

## The Subtle Path to Heterodoxy: Reflections on the Concept of 'Yiduan' in the *Jinsilu*

Milan Hejtmanek<sup>1</sup>

---

### ARTICLE INFO

Available Online October 2013

Key words:

Heterodoxy;  
Korea;  
Chosŏn dynasty;  
Neo-Confucianism;  
Jinsilu.

### ABSTRACT

Neo-Confucian philosophy in the Korean Chosŏn period (1392-1910) partook of a moral discourse that drew extensively on Song Chinese texts from the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries. Among these, the *Jinsilu* (Reflections on Things at Hand), compiled by Zhu Xi and LüZuqian in 1175 proved especially influential. This paper examines in detail a central theme of the *Jinsilu*: heterodoxy or yiduan, situating it both within the broader traditions of earlier Confucianism and as well as within the context of Neo-Confucian thought or daoXue as it was developed the 11<sup>th</sup> century, by the brothers Cheng Yi and Cheng Hao. It identifies three distinct, if overlapping conceptions of heterodoxy in the *Jinsilu*. The paper argues that the most pessimistic and aggressive attitude toward the danger of straying from the orthodox way and the condemning of those who had done so derived from Cheng Yi. His thought and sense of near dread concerning heterodoxy would prove highly influential in Chosŏn Korea.

---

### Introduction

It is a remarkable feature of recorded human civilization that discourse drawn from a wide variety of times and places displays fierce struggles over what constitutes proper moral behavior and correspondingly what should be castigated as wrong and evil. Moral traditions in the West as diverse as Judaism, Islam, and in the East Buddhism, Hinduism, and Confucianism have bequeathed prolific discourses deploying a wide array of rhetorical strategies to argue both sides of complex ethical issues. The production and reproduction of dogma and its antithesis, heresy or heterodoxy, is a central activity of any system of moral thought.

Implicit in this vast spectacle of opposing camps castigating each other over the supposed errors their respective moral positions is the observation of Jacques Berlinerblau that heterodoxy itself can only be understood in relation to orthodoxy, for it cannot exist on its own but only as the object of condemnation by the camp styling itself as "orthodox."<sup>2</sup> Indeed without a sense of the borders of appropriate thought and belief defined by notions of heterodoxy, notions of what is proper lose focus and meaning.

Moreover such battles are intimate ones, waged within communities sharing a common language and overlapping values. Heterodoxy is a threat precisely because it appeals to the same social and intellectual groups as those sharing the orthodox values and challenges their claim to truth using a similar conceptual framework attempting "order its discourse to some other end." The challenge is perceived as all the more menacing due to its ideological proximity.<sup>3</sup>

In the long tradition of Confucianism, such considerations of the correct 正 (Korean *chŏng*) and the warped 曲 (*kok*) or 邪 (*sa*) have long been ardently, even violently argued. As Liang Qiqiao once mused:

Since Han times, Confucianism has been, for over 2,000 years, the dominant Teaching. . . .  
And there have been disputes over orthodoxy and heterodoxy. . . as each person considers his own thinking to be Confucius' teaching, while criticizing others as being not Confucian. Thus. . . Confucius became, in turn. . . Han Yu (786-824) and OuyangXiu (1007-70), and Cheng Yi (1032-1107) and Zhu Xi (1130-1200), and then Lu Xiangshan (1139-92) and Wang Yangming (1472-1529). . . .This has been the result of 2,000 years of defensive mentality. But was Confucius really what they say he was?<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Korean History, Seoul National University

<sup>2</sup>Berlinerblau (2001), pp. 330-31.

<sup>3</sup>George V. Zito(1983), p. 125.

<sup>4</sup> Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, *Ying-ping-shih ho-chi, Wen-chi*, 9:55-56, cited in Ching (1974), p. 371. The Chinese names have been converted to pinyin romanization for the sake of consistency.

The world of Neo-Confucianism 性理學 in Korea fits well into this mold, with keenly felt disputes raging over major metaphysical issues relating to the nature of principle 理 and material force 氣, their connection to the realm of fundamental moral instinct 四端 and affect 七情. Over time these became deeply embedded in political communities sharing a common worldview, but at times bitterly divided over whose position was more orthodox.

The complicated discourse of heterodoxy within the Neo-Confucian tradition finds a point of commonality in the use of the term *yiduan* (Korean *yidan*) "heresy" or "heterodoxy" to stigmatize those deemed morally benighted. This term appears to be an organic metaphor referring to "wild shoots" that lack a common origin. Its *locus classicus* in the Confucian tradition is a reference in the Analects 2:16 論語:

子曰攻乎異端斯害也已

This somewhat mysterious passage has been given a standard translation in English by James Legge as: "The Master said, "The study of strange doctrines is injurious indeed!"

While tantalizing in its implications, in the end, as Derk Bodde concluded after an extensive examination of the passage, "We have no idea when or why Confucius made this utterance."<sup>5</sup>

Another important precedent for Neo-Confucian identification of new targets for identification as *yiduan*, was that of Han Yu 韓愈 (768—824), who, as noted in the *XinTangshu* 新唐書, devoted much energy to castigating the Buddhists and Daoists, now deemed heterodox in the classical sense:<sup>6</sup>  
先生之業,可謂勤矣. 祇排異端,攘斥佛老

This perspective would be made even more explicit in the emerging *daoxue* discourse of the Northern Song period, given potent focus by Zhu Xi in the twelfth century in his compilation of writings from a set of eleventh-century thinkers, *Jinsilu*.

### ***Reflections on Things at Hand (Jinsilu 近思錄)***

*Reflections on Things at Hand* is the earliest and most influential of the Neo-Confucian compendia. After being compiled in 1175 over the subsequent centuries it came to be disseminated widely over East Asia it came to be read and studied closely by most, if not all, the major scholars and thinkers in China, Korea, and Japan. As much as the content itself, the conceptual classification provided by Zhu and Lu was seminal in systematizing the scattered and haphazard legacy of the Northern Song thinkers. The structure itself, set out in the following fourteen chapters, became a blueprint for all subsequent compendia of Neo-Confucian thought and gave form to the realm of *daoxue* and helped provide a unified vocabulary for its articulation. Chapter Titles:<sup>7</sup>

1. On the Substance of the Way 道體類
2. The Essentials of Learning 為學類
3. The Investigation of Things and the Investigation of Principle to the Utmost 致知類
4. Preserving One's Mind and Nourishing One's Nature 存養類
5. Correcting Mistakes, Improving Oneself, Self-Discipline, and Returning to Propriety 克己類
6. The Way to Regulate the Family 家道類
7. On Serving or Not Serving in the Government, Advancing or Withdrawing 出處類
8. On the Principles of Governing the State and Bringing Peace to the World 治體類
9. Systems and Institutions 治法類
10. Methods of Handling Affairs 政事類

---

<sup>5</sup>Henderson (1998), p. 21. Henderson also points out that the meaning of *yiduan* also has a variant interpretation as the beginning point of a line or thread that do not mesh with the common fabric, also indicating deviation.

<sup>6</sup>*XinTangshu*, 189, Biographies, 101, 先生之業,可謂勤矣. 祇排異端,攘斥佛老.

<sup>7</sup>As Wing-tsit Chan usefully points out, strictly speaking these chapter titles were not original to Zhu Xi and Lü Zuqian, but were added at a later date by subsequent scholars, starting with Yeh Cai 葉采 (fl. 1248). They are, however, generally close in meaning to the summaries that Zhu Xi provided, and in the case of Chapter 13, on heterodoxy, similar to Zhu's own use. See Chan (1989), 363-365.

11. The Way to Teach 教學類
12. Correcting Mistakes and the Defects of the Human Mind 警戒類
13. Sifting the Heterodoxical Doctrines 辨異端類
14. On the Dispositions of Sages and Worthies 觀聖賢類

The work consists of 662 passages, drawn from 14 works of four eleventh-century thinkers living around Luoyang: Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤 (1017-73), Zhang Zai 張載 (1020-77), Cheng Hao 程顥 (1032-85), and Cheng Yi 程頤 (1033-1107). On the basis of efforts by Zhu Xi, his colleagues, and disciples this group later came to be identified as the progenitors of Song-period *daoxue* and apotheosized as sages, while other contemporary thinkers, such as Shao Yong 邵雍 (1011-77) were excluded and marginalized.

Scholars have carefully examined the sources of the various passages and determined that by far the largest number came from the writings of Cheng Yi (338 out of the 662, or about 54%), next his brother Cheng Hao (162 or 26%), next their uncle Zhang Zai (110 18%), and last, their teacher Zhou Dunyi (12 or 2%).

The work was compiled by Zhu Xi (1130-1200) and his friend and intellectual partner Lü Zuqian 呂祖謙 (1137-81) over the space several weeks in the fifth month of the important year of 1175, which was to see as well the famed discussion between Zhu Xi and Lu Jiuyuan 陸九淵 one month later at the Goose Lake Temple.

In Korea, this work was of central importance in the understanding and adoption of Neo-Confucianism. Virtually every major *sōngnihak* thinker in the Chosŏn period had writings associated with the *Jinsilu*, including such prominent thinkers as diverse in their intellectual approaches as Cho Kwang-jo 趙光祖 (1482-1519), Yi Hwang 李滉 (1501-1570), Cho Sik 曹植 (1501-72), Sŏng Hon 成渾 (1535-98), Yi I 李珥 (1536-84), Kim Chang-saeng 金長生 (1548-1631), Hŏ Kyun 許筠 (1569-1618), Kim Chip 金集 (1574-1656), Song Yi-yŏl (宋時烈) (1607-1689), Yun Hyu 尹□ (1617-1680), Yun Chung 尹拯 (1629-1714), Chŏng Che-du 鄭齊斗 (1649-1736), An Chŏng-bok 安鼎福 (1712-1791), Hong Tae-yong 洪大容 (1731-1783), and Chŏng Yag-yong 丁若鏞 (1762-1836).<sup>8</sup>

Politically the *Jinsilu* proved highly influential, as it was frequently used as a text for exegesis during Royal Lectures, beginning at least as early as 1418, where a reference to Sejong (r. 1418-50) in the first year of his reign being lectured on the work is to be found in the *Sillok*.<sup>9</sup> Later in the fifteenth century, Sŏngjong (r. 1469-1494) would use the notorious passage in the *Jinsilu*, Chapter 6<sup>10</sup> concerning the immorality of widows' remarriage as a justification for banning offspring of remarried widows from participation in the state examination.<sup>11</sup>

Following the disastrous fall of Cho Kwang-jo and his Neo-Confucian reformer allies in the 1519 *kimyo* literati purge, the work declined in royal unpopularity until the reign of Sŏnjo (r. 1567-1608) when it enjoyed both royal favor and was in great fashion among the literati, as noted by a rare critic of *sōngnihak* in 1576:

[The adherents of *sōngnihak*] maintain that literati customs are degraded and read the *Sinjŏng* 心經 and *Jinsilu* seeking fame. They delude those around them with the teaching of empty practice and build *sŏwŏn*, thereby causing grievance to the populace. That Cheng Yi and Zhu Xi both gained the stigma [of promoting] false learning (*wihak* 偽學) was their own fault.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> For detailed biographies of these Korean thinkers, see the Han'gukhak Chungang Yŏn'guwŏn Biographical Database; for their collected writings, see Han'guk Kojŏnpŏnyŏkwŏn Database.

<sup>9</sup> *Chosŏn wangjosillok, Sejongsillok*, 1418.11.13 *musul*.

<sup>10</sup> *Jinsilu*, 6:13. "[For a widow] to starve to death is a very small matter. To lose one's integrity, however, is a very serious matter."

<sup>11</sup> *Chosŏn wangjosillok, Sŏngjongsillok*, 1483.9.11 *sinch'uk*.

<sup>12</sup> *Chosŏn wangjosillok, Sŏnjosujŏngsillok*, 1576.7 *imjin*. The author, Im Ki 林芑, of this memorial was a low-ranking official, whose broadside attack on the Neo-Confucianists aroused a firestorm of dissension, but Sŏnjo refused to censure him. While literati later in the Chosŏn period, such as Yun Hyu, challenged the absolute authority of Zhu Xi, this may well have been the last such official attempt in the Chosŏn period openly to condemn Zhu Xi and Cheng Yi thought in such harsh terms. It is notable for being cited in the revised (*sujŏng*) *Sillok*.

### 'Heterodoxy' in the *Jinsilu*

In the vast conceptual space addressed by the work, due attention was paid to the need to identify and guard against heretical thought. The term '*yiduan*' appears multiple times in four chapters: 2 (為學類 "On the Essentials of Learning"), 3 (致知類 "The Investigation of Things"), 13 (辨異端類 "Sifting the Heterodoxical Doctrines"), and 14 (觀聖賢類 "On the Dispositions of Sages and Worthies").

The general sense of its use in Chapters 2, 3, and 14 is largely that of Buddhism and Daoism as heretical doctrines. In Chapter 2:56, for example:

The learning of the ancients consisted of only one thing, whereas the learning of today consists of three things, not including the heterodoxical doctrines. The first is literary composition; the second, textual criticism; and the third Confucianism. If one wishes to advance toward the Way, nothing other than Confucianism will do.<sup>13</sup>

This passage, by Cheng Yi, treats learning with a three-fold division: the desirable field of Confucianism, the less-desirable but still acceptable realms of literary composition and textual criticism, and the unnamed heretical fields, presumably Buddhism and Daoism. The need to exclude them explicitly speaks to their general popularity.

Similarly, the passage in Chapter 3 once again echoes the unnamed heterodoxical doctrines, but in a more lenient, tolerant way, likely representative of Zhang Zai, the author of the passage.

In reply to Fan Sunzhi Master Hengchu [Zhang Zai] said: It is not difficult to discuss the strange things and monstrous beings you inquired about, but you may not believe in what I say. Mencius said, "He who knows his nature knows Heaven." When one has studied to the point of knowing Heaven [Nature], then how things originate should be abundantly self-evident. When one knows how things originate, then whether there is such and such a thing will be completely understood, and one need not depend on any to know. If you gentlemen hold on without fail to what you have discussed, are not overcome by heterodoxical doctrines, and keep advancing without stop, you need not refute the theories of monstrosities or attack heterodoxical doctrines, and within a year our Way will win.<sup>14</sup>

Given the stridency of the author's nephew, Cheng Yi, on the issue of heresy and the subsequent development of an aggressive posture toward all thought deemed heretical by Zhu Xi his intellectual descendants, the generous, tolerant spirit of this passage, confident in the self-evident truth of the *daoxue* position seems almost quaint and hints at a path that subsequent thinkers might have taken but in the main did not.

The attitude of Cheng Hao and Cheng Yi toward Buddhist doctrines was distinctly more defensive and critical, but differed in nuances, perhaps as a result of their experiences in life. Cheng Hao spent some ten years of his youth immersed in various Daoist and Buddhist schools before returning to Confucianism, and the experience seems to have given him a keen appreciation of the sophistication and attractiveness of non-Confucian intellectual traditions. It is an interesting, even remarkable fact, that no instance of the use of the term *yiduan* in the *Jinsilu* can be directly traced to writings by Cheng Hao. Rather his critique of non-Confucian schools while condemnatory is marked by a degree of informed appreciation of their sophistication and of their concomitant power to seduce the unwary. For Cheng Hao the attractiveness of Buddhism lay precisely in its incorporation of certain salutary practices, such as those embodying reverence or seriousness (*jing* 敬), even as it completely neglects other more important aspects of the Way, including the need to face the world with standards of behavior based on righteousness (*i* 義).

... Therefore the superior man in dealing with the world is not for anything or against

---

<sup>13</sup>古之學者一，今之學者三，異端不與焉。一曰文章之學，二曰訓詁之學，三曰儒者之學。欲趨道，舍儒者之學不可 Translation from Chu Hsi and Lu Tsu-ch'ien (1967), p. 63. Note that the romanization has been changed to pinyin, for consistency.

<sup>14</sup>Chu Hsi, Lu Tsu-ch'ien, (1967) pp. 94-95. 橫渠先生答范巽之曰：所訪物怪神奸，此非難語，願語未必信耳。孟子所論"知性知天"，學至於知天，則物所從出，當源源自見。知所從出，則物之當有當無，莫不心論，亦不待語而後知。諸公所論，但守之不失，不為異端所劫，進進不已，則物怪不須辨，異端不必攻。

anything. He follows righteousness as the standard. If one is for or against anything, there will be a distinction between him and the Way and that would not be Heaven and Earth in their completeness. In the learning of the Buddhists there is seriousness to straighten the internal life but no righteousness to square the external life. . . .<sup>15</sup>

The consequence of a wrong turn toward Buddhism may be a moral dead end. Yet, having sampled the power of such alternative doctrines to mislead, Cheng Hao by no means underestimates their seductiveness, and deploys sensual metaphors in his rhetorical cause:

A student should forthwith get as far away from Buddhist doctrines as from licentious songs and beautiful women. Otherwise they will soon infiltrate him.<sup>16</sup>

In the end, however, for Cheng Hao as for Zhang Zai Buddhism, while beguiling to the naïve and untutored, poses no substantial threat to those who have gained a mature understanding of Confucian thought.

About Buddhist doctrines, it is all the more unnecessary to say we should be cautious at all times. After we have gained self-confidence, they cannot confuse us.<sup>17</sup>

The *Jinsilu* also presents Cheng Hao's ruminations on the field of non-Mencian thought in ancient China, but grafting on Buddhism as well. The following seminal passage reflects his understanding of the past 1500 years of heterodoxy and how the various threats to his own understanding of Confucian orthodoxy compare to one another. It is significant that Zhu Xi and Lu Ziqian chose to place this passage at as opening to Chapter 13, "Sifting the Heterodoxical Doctrines", and it was likely one of the most influential in the entire work:

Master Ming-dao said: The harm of Yang Ju and Mo Di is greater than that of Shen Zi and Han Zi, and the harm of the Buddha and Lao Zi is greater than that of Yang and Mo. Yang Ju's egoism bears some vague resemblance to the doctrine of righteousness, while Mo Zi's universal love bears some vague resemblance to humanity. Shen Zi and Han Zi are shallow and vulgar, and obviously so. Therefore Mencius attacked only Yang and Mo, for they delude the world to the highest degree. The words of the Buddha and Lao Tzu are somewhat reasonable. In this they cannot be matched by Yang and Mo. This is why they are very much more harmful. Their harmful teachings have been exposed by Mencius. That is why the road is now open and wide.<sup>18</sup>

In sum, the attitude presented in his own voice in the *Jinsilu* by Cheng Hao is that of one who has returned to the ideological fold of his youth after straying into dangerous heretical realms. For him Buddhism and Daoism maintain a superficial appeal, for they capture certain partial truths, but as a result are all the more dangerous to the uninitiated. In the end, though, Cheng Hao maintains a genial confidence in the power of *daoxue* to triumph after its many centuries of eclipse.

His younger, and more influential brother, Cheng Yi, while sharing many of the same understandings of orthodoxy and heresy, in the *Jinsilu* is shown as holding a more pessimistic and aggressive attitude toward the realms of the profane. His own, famed presentation of his brother's life (from his memorial biography) makes pointed reference to *yiduan*, and highlights the deep, subtle dangers it posed. This passage is very likely the *locus classicus* of all subsequent evocations of *yiduan* as a unified concept authorizing defensive confrontation. His use of the phrase "辨異端" ("sifting heterodoxical doctrines") was picked up by Zhu Xi and Lu Ziqian as a classification of *daoxue* knowledge, and used to assemble a variety writings in Chapter 13 and given that title. An ironic fact is, though, that the term "*yiduan*" itself does not appear in any of the writings in this chapter entitled 辨異端, and it would seem that its generalized application to indicate any school of thought deemed heterodox by the *daoxue* thinkers was just beginning in the eleventh century and

---

Chu Hsi, Lu Tsu-ch'ien, (1967), p. 281. . . .故君子之于天下也，無適也，無莫也，義之與比。若有適有莫，則於道為有間，非天地之全也。彼釋氏之學，於"敬以直內"則有之矣，"義以方外"則未之有也。 . . . (13:3)

<sup>16</sup>Chu Hsi, Lu Tsu-ch'ien, (1967), p. 283. 學者于釋氏之說，直須如淫聲美色以遠之。不爾，則駸駸入其中矣。 . . . (13.5)

<sup>17</sup>Chu Hsi, Lu Tsu-ch'ien, (1967), p. 283-84. 釋氏之學，更不消言常戒。到自家自信後，便不能亂得。 (13.5)

<sup>18</sup>Chu Hsi, Lu Tsu-ch'ien, (1967), pp. 279-280. As Wing-tsit Chan has pointed out (p. 279, fn.2) there is reason to believe the text interchanges "righteousness" 義 and "humanity" 仁 when discussing Yang Ru and Mo Di, provoking centuries of debate. 明道先生曰：楊墨之害，甚于申韓。佛老之害，甚于楊墨。楊氏為我，疑於義。墨氏兼愛，疑於仁。申韓則淺陋易見。故孟子只闢楊墨。為其惑世之甚也。佛老其言近理，又非楊墨之比。此所以為害尤甚。楊墨之害，亦經孟子闢之，所以廓如也。

was taken up by Zhu Xi and widely used a century later.

In his pursuit of learning, when he was fifteen or sixteen, the Master [Cheng Hao] heard Zhou Maoshu of Runan discuss the Way. He gave up forthwith the endeavor to prepare for civil service examinations and enthusiastically made up his mind to seek the Way. As he did not know the essentials he drifted among the different schools and went in and out of the Daoist and Buddhist schools for almost ten years. Then he returned to seek the Way in the *Six Classics* and found it there. . . He sifted the heterodoxical doctrines which seem to be right, and he removed the delusions which had kept a hundred generations in the dark. . . He said, "The Way has not been illuminated because the heterodoxical schools have harmed it. The harm they did in the past was immediate and was easily known, but the harm now is deep and is difficult to sift...Their doctrines are extremely deep and extremely subtle, but they cannot be used to enter into the Way of Yao and Shun.... Even people of great ability and bright intelligence have been tarnished by what they see and hear. They are as if drunk or in a deep dream without realizing they are so."<sup>19</sup>

This theme in Cheng Yi of the great dangers for even the best and brightest minds inherent in straying off the correct path may well have derived from following at a distance his brother's decade-long explorations of the heterodox. There is a special poignancy to his lament (put in words from his own brother's mouth), "They are as if drunk or in a deep dream without realizing they are so" that may speak to personal experience and resonates with Cheng Yi's own seeming tendency toward misanthropy compared to his brother's warm sociability. It is said that when the two entered a hall together, everybody followed Cheng Hao to one side, while nobody followed Cheng Yi to the other.<sup>20</sup>

Passages from the *Jinsilu* provide insight into Cheng Yi's somewhat morbid fear of contact with the world and his belief that it would provoke the possibility of error. In Chapter 4 ("Preserving One's Mind" 存養類) in an intricate discussion of the interpretation of hexagram 52 from the *Book of Changes* 周易, is found the following tortured depiction of Cheng Yi wrestling with desires and advocating withdrawal from contact with external things, in order to avoid error.

One cannot be at ease when he is resting because he is stirred with desires. How can he rest when desires pull him forward? ...When one stops at the point which cannot be seen, there will be no desires to disturb his mind and he can rest at ease.... Walk in the hall and do not see the people in it." The space between the hall and the porch is very near. But if one stops with his back to it, even what is nearest cannot be seen. This means that one is not lured into contact with external things. When he is free from such contact, internal desires will not arise. To rest in this way is to do so according to the proper principle of resting. In this kind of resting "there will be no error."<sup>21</sup>

Such an express desire to avoid any moral contamination through complete withdrawal from the world struck even Zhu Xi as odd. Although he chose to include this passage in *Jinsilu*, from remarks found in the *Classified Sayings of Zhu Xi* (朱子語類) it is clear that he disagreed with it: "The idea of having no contact with external things is difficult to understand."<sup>22</sup>

This strain of active defensiveness seems to have provoked deep suspicions concerning not only the dangers inherent in the world without, but also those subtle snares that lurked within one's own mind. As a result, for Cheng Yi, one must be on constant guard lest heterodox ideas take seed, unaware, in the sanctity of one's private thoughts.

---

<sup>19</sup>Chu Hsi, Lu Tsu-ch'ien, 1967, 299-301. Emphasis is the author's and not in the original translation. 道先生行狀曰：...先生爲學，自十五六時，聞汝南周茂叔論道，遂厭科口之業，慨然有求道之志。未知其要，泛濫于諸家，出入於老釋者，幾十年。返求諸六。而後得之。...辨異端似是之非，開百代未明之惑...其言曰：道之不明，異端害之昔之害近而易知，今之害深而難辨...窮深極微，而不可以入堯舜之道。雖高才明智，膠於見聞，醉生夢死，不自覺也。(14：17)

<sup>20</sup>Chu Hsi, Lu Tsu-ch'ien, (1967) , "Introduction", p. xxxi.

<sup>21</sup>Chu Hsi, Lu Tsu-ch'ien, (1967) , pp. 124-25. Emphasis is the author's and not in the original translation. 人之所以不能安其止者，動於欲也。欲牽於前而求其止，不可得也....止於所不見，則無欲以亂其心，而止乃安...."行其庭，不見其人。"庭除之間至近也。在背則雖至近不見，謂不交於物也。外物不接，內欲不萌，如是而止，乃得止之道。於止爲無咎也。(4:5)

<sup>22</sup>Chu Hsi, Lu Tsu-ch'ien, (1967) , p. 125, citing *Zhuzyulei*, 73:10a.

Master Yichuan [Cheng Yi] said: Confucianists should devote their minds deeply to the correct Way and permit no mistakes. Mistakes begin very subtly, but at the end there will be no hope.<sup>23</sup>

## Conclusion

Within the *Jinsilu*, then, are to be found three distinct, albeit overlapping conceptions of heterodoxy, jointly conceived as Buddhism and Daoism, but connected through extension to the world of non-Mencian thought in ancient China. All found Buddhism and Daoism to be a dangerous perversion of the true Way, but their writings show distinct differences in their assessment of its current threat and the methods for overcoming it.

For Zhang Zai, the delusions inherent in heterodoxy were lamentable and its potential damage great, but a genial optimism informs his faith that the ancient wisdom of *daoxue*, as rediscovered and freshly proclaimed, was sufficiently convincing that within a short while its superiority would be self-evident.

Cheng Hao, as a recovering former devotee of the non-Confucian thought, is less willing to underestimate the beguiling nature of Buddhism and Daoism and positions himself and his followers on the frontline of the millennia-long battle against heresy, although he never terms it as *yiduan*. Having deeply immersed himself deeply in their precepts he is all too aware of its ideological hold on adherents. Yet there is reason for optimism. Just as Mencius was able to undermine the authority of Yang Ju and Mo Zi through his critique of them, thereby creating a Way that is “now open and wide” so, too, he implies, if the evils of contemporary Buddhism and Daoism are exposed, a similar optimism can be felt for the future prospects of *daoxue*.

For Cheng Yi, whose writing forms the core of the *Jinsilu*, the situation seems distinctly bleaker. The world around is conceived as full of threats and subtle snares, where contact with the external world risks moral contamination through the arousal of improper desire, and in which heterodoxical thought (termed *yiduan*), holds sway. Even the most morally grounded, such as his own brother, had not been fully immune, and the possibilities for moral error lie hidden at every turn, requiring frequent, earnest “sifting” to reveal the essential truth or falsity of the moral universe surrounding one. This profoundly defensive posture, seeking to protect oneself from horrible errors of all kinds, from which recovery may well be hopeless, appears to have resonated well with Zhu Xi in his own age, authorizing in turn aggression toward perceived heterodoxy and embedding itself in the Neo-Confucian world view, including that bequeathed to Chosŏn Korea.

The Confucian moral imperative at the core of Chosŏn Korea political and intellectual life was deeply informed with the threat of lapsing into subtle and dangerous deviations from righteous behavior, a pre-disposition inherited from early Neo-Confucian thinkers in the eleventh century and amplified by the prestige accorded the *Jinsilu* in Korea from the sixteenth century.

## References

Berlinerblau J, 2001. Toward a sociology of heresy, orthodoxy, and doxa. *History of Religions*, 40:4, 330-31.

Chan WT, 1989. *Chu Hsi: New Studies*, University of Hawaii Press.

Ching J, 1974. Truth and ideology: the Confucian way (tao) and its transmission (tao-t'ung). *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 35:3, 371-388.

*Chosŏnwangjosillok, Sŏnjosujŏngsillok* [<http://sillok.history.go.kr>].

---

<sup>23</sup>Chu Hsi, Lu Tsu-ch'ien, (1967) · pp. 280-281. Emphasis is the author's and not in the original translation. 伊川先生曰:儒者潛心正道,不容有差。其始甚微,其終則不可救 (13:2)。

Chu Hsi, Lu Tsu-ch'ien, 1967, trans. by Chan W. Reflections on Things at Hand: the Neo-Confucian Anthology. New York: Columbia University Press.

Han'gukhakChungangYŏn'guwŏn Biographical Database [<http://people.aks.ac.kr/index.aks>]

Han'gukKojŏnpŏnyŏkwŏn Database [<http://db.itkc.or.kr/itkcdb/mainIndexIframe.jsp>].

Henderson JH, 1998. The Construction of Orthodoxy and Heresy: Neo-Confucian, Islamic, Jewish, and Early Christian Patterns. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Liang Ch'i-ch'ao. (1941). *Ying-ping-shih ho-chi, Wen-chi* (Shanghai, 1941), 9:55-56.

XinTangshu, [<http://www.guoxue.com/shibu/24shi/newtangsu/lianshu.htm>].

Zito GV, 1983. Toward a sociology of heresy. *Sociological Analysis*, 44:2, Summer, 123-130.