

는 조선시대의 성리학의 최고의 인물이지만, 그럼에도 불구하고 당시에 또 사후에도 여러 학파 학자들에 의해 비판을 받았다. 이 발표의 목적은 그 비판의 원인을 분석에 있다. 율곡 사상에 대한 비판은 율곡의 에 대한 논쟁에서 그 대표적인 예를 찾아볼 수 있다. 또한, 조선 중/후기 학자의 문집에서도 율곡 사상 체계에 대한 철학적인 비판을 쉽게 찾아볼 수 있는데, 이기론에 대한 율곡의 입장, 어린 시절의 불교 경험, 나훔론에 대한 평가 등이 그 대표적인 예이다. 비판하는 학자들은 크게 율곡의 주장을 단순한 실수로 간주하거나 유교에 대한 다른 해석 즉 이단이라는 관점으로 끼쳐 해석하였다. 이 비판과 논쟁들을 분석하면 조선시대 유교 사상에서의 이단의 개념 사용을 구체적으로 파악할 수 있으며, 이를 통해 여러 학파 논쟁의 철학적인 원인과 그리고 비판 방식을 유추해 볼 수 있다.

## Yulgok as a Heretic

The aim of the paper is to present survey of late Chos ŏn period reflection concerning work and thought of Yulgok Yi I (1536-1584) from the perspective of scholars of competing schools and alternative philosophical currents. Although it is well known fact that many scholars affiliated with Toegye school criticized Yulgok's teaching, common opinion is that these critiques were rather scholastic academic debates concerning subtleties of *li* and *qi* hermeneutics. However these debates led sometimes to serious consequences as could be seen for example in the question of Yulgok's enshrinement in *Munmyo* (1682) his depose (1689) and subsequent reinstatement in 1694. Enemies of Yulgok school thus did not hesitate to dispute Yulgok's Confucian orthodoxy.

In order to understand precise mechanism of attacks of Yulgok we have to distinguish between scholarly critiques, which consider Yulgok as a true Confucian but with certain mistaken opinions and open attacks, which labeled Yulgok as a traitor of orthodoxy with heretic stances. This wide range of possible stances is well preserved in the works of scholars of later Chos ŏn period, who criticized Yulgok from multiple positions. Udam Ch ŏng Sihan (1625-1707) for example used supposed link between Yulgok and Luo Qinshun to create heretic lineage connecting Lu Xiangshan, Luo Qinshun and Yulgok and described Zhengan as the one who “ thought that *li* and *qi* are one thing and did not differ from the opinion of Xiangshan ... and openly insulted the established explanations of Master Zhu” adding that “Yulgok thus took Zhengan as his teacher.” Although this argument is obviously not valid, the aim of such comparison Lu Xiangshan and Yulgok is to exclude Yulgok from the realm of orthodoxy and equal him with one of the most notable Confucian heretics and we can find many similar accusations.

In my paper I would like to explore relevance of these attacks on Yulgok, their motives and most notably methods and arguments used. Given the standard academic animosity between Chos ŏn scholars we have to carefully distinguish between rhetorical accusation and serious arguments in order to fully understand means and the meaning of scholarly dialogue concerning Yulgok's heritage and its traditional evaluation.