jeongni*) from the understanding of *seongmyeong* (heavenly-bestowed innate nature).”¹⁶ The term of *cheonli* strongly presupposes the context of self-cultivation — the dissipation of of human desire and the preservation of the [heavenly principle \(*cheonli*\)](#) through the deep recognition of the *cheon-li*. Although *cheon-gi* assumes a natural order based on laws and principles under the Neo-Confucian worldview, it pays more attention to the natural features and their dynamic aspects than *cheonli*. Here emphasis is placed on the aesthetic recognition of the [lively and individual](#) forms of nature.¹⁷ Thus, *cheon-gi* is the “dynamic aspects of the natural order manifested in individual matter.” This is to say that the [mystery](#) of nature which does not distinguish between right and wrong is called *cheon-gi*, and the distinguishing of values to be right and virtuous is called *cheon-li*, which indicates that the concept of “[what and how things ought to be](#)” (*sodangyeon*) is not included in *cheon-gi*.¹⁸ Thus, “nature” in the theory

of *cheon-gi* is not the natural object as a means for cultivating *seongjeong*.

The concept of “*jin*” (Truth) is related to the theory of *cheon-gi*. In the concept of *cheon-gi* are connoted “nature” and “*jin*.” The concept of *jin* is frequently used in *Zhuangzi*, but not found in the Confucian classics. The view of poetry as something derived from *cheon-gi* starts from the recognition of the fact that the origin of the poetry is from the mysterious power of the heaven which is beyond human. In addition, *cheonjin*, as the pure essence embodied in people who are naturally gifted, is also *cheon-gi*. *Zhuangzi* said the following about the concept of “*jin*” in the chapter “Yufu” (The Old Fisherman).

By the Truth I mean purity and sincerity in their highest degree. He who lacks purity and sincerity cannot move others. Therefore he who forces himself to lament, though he may sound sad, will awaken no grief. He who forces himself to be angry, though he may sound fierce, will arouse no awe. And he who forces himself to be affectionate, though he may smile, will create no harmony. True sadness need make no sound to awaken grief, true anger need not show itself to arouse awe, true affection need not smile to create harmony. When a man has the Truth within himself, his spirit may soar among external things. That is why the Truth is to be prized.

This may be applied to human relationships in the following ways. In the service of parents, it is love and filial piety; in the service of the ruler, it is loyalty and integrity; in festive wine drinking, it is merriment and joy; in periods of mourning, it is sadness and grief. In loyalty and integrity, service is the important thing; in festive drinking, merriment is the important thing; in periods of mourning, grief is the important thing; in the service of parents, their comfort is the important thing. In seeking to perform the finest kind of service, one does not always try to go about it in the same way. In assuring comfort in the service of one’s parents, one does not question the means to be employed. In seeking the merriment that comes with festive drinking, one does not fuss over what cups are to be selected. In expressing the grief that is appropriate to periods of mourning, one does not quibble over the exact ritual to be followed.

Rites are something created by the vulgar men of the world. The Truth is that which is received from Heaven. By nature it is the way it is and cannot be changed. Therefore the sage patterns himself on Heaven, prizes the Truth, and does not allow himself to be cramped by the vulgar.¹⁹

As can be seen above, the primary meaning of *jin* is not to be constrained by normative, institutional or artificial formalities. One must not be subject to the conventions of expression and must thus avoid hypocrisy as it arises in customs and habits. Although having [filial piety](#)

and brotherly love is important, one must not be constrained by the rules of filial piety and brotherly love. *Jin* is a spiritual power operating from within, able to move human beings more deeply than external forms of expression. *Jin* is not subject to the limitations of the norms existing in the world, and it is the true original character spontaneously received from the Heaven. In this way, *jin* transcends simple frankness, or factuality. The concept of *jin* as “the true character inherent in human beings which is bestowed by heaven” goes beyond the concept of “*seon*” or good nature, which is distinct in Confucianism. If *seon* in Confucianism emphasizes submission to external ethics, *jin* is true to one’s emotions and sentiments, thereby not submissive to external demands. Zhuangzi therefore states in the chapter titled “*Qiusui*” (Autumn Flood): “Do not bring about the ruin of true nature (*cheonseong*) artificially, do not spoil true nature willfully, do not sacrifice true nature for fame. One is said to return to *jin* if these are carefully followed.”²⁰

The theory of True poetry of Kim Chang-hyeop and Kim Chang-heup which was based on the *cheon-gi* perspective, played a pioneering role in the art world of the eighteenth century. Kim Chang-hyeop saw the “true way” of poetry, not as being bound to the form of the poetry, but rather as poetry without embellishments and flourishes that exhibits the *seongjeong* and the *cheon-gi* of the poet, or in other words, “*jinsi*” (true poetry).²¹ The background for the assertion of the theory of true poetry was due to the gradual formalization and increasingly conventional nature of Neo-Confucianism, suppressing the true spirit of poetry which is the expression of the poet’s natural character.

The theory of True poetry, which was established based on the theory of *cheon-gi*, affected not only poetry, but also other forms of art such as paintings and calligraphy and music. Jeong Seon, the representative painter of the *jin-gyeong* period, frequently visited the Cheongpunggye (Valley through which the Fresh Wind Blows), Kim Chang-heup’s residence, and exchanged ideas and was deeply influenced by theories of the members of the so-called Baegak Confucian school. Yi Ha-geon, influenced by Kim Chang-hyeop, discusses the application of this theory to the aesthetics of painting.

Generally speaking, when a painting is an imitation of works from the past, *cheon-gi* cannot survive as the brush strokes became narrower. If the work is restricted to existing models alone, thought becomes barren and the spirit becomes dull. By all means do not imitate the people of ancient times, and do not limit oneself to existing models. Then vital energy and rhythm can become animated, and the artwork equipped with the creative energy and the sensibility of the painter’s brush strokes can reach an other-worldly state inspired by Heaven (*chulsininmyo*).²²

In the field of music as well, Hong Dae-yong defines a song from the *cheon-gi* perspective as follows: “As singing is a means of expressing *jeong* (feeling), *jeong* germinates and is expressed through language, and once this language is put in writing, this is called a song. Good songs are those discarding artificial elaborateness, absurdity, and moral rights and wrongs, thereby relying on nature to derive *cheon-gi*.”²³ He defines songs excluding artificiality as those that rely on nature and manifest *cheon-gi*. In addition, he thought that the crisis experienced in poetry and songs after the *Book of Songs* was brought about by the intervention of artificial factors that contradicted the theory of *cheon-gi*.

After the Zhou dynasty, the cultures of China and the outlying regions combined, the dialects changed, and cultural practices became gradually more harsh, while the pretensions of the people increased day by day. The changes in the dialects changed the form of poetry and songs, and the increasing lies among the people led to their writing not corresponding with *jeong*. Due to this, the way of transcribing meanings became more detailed with the sense of poetic rhythm becoming more skillful and the poetic form and rhythm becoming more elaborate. However it lost its naturalness, and even though the principles are proper, *cheon-gi* is further depleted, making the inheritance of the elegance of the *Book of Songs* to enlighten the country a seemingly impossible task.²⁴

This means that discarding rules and formalities, the songs which are based on *cheon-gi* and nature can recover the genuine meaning of the *Book of Songs*.²⁵

As can be seen above, the philosophical term *cheon-gi* is used as an artistic concept to throw light on the characteristics of literature, painting and music. While this interpretation connects arts to ethics and morals, it does not confine art to the realm of ethics, but rather recognizes its independence. The logical explanation of this process is stated as the theory of *cheon-gi*. Departing from the moralist perspective which emphasized the process of returning to a state of *jeong* (moral righteousness) by governing one’s *seongjeong*, the theory places value on the frank expression of one’s *seongjeong*. In this way there was an attempt to overcome the aesthetic limitations of Neo-Confucianism by adopting non-Neo-Confucian elements in the arts.

The concept of *jin* in the *cheon-gi* theory, is a concept of *cheon-gi* in which the innocence of one’s true character is expressed unpolluted by artificiality and formality. In other words, this is the “mind-heart” that operates as the source of humanity’s infinite creativity, away from conventional worldliness and artificial skills. Accordingly, *gyeong* is another concept of *cheon-gi* which means the creative power of non-action and spontaneity, suggesting the idealized state as the embodiment of *Dao*. Here the two concepts of *cheon-gi* are combined.

The Concept of Jin-gyeong in the Silhak School

The concept of *jin-gyeong* viewed from *cheon-gi* theory strongly emphasized the aesthetic pleasure taken in the vitality of the natural environment and the source of creativity innate within each individual. In contrast, the concept of *jin-gyeong* within the Silhak School focused on the “true image” of the authentic experience of the actual objective world. The meanings inherent in Silhak concept of *jin-gyeong* are evident in the work of Yi Ik, a contemporary of Jeong Seon. He deplored the fact that the academic traditions of the time had become rigid and uniform as Neo-Confucianism, and emphasized *jadeuk* (自得) and *sildeuk* (實得) through a thorough investigation and accurate understanding of related facts, calling for a change in the academic climate.²⁶ *Jadeuk* is the self-realization of the truth through one’s own subjective reflection and comprehension, while the spirit of *sildeuk* stresses the importance of practical matters. These are both reflected in literary criticism and the view of art works. These attitudes were greatly influenced by Yun Du-seo, who as a painter, clearly demonstrated the spirit of *sildeuk* as is noted in the posthumous record of his life.²⁷

In *cheon-gi* theory, nature was an embodiment of Tao, furnished with the creative power of the universe, while for Silhak scholars, nature was a scientific object that existed objectively. The knowledge Yi Ik acquired from studying modern Western science dramatically altered his way of perceiving and understanding nature. Rather than seeing the natural world as a medium for the cultivation and the embodiment of Tao, he asserted that nature was an object of the sensory organs, and thus should be recognized through these senses. His stance on the objective observation of nature was accompanied by a thorough examination and criticism of existing theories. Yi demarcated the domain of norms from the realm of nature. Through this separation of the laws of nature and the ethical rules of the time, Yi attempted to strike a balance between the use of rational science and the inheritance of tradition.²⁸

The Silhak concept of *jin-gyeong* is a reflection of the objective understanding of art arising from the Silhak value system. It was a spirit of extreme realism that rejected imitation and existing ideas, and perceived objects as they really were. This recognition of reality is concretely manifested in the development of the paintings of *pungsokhwa* and the emergence of *sogak* performed among the common people. *Cheonggu yeongeon* (Enduring Poetry of Korea) expounded positive theories on the songs of the common people and the accurate depiction of their lives.

After *the Book of Songs*, poetry gradually grew more distant from that of the ancient times, and those who studied poetry after the Han and Wei dynasties, considered those who were quick in [the use of ancient stories and expressions from the classics in the](#)

production of poetry and the beautiful elaboration of rhetoric to be erudite. The act of perceiving and grandly embellishing a scene was considered talent. In addition, the emotions of the poet were obscured by adherence to the poetic rules. . . . The melodies which arise from songs sung by common people, even though they may not be beautiful or sophisticated, are generally happy and joyous, of desires, blame and wild jumping about which arise out of the *jin-gi* (true action 작용working이 어떨까요.) naturally.²⁹

Although superficially *the Book of Songs* continued to be put forth as a model, staying within the boundaries of Confucianism, the ideas of *seong-jeong* and *jin-gi* were emphasized, rather than edification. *Jin-gi* is same as *cheon-gi*. Unlike traditional court music, the songs on the streets were merry and faster, humorous and even included lewd subject matter, demonstrating the value of the frank expression of *seong-jeong* arising out of the core mentality of human beings.

Hong Dae-yong in particular believed the idealized sphere of song and poetry should depict the actual state of the times; this style of artistic effort was considered to originate from nature and *cheon-gi* which excluded artificial consciousness, demonstrating a combination of the theories of *cheon-gi* and Silhak.

The *feng* (airs) in *the Book of Songs* were originally songs that narrated the everyday stories of the common world. . . . Because these were set to melodies straight from people's mouths, even though the melody may be inappropriate, the words spring from deep inside the heart. And even the songs of woodcutters or farmers come from nature if they express simplicity and innocence. These are still better than the attempts by the scholar-officials to embellish and decorate in the name of classicism until the *cheon-gi* is destroyed. Those who can observe customs well with sincerity are not limited by their position, and can fathom the meaning with their hearts. That such people are able to inspire emotions in others and make them happy, and end up making all the people merry and completing customs is the same in times of old.³⁰

Hong believed that genuine songs were a pure expression of nature and *cheon-gi* without consideration of the aim of teaching right from wrong, and that such expressions could ultimately transform reality in the right way. The concept of Silhak *jin-gyeong*, which meant an objective view of the real world, required artists to demonstrate a real interest in the social and political material world, and focus not only on the cultivation of the self. Art was not something that was only practiced by the scholar-official literati, and the expression of sincere emotional sentiment by commoners was actually considered a more genuine form of art than the art of the

scholar-officials that was entrapped in falsehoods and the existing norms.

The Contemporary Significance of *Jin-gyeong*

Although the *jin-gyeong* era of late Joseon dynasty was broadly founded on the Neo-Confucian artistic theory of “art embodying the *dao*,” it differed from the early and mid-Joseon periods in its open character. Various artistic phenomena unseen in the former periods emerged to counter the succession of conventional artistic modes, and the aesthetic demands of the middle people grew, necessitating the search for a new theory of art. Even though the concept of *jin-gyeong* was not in itself established as a maxim nor used as an aesthetic concept, there is an ideological basis for using it as the core concept to explain the artistic revival of that period. Not merely applicable to painting alone, *jin-gyeong* is an aesthetic concept that can serve as the backbone to an overall theory of art that includes other diverse genres of the period such as literature and music.

The above discussion describes how the concept of *jin-gyeong* implies internal *cheon-gi* as originated in the thought of Zhuangzi and the understanding of an objective real world as expounded in Silhak thought, and the attitude of harmony with nature that has long existed in Korea. *Jin-gyeong* is examined in this way. The search for a new theory of art will fail if there is no clear recognition of self-identity for the development of one’s own culture and in exchange with other civilizations.

First, just as Western art outgrew elite modernism and searched for an escape route in for art through the blurring of the boundaries with popular art, during the the *jin-gyeong* period, the artistic works of the scholar-official literati which cherished *mujahyang* (“an impression of the lofty character of artists as one of Confucian attainment”) and *seogwon-gi* (“a atmosphere of the scholarly attainment of the artists”) embraced the art of the common people. This was a natural tendency as the sphere of art in the *jin-gyeong* era had broadened to such an extent it became incomparable with that of early and mid-Joseon.

Under the artistic perspective of the Joseon scholar-officials, art was a means of moral cultivation to correct the mind-heart. The scope of the concept of Tao in this practice is very broad. The *Tao* of *jaedoron* began with the concept of human morality, and the most primary of the inherent meanings in the term “*Tao*” is individual moral cultivation. In other words this is the moral nourishment of one’s *seongjeong*. However, acknowledgement of only those moral sensibilities of humans with the aim of moral cultivation, in turn ends up repressing and restricting the other various human emotions and feelings and results in the standardization and normalization of art. This is equivalent to killing all humanity and art since art should unbind the chains that bind all individuals, and break down all boundaries be they physical or

moral. The key word here that forms the basis of escaping all of this is *cheon-gi*. One should not only learn the methodological form of writing poetry or painting pictures, but reawaken the question of the true origin of creativity.

The origin of genuine creativity, as seen in the concept of *jin* in a *cheon-gi* theory, is the natural expression of life force, which is manifest in a temperament devoid of either artificiality or affectation prior to contamination by civilization and social institutions. This is the eternal fountain of art. In this manifestation of *cheon-gi*, each individual can experience the process of self-awakening to one's individual subjective value through the aesthetic experience provided by art. In this each individual can express his or her individuality according to a chosen method, and encounter one's true internal essence. The innocent and unworldly heart is the fountainhead of creativity. From this exchange, the inner nature of human beings, which has become accustomed to everyday habits, can once again be unified and meet others in the most sincere form possible. This is one of the genuine functions of art in modern society.

Essentially, artistic creativity is not craftsmanship, but the expression of *cheon-gi* or *seong-jeong*. However, as various advanced artistic media appear, art is becoming increasingly dependent on technical skills. This is particularly due to the emergence of a cinematic and image-orientated culture, which has been a positive influence in terms of the diversification and expansion of the means of expression. Nevertheless, the medium and technical aspects of art should not become the focus of artworks.

In traditional East Asian societies, human activities represented by art did not simply refer to the craftsmanship and talent of human hands. The aim was to transcend the realm of craftsmanship and attain the sphere of Tao. Even if this were not founded directly on the theory of moral cultivation, through the process of manifesting one's *cheon-gi*, one's individual subjectivity naturally became charged with the universality of Tao and strove toward the "union of Heaven and the human (전에는 humans라고 했던데, the human 이런 표현도 말이 되나요?)" (*cheonilhabi*). The origin of all arts is the *seongjeong jijin* which retains infinite creativity and is full of unrealized possibilities.

Second, a significant difference between the modern and postmodern era is that art no longer performs the simple function of decoration or amusement to the degree that one can say that social art has turned into an artistic society. Moreover, the art of the postmodern era no longer supports the right of the autonomy of art independent of politics and ethics, rather art is so intricately related to society to the point of becoming inseparable.

The conceptualization of *jin-gyeong* within the Silhak school displays realist tendencies and social activism. Originally the scope of the meaning of *Tao*, derived from *Jaedoron* of Jeong Do-jeon, includes the *Tao* of "governing the country" (*jingshi*) through the embodiment of moral politics. However, whether *Tao* seen from the perspective of the reform

of social reality or the moral cultivation of the individual within the original context of Confucianism, the meaning of moral cultivation was not simply the individualistic training of one's mind. In the Neo-Confucianism of the Song dynasty, moral cultivation as an individual practice was closely related to the social practice of ethics and morals. Neo-Confucian moral cultivation was based on the elaborately detailed theory of *inseong* (that treats human nature as the object of contemplation and self-reflection), [which was itself based on the premise of the establishment of norms and standards concerning the social and political order](#). This very social practice is "[governing the country](#)." The argument that moral philosophers are idealists and at the same time practical reformers is exceedingly appropriate. However, one cannot overlook the fact that this reform of reality is governed by morals. In other words, the act of "[governing the country](#)" in Neo-Confucianism is the social and political practice of morality. The *Jaedoron* of the Song dynasty was on the one hand based on the cultivation of individual morality, but also might be interpreted as a principal of social principle.³¹

Moral sensibilities and aesthetic sensibilities are not mutually exclusive, as they are related to each other. Frankly, aesthetic experience is rarely "pure." Aesthetic values are subjective when related to one's individual aesthetic experiences, but they are objective in that they are dependent on the society. Aesthetic values are individual responses to things and at the same time concern the social and cultural context of such reactions.³²

Third, the meaning of nature is latent within the concept of *jin*. *Sansuhwa* for the sake of beautifully drawing the principle of "*Tao* modeling itself after Nature" (*dobeop jayeon*) as articulated by Laozi came into fashion in the Song Dynasty when the Neo-Confucian worldview was prevalent. This indicates that *sansuhwa* was connected to the consciousness of the Neo-Confucian scholar-officials. In this way they tried to maintain a psychological balance between the individual self and the social self with the practical aim of developing a more moral and rational society. [Through the appreciation of *sansuhwa*, they remained at the level concentrating on oneself through reclusion in nature. They maintained a certain distance, entrusting the heart to the object. This is a search of the social self through nature, without excessive attachment to the individual self.](#)³³ Thus, uncontaminated by the world, one was granted one's own time and space in which to foster oneself, and unconstrained by reality, one could live a life more engaged [in social actuality](#).

The significance of *sansuhwa* as an embodiment of *Tao* has already faded for most modern people. Nature, the subject of *sansuhwa*, has become a model of romantic lyricism sensed through the eyes, or an object of representation, resulting in paintings of natural scenery (*punggyeonghwa*). However, opposed to the modern view in which rationality is supreme, where nature is seen as an object for the development of civilization, nature is now viewed from the perspective of environmental aesthetics. The contemporary significance of *sansuhwa* based

on the value of harmony with nature can be found here. The world of nature has the power to heal not only human psychological wounds, but also the wounds of the earth. Furthermore, the consciousness of the symbiosis between humans and nature with its shared basis of life is emphasized as a new vision that can transcend the alienated anti-life cultural forms of industrial society and the materialist value system of modern society. Accordingly, *sansuhwa* should not be limited to the realm of unworldliness, but be recognized as the central medium of a pan-naturalism that can recover and heighten the essence of life which is being contaminated by the abuses of modern industrial civilization. A future direction of development should be explored on the basis of these thoughts.³⁴

If the progress of a society is realized through the process of cultural exchange between different eras and regions, the exchange between traditional and modern cultures, or between Eastern and Western cultures it should not result in ultimate homogenization through a unilateral acceptance. Blind adherence to tradition is only an act of self-delusion and cannot exhibit any cultural force. Although this paper cannot serve as an effective alternative to the establishment of increasingly complex contemporary theories of art, it has hopefully provided an opportunity to reflect on the subjectivity and autogenous growth of Korean culture.

-
1. Yves Michaud, "21 segi jeonhwan-gi-ui hyeondae misul" (Modern Art at the Turn of 21st Century), trans. Ha Tae-hwan (collection of symposium papers, 1999).
 2. Yi Dong-hwan, "Hanguk mihak sasang-ui tamgu" (Study of Korean Aesthetic Theory), *Minjok munhwa yeon-gu* (Study of Korean National Culture?) (Institute of Korean Culture, Korea University) 32 (1999): p. 44.
 3. Bak Eun-sun, *Geumgangsando yeon-gu* (Study of the Paintings of Mt. Geumgang) (Seoul: Iljisa Publishing Co., 1997), pp. 193-211, 296.
 4. Choe Jun-sik, *Hangugin-eun wae teul-eul geobuhaneun-ga* (Why Do Koreans Reject the Stereotype?) (Seoul: Sonamoo Publishing Co., 2002), pp. 48-56.
 5. *Wanmul sangju* refers to a Confucian principle that warns that too much affection for trivial things can lead to the loss of the objective. Yu Bong-hak, "Gyeonghwa sajok-gwa jin-gyeong munhwa" (Gyeonghwa sajok and Jin-gyeong Culture), in *Jin-gyeong sidae* (Jin-gyeong Era) (Seoul: Dolbegae, 2002), pp. 48-56.
 6. Kim Heung-gyu, "Joseon hugi yesul-ui hwan-gyeong-gwa sotong gujo" (The Environment and Communication-exchange Structures Surrounding Late Joseon Art), in *Hanguk sahoeron* (Theories of Korean Society), ed. Jeong Chang-su (Seoul: Sahoe Bipyongsa, 1995), pp. 415-439.
 7. Yi Jong-muk, "16 segimal 17 segi hansisa yeon-gu" (A Study of Poetry Written in Chinese from the Late Sixteenth to Seventeenth Century), *Jeongsin munhwa yeon-gu* (Korean Studies Quarterly, Academy of Korean Studies) (winter 2000): pp. 87-89, 95.
 8. 顧里巷歌謠之作，出於自然之音響節奏者，腔拍雖間於華夷，邪正多從其風俗，分章叶

(韻)韻, 而感物形言者, 固異曲同工, 而所謂今之樂猶古之樂也. Hong Dae-yong, *Daedong pungyoseo* (Folk Music in Traditional Korea).

- ⁹ Quoted from Yu Hong-jun, *Hwain yeongjeon* (Biographies of Painters) (Seoul: Yuk Sa Bi Pyong Sa, 2002), pp. 172-173.
- ¹⁰ An Dae-hoe, *18 segi hanguk hansisa yeon-gu* (A Study of Poetry Written in Chinese in the Eighteenth Century) (Seoul: Somyeong Publishing, 1999), pp. 33-37.
- ¹¹ Hong Seon-pyo, *Joseon sidae hoehwasaron* (History of Paintings in Joseon Dynasty) (Seoul: Moonye Publishing Co., 1999), p. 258.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, p. 260.
- ¹³ An Byeong-hak, "Domun: munhak-ui bonjil hyoyong geurigo geulsseugi" (Domun: Nature and Efficiency of Literature and Writings), in *Joseon yuhak-ui gaenyeomdeul* (Concepts of Korean Confucianism) (Seoul: Ye Mun Seo Won, 2002), p. 428.
- ¹⁴ 其嗜欲深者, 其天機淺. "Dazongshi," in *Zhuangzi*; 今予動吾天機, 而不知其所以然. "Quishui," in *Zhuangzi*; 聖也者, 達於情而遂於命也. 天機不張, 而五官皆備, 此之謂天樂, 無言而心說. "Tianyun," in *Zhuangzi*; 夫天機之所動, 何可易也. "Quishui," in *Zhuangzi*.
- ¹⁵ 晝夜之相代, 而日月互為光明, 四時之運行, 而風雲變化, 草木彙榮, 此有目者所共睹也. 而世之高賢逸士, 乃或專之以為己樂, 若人不得與焉者, 何哉. 勢利誘乎外, 則志意分, 嗜欲炎於中, 則視聽昏. 若是者, 眩瞶(早)勃亂, 尚不知其身之所在, 又何暇於玩物而得其樂哉. 夫惟身超乎榮辱之境, 心遊乎事為之表, 虛明精一, 耳目無所蔽, 則其於物也, 有以觀其深, 而吾之心, 古泯然與天機會矣." Kim Chang-hyeop, *Nongamjip* (Complete Works of Nongam), book 24: *Jaewoldanggi*.
- ¹⁶ 一(天機)則從形氣上看活意也, 一(天理)則從性命上認正理也. Kim Chang-heup, *Samyeonjip* (Complete Works of Samyeon), book 33: *Illok*.
- ¹⁷ Song Hyeok-gi, "Kim Chang-hyeop-ui munhangnon yeon-gu" (Study of Kim Chang-hyeop's Literary Theory) (Master's thesis, Korea University, 1996).
- ¹⁸ Yi Seung-su, "17 segimal cheon-gi ron-ui hyeongseong-gwa insik-ui giban" (Foundations of the Formation and Knowledge of the end of Seventeenth Century Theory of Cheon-gi), *Hanmunhak yeon-gu* (Studies of Classical Chinese) 18 (1993): pp. 320-330.
- ¹⁹ 眞者, 精誠之至也, 不精不誠, 不能動人. 故强哭者, 雖悲不哀, 强怒者, 雖嚴不威, 强親者, 雖笑不和. 眞悲無聲而哀, 眞怒未發而威, 眞親未笑而和. 眞在內者, 神動于外, 是所以貴眞也. 其用于人理也, 事親則慈孝, 事君則忠貞, 飲酒則歡樂, 處喪則悲哀. 忠貞以功為主, 飲酒以樂為主, 處喪以哀為主, 功成之美, 無一其迹矣. 事親以適, 不論所以矣, 飲酒以樂, 不選其迹矣, 處喪以哀, 無問其禮矣. 禮者, 世俗之所為也, 眞者, 所以受於天也, 自然不可易也, 故聖人法天貴眞, 不拘于俗. "Yufu," in *Zhuangzi*.
- ²⁰ 無以人滅天, 無以故滅命, 無以得殉名, 謹守而勿失, 是謂反其眞. "Quishui," in *Zhuangzi*.
- ²¹ 詩者性情之眞, 而天機之動也. Kim Chang-hyeop, "Japsik," in *Nongamjip*.
- ²² 凡畫, 倣古人, 則筆勢局促而天機不活, 限標題, 則意匠枯燥, 而精神頓減, 須不做古人, 不限標題, 然後自然氣韻生動, 意態具足, 方有出神入妙之境矣. Yi Ha-gon, "Dutacho."
- ²³ 歌者言其情也 情動於言 言成於文 謂之歌 捨巧卒 忘善惡 依乎自然 發乎天機 歌之善也. Hong Dae-yong, op. cit.

- 24 自周以後 華夷雜糅(ᄇ) 方言日日益變 風俗澆(ᄇ)薄 人僞日日益滋 方言變而詩與歌異其體 人僞滋而情與文不相應 是以其聲律之巧 格韻之高 用意雖密 而愈失其自然 理致雖正而愈喪其天機 欲以此而紹風雅而化邦國 則不亦遠乎. *Ibid.*,
- 25 Yi Yeong-uk, "Joseon hugi gajip-ui annon yeon-gu" (Study of Musical Theory of Late Joseon Songs), *Hanguk eumaksa hakbo* (Journal of Korean Historico-Musicology) 27(2001): p. 52.
- 26 Choe Seok-gi, "Seongho Gyeonghak-ui ironjeok gijeo" (Yi Ik's Understanding of Confucianism and Its Theoretical Basis), *Hanguk hanmunhak yeon-gu* (1996) 21: pp.626-629.
- 27 Yu Hong-jun, *op. cit.*, p.71; Bak Eun-sun, *op. cit.*, p.193.
- 28 Kim Yong-geol, "Seongho jayeon insik-gwa igiron chegye byeonhwa" (Yi Ik's Understanding of Nature and *Li-Qi* Theory), *Hanguk silhak yeon-gu* (Journal of Korean Silhak) (1999) 1: pp.16-32.
- 29 詩自風雅以降, 日興背騫(ᄇ)?, 以漢魏以後, 學詩者, 徒馳騁事辭以爲博, 藻繪景物以爲工, 甚至於較聲病鍊字句之法出, 而情性隱矣 . . . 至於里巷謳(ᄇ+欠)之音, 腔調雖不雅馴, 凡其愉佚怨歎猖狂粗莽之情狀態色, 各出於自然之真機. "Hubal" (Epilogue) in *Cheongu yeongeon* (Enduring Poetry of Korea).
- 30 Hong Dae-yong, *op. cit.*, 雖然 詩之所謂風者, 固是謠俗之恒談, --- 惟其信口成腔, 而言出衷曲不容安排, 而天真呈露, 則樵歌農謳, 亦出於自然者, 反復勝於士大夫之點竄敲推, 言則古昔, 而適足以斷(ᄇ)喪其天機也. 苟善觀者, 不泥於迹, 而以意逆志, 則其使人歡欣感發, 而要歸於作民成俗之義者, 初無古今之殊焉."
- 31 Kang Myeong-gwan, *Jeong Do-jeon-ui Jaedoron yeon-gu* (Study of Jeong Do-jeon's *Jaedo* Theory), *Hanmunhak nonjip* (Collected Papers of [Korean Classics Written in Chinese](#)): pp. 72~73.
- 32 Marcia Muelder Eaton, *Mihak-ui haeksim* (Basic Issues in Aesthetics), trans. Yu Ho-jeon (Seoul: Dong Moon Sun, 1998), p.262.
- 33 Jo Song-sik, "Bulsong sadaebu-ui uisik segye-wa chulsagwan mit geu yesul" (The World View of Scholar-Official of Northern Song Dynasty and the Arts), *Mihak* (Aesthetics) (1993): pp. 22 ~ 23.
- 34 Hong Seon-pyo, *op. cit.*, pp. 465-466.

Glossary

Begak 白岳

Cheon-gi 天幾

Cheonggu yeongeon 青丘永言

Cheongpunggye 清風溪

Guhakcheop 丘壑帖

Gyeonghwajasok 京華士族

Jaedoron 載道論,

Shujing (Ch.) 詩經

Silhak 實學

Yufu (Ch.) 漁夫
Zhuangzi 莊子
bonyeonjiseong 本然之性
cheon-gi 天幾
cheon-gi 賤技
cheon-li 天理
cheonilhabil 天人合一
cheonseong 天性
dao (Ch.) 道
dobeop jayeon 道法自然
feng (Ch.) 風
gagok 歌曲
gwanpung 觀風
heonmyeong jeongil 虛明精一
hwarui 活意
hyeonggi 形氣
jadeuk 自得
jeong 情
jeong 正
jeong-sim 正心
jeongni 正理
jin 眞
jin-gi 眞機
jin-gyeong sansuhwa 眞景山水畫
jin-gyeong 眞境
jincwi 眞趣
jingshi (Ch.) 經世
jinhyeong 眞形
jinmun 眞文
jinmyeonmok 眞面目
jinsi 眞詩
jinsiron 眞詩論
malyae 末藝
munjahyang 文字香
pansori 판소리

pungsokhwa 風俗畫
sanjo 산조
sansu punggyeonghwa 山水 風景畫
sarim 士林
seogwon-gi 書卷氣
seongjeong jijeong 性情之正
seongjeong jijin 性情之眞
seongjeong 性情
seongmyeong 性命
sildeuk 實得
sinawi 시나위
siseo hwageum 詩書畫琴
sodangyeong 所當然
sogak 俗樂
wanmul deungnak 玩物得樂
wanmulsangji 玩物喪志

References

- An, Dae-hoe. 1999. *18 segi hanguk hansisa yeon-gu* (A Study on the History of Korean Classical Chinese Poetry in Eighteenth Century). Seoul: Somyeong Publishing.
- Bak, Eun-sun. 1997. *Geumgang sando yeon-gu* (A Study on *Geumgangsando*). Seoul: Iljisa.
- Bak, So-jeong. 2001. “Akron-eul tonghebon jangja-ui yesul cheolhak” (Jang Ja’s Philosophy of Arts Through Music Theory). Ph.D. diss., Yonsei University.
- Choe, Jun-sik. 2002. *Hangugin-eun wae teul-eul geobuhaneun-ga* (Why do Koreans Reject the Framework). Seoul: Sonamoo Publishing Co.
- Choe, Seok-gi. 1996. “Seongho gyeonghak-ui gijeo” (The Foundation of Seong Ho’s Study of Chinese Classics). *Hanmunhak yeon-gu* (Studies of Classical Chinese) 21. Seoul: Hanmun hakhoe.
- Choe, Wan-su, et. al. 1998. *Jin-gyeong sidae* (The Jin-gyeong Era). Seoul: Dolbegae.

-
- Eaton, Marcia Muelder. 1998. *Mihak-ui haeksim*. Translated by Yu Ho-jeon. Seoul: Dongmunseon.
- Han, Jeong-hui. 1999. *Hanguk-gwa jungguk-ui hoehwa* (Chinese and Korean Pictorial Arts). Seoul: Hakgojae Publishing.
- Hanguk Misul-ui Jasaengseong Ganhaeng Wiwonhoe (Compilation Committee for the Publication of the Spontaneous Development of Korean Art). 1999. *Hanguk misul-ui jasaengsaengseong* (The Spontaneous Development of Korean Art). Seoul: Hankil Art.
- Hanguk Sasangsa Yeon-guhoe (Society for the Study of Korean Ideological History). 2002. *Joseon yuhak-ui geanyeomdeul* (Concepts of Joseon Confucianism). Seoul: Yemun Sowon.
- Hanguk Yesul Hakgwa Eumaksaryo Gangdokhoe (Reading Society for Korean Art History and Music History), ed. 2000. *Joseon-hugi munjip-ui eumaksaryo* (Collection of Music History Materials from Late Joseon). Seoul: Korean National University of Arts, Institute of the Traditional Arts.
- Hong, Seon-pyo. 1999. *Joseon sidae hoehwasaron* (History of Paintings in Joseon Dynasty). Seoul: Moonye Publishing Co.
- Im, Yu-gyeong. 1994. “18 segi cheon-giron-ui teukjing” (Characteristics of the Eighteenth Century Theory of *Cheon-gi*). *Hanmunhak yeon-gu* 19.
- Jin, Hong-seop, ed. 1996. *Hanguk misul jaryo jipseong* (Collection of Korean Art History Materials). Seoul: Ilchokak Publishing Co.
- Jo, Min-hwan. 1996. *Yuhakjadeu-i boneun nojang cheolhak* (Confucianists’ View of the Philosophies of Laozi and Zhuangzi). Seoul: Ye Mun Seo Won.
- Jo, Song-sik. 1993. “Buksong sadaebu-ui uisiksegye-wa chulsagwan mit geu yesul” (North Song Dynasty Scholar-Officials’ Conscious World, Their Perspective on Going Into Government Service, and Their Art). *Mihak* (Aesthetics) 18.
- Kang, Myeong-gwan. 1999. *Joseon sidae munhak yesul-ui saengseong gonggan* (Creative Spaces of Literature and Art in the Joseon Period). Seoul: Somyeong Publishing.
- Kim, Byeong-guk. 2002. *Gojeon siga-ui mihak tamgu* (Search for the Aesthetics of Classical Poetry). Seoul: Worin.

-
- Kim, Chang-heup. *Samyeonjip* (Complete Works of Kim Chang-heup).
- Kim, Chang-hyeop. *Nongamjip* (Complete Works of Kim Chang-Hyeop).
- Kim, Chun-mi. 1997. *Hanguk yesulhak-euro ganeun gil* (The Road to the Korean Art Studies). Seoul: Sigongsa Co.
- Kim, Chung-yeol. 1995. *Nojang cheolhak gangui* (Lectures in the Philosophies of Laozi and Zhuanzi). Seoul: Ye Mun Seo Won.
- Kim, Hye-suk, et al. 1997. *Yesul-gwa sasang* (Art and Ideas). Seoul: Ewha Womans University Press.
- Kim, Jong-tae. 1989. *Hangukhwaron* (Treaties on Korean Paintings) Seoul: Iljisa Publishing House.
- Kim, Mun-sik. 2000. *Jeong Jo-ui gyeonghak-gwa jujahak* (King Jeongjo's Understanding of Confucianism and Neo-Confucianism). Seoul: Munheon-gwa Haeseok-sa.
- Kim, Nam-hyeong. 1996. "Seongho-ui bipyeong uisik" (The Critical Consciousness of Yi Ik). *Hanmunhak yeon-gu* (A Study of Classical Chinese). 24.
- Kim, Sang-won. 2001. "Chae Won-bae-ui jungseo munhwa yunghapron" (Cai Yuanpei's Theory on Fusion of China and the West). *Inmun gwahak* (Human Science) 31.
- Kim, Yong-geol. 1999. "Seongho-ui jayeon insik-gwa igiron chegye byeonhwa" (Yi Ik's Understanding of Nature and Changes in *Li-Qi* Theory). *Hanguk silhak yeon-gu* (Journal of Korean Practical Learning) 1.
- Kwon, Deok-ju, et al. 1982. *Jungguk misul sasang-e daehan yeon-gu* (A Study of Chinese Art Ideologies). Seoul: Sookmyong Women's University Press
- Kwon, Yeong-pil, et al. 1994. *Hanguk mihak siron* (Essays on Korean Aesthetics). Seoul: Institute of Korean Culture, Korea University.
- Michaud, Yves. 1999. "21 segi jeonhwan-gi-ui hyeondae misul" (Modern Art at the Turn of 21st Century). Translated by Ha Tae-wan. Collection of Symposium Papers.
- Min, Ju-sik. 1990. "Toegye-ui mijeok in-ganhak" (Toegye's Aesthetic Study of Humans). *Mihak* 15.
- O, Byeong-nam. 1994. *Mihak gangui* (Lectures in Aesthetics). Seoul: Seoul National University

Press.

- O, Ju-seok. 1999. *Yetgeurim ilgi-ui jeulgeoum* (The Joy of Reading Traditional Art). Seoul: Sol Publishing.
- O, Se-chang, ed. 1998. *Geunyeok seohwajing* (Paintings and Calligraphy in Korea). Translated by Dongyang Gojeon Hakhoe (Society for Asian Classics) and compiled by Hanguk Misul Yeon-guso (Korean Art Institute). Seoul: Sigongsa.
- Shu, Fuguan. 1990. *Jungguk yesul jeongsin* (The Spirit of Chinese Art). Translated by Kwon Deok-ju. Seoul: Dong Moon Sun.
- Sin, Eun-gyeong. 1996. “Hangukjeok miuisik-ui han yuhyeong-euroseoui musim” (*Musim* as One Form of Korean Aesthetic Consciousness). *Jeongsin munhwa yeongu* (Korean Studies Quarterly) 19. 2.
- Song, Hyeok-gi. 1996. *Kim Chang-hyeop-ui munhangnon yeon-gu* (A Study of Kim Chang-hyeop’s Literary Theories). M.A. Thesis, Korea University.
- Tatarkievicz, W. 1994. *Yeoseotgaji gyeonyeom-ui yeoksa* (The History of Six Concepts). Translated by Yi Yong-dae. Seoul: Theory & Praxis Publishing Co.
- Yi, Dong-ju. 1996. *Uri yetgeurim-ui areumdaum* (The Beauty of Traditional Korean Art). Seoul: Sigongsa Co.
- Yi, Dong-jun. 1997. *Yugyo-ui indojuui-wa hanguk sasang* (Confucian Humanitarianism and Korean Thought). Seoul: Hangilsa Publishing.
- Yi, I. *Seonghakjibyo* (Collected Works on Sacred Learning).
- Yi, Ik. 1999. *Seongho saseol*. Translated by Choe Seok-gi. Seoul: Hangilsa Publishing Co. _____. *Seongho saseol*.
_____. *Seongho seonseng jeonjip* (Collected Works of Yi Ik).
- Yi, Ji-yang. 1999. “18 segi jin chuguron-gwa seongryeongseol” (Eighteenth Century Theory of Pursuing *Jin* and Theory of Spirit). *Hanmunhak yeon-gu* 24.
- Yi, Jong-muk. 2000. “16 segimal 17 segi hansisa yeon-gu” (A Study of Poetry Written in Chinese from the Late Sixteenth to Seventeenth Century). *Jeongsin munhwa yeon-gu* (winter): 87-89, 95.

-
- Yi, Seung-su. 1993. "17 segimal cheon-giron-ui hyeongseong-gwa insik-ui giban" (Formation and Theoretical Basis of the Seventeenth Century Theory of *Cheon-gi*). *Hanmunhak yeon-gu* 18.
- Yi, Tae-ho. 1996. *Joseon hugi-ui sasil jeongsin* (The Realism of Late Joseon). Seoul: Hakgojae Publishing.
- Yi, Yeong-uk. 2001. "Joseon hugi gajip-ui angnon yeon-gu" (A Study of the Music Theory of Song Books in the Late Joseon). *Hanguk eumaksa hakbo* (Journal of Korean Historiography) 27: 52.
- Yu, Hong-jun. 1998. *Joseon sidae hwaron yeon-gu* (Theories of Paintings in the Joseon Period). Seoul: Hakgojae Publishing.
- . 2002. *Hwain yeoljeon* (Biographies of Painters), vols 1 and 2. Seoul: Yuk Sa Bi Pyong Sa.
- Yun, Sa-sun. 1998. *Joseon sidae seongnihak yeon-gu* (A Study on Neo-Confucianism in the Joseon Period). Seoul: Institute of Korean Culture, Korea University.

K C I