

(1960)

()

I.

“ ”

.

“ ”

“

,

(Existentialism) , 19

가

.

.

20

가

,

,

(Edmund Husserl)

(

)

가 21

.

.

가

가

.

가

,

21

19

20

.

.

(, 1987: 336).

,

,

,

가

.

가

,

.

가

가 3 1 (2000)

1960

가

1920

. 1970

1945

, 1950 6.25

1952

8 「 J²⁾

가?

1960

1953 「 J

() “

論”

「 J 「 J

1910

, ‘ 가?’

. 1910

(, ,

), , , 가

. 1920

가

(W. James), (Thomas More), (F. W.

1954

「

(實存

Nietzsche),

(H. Cohen),

(E. Husserl)

主義) <

> J(

)가

1946

가

8

1920

. 1920 6 25

「 J

1955

“

”가

, 1920

「 J

“

”가, 2

“

:

「

J

”

1)(

, 1987).

2) 「

”가, 『新興』 2 (1929. 12.7)

: Husserl 『

가, 1987), pp. 399-402.

: 1953 4 1967 12

1989

20

1) 『新興』 (1929. 7.15)

“『

』

(1960)

“ ”, “ ”, “ ” 가 가
“ ” 가
가

1956
“ ”, “ ” 가
“ ”
1957 “ ”,
“ ”, W. S. “ ” 가
“ ”, “ ”, “ ” (, 1958: 34)
“ ”
“ ”

1958 가
“ ”, “ ”, 가
“ ” 가
“ ” 가”() 1956
1958 6 4
가 1958 8
< > 가
가

“ ”, “ ”, “ ”
“ ”, “ ”, “ ”
“ ”, “ ”, “ ”
가”
(參入)
.(

, 1958: 57)

(誠實)

(1813- 1855)

가 3 1 (2000)

(1874- 1948) 가
, , ‘ ’ .(가 , 1965: 76)
,
6.25 5,60
- -
1957 7
「 」 2
- Sartre
“
”
1958 10 , 1966 「
“가 ”, 1959 」 4 “Heidegger
“ - ”, (1)” 1967 5 “Heidegger
“ ” , 1960 가 “ (2)”
“ < > ” “ 1968 7 “Heidegger
” , “ Stimmung Geschick”
“ ” , 8 가 “Heidegger”
” , 1961 가
“ ” “ ” 가
가
가
가
“ ”(,) 가
「 」 가 1966 5
“Heidegger
1964 “ 詩 神” , 1967 6
” , “ ” 2 가 “Heidegger < >
” , 1965 가 “ ” <理氣>
“ ” “
- . . ”
가 “ 1968 11 3
“Heidegger (行) ” ,
1969 11 4 가 “Heidegger
”
1954 「 」 “
” <
가 > < >
< > 가
가
가

(1960)

1960

가

가 (, 1992: 19 . 가 , . 183).

1950 . 20
6·25

, 1958 「 」(
, :), 「 가
」(, :) . (1996: 278- 292, 311- 328)
, 1959 「 가」 , 1880
(, :), 「
」(, :), 가
「 」(, :) 가
 . (明治) 20 (1887- 1896)

1906

9

가

가
가 1920

가 3 1 (2000)

1930 1925 1931

1966 10 「 」 (4

) . “< >

” , “

”

1945

, 6 · 25

가

1950- 60

가

, 가

. 1964 11

가

「 」

1931

1930

가

(

, 1966: 51-52).

가

가 (, 1984: 166- 167).

4)

?

「 」 「 」

, , ,

1.

「 1977 10 10 「

」 (1977) 1964
1977 70 가

가

3)

3) 1964 11 11

4) , 「 」 (: , 1963)

“ ”

(1960)

가

.

가 , , , ,

(, 1966: 52).

‘ , ’

가 가

가

가 가

가 (

, 1966: 53). 가 (, 1966: 110).

,

1967 “

”

.

.

가가

< >

가 .

가 .

1)

, 2) , 3)가 ,

4) , 5) 가 ,

, 6) , 7) 가 .

가 (가

, 1966: 105- 109).

. , ,

,

.

, 가

.

,

,

.

(situation)

가

가 ,

가

.

가 ,

가 .

(人間) 가

(, 1967: 105).

“

: Personality ”

,

(Martin Buber) , 『 』 21 (1963) “

.

”

.

.

가

가 . < >

(, 1963: 19).

(, 1967: 109).

, “

”

,

, “

가

-

” 20

,

, , , , ,

, , , , ,

,

,

가

,

1960 가

60 2

1968 가 “

가

”

.

.

,

2.

,

, 가

1962 (David

(1960)

C. McClelland)

(H. A. Murray), (A. H. Maslow), (J. W. Atkinson)

70 80 5).

6) ,

가 .

(, 1968: 2).

,

1960 . 60

가 가 ,

3.

1. ,

,

, 1966 가

(George F. Kneller, 1966) 「 」,

2. 가

1967 가 (Otto F.

Bollnow, 1967) 「 」,

(1967)가 「

: 」

가 .

가

(, 1968: 35).

5) 「 」 , 1983 10 43 1 , 84

9 46 1 , 86 10 52 1 , 88

10 57 1 90 60 1

5 .

1977 「 」

1982 5 2 .

6) "(, 1970); ,

" ; "(

, 1975); , " , 1975);

"(, 1981); , "

- O.F. Bollnow , " ,

"(, 1981); , 「

"(,

1983); , " "(, 1984); ,

" , 1987); , " "(,

"(, 1989)

가

가

가 3 1 (2000)

가

(1967)

, 「 (1969)

가

가

가

(, 1969:).

가

60

(, 1967: 2).

가

2 “ ” :

가

(哲學史上)

가

가

가

가

(1963: 85- 102)

(, 1967: 2)

(1966: 11) 「

「 (G. F. Kneller) 「

」(*Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*), (N. Berdyaev) 「

」(*Slavery and Freedom*), (M. Buber) 「 (Ich und Du),

(1960)

4 가
「 27 (1966) “
”
가 1965
1957
「 9 X
“ (Existentialism): 1967 「 3 가
(Maritain) ” 가 (1965 , 1993: 187)
「 1 1 60
“ ”
(1963)
「 V.
「 11 5 “
”
1960 20
4.
가
가
1963 「 21
“
”
1966 「 (145 , 11) , ,
(C. A. Bowers)
“ ” , ,
“ ” , ,
가
가

가 3 1 (2000)

가

1920

1950- 60

1960

1920

1960

40

1945

1950

6.25

7)

가

(1969:

)가

“

가

가

”

1950

1960

가

1970

80

「

」가 1920

1950- 60

가

7)

(1998: 253)

“

가

가

가

”

- Bollnow, Otto F(1967). 「
 (1967). 「
 (1981). 「
 (1966). < > 「 (1989). 「 1953.4
 4 . 46 53. 1967.12.
 (1963). 「
 (1975).
 「 21 .
 5 19.
 No. 3. CD-Rom (1997).
 (1966).
 「 27 .
 165 172.
 (1968).
 (1987). 「
 (1996). 「
 (1966). 「現代教育」
 17 .
 9 28.
 (1967). 「
 149 . 10
 4 110.
 (1966).
 「 4 .
 101 110.
 (1998). 「
 Kneller, George F(1966). 「
 Bowers, C. A(1966).
 「 145 .
 133 139.
 (1984). 「
 (1992). 「
 Bollnow, Otto F(1967). 「
 (1967). 「
 (1981). 「
 (1966). 「 1953.4
 1967.12.
 (1963). 「
 (1975).
 (1969).
 (1969). 「
 (1983).
 (1970).
 (1957). 「
 (1981).
 - O.F.Bollnow
 (1987).
 가 (1965). 「
 16 .
 (1975).
 (1984).
 (1979). 「
 (1945- 1978)」.
 (1958). 가.
 「 7 .
 (1980). 「
 (1956- 1979)」.
 (1999). 「 (1963- 1998).
 (1990). 「
 1 (5).
 (1966,67,68). 「

가 3 1 (2000)

4,5,6,7,8 .

(1957). 「 」. 2 .

(1987). 「 」(). :

.

(1968). 「 」. : .

(1958). . 「 」,

7 .

ABSTRACT

The Acceptance and Development of the Existential Philosophy of Education in Korea

Sun-Bo Kang
(Korea University)

The purpose of this study is to examine the acceptance, development, and influences of existential philosophy of education in Korea.

The development of science and technology in modern society caused the dehumanizing phenomenon. Therefore, man tends to be as a being of means or a mechanical being. The Existentialism, which appeared in the early 20th century, contrived the recovering of the humanity while emphasizing on the quest for the human being.

The existentialism was introduced to the field of philosophy in Korea during the 1920s. However, its acceptance and development as an educational philosophy was during the 1960s.

Despite this slow acceptance of existentialism in education, Sasanggye, one of the leading monthly academic journals of the early 20th century intellectual class in Korea, played a very important role in the introduction of the existentialism to the general public. During the 1950s-1960s process of the existentialism's formal acceptance to the field of education in Korea, Enwoo Kim, Shinwong Kang, and Kyuho Lee, three of the leading scholars in the educational philosophy, sought for the possible future of Korea's education in the existentialism,

therefore their prudent academic effort should take a significant place in the process of the existentialism's reception to educational philosophy in Korea.

Due to the fact that the most part of the modern Korean educational system was established under heavy influence of the American pragmatism of John Dewey during the two decades after the 1945 Liberation, the influence of the existentialism in education was very insignificant. This insignificant contribution of the existentialism was also caused by the characteristic methodological limitation. Undoubtedly the inferior surroundings in the educational practice in Korea during that period also played an important role in this insignificant contribution of the existentialism in the field of education and, the existentialism had been a mere theory without practice among many other minor ideas in education. However, it seems that the historical importance of the existentialism was quite significant as its role of providing a broader understanding of education and students to the educators in the field through its unique idea of the uncontinual formulative possibility in education(die Möglichkeit der unstetigen Formen in der Erziehung).

Key words : Existential philosophy of education, Acceptance of existentialism, Whole education, Educational anthropology, Existential view of man, Encounter, Humanism