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ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the phenomenon of making martyrs in the Protestant Church in Korea (PCK) especially the relationship between the institution and the designation. Tracing the historical development of ideology of martyrdom linguistically and semantically from the pre-Constantinian base-line, the writer points out that martyrdom is not a fixed or universal concept but is variously employed in different times, settings, and places to justify, legitimate and memorialise a death in a specific group and frequently for a specific reason or purpose. It may also be directly linked with the identity of one persecuted community setting a firm boundary between it and the hostile persecuting group. Furthermore, the designation of martyr is an intentional act which speak to the living not the dead. In other words, martyrdom is a part of the interpretive semantics of a particular death seen by particular lives for particular purposes. Martyrdom pertains to the politics of death, yet at the same time to the politics of the living.

Martyrs for the PCK represent three major periods of Korean Protestants’ death-events: the late Chosun Dynasty (1866-1905), the rule of Japanese imperialism (1905-1945), and before and during the Korean War (1945-1953). Most Protestant Christians’ deaths occurred as a result of a clash between religion and the political power represented in each era. The PCK only started to ‘make martyrs’ by collecting and interpreting the first such deaths after 1926 and increasingly from 1983 onwards. However, their work of martyr-making has exposed PCK leaders to misusing the term, by including death after natural disasters and accidents. It is arguable that the situation in post-World War II Korea was such that the strands of anticommunism and ethnic nationalism profoundly influenced the historicity of the death-event. Martyr-making processes in the PCK context, therefore, functioned politically to define the persistently common enemy of communism and anti-nationalism, mobilizing Christians against them, and justifying creative martyr-making by its effect. Thus it will be argued that martyr-making is part of the power structure of the PCK: and power, any power, always has the potential to be wrongly used.

To analyse the operation of PCK’s martyr-making more specifically, this thesis includes two case studies. The first is of Rev R. J. Thomas who is said to be ‘the first Protestant martyr in Korea,’ whose martyr status was tentatively designated in 1926 and elevated at the time of the 1884-1984 celebration of Protestantism in Korea. And the second is Rev Son Yang-Won, widely known as ‘the atomic bomb of
love’ from 1948 when he adopted the killer of his two sons amid the ideological conflict between the leftist and rightist, whose reputation as the ‘martyr of love’ increased from 1950 immediately after being killed by communists in the early stage of the Korean War. The Thomas case uncovers the ethnic nationalistic tendency of the PCK’s martyr-making, and their anticommunist attitude in the treatment of Rev Son.

In short, it will be argued that PCK leaders controlled the collective memory about deaths in the specific historical contexts to sustain their socio-political views, placing and displacing some death-events to commemorate some or intentionally exclude others, based as much on the ruling ideologies of South Korean society, mainly anticommunism and ethnic nationalism, as on the image of Jesus’ death. What this may mean for the PCK now and in future is briefly explored in the final comment.
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INTRODUCTION

This research will seek to analyze the phenomenon of making martyrs in the Protestant Church in Korea (PCK), showing the power structure and the institutional aspect of such a designation in this specific context.

Studies of modern martyrology make the obvious fact that martyrs have to be made.¹ This ‘making’ is a matter of ‘presentation’ of a martyr’s story and image which were produced in a particular context (a specific time and place) with a specific interpretative perspective for a particular audience. To read martyrs’ stories, therefore, “demands a certain imaginative placing within the world from which they came”.² At the same time this ‘making’ is a matter of ‘power’ in its construction, power both derived from and supporting the institutions. This power of and from martyrs comes out through the narratives,³ and the narrative is made and remade over time by the power of the Church. Thus we can say that the power of martyrs is the power of the Church, and “the discourse of martyrdom is also the discourse of power”.⁴

Therefore this research will be a journey between three aspects of two processes: a death-event and martyr-making time, the early period of Church (before 313 A. D.) and the PCK context, and history and narrative (discourse) theory.

Research Background and Foundation

In 1964, Richard Eun-Guk Kim published a very controversial but impressive novel in America, The Martyred, based on his own experiences:⁵ born in North

---


³ Weiner and Weiner, Martyr’s Conviction, 12.

⁴ Castelli, Martyrdom and Memory, 197.

Korea in 1932, and educated in the South, he fought for the South during the Korean War aged 18. In 1954, after the truce, he went to America and graduated from Harvard University, and taught at the University of Massachusetts.

Its background is the Korean War, which broke out in June 1950. The narrator in the novel is Captain Lee, a young intelligence officer of the South Korean army. For a brief period, the North Korean people’s Army took Seoul and advanced into southern part of South Korea. However when the UN troops took part in the War, South Korean troops returned to Seoul and occupied Pyongyang in the North. There in Pyongyang, Captain Lee has to investigate the fate of fourteen Christian ministers who had been arrested by the Communists. There were only two survivors: Rev Hann and Rev Shin. However, the Rev Hann was mad. The other, Rev Shin, was thus investigated by the intelligence agency of South Korean Army. By mid-part of this novel, Rev Shin is depicted as a traitor who betrayed the twelve executed ministers to save his own life, and indeed all Christians in Pyongyang commemorate the twelve martyred Ministers who are regarded as the ‘true martyrs.’

Using these martyr accounts, Colonel Jang, Head of the Intelligence Agency, neatly propagates anticommunism to the people. The investigation of the young intelligence officer, however, discloses the reality of the twelve ministers’ deaths: they were apostates. The twelve were executed because they had apostatised from their Christian faith when they were faced with the hardship of severe oppression by communists. However, the two survivors endured that persecution preparing for death. The communists had let two devout ministers live rather than twelve betrayers.

In this novel the author is asking readers that “who is true martyr: the ministers Shin and Hann, or the killed twelve?” Certainly the Rev Shin is presented as a martyr-like minister in the novel. Yet whether the author intended or not, his novel challenges the purposes of the PCK’s martyr-making process in which the PCK leaders desire to obtain socio-political and religious power. When this novel was translated into Korean and played on the screen in 1955, PCK leaders argued against allowing it to be shown. The reason is clear. This novel, _The Martyred_, exposed aspects of the manipulation of death-events in the PCK’s martyr-making processes. Without deep, thorough and dispassionate investigation of the death-event, I will argue, martyrs should not be made, for the one so called does not remain an individual but is designated by the commemorative interpretation of a specific group
in a particular context, and that designation both has power and can come from power.

The oppression of Protestant Christians by the authorities who had power at the time of Protestant martyrdoms took place in three periods in Korea: the late Chosun Dynasty (1866-1905), under the Japanese colonial regime (1905-1945), and before and during the Korean War (1945-1953). In these periods, most martyrs’ death of Protestant Christians are presented in the historical narration as part of the conflict between Christianity and socio-political ideologies: first against late Chosun’s feudalism, then against Japanese colonialism, and finally against communism.

During those three periods about one thousand Korean Protestants’ deaths for their faith have been counted. However, this figure is merely an estimate. James H. Grayson successfully expressed the controversial point that the many thousands of Korean Roman Catholics who suffered martyrdom for their faith in the bloody purges of the 1860s are well recognized but it is not so well known that Korean Protestants also died for their faith. Even if Paul Middleton’s indication that “the study of Christian martyrdom is an already crowded field”, this is the case only for western churches. While there are some materials on Roman Catholic martyrs, there is little research on Korean Protestant martyrs; few academic assessments, few historical discussions, and few field studies in the PCK. Until now, there were some consultations casually studying the issue of martyr-making or the discourse of martyrdom as a whole, yet they were just a passing interest without subsequent studies or discussions. The PCK’s martyr-making continues without any input or challenge from those consultations. Some accounts of PCK martyrs are read with uncritical acceptance of both aim and method, and given that the PCK enthusiastically makes martyrs without any historical and theological understanding about the discourse of martyrdom and the concept of the term, this makes for problems, especially when the term is used, as it currently can be, for a Christian who died accidentally while on church work.

---

7 Middleton, Radical Martyrdom, 3.
But there is a more flawed undercurrent to the designation of martyrs. According to the accepted PCK martyrs’ list in *the Korean Martyrs’ Memorial* which was published by the Council for the 100th Anniversary of the Korean Church (CAKC) in 2001,9 of 191 designated Protestant martyrs, 171 martyrs died as a result of their anti-communist stance. This suggests that most of the PCK martyrs were made by the PCK intentionally for the ideological purpose of propagating anticommunism, which has been deeply rooted in the PCK and secular society in South Korea after 1945, the year of national liberation from Japanese colonial rule. Of 191 martyrs only 16 deaths which occurred in the long period of Japanese imperial rule, specifically in the Shinto Shrine conflict, were designated martyr. Compared with those designated as martyrs who were killed in the brief years of the Korean War, the number of the martyrs selected from the colonial period is small. This does not mean that the number of the deaths in the period of colonial regime is smaller than those of during Korean War. Rather, it suggests that the PCK lacks the enthusiasm to investigate or make martyrs during the colonial period. Moreover, we can infer that the PCK martyr-making is closely related to the production of ideological interpretation about the deaths, whether linked to nationalism or anticommunism.

Furthermore it is important to observe the exact point at which past deaths were defined by the PCK as martyrs. The work of the PCK’s martyr-making was officially and intensively conducted from 1983 as part of the preparation for the 100th anniversary of the PCK, to show the power of the PCK’s miraculous growth to the world churches and Korean secular society. It will be a premise of this thesis that the PCK did not investigate all of the ‘death-events’ which appeared in the history of the PCK with the care which might be expected. Indeed, it will be argued that in making martyrs, the PCK was much influenced by anticommunism in South Korean society, thereby showing its commitment to the Korean state.

Kang In-Cheol, a sociologist of religion, has analyzed this driving feature of the PCK’s martyr-making since 1983 from the angle of the “dynamics of double competitions”:10 externally between the PCK and the Catholic Church in Korea

---

9 Hanguk kidokgyo 100junyeon saeophyeopuihoe (The Council for the 100th Anniversary of the Korean Church (CAKC)), *Hanguk kidokgyo sungyoja ginyeomgwahoe* (Korean Martyrs’ Memorial), Seoul: CAKC, 2001, 37-40.

(CCK), and internally among the Protestant denominations. About 10,000 of the CCK’s faithful died martyrs in persecutions since Catholicism was established in Korea in 1784, among whom were 103 martyrs who were canonized in 1984 when Pope John Paul II visited Korea to celebrate the 200th Anniversary of the CCK. At the same time, the year 1984 was also important to the PCK as the 100th anniversary of the PCK. Thus, if the PCK needed something to show the ‘brilliant original orthodoxy’ of Protestantism in Korea, they needed to produce their own martyrs. Therefore, the PCK immediately designated the deaths of the Protestants as martyrs, less, it seems, to express faith but rather to compete with Roman Catholicism. The PCK did not investigate either the death-events in their history or the concept of martyrdom. This double failure is a major problem for the PCK’s martyr-making. They appear to use this martyr-making work to sustain or consolidate their present ideologies, which ties then to particular political views, structures and memories.

Even inside local churches in Korea, martyr-making currently follows an odd trend in using the word ‘martyrdom’ inaccurately or in what we can call a rather loose manner. The victims of personal mistakes or tragedies such as natural disasters and accidents are often given the name of martyr, and people who died during short-term mission trips are called martyrs as well. One example is of two students who died in Fiji during their short-term mission trip because of a shipwreck: these two are called martyrs in local churches.

Who makes those students martyrs, and why? I shall suggest that the leaders’ group of the local church which the students attended themselves called them martyrs to minimize the negative influence of the death such as the family’s objections and claims for compensation for the death. Moreover, by making them martyrs, they can add legitimacy to their long-established intention to get others to

---

11 Interestingly the PCK’s centennial ceremony in 1984 was launched ignoring the earlier mission works of the Scottish missionary John Ross, who translated first the Bible into Korean from 1879 in Manchuria, China with the first converted Koreans in 1879. Even though the PCK designated R. J. Thomas as ‘the first Protestant martyr in Korea’, who visited Korean twice in 1865 and 1866, and died amid the General Sherman affair in 1866, they officially indicated that the mission to Korea started in 1884 when the layman Lee Seung-Hun was baptised in Beijing, China by French Jesuit Jean-Joseph de Grammont. For the early period of mission works for Korea, see, Hanguk gidokgyo yeoka yeonguso (The Institute of Korean Church History Studies (IKCHS)), Hanguk Gidokgyoui Yeoksa I: 16C.-1918 (A History of Korean Church I: 16C.-1918), Seoul: Gidokgyomunsa, 1989.

12 Ha Yong-Jo, ‘Handongdaeui cheok Sungyoja’ (The first martyrs of Handong University), Bikgwa Sogeum (Light and Salt) 149 (1997), 206-7.
commit themselves to church service, new workers modeling themselves on those who ‘sacrificed their lives’ for the faith. The church knew that “martyrdom becomes influential through the narratives that celebrate it.”\textsuperscript{13} Therefore, we can suggest that making martyrs is part of the exercise of power inside the Church and thus part of the use of the traditional martyr-image in “ecclesiastical power politics”.\textsuperscript{14}

Nowadays, most of the many PCK denominations are still enthusiastic about making their own martyrs without any mature recognition of the issue of problems associated with martyrdom. They just collect and count the number of martyrs, who then become useful tools for the claim to and expansion of the power of that church in both religious and secular society. They seem to assume that sheer numbers of martyrs supports both their orthodoxy and their mission stratagem which is driving young devout Christians into the front line of mission fields which sometimes become the jaws of death\textsuperscript{15} on the basis of the Tertullian’s famous dictum “the blood of Christians is seed”.\textsuperscript{16} Moreover, it increases their authority because the image of martyrs is traditionally regarded as the closest imitation of Christ: the more ‘imitations of Christ’ a church has the better it is, seems to be the motto.

**Martyrdom and Scholarship**

The scholarship on the study of Christian martyrdom is well served by the work of Paul Middleton\textsuperscript{17} among others. He notes that Campenhausen\textsuperscript{18} and Frend\textsuperscript{19} made general investigations into the phenomenon of martyrdom while the theology

\textsuperscript{13} Weiner and Weiner, *Martyr’s Conviction*, 12.
\textsuperscript{14} Grig, *Making Martyrs*, 3.
\textsuperscript{15} For example, Kim Sun-II, an interpreter aspiring and Christian missionary, who was killed by militants in Iraq on 22 June 2004, and Rev Bae Hyung-kyu, a minister of Presbyterian Church of Korea, and his mission fellow Shim Seong-Min who were executed by Taliban on 25 and 30 July 2007 in Afghanistan, were sent by local churches for their mission work. By making them martyrs the local church leaders might minimize the negative influence of the deaths and continually sustain or even strengthen their mission stratagem. See, Jennifer Veale, “Korean Missionaries Under Fire”, *Time*, 27 July 2007. Internet Access: http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1647646,00.html .
\textsuperscript{17} Middleton, *Radical Martyrdom*, 3-5.
of martyrdom was provided by T. Baumeister\textsuperscript{20} and B. A. G. M. Dehandschutter.\textsuperscript{21} D. Boyarin\textsuperscript{22} and G. W. Bowersock\textsuperscript{23} studied its history and origins. He also shows that studies on its literary presentation were offered by E. Mühlenberg\textsuperscript{24} and T. Rajak\textsuperscript{25} and studies on Jewish martyrdom and its influence on Christianity were conducted by J. W. van Henten,\textsuperscript{26} M. de Jonge,\textsuperscript{27} and recently S. Shepkaru,\textsuperscript{28} and that J. D. Crossan\textsuperscript{29} and Everett Ferguson\textsuperscript{30} explored the comparison between political resistance and early Christian martyrdom. Recently, C. R. Moss investigated the status of early Christian martyrs\textsuperscript{31} and various discursive figures in ancient martyr accounts.\textsuperscript{32}

However, though studies on martyrdom focused not only on the issue of martyrdom itself but also on various themes such as Christianization in the fourth and fifth centuries,\textsuperscript{33} social justice,\textsuperscript{34} political resistance, and gender,\textsuperscript{35} most of these

\textsuperscript{29} J. D. Crossan, \textit{The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately after the Crucifixion of Jesus}, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
\textsuperscript{33} Grig, \textit{Making Martyrs}. 
studies, as far as I have surveyed, seem to be safely limited to the early centuries of church, and moreover to include just the orthodox catholic Church martyrs as proper or authentic.\textsuperscript{36} In other words, studies which critically appraise the process and outcome do so for a very narrowly defined set of subjects in the distant past when the church was indeed universal.

It is less easy to find such critical and broad studies on martyrdom during the Reformation and subsequent periods.\textsuperscript{37} Since the Church had been divided Christians killed each other “in the course of inter-confessional struggles”.\textsuperscript{38} Martyrs were made, clearly, by the different confessions and traditions of churches in confrontation with each other. Thus, it became difficult to consider martyrdom as a common treasure of the Church because the Church could no longer claim to be the ‘one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church’. After the Reformation, combat between orthodoxy and so-called heresy again took place but those so-called heresies have been reconsidered recently with an ecumenical perspective.\textsuperscript{39} The Reformed church’s systematic and cruel persecution toward the Anabaptists and Mennonites in the past and the process of reconciliation between them in the present\textsuperscript{40} is just one example.


\textsuperscript{36} Recently Paul Middleton studied “the radical martyrs” who “intentionally sought out arrest and martyrdom”. Though they are outside early Christian martyrology, and ignored by scholars, he insists that they “must be taken into account in any theological map of Christian martyrdom”. Middleton, \textit{Radical Martyrdom}, 1.


These tensions seem to be partly why studies on martyrdom were mostly limited to the early centuries of the Church. Given this situation in scholarship on Christian martyrdom, this thesis will offer a basic guideline for further studies on the modern protestant martyrologies.

Approaches

A linguistic approach is generally adopted as a start point of the conceptual studies of martyrdom. Analysing the course of semantic transformation of the concept of martyrdom driven from Greek μαρτυς and its cognates μαρτυριον, μαρτυρία, and μαρτυρέω from its genuine means of ‘witness’ in a court to modern martyrological sense, the idea of martyrdom originated from Christian tradition.41 Most scholars agree that μαρτυς and its cognates connotes the death caused by witnesses for faith in New Testaments, yet its modern martyrological sense was completed in about 156-7 A. D. in the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp. Based on this linguistic approach martyrdom could gain the concept of ‘Christian witness unto death’ or ‘death directly caused by the confession of Christian identity’.

Recently scholars who study on the issue of martyrdom preferred the ‘functional definition’ proposed by Jan Willem van Henten and Friedrich Avemarie rather than the linguistic approach.42 According to this definition, a martyr is defined as “a person who in an extremely hostile situation prefers a violent death to compliance with a demand of the (usually pagan) authorities”.43 Though this approach is not enough to include all sorts of martyrdom,44 taking the functional


43 Henten and Avemarie, Martyrdom and Noble Death, 3.

44 Middleton, Radical Martyrdom, 10.
definition allows studies on martyrdom to be opened to Jewish martyrrology and the Graeco-Roman Noble Death tradition beyond Christian tradition.

Placing these two approaches on one hand, this thesis proposes another way to approach the study on martyrdom, which is *Interpretive Semantics*. While the above two approaches try to define martyrdom by investigating the *cause or motive* of death and answering the question ‘what is martyrdom or who is a martyr?’ – though each has a different scale – the approach of *Interpretive Semantics* looks for the *meaning* of the death responding to the question, ‘what does that death mean to this society or community in that particular context?’ In other words, it is a matter of discourse about how a death-event is memorised, interpreted, and presented to the people. Though the memory and interpretation might be various, and in some cases contest each other depending on perspectives and contexts, *Interpretative Semantics* starts on the basis of the prototype idea of martyrdom constructed by the Christians in pre-Constantine period in which Jesus’ death on the cross was taken as a core position in their interpretation, and a desire to imitate Jesus Christ participating in his suffering. While in martyr accounts the cause of death would be different at different times, the fact that a martyr’s death is the act of imitation of Christ is fixed and definite. In this sense, it is worth noting that the violent death of Jesus on the cross was interpreted as fulfilment of love, forgiveness, and reconciliation rather than earthly revenge or judgement amid a violent situation.

**Propositions on the Issue of Martyrdom**

One common proposition for understanding martyrdom is that martyrdom is a *contextual* concept. Because the idea of martyrdom is transformed in accordance with the spatiotemporal context, it is difficult to gain a universal definition of martyrdom which people in various socio-political or religious contexts can agree to accept.

While in the early period of church, the title was given to those Christians killed due to their Christian identity, when the Church was freed from persecution after 313 the idea of martyrdom was transformed or expanded into martyrdom ‘without death’, ascetic and monastery life qualifying as martyrdom. As Robert Kolb pointed out, martyrdom was transformed from a historical to a mystical aspect in the
medieval period. By taking the third position in the heavenly hierarchy, martyrs (along with saints) played an intercessory role between sinful people and innocent God. However in the Reformation era, those martyrs’ mystical figures were rejected by the reformers who proclaimed only the authority of the Bible. In the intellectual and physical conflict between Catholic authority and Protestant power, each side claims martyrs, and with the idea of martyrs’ actual death not ascetic deprivation, death reappeared.

Furthermore, while traditionally in both the early Christian and the Reformation periods, martyrs were killed amid a situation of ‘odium fidei’, as were some nineteenth century martyrs in various places around the world, from the twentieth century onwards, martyrdom was attributed to those who killed amid circumstance of ‘odium charitatis’ or ‘odium iustutuae’. For instance, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Oscar Romero, Martin Luther King obtained the title of martyr due to their involvement in political movements for social justice. They were called martyrs of the Kingdom of God.

Here we can discern the second proposition of martyrdom. It is that martyrdom is the most religious ideology, yet at the same time it is the most political concept, based on the idea, and indeed the fact, that religion cannot be distinguished from politics. The sacred is always essentially presented in the space of the secular even when, as almost all do, Christians live in a secular society. In this sense, as Craig J. Slane indicated, martyrdom is the Christian’s “the last ethical act”.

Besides modern martyrs noted above, Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God and demand for repentance directly challenged the political authority and was a direct cause of his crucifixion. Though he was specifically accused of blasphemy (a religious concept) as a ‘Messiah’ impersonator, the direct cause of his execution was political: ‘King of Judaea’. His adherents too were politically persecuted by Roman


46 The order of the heavenly hierarchy is that Jesus Christ – Twelve disciples – Martyrs – Confessors. Gregory, Salvation at Stake, 37.


49 Slane, Bonhoeffer as Martyr, 120.
authorities as their religious profession of Christian identity was regarded as a threat to the order of Roman society of *Pax Deorum* and *Pax Romana*.\(^{50}\) The cause of these and other martyrs’ deaths was a result of their religious confession and activity essentially presented as a political act.

**Research Questions**

The main research question will be ‘what does martyrdom mean in the PCK context’ and ‘who can be called martyrs in the PCK’, even though it is difficult to find one agreed and acceptable universal definition of martyrdom. Nevertheless, one important key concept, the death-event, remains through the semantic transformation of the term. The work of martyr-making is inevitably the process of reconstruction, selecting the event of death in history with the tool of intentional interpretation of memories about that death. Accordingly this research starts with the basic question about the death-event, and therefore the power structure which interacts with the death-event and its interpretation. Thus some questions naturally follow: who made specific Christians die and for what purpose? Similarly, why were certain PCK Christians persecuted?\(^{51}\) However, there is a serious difficulty in answering this question: to what extent can a death-event of the past be re-enacted? Nevertheless, further questions follow: whether deriving from religious or social politics, who wanted to make (or unmake) martyrs, and why? What purpose did that designation serve in terms of the power interaction about the *interpretation* of death?

Moving somewhat beyond these questions, I shall discuss the authority of the martyr-making process: who makes ‘official’ martyrs and by what authority is this done? In the traditional saint-designation process of the Roman Catholic Church, the Pope (or local bishop in the early period) has the authority to designate saints.\(^{52}\) However, in a Protestant Church who can have this authority? I shall argue in answer


\(^{52}\) See, the Apostolic Constitution of His Holiness John Paul II, *Divius Perfectionis Magister* (25 January 1983). ‘The results of the discussions of the Cardinals and Bishops are reported to the Supreme Pontiff, who alone has the right to declare that public cult may be given by the Church to Servants of God’. Internet Access: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_25011983_divinus-perfectionis-magister_en.html.
to this question in the Korean context that the process of martyr-making should be conducted by *cooperation among churches* of a variety of the many denominations in the PCK. Furthermore, I shall suggest a theology of martyrdom for the PCK context by discussing the case of Rev Son Yang-Won’s twentieth century martyrdom looking for an answer to the question of how PCK Christians can make sense of the martyrdoms of the past. To suggest a theology of martyrdom for the PCK, the pre-Constantine martyr accounts will be presented as a prototype of martyrdom verifying Rev Son’s martyrdom, and the validity of the attribution of two Korean ‘martyrs’ will be carefully examined to exemplify the problem.

**Methodology and Sources**

This research will take a socio-historical approach based on Interpretive Semantics mentioned above to analyse the phenomenon of making martyrs in the PCK. To conduct this analysis I have made a number of close readings of relevant primary and secondary sources, such as the official documents, archives, manuscripts, and epitaphs on martyrs’ monuments. For example, careful examination will be made of the *Acta* of Christian martyrs and the early church fathers’ works for the early church periods; Japanese and Korean official documents; and missionaries’ records for martyrs in Korea.

The sources have been collected from various libraries: New College Library and the Main University Library at the University of Edinburgh and the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh; the National Assembly Library and the Library of Congress in Korea; and the School of Oriental and African Studies Library in London. Sources have been also collected by internet accesses to relevant web pages. There was much close reading of primary materials from 19th and 20th century official archives, as well as leading journal articles and published literature, in order to trace key themes of martyr-making in the PCK such as the relationship between history and ideology. Specifically, the CAKC’s 191 and 226-long martyr lists of the Korean Church Martyrs Missionary Association (KCMMA) have been a core object of examination and analysis.

Furthermore, to conduct this research I have had exclusive interviews with those who are relevant to making martyrs in the PCK. The list of interviewees is as follows:
1. Rev Dr Kim Gwang-Soo, Church historian, the first Director of the Korea Martyrs Memorial, and a descendant of elder Paik Hong-Jun who is known as ‘the first Korean’ martyr in the PCK.

2. Elder Oh Seong-Sik, son of Oh Mun-Whan who is the author of *The Life of Rev. R. J. Thomas* (1928), author of *A History of 80 years’ Moedong Church*, retired professor in the School of Law, Inje University.

3. Elder Kim Gyeong-Rae, General Secretary of the CAKC.


5. Rev Lee Eung-Sam, Director of the KCMMA.

Unfortunately during the research one of the key persons, Rev Lee Yeong-Chan, passed away. He was the person who was leading the PCK’s martyr-making, and first reported on the current status of the martyrs in 1983 when the pan-denominational memorial service was held in Saemunan Presbyterian Church.

Taking research questions and the above-mentioned approach, Chapter 1 will deal with the transformation of the idea of martyrdom, arguing that martyrdom is not a fixed or universal concept but a contextual ideology changing meaning in accordance with particular social transitions. Chapter 2 presents a paradigm of the martyr-making process in a three-stage theory: the noting of death-events occurring in history; the selecting of a specific death among various death-events; and finally the naming of a martyr based on power practice. This paradigm then will be applied to the specific context of the Protestant Church in Korea in Chapter 3, by investigating various death-events which occurred in PCK history. In Chapter 4, the PCK’s martyr-making process will be examined following the above paradigm of martyr-making. In the process of examination we will discern the problematic tendencies of the PCK’s martyr-making works based on the current socio-political and religious ideology in which they appear to abuse or misuse their power. In the last Chapter, this thesis will propose a theology of martyrdom especially for the PCK context, divided as it still is between North and South Korea, largely based on the pre-Constantine *Imitatio Christi* understanding of Christian martyrdom. This final chapter introduces the case of Rev Son Yang-Won’s martyrdom, carefully analyzing it to tease out the politically useful from the theologically acceptable. It concludes by suggesting taking his life and death as an exemplar for martyr-making might help to overcome the PCK’s martyr-making problems.
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Introduction

It is hard to give a clear answer to the question of ‘what is martyrdom?’ Responses may differ according to various perspectives and worldviews. The word is widely employed for those who died or were killed for the sake of a cause dear to them in various socio-political or socio-religious spheres in our daily life. For example, recently amid the revolutions in African countries such as Egypt and Libya, both civil anti-governmental demonstrators against the long-term dictatorship of their president and governmental authorities supporting the established leadership commonly employ the term ‘martyrdom’ in expectation or hope that people worldwide will accept their actions as justified.1

Classically, nonetheless, we can say that a ‘martyr’ is a title of one who has sacrificed their earthly life for the sake of their faith, and that this title is given by the living who remain. Though the aspects of witness and confession are mentioned as key elements of martyrs’ action, taking the semantic development of the Greek word μάρτυς and its cognates, the title is given to those who prove their witness by

suffering death\(^2\) in the situation of a specific *odium fidei*. Thus, martyrdom inherently involves a violent death. Death is the inevitable end of humans’ earthly life. However, death is not an empirical apprehended event as long as we are living. For the living, therefore, death is a mystery. This “hidden incomprehensibility”\(^3\) of death makes martyrdom itself a mysterious, undefined, ambiguous, yet at the same time powerful ideology.

Moreover the dead can no longer speak about their death: why was she or he killed?; in what circumstance did she or he die?; what was the exact scene of her or his death? Judgments on behalf of, or concerning the dead are inevitably done by the living posthumously and whether these judgements are positive or negative depends on memories collected by the living and interpretations about the deaths in the particular context or *Sitz im Leben* made by the contemporary judging community. In accordance with the memory and interpretation of the death conducted by the living under a specific or contextual ideological perspective, the dead person can be a martyr, criminal, or simple victim of violence or can have undergone a perfectly ordinary death. In this aspect, we can say that “the concept of martyrdom has evolved as an interpretation of death itself”\(^4\).

Taking the undefined character and its conceptual ambiguity, Paul Middleton indicates that “martyrs are not defined; martyrs are made”.\(^5\) This chapter will therefore trace the transformation of the ideology of martyrdom rather than make an effort to define martyrdom. I will investigate the conceptual history of martyrdom linguistically from witness to death, and semantically examine the developments of the meaning of death from the early period of Christianity to modern usages of the term through historical approaches, briefly analysing the causes or motivations of those Christians’ deaths who were designated as martyrs. Though there are on-going debates about the origins of martyrdom,\(^6\) this chapter will clarify the meaning of their

\(^2\) Strathmann, *Martyrdom*, 495.


death by singling out specific periods in relation to the power structure. As a result of this investigation, we will be able to discern that martyrdom is not a fixed or universal concept. Rather, it is diversely employed in different times, settings, and places to justify, legitimate and memorialise a death in a specific group and frequently for a specific reason or purpose. In the process of transformation we can also recognise the powers which crucially interact to construct an ideology of martyrdom and the naming of martyrs.

1.1. The Conceptual Transformation of Martyrdom

The word ‘martyr’ derives from the Greek ‘μάρτυς’ meaning a first-hand witness in a court of law. In Christian tradition, however, the sense of μάρτυς was transformed on the basis of historical experience and its interpretation, moving from witness to death. Allison A. Trites examined those semantic relations between ‘witness’ and ‘martyr’ in the modern sense suggesting “a logical process of five stages whereby the word μάρτυς came to mean ‘martyr’”:

1. Originally, μάρτυς meant a witness in a court of law with no expectation of death.
2. Then it came to mean a man who testified to his faith in a law court and suffered death as the penalty for his witness.
3. Next, death is regarded as part of the witness.
4. Μάρτυς becomes equivalent to ‘martyr’. Here the idea of death is uppermost, though the idea of witness is not entirely lacking.
5. The idea of witness disappears, and the words μάρτυς, μαρτυρίον, μαρτυρία and μαρτυρεῖν are used absolutely to refer to martyrdom.

These five stages will be critically investigated on the basis of Strathmann’s article, from the viewpoint of power interaction. The first stage, however, will not be considered here because in the usage of the term μάρτυς and its cognates for a witness in a court of law, there was no circumstance which led the witnesses to die

---

7 Trites, ‘Μάρτυς’, 72.
8 Trites, ‘Μάρτυς’, 72-3.
9 Strathmann, ‘μάρτυς κτλ.’, 474-508.
because of their testimony at the trial. This means that the transformation of the word μάρτυς and its cognates took place after it was used to mean a witness to truths or views and was then transformed when the term was linked to the death of the witness.

1.1.1. Martyrdom as Witness to the Truth

The word μάρτυς was used generally in a legal context which denotes “one who can and does speak from personal experience about actions in which he took part and which happened to him, or about persons and relations known to him”\(^\text{10}\) at a trial. In this case the meaning of the word is closely related with empirical facts itself. The testimony of μάρτυς did not threaten the witness’s life. The basic meaning of the term was transformed when the term began to be used generally outside a law court. According to Strathmann the meaning of μάρτυς and its cognates was broadened from witness to facts to “the proclamation of truths or views of which the speaker is convinced”\(^\text{11}\) when they were used outside the legal sphere. Thus the words μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρία started to reflect “ethical judgments, expressions of moral convictions or views”\(^\text{12}\) rather than empirical facts. This conceptual transformation of μάρτυς and its cognates implicated Trites’ second and third stage: “suffered death as the penalty for his witness” and “death is regarded as part of the witness”.

Socrates’ trial and death, which was handled by Plato in the Apology at the very beginning of the fourth century B.C., is an example of this usage in the non-biblical literature. According to Plato’s description, Socrates tenaciously demonstrated the truth of what he taught by his behaviour both in life and in death. He did not fear death and went to death with conviction.\(^\text{13}\) Strathmann also pointed out that centuries later the term was used in Epictetus for an act which confesses a truth in adverse circumstances. That the act of confession happened to lead to death was by no means inevitable.\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{10}\) Strathmann, ‘μάρτυς κτλ’, 476.
\(^{11}\) Strathmann, ‘μάρτυς κτλ’, 478.
\(^{12}\) Strathmann, ‘μάρτυς κτλ’, 478.
\(^{13}\) Plato, Apology 32c, 41d; Strathmann, ‘μάρτυς κτλ’, 480.
\(^{14}\) Strathmann, ‘μάρτυς κτλ’, 481.
In the usages of the term in the Septuagint, Greek Old Testament, especially in Isaiah 43:9-13 and 44:7-11, Strathmann points out that the content of the witness, the reality of God and His saving action in the history of Israel, was not a fact which can be observed and attested but a fact which is certain only in faith, that is, it is a religious truth. He explained the slight change of the meaning of μάρτυς from witness to general truths or views to the intentional witness to evangelical truth: “the witness to this reality of God which is believed and experienced in faith bears the character of a religious confession advanced with the claim to recognition”.  

In the New Testament literature this conceptual transformation of the word μάρτυς and its cognates from a ‘witness to facts’ to a ‘witness to the truth or view’ are seen particularly in the Lukan writings. According to Strathmann, Paul’s witness is more to truth than to historical facts in the Lukan narratives because Paul cannot appeal to firsthand knowledge of the Christ-event like the older apostles: he could experience Jesus only through the vision at Damascus. That is, when the Greek word μάρτυς is applied to Paul in Acts 22:15 and 26:16, Paul became a confessing witness “who seeks to propagate the Christian faith”. Those references show that “the activity of witnessing is now intensified by the activity of confessing the truth”. Moreover, Strathmann indicates that in Luke’s rendering of Stephen’s death in Acts 22:20 where Stephen is called ‘τοῦ μάρτυρα τοῦ σου’ [your witness], a further step in the development of the word is taken “from a witness to facts (Tatsachenzeuge) to a witness that confesses faith (Bekennenzeuge)”. According to Strathmann this separation of those two elements, witness to the facts and witness to truth (confession) “enables the term to survive” when the apostolic witnesses to the firsthand knowledge of Jesus’ life and death disappeared. However he highlights that the term does not yet refer to the martyrlogical sense because of the genitive ‘σου’ [your] which shows that the term still keeps the original sense. Strathmann says

15 Strathmann, ‘μάρτυς κτλ’, 484.
17 Acts 9:1-19
19 Slane, Bonhoeffer as Martyr, 41.
20 Slane, Bonhoeffer as Martyr, 41.
“Stephen is not called a witness because he dies; he dies because he is a witness of Christ”. 22

Similarly, the usages of term μαρτυς and its cognates in Revelation retain their meaning of witness to the truth. Antipas in Revelation 2.13 and two prophets in 11.3 became martyrs not by their death but by their faithful witness which led them to die like the case of Stephen in Acts. Strathmann, however, insists that in Revelation the meaning of the term μαρτυς and its cognates were being developed once more.

Not every committed Christian who dies for his faith is called μαρτυς. The name is reserved for those who are at work as evangelistic witnesses. There is no further place here for the idea of the witness to historical facts. The witness is now the one who persuasively declares the truth of the Gospel. But again not every one who does this is μαρτυς. The term is reserved for those who prove the final seriousness of their witness by suffering death. 23

Neither every Christian who dies for his faith, nor everyone who witnesses to the truth of the Gospel (not just historical facts) but does not suffer death, is a μαρτυς. It shows that, as Craig J. Slane correctly pointed out, “the New Testament is pregnant with the idea that one’s witness may include suffering and death”. 24 Here the death which resulted by the act of the confessing witness is given an important place in the conceptual transformation of the term μαρτυς and its cognates. Clearly the Greek word μαρτυς and its cognates have reached Trites’ second and third stage that death as the penalty for this witness is regarded as part of the witness in the New Testament sources. 25 In New Testament era, however, the semantic transformation of the term as death had not yet taken place, though the word was beginning to be terminologically associated with death.

24 Slane, Bonhoeffer as Martyr, 44.
25 Trites indicated that in Revelation only the word μαρτυς definitely arrived at the meaning in a martyrological sense but the other words μαρτυριον, μαρτυρία and μαρτυρειν have not became equivalent to martyrdom. Trites, ‘Μαρτυς’, 80. Strathmann, however, points out that the words form “a preliminary step towards the martyrological concept of the witness (μαρτυς = martyr)” except μαρτυριον in Revelation and some verses in Acts. Strathmann, ‘μαρτυς κτλ’, 502, 504.
1.1.2. Martyrdom as Death

The earliest appearance of the word μάρτυς and its cognates to refer solely to the martyrdom of death in Trites’ fourth and fifth stage is *The Martyrdom of Polycarp* which was written in western Asia Minor in the mid-second century A.D.\(^{26}\) This suggests the conceptual transformation of the word μάρτυς and its cognates from mere witness to intentional death was completed at least by the time *The Martyrdom of Polycarp* was written during or after the severe persecution in Asia Minor.

In *The Martyrdom of Polycarp*, the stem ‘μαρτ-’ is frequently used in a martyrological sense.\(^{27}\) A good example is found in 2.2. There, μάρτυς is used for the first time in early Christian Fathers’ documents to mean ‘the witness of blood’, the death.\(^{28}\)

For who could fail to admire their nobility and patient endurance and loyalty to the Master? For even when they were so torn by whips that the internal structure of their flesh was visible as far as the inner veins and arteries, they endured so patiently that even the bystanders had pity and wept. But they themselves reached such a level of bravery that not one of them uttered a cry or a groan, thus showing to us all that at the very hour when they were being tortured the martyrs of Christ [οἱ μάρτυρες τοῦ Χριστοῦ] were absent from the flesh, or rather that the Lord was standing by and conversing with them.\(^{29}\)

---


\(^{27}\) For the usages of μάρτυς and its cognates in a martyrological sense in *The Martyrdom of Polycarp*, see, 1.1; 2.1.2; 13.2; 14.2; 15.2; 16.2; 17.1,3; 18.3; 19.1; 21.1; 22.1; Strathmann, ‘μάρτυς κτλ.’, 505.


Another good example appears in 1.1 describing Polycarp’s death.

We are writing to you, brothers and sisters, an account of those who were martyred [τὰ κατὰ τοὺς μαρτυρήσαντας], especially the blessed Polycarp, who put an end to the persecution as though he were setting his seal upon it by his martyrdom [διὰ τῆς μαρτυρίας]. For nearly all the preceding events happened in order that the Lord might show us once again a martyrdom that is in accord with the gospel [τὸ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον].

In those paragraphs, μάρτυς and its cognates are narrated as the evidence of bleeding and death.

In the process of the conceptual transformation of μάρτυς and its cognates from witness to death in the Asia Minor context, two loci of power are found. Firstly, we find the power of local authorities which led the Christians in Asia Minor to die as the victims of public entertainment: in fact, Asia Minor was “unusually fond of spectacles and public entertainments”. Because Asia Minor was one of the major training areas for gladiators, the public in Asia Minor were enthusiastic in enjoying the gladiatorial show and ‘fatal charades’. Thus the local magistrates sought victims for a show to provide spectacles to the public. Amid that situation, Christians in Asia Minor as an easily recognizable and often unwelcome minority were available for those entertainments. It was in the process of those violent death-experiences which resulted from the exercise of local authorities’ power that the term changed conceptually from witness to death.

Secondly is the power of interpretation inside Christianities. There are arguments that heretics or heretical arguments caused the conceptual change of the term from witness to death. Ignatius, in criticizing Docetists who denied that Christ had the body of a human, described martyrdom as the witness of suffering for Christ. By arguing that he testified to Christ through the witness of bleeding,

---

30 Martyrdom of Polycarp 1.1. Quoted from Holmes, The Apostolic Fathers, 307 (Greek added).
31 Bowersock, Martyrdom and Rome, 18.
33 Ha, Polycarp, 119.
34 Ignatius, Letter to the Smyrnaeans 4.2; Letter to the Romans 6.3.
Ignatius emphasized the suffering of the body. In fact, Ignatius and Polycarp criticized Docetists by asserting that Christ was killed physically, and those witnesses (martyrs) followed Christ by also being killed.

It is important to point out that The Martyrdom of Polycarp was written with the ‘intentional purpose’ of encouraging the Christian communities to follow Polycarp after his death. From this perspective, the story of Polycarp’s death is a “testimony to the cult of the martyrs in the Church, i.e., the veneration of the relics of the saints and the annual celebration of the day of martyrdom with liturgical observance” rather than an historical account. The story is certainly the product of an intentional interpretation of the death.

It may be true that when the term began to connote death as a result of witness, a certain time lag occurred between the death-event and its recording in literature. This time lag was the period of collecting memory, connecting those memories to the present, and in the process interpreting the death. In other words, this time lag would be a period for the interaction between interpretation and power in which the story was made worthy. That is, a written record based on the memory of the event, often written by others, inevitably becomes the intentional interpretation of that memory. For example, when the first conceptual transformation of the word μάρτυς and its cognates was starting to appear in the period of Socrates and Plato, we can find the two sorts of power interaction with a time lag. Firstly it was the power of the state which led Socrates to die because of his testimony to an abstract truth or his personal conviction. Secondly it was the power of Plato which collected and shaped the memory about Socrates’ death after the event and then interpreted and disseminated the memory of the event to the group, in order first to elevate and then to follow him as a model of a moral hero.

35 Ignatius, Letter to the Smyrnaeans 1.2.
36 Ignatius, Letter to the Trallians 10-11, Polycarp, Letter to the Philippinans 7.1, 9.1-2; The Martyrdom of Polycarp 1.2; 2.2.
37 See, The Martyrdom of Polycarp 1.2; 17.3; 18.3; 19.1; 20.1.
38 Shepherd, Jr., ‘The Martyrdom of Saint Polycarp’, 141.
39 Ha, Polycarp, 102.
The discourse of martyrdom is thus closely related with two sorts of power with a time lag: power to kill people who witness to their faith and power to interpret the death. The former involves the interaction of power between politics and religion which happened at the very time of persecution leading to death of Christians, while the latter is concerned with the interaction of power in the group which interprets the collective memory about the death in the present context. This may also include an interaction between politics and religion. Through these two elements martyrs were made or unmade.

1.2. Semantic Transformation of Death: Causes of Martyrs’ Death

As the concept of martyrdom inevitably came to be involved with a death-event, a set of questions arises naturally: Why were the Christians killed? Why did power-holders (whether political or religious authorities) kill the Christians? What were the causes of the Christians’ death in the time of persecution?

1.2.1. Death for being Christian, for claiming the Christian name

Through studies on the issue of persecution of Christians in the Roman period, modern historians generally agree at least three points. First, there was no persecution by the Roman government until 64.41 Second, the incidence of persecutions between 64 and 250 was sporadic, being usually isolated actions which were conducted by local authorities or resulting from popular hostility towards Christians. Lastly, there were three major empire-wide persecutions. The first systematic persecution was initiated by Decius in January 250 which ended in June 251 when the emperor died at the hands of Goths. The second widespread persecution by the Roman government took place in 257 by Valerian’s edict and it lasted less than three years. The last general persecution by any Roman government, known as the ‘Great Persecution’, was initiated by Diocletian in 303 and ended in 306-7 in the West, continuing until 324 in some parts of the East when Licinius was finally defeated by Constantine.42

The first phase of persecution towards Christians before 64 was driven mainly by Jewish hostility which was clearly shown in the New Testament. In the Gospels Jesus was accused by Jewish authorities (Sanhedrin) and finally condemned to death by Pontius Pilate, the fifth Procurator of Judea. However, the authors of the Gospels, especially Matthew, indicate that Pilate was reluctant to execute Jesus by depicting his hand-washing performance in front of the crowd in accordance with his wife’s advice (Mt 27.24). Pilate turned his responsibility for Jesus’ death over to the crowd who were shouting “crucify him” (Mt 27.23, 24b) by setting Barabbas free instead of Jesus at the Passover Festival. In Mark the author showed that Pilate finally sentenced Jesus to death in the Cross in order to “please the crowd” (Mk 15.15). Even in John, Pilate tried to release Jesus but the Jews threatened him with the anger of Empire; shouting “If you release this man [Jesus], you are no friend of the emperor. Everyone who claims to be a king sets himself against the emperor” (Jn 19.12, NRSV).

The antagonism of the Jews towards the Christians becomes more obvious in the case of Stephen and Paul in Acts than in the scene of Jesus’ passion narrative in the Gospels though we must bear in mind that, as Grig pointed out, Acts was infused with a pro-Roman attitude. In Acts 6.9-13 Stephen was accused by Jews, from Cyrene and Alexandria as well as the provinces of Cilicia and Asia, of making blasphemous statements against Moses, God, the holy place (the Temple), and the law. He was thrown out of the city, and then killed by stoning of the Jews (Acts 7.57-60) without any legal judgment by the Roman governor. The author of Acts indicated that Paul, ‘an apostle to the Gentiles’ (Gal 2.8), was indicted by the Jews as “a pestilent fellow, an agitator among all the Jews throughout the world” and “a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes” (Acts 24.5, NRSV) but the Roman authorities were reluctant to become involved into the accusation of the Jewish people against the Christians. They regarded any problems with the followers of Jesus as an internal

---

43 Ste. Croix, Christian Persecution, 107-8. Though we agree with Lucy Grig’s perspective that the persecution by the Jews towards Christians is a “highly vexed issue”, and that because the New Testament text, especially Acts, has such a strongly “apologetic and pro-Roman stance” it cannot be used as a reliable source (Grig, Making Martyrs, 12, 154 (note 23)), it does not mean that the persecution of Christians conducted by Jewish authorities was all manipulated or exaggerated. Whether it was on a large or sporadic scale, Jewish hostility was nonetheless real and an actual historical cause of Christians’ death. Furthermore, despite the fact that the New Testament texts have internal contradictions and a clear apologetic bias in favour of the ‘truth’ of what they are writing, it is by and large the main text we have, and the one with which we must cautiously make do.

44 Grig, Making Martyrs, 154 (note 23).
Jewish matter, and they themselves did not express any hostility towards Paul and his preaching. These scenes suggest that the persecution of Christians, at least before 64, was directly caused more by Jewish hostility towards Jesus and his adherents. The final judgement, of course, was in the governor’s hands.

The odium felt by Jewish people towards Christians may well have spread to Roman society. This phenomenon can be seen in the persecution of Christians by Nero in 64. After the great fire in Rome in July 64 Nero picked on the Christians as scapegoats to eliminate the rumour that he himself was responsible for starting the fire because the Christians were already “hated for their abominations” by the populace. Once the Christians were branded as “criminals who deserved extreme and exemplary punishment” by Nero and the inhabitants of Roman society at that time, there would be nothing to protect them from the condemnation of the magistrate and the populace.

Furthermore, in the eyes of the Romans the secrecy of Christians’ rites was popularly suspected to be a cover for political conspiracy or a variety of morally hideous crimes such as baby-eating and incest. Thus the Christians were classified as “the first source of evil”. Simply being a Christian meant being a member of an anti-social body and potential criminal conspiracy in the Roman society. Even at times of natural disaster the Christians were selected as scapegoats. Tertullian said

[The pagans] suppose that the Christians are the cause of every public disaster, every misfortune that happens to the people. If the Tiber overflows or the Nile

46 In this point Ste. Croix pointed out that “the standard procedure in punishing Christians was ‘accusatory’ and not ‘inquisitorial’; a governor would not normally take action until a formal denunciation (delatio nominis) was issued by a delator, a man who was prepared not merely to inform but actually to conduct the prosecution in person”, Ste. Croix, Christian Persecution, 120.
49 Tacitus, Annales XV.44.8.
51 Tacitus, Annales XV.44.4.
doesn’t, if there is a drought or an earthquake, a famine or a pestilence, at once the cry goes up, “the Christians to the lion”.\textsuperscript{52}

This public hostility in Roman society towards Christians which is also clearly seen in the \textit{Martyrdom of Polycarp}\textsuperscript{53} continued down to the middle of the third century.\textsuperscript{54}

Aside from public antagonism against Christians, the general attitude of the Roman state before the Decian Persecution of 250 might be well described in the Emperor Trajan’s reply to the question of Pliny the Younger, governor of Bithynia, in around 112: “Indeed nothing can be laid down as a general ruling involving something like a set form of procedure. They [the Christians] are not to be sought out; but if they are accused and convicted, they must be punished”.\textsuperscript{55} This statement suggests that there was no general policy of repression towards Christians. In this aspect, Herbert Musurillo clearly pointed out both the ambiguity and uncertainty of the reason for Christians’ arrest by magistrates and the Roman government’s legal foundation for the persecution of Christians.\textsuperscript{56} It seems right to say that Christians were allowed to exist in Roman society not because of their legality of being, but because of the government’s attitude of “toleration by default” which was shown by “their inaction” or “a passive acquiescence” in the presence of uncontrollable cults, which showed an “appreciation of the limits of their power”.\textsuperscript{57}

However Pliny’s letter which was sent to Trajan supplies us with another reason for the Roman governor’s repression of Christians, aside from any public odium and one which is more relevant for our discussion: the “obstinacy and unbending perversity”\textsuperscript{58} of the Christians in confessing their faith and sustaining their identity, which deserve to be punished in any case. The stubbornness of Christians was obviously exposed when Pliny conducted “the sacrifice test”\textsuperscript{59} by ordering

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
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\item[53] The proconsul said to Polycarp, “Try to move the people” (\textit{The Martyrdom of Polycarp} 10.2, and also see, 12.2). Quoted from Musurillo, \textit{ACM}, 11.
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accused Christians to “worship the emperor’s statue and the images of gods, and curse Christ”. Furthermore this ‘obstinacy’ of Christians claiming Jesus Christ as the only King and Savior was regarded as atheism in the eyes of the Roman authorities and residents including other pagans. Their obstinate refusal to take part in the imperial cult or to offer sacrifice to the gods always exposed them to the charge of disloyalty to both emperor and state. Simply being a Christian easily became an offence. Ste. Croix rightly argues that oppression towards Christians in the Roman Empire was caused by the “monotheistic exclusiveness” of Christians, which threatened the Pax Deorum, “the right harmonious relationship between gods and men”. Thus oppression was inevitable because becoming a Christian or keeping a Christian identity was regarded as a challenge to Roman theocratic society. In this sense it seems clear that the fundamental element of the cause of martyrs’ death by the ruling powers is their confession of Christ in public, though it is hard to single out one agreed solution or consensus among scholars to explain the legal basis of persecutions of Christians and the reason for their arrest in the Roman period.

Being a Christian and witnessing to Christ meant being condemned in Roman society. Indeed, Christians’ identity lies at the core of the Christian persecution: Christians are victimized for being Christian, for claiming the Christian name. In all three synoptic Gospels, Jesus was required to answer whether he is the Christ, son of God, in front of the Jewish authorities (Sanhedrin) and eventually he was accused because of his identity as the Christ (Mk 14.61-61// Mt 26.63-64// Lk 22.67, 70). This formula was evidently applied in some of the acts of martyrs. When the martyrs were accused they were asked by the interrogator (magistrate) whether they are Christians. Once the Christian identity was confirmed by replying “I am a Christian!” in the process of investigation, the Christian was condemned to death.

60 Pliny, Epistulae X. 96; Martyrdom of Polycarp 9, 10.
62 The debates on this subject go back to the late 1880s and early 1890s which can be divided into three schools generally. The first advocates a general law (imperial edict), issued under either Nero or Domitian, which prohibited Christianity; the second highlights the provincial governor’s power of coercitio, insisted on by Theodor Mommsen in his work ‘Provinces of the Roman Empire’; and the third argues that persecution was caused by Christians’ breaking existing criminal law. See, Joseph Streeter, ‘Introduction: de Ste. Croix on Persecution’ in Ste. Croix, Christian Persecution, 12-13 (especially see the notes 39-45); Musurillo, ACM, lvii-lxii.
63 Martyrdom of Polycarp 10.1; of Carpus, Papyrus 5, 34; of Justin, Chariton, Charito, Evelpostus, Hierax, Paeon, and Liberian (Valerian) 3-4; of Lions 19 (Blandina), 20 (Sanctus), 26 (Biblis); of Scillitan Martyrs 9 (Vestia), 10, 13 (Speratus); of Apollonius 2 (Sakkeas).
1.2.2. Death for Heresy and Sedition (Treason)

Martyrdom did not end once the state ceased to oppose Christians as followers of a minority cult. In the pre-Constantine period, martyrdom came about through the refusal of the monotheistic Christian community to relate to or indeed subordinate themselves to the accepted institutions of the state, for which they were accused of atheism. Once the power of church and state were closely intertwined, the Church came to be a majority with an ‘exclusively monotheistic Christian identity’, and it then played the vital role of persecuting pagans or ‘heretics’. This position-shift of the Church from persecuted lambs to persecuting lions64 took place after the edict of Milan in 313 when Roman society entered into the process of Christianization, and more concretely towards the end of third century, in 380, with the emperor Theodosius’ legislation on Nicene Orthodox Christianity which required all Roman citizens to become Christians and to accept the Nicene Creed.65 Given the time-lag in making a victim into a martyr, any who had died before 313 who had not yet been designated as a martyr up to 313 had a problem. If they had belonged to what after 313 was regarded as the orthodox Church, their chances were high. If, however, their pre-313 Church was regarded as unorthodox, they would have little or no chance of being called a martyr. The specific ‘death for faith’s sake’ of so-called heretics who were categorized as not belonging to the orthodox Church could thus not be called martyrs even though they had been oppressed and killed by the same political authority as those accepted as martyrs.66

66 For example, Priscillian, bishop of Avila, was the first Christian to be executed for heresy (for the practice of magic) in 385. See, Henry Chadwick, Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church, Oxford: Oxford University, 1975. The voluntary deaths of Montanists under the oppression of the Roman authority in Asia Minor were not officially approved as martyrs of the Orthodox Church by the early Church (Catholic Church) fathers such as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian and so on. Paul Middleton re-examined this phenomenon of voluntary martyrdom theologically terming it ‘radical martyrdom’. See, Paul Middleton, Radical Martyrdom. Also see, Bowersock, Martyrdom and Rome, 2-5; Ste. Croix, Christian Persecution, 153-200 (especially 155-64).
Let us look further at the physical power that drove the witnesses to their death, which was part of the debate between heresy and orthodoxy.\(^67\) When the church authorities were supported by political state power they become the majority in the society with the power to persecute any minority practice judged deviant. The ecclesiastical authority sponsored by the socio-political state power had two sorts of power: physical power which put witnesses of the minority (so-called heretics) to death, and the equally important power of interpretation about the death; the state-church decided whether the dead could be designated as an official martyr or not. Though minorities might proclaim their dead fellow as a martyr, he would officially just be a dead \textit{pagan}\(^68\) who could not be categorised as a true martyr by the orthodox Christians. For example, after the Emperor Constantine’s conversion, the Emperor immediately intervened in the theological struggles among Christians, issuing edicts against the now-heretical Arians. Thereafter Arians experienced a rigorous persecution by the state-sponsored orthodox Church. Their books were ordered to be burnt and they were not allowed to build churches anywhere within the Empire.

In North Africa the Donatists were another persecuted minority.\(^69\) In their view, the persecution of this ‘minority-ship’ symbolised them as true disciples of Christ. They declared, “The Church which suffers persecution must be considered as the truly catholic Church, not the one which is responsible for persecutions”.\(^70\) Though numerous Donatists suffered martyrdom on the basis of their deep Christian conviction, their deaths were not regarded as true martyrdom by the catholic majority. Especially, Augustine theologically legitimated the use of force justifying the persecution of the Donatists when he witnessed the Donatists in his own town being “brought over to the Catholic unity by fear of the imperial edicts”.\(^71\) Augustine’s argument on the acceptability of coercion\(^72\) exercised by the state in the service of


\(^{70}\) Quoted from Vischer ed., \textit{Commemorating Witnesses}, 22.


\(^{72}\) For Augustine’s view of religious coercion against heresy and pagans, see, Peter Brown, ‘St. Augustine’s Attitude to Religious Coercion’, \textit{Journal of Roman Studies}, 54 (1964), 107-16; Michael
the Church has often been reused in subsequent centuries and provided the legal basis for the persecution of heretics and pagans. For instance, Thomas Aquinas, the greatest medieval theologian, declared that obstinate heretics “deserve[d] not only to be separated from the Church by excommunication, but also to be severed from the world by death”.

Since the argument formulated by Augustine in the fourth and fifth centuries had been accepted by the established orthodoxy of Western Christendom, bishops, councils and popes asked state authorities to eliminate heresies from Christian territories and to punish heretics. One of the logical consequences of these requirements was codified in the fourth Lateran Council of 1215. In accordance with the theory and practice of state-sponsored persecution of heretics and pagans, for instance, the Jews underwent a rigorous repression through massacre and expulsion in numerous areas of Europe.

The Reformation period was no exception to the practice of Augustine’s theory of coercion and Thomas Aquinas’ death penalty for heresy. Early Reformers, such as John Wycliffe and John Huss, and later Protestants such as Martin Luther and John Calvin, and their followers were persecuted and even killed. The persecutors were the Roman Catholic Church and her sponsoring state authorities on the grounds of exterminating heresy for the health of all. However, the Reformers also shifted their position from persecuted lambs to persecuting lions when they obtained power under the aegis of local states and were a majority.

After 1525, for example, Luther agreed with the use of state-force to remove false religion, that is, Roman Catholics, Jews, and radical reformers such as Anabaptists, from Protestant territories. In Geneva, Calvin approved the burning of the anti-Trinitarian heretic Michael Servetus in 1541. The list is long on both sides. As Paul Middleton neatly pointed out, “Christians created other Christian martyrs.”


Why did churches execute those Christians opposing a particular theology of ecclesiology as heretics? As William Monter rightly observed, in the Reformation period, the execution of heretics turned out to be a “form of state-building”.\(^7\) This means that any heresy execution which was conducted by or under the aegis of state-sponsored religious authorities was closely related to the majority’s desire to gain or maintain absolute socio-political power in their territory. This becomes more obvious when we examine the case of England. Henry VIII approved the executions of both Lutherans, such as Thomas Bilney and Robert Barnes for heresy, and Catholics, such as Thomas More for treason, especially during the late 1530s, and sent Dutch Anabaptists to the stake as well.\(^7\) In ordering those executions, he acted as the ruler in both religious and political arenas. In England, specifically, “the Catholics martyrs were only executed for treason or sedition”\(^9\) not for their particular theology, and this may represent common practice. The need of the state was to protect the inner politics of England from intervention by foreign state-sponsored religious power, whether Catholic or not and/or to consolidate the power of the ruler. The specific reason varied over time, but the necessary cause was maintaining the integrity of the state from the ruler’s perspective. In this sense what the most important point we should consider is that

the executions in Reformation Europe were not simply deaths for heresy, carried out by secular authorities. There was abundant justification for secular judges to hand down death sentences to members of a rival religious organisation (and in the age of confessionalism, the significant word is indeed ‘organisation’) for sedition, lèse-majesté, rebellion, and conspiracy...The crime of heresy had become so fully secularised that it almost disappeared from legal vocabularies.\(^8\)

In the Reformation period, martyrdom is indeed the most commonly used religious term for claiming true religion on both Catholic and Protestant sides. However, at the same time martyrdom is the most clearly political issue or means for


\(^8\) Monter, ‘Heresy executions’, 54 (Especially, see, note 11).


\(^{80}\) Monter, ‘Heresy executions’, 60.
gaining power to rule the territory by true political religious theocracy. For both Reformers and Catholics, therefore, it might be regarded as a true that “to tolerate different religions was to commit political suicide”. The combination of politics and martyrdom is not just adapted to the Reformation period. Since the Church and state had been intertwined from the 4th century, the issue of martyrdom has frequently been related to political issues. More fundamentally, because beliefs almost always require socio-political behaviour as a fruit of Christian’s faith, confessing truth in accordance with the teaching of Jesus in the Gospel meant “living it with others”. Heretical Christians as a minority were persecuted by state-sponsored orthodox authorities as a majority “not for their religious faith alone, but for what they did or failed to do on the basis of their convictions”.

The age of martyr-making, though, is by no means ended, as has already been alluded to in the Introduction to this thesis in the discussion of modern martyr-making in Korea. In order to bring us up to the present, we need to tie up the loose ends of this socio-political evaluation of martyrs.

1.2.3. Death for the Kingdom of God

In 1998 ten niches on the west front of Westminster Abbey, formerly occupied by medieval saints, were filled with ten statues of twentieth-century martyrs: The Grand Duchess Elizabeth of Russia, Manche Masemola of Sekhukhuneland, Maximilian Kolbe of Poland, Lucian Tapiedi of Papua New Guinea, Dietrich Bonhoeffer of Germany, Esther John of Pakistan, Martin Luther King of the United States, Wang Shiming of China, Archbishop Janani Luwum of Uganda, and Archbishop Oscar Romero of El Salvador. According to Anthony Harvey, Sub-Dean of Westminster, these ten martyrs were chosen deliberately for their merit and popularity. They represent “the whole gamut of this ultimate Christian witness across a wide range of denominations, cultures and continents”. The statues were unveiled by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the presence of the Queen and the Duke of

81 Coffey, Persecution, 38.
82 For example, Lk. 6.46, Mk. 3.35, Jas. 2.17. Gregory, Salvation at Stake, 75.
83 Gregory, Salvation at Stake, 75.
Edinburgh and Church leaders and representatives from all over the world on 9 July 1998.\(^{85}\)

However, there were some anxious questions when these martyrs were chosen and shown to the public. One of the questions evoked regarding the decision of who to include concerned the reason for the death of a third of those chosen martyrs: Were not the reasons for the death more political than religious?\(^{86}\) It was suggested they might not fit the classical definition of martyrdom, that is, the word attached to a Christian’s death which directly resulted from the deceased’s confession of the Christian faith. Of the chosen ten martyrs some were not actually required to confess their faith and their identity as a Christian before they were killed by their opponents. They did not die directly for the Christian name or for being a Christian who confesses Christ as their only messiah and the only saviour of their life. Rather than confessing their Christian identity and Christian faith directly, they died because of the “circumstances related to their witness for Christ”.\(^{87}\) They were victims of the struggle for human rights and the resistance of dictatorial rules, of political revolutions of Soviet and Nazi, of brutalities of War and so on.

In this aspect we might say that the martyr’s status gained through confessing Christ or Christian identity was transformed into a figure who needed to show actions on behalf of the Christian faith, showing they were achieving the kingdom of God in their earthly life in addition to simple personal proclamation of “I am a Christian” in the early period of Christianity. As explained by Bishop Leslie Brown of Uganda, “it is rare nowadays for a Christian to be condemned on the ground of his faith. Some alleged crime, political or otherwise, is almost always the ostensible reason for his death”.\(^{88}\) Indeed Archbishop Oscar Romero said, “…I now offer my blood to God for justice and the resurrection of El Salvador…if God accepts the sacrifice of my life, my hope is that my blood will be like a seed of liberty…”\(^{89}\)


\(^{86}\) Harvey, ‘Preface’, xiii.


In modern society simply confessing the Christian faith and being a Christian does not usually cause Christians to be killed. Instead, they are killed when their Christian confession led them to conduct some earthly actions in pursuit of Christ’s love, truth, justice, peace, and so on in their attempt to accomplish or achieve the Kingdom of God on earth by challenging unjust ruling powers in society, just as Jesus did for minorities. Christians are now threatened and attacked not because they personally profess their Christian faith but because they show solidarity with those who are oppressed as a minority in a society by an excessive or dictatorial regime. In showing solidarity, the eventual martyrs defend the minorities and denounce the destruction of their lives by the authorities. While the traditional definition of a martyr is one who dies in the context of odium fidei (hatred of faith), in much more complex modern society a martyr is one who dies in odium charitatis and iustitiae (hatred of love and justice). Leonardo Boff said that

the true name of God is justice, love, peace without qualification; true faithfulness to God – and this in the end is what counts for salvation – is faithfulness to truth, justice and the requirements of peace. Therefore, all those who have died, and those yet to die, for these causes, regardless of their ideological allegiance, are truly martyrs through the spilling of their blood because they perform virtuous actions in the spirit of Christ. They are not martyrs of the Christian faith, not heroes of the Church; they are martyrs of the kingdom of God, martyrs to the cause that was the cause of the Son of God when he was in our midst.

Conclusion

We have examined the conceptual and semantic development of the ideology of martyrdom from a prototype of Christian martyrdom in the first three centuries (pre-Constantine period) to the modern understanding of martyrdom. Through this investigation, we have discerned that the ideology of martyrdom is not fixed and universal but is rather a transforming one. There are semantic layers in its conceptual

---

90 There are cases, especially in the Muslim world, where merely being Christian can lead to state or locality-initiated killing, but this cannot be discussed here.


history, which show the contextual shifts which the ideology transforms. Linguistically, the Greek word, μάρτυς and its cognates was transformed from witness to death. And, once the term obtained the meaning of ‘witness unto death’, it became obvious that the cause of deaths, as Augustine said, is a or the crucial factor in designating martyrs, though it is hard to cover exact causes of such deaths due to the various perspectives. In accordance with one’s perspective, semantic layers of death (for Christian identity, heresy, treason, and the Kingdom of God) existed both synchronically and diachronically. It also showed the obvious fact that martyrdom as witness unto death is a socio-religious or socio-political phenomenon which clearly appeared when the community takes on the status of minority.

As Pre-Constantine Christians were an oppressed minority, their faith-confessions and explicit claims of Christian identity were direct causes of their death. However, wherever Christianity became a majority supported by state power, especially evident in the medieval period in Europe, their Christian faith or Christian ethic were not necessarily causes of their death: virginity or asceticism, for instance, were perceived as alternative bases for the designation of martyr. From the fourteenth to the seventeenth century, the Reformation era, the idea of martyrdom took once again the violent death endured for orthodox religion with both Catholic and Protestant claiming it for themselves. Luther said, “Since in all the Scriptures the persecutors and haters have commonly been wrong and the persecuted right, the majority always supports the lie and the minority the truth”. In modern society, likewise, the martyr’s death for achieving the kingdom of God (Mt 6.10) emerged among the minority or in solidarity with it.

Through this chapter, we have discerned that martyrdom is part of the interpretive semantics of a particular death seen by particular lives for particular purpose. In other words, martyrdom pertains to the politics of death, yet at the same time to the politics of the living. Then, how do the living render a death worthy? Let us move to the martyr-making mechanism and its paradigm among the living.

---


94 See, Middleton, Martyrdom, 109. He precisely points out that Augustine’s apologetic dictum that the cause made a martyr is “by now” a matter of perspective questing “whose cause counts?”.

95 Weimarer Ausgabe VII, 317. Quoted from Bainton, Concerning Heretics, 45.
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Introduction

To call someone a martyr is an act of ‘naming’ or ‘labelling’ a death. As the dead no longer speak, even if they had themselves desired to be martyrs, the posthumous title of martyr for the dead must be given by the living. Even those people who live and die amid severe persecution cannot gain the title unless the memory about the death is collected and interpreted by a living group which claims them. To designate a death as martyrdom entails selecting a specific death among various types of death and then attributing that meaning to the death through legitimating and commemorating the death in accordance with the namers’ present purpose. As Herbert Hirsh has argued, “naming something” is a social action that influences “how it is perceived” in a society to which the namer belongs. Selection, legitimisation, and commemoration of a specific death are, therefore, a sequence of actions for designating martyrs.

However, this act of naming or labelling a death inevitably involves power, that of selection and interpretation, and power, any power, always has the potential to be wrongly used. In this respect, it is fair to say that the operation of martyr-making is almost always exposed to the risk that it may enable such power to be used as an effective tool of political, social, economic and religious strategy through selecting a specific Christian’s death and wrapping up the death with the intended ideological interpretation of a specific group. Precisely, martyrdom as a social act of calling a specific death as a legitimated martyrdom is part of making the discourse by the

living groups’ predetermined purpose to construct and sustain their ruling ideologies through accepted means. In other words, a martyr is legitimated in a society not by the individual’s belief-activity of confessing or proclaiming faith which caused their death in the past, but by the social act of a specific group or community which has power to select a specific death among many deaths in accordance with its particular current context and perceived needs. This suggests that martyrdom in texts, liturgical rites, or whatsoever commemorating past activities in a society is a result of reflection and representation of a community’s cognition towards the world that they are confronted with in the present context.

What sort of death can be approved and legitimated as martyrdom in a society, therefore, depends clearly on the subsequent socio-religious and political interpretation of a community, group, or society about the death. Accordingly, selecting a specific death among deaths and designating the death as martyrdom is related less to the past event of death and much more to the remembering and commemorating that death in the present. To understand martyrdom, therefore, it is absolutely necessary to analyse the recognising community’s context and the character of the present community which produce the discourse of martyrdom through stories (texts), images, rites, and so on. Indeed, it seems right to say that “martyrs are made not simply their beliefs and actions but by those who witnessed them, remembered them and told their story”. The story makes the martyr, and the power of the martyr comes through the narratives that celebrate them. In this sense, the term ‘martyrdom’ is “a technical term and powerful one” being not just a completed event but an ideological statement about that event for present power.

Having set out these discursive figures of martyr-making, this chapter will closely examine the ‘making’ mechanism of martyrdom focusing on the relevant issues: power, memory, interpretation, etc.: How are deaths memorised, interpreted, and finally designated posthumously by a group which claims them?

---


Though narrative theorists, as E. Weiner and A. Weiner pointed out, argue that the “historical veracity” of an embodied death-event in texts is treated as a “second issue” which does not “detract from their persuasive power”, 6 we will suggest that the death-event lies at the core of the mechanism. Therefore, this chapter will argue that the investigation of the death-event must be the primary step in the process of making martyrs to prevent the abuse or misuse of power in the making practice. Though it may not be possible to draw on the exact reality of the past’s event, in taking the way of ‘hermeneutics of suspicion’ to read the martyrological texts, we may be able to peel off to some extent the ornamented and exaggerated memories and interpretations conducted by the specific living from the text, and then gain a somewhat closer picture of the event, finding counter-narratives about the death.

2.1. Structure of Martyrdom

In order for the phenomenon of martyrdom to emerge there actually has to be two separate acts: an individual choice for death, and a social act of making martyrs. 7 In any study on the issue of martyrdom these two acts should be consciously distinguished from each other but they are inseparable in the process of martyr-making. While the former belongs to the dimension of those who were killed by a religious or political power in the past as a result of their witness to their personal faith (or the kingdom of God), the latter belongs to an act of the living at a later point, when the dead are claimed and acclaimed as a martyr. These two acts are interdependent. An interpretation in the present begins from a past event, and an event in the past obtains a significant meaning through the present interpretation. In terms of martyrdom, a martyr is a product of an interpretation act in the present about a death in the past giving a social meaning to the death. That is, it is the presentation of a past event. In the process of this transition from past to present the key element is the memory about the death.

Through the memory of the witnesses or the agency of a group who want to make the deaths worthy the past death-event speaks to the present. A death in the past can be revived in the present through memory-based oral tradition or various

6 Weiner and Weiner, Martyr’s Conviction, 15.
types of cultural apparatus such as text, literature, monuments etc. Martyrdom is “the product of commemorative interpretation”\(^8\) of the memory about the particular death in the present context, and thus the discourse of martyrdom is inevitably related to the ‘collective/social memory’\(^9\) or ‘cultural memory’\(^10\) of death and its commemorative interpretation. Accordingly, the work of martyr-making follows a series of steps. First the death-event must take place, secondly there is a construction of memories or witnesses (collective/social or cultural memory), and third an interpretation about the deaths based on the memory under a specific perspective and power in the particular context of the living. Memories or witnesses play the vital role of a bridge to link an event in the past and an interpretation in the present context. In order for martyrdom to emerge, therefore, these three basic elements must be merged. The interaction of three-fold elements of martyr-making can be termed a **Paradigm of Martyr-Making**.

---

\(^8\) Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory*, 6.


However, neither can all the dead be martyrs, nor can all types of social memory and interpretation about the same death-event be taken into the martyr-making process. Only a selected specific death among deaths, a specific group’s collection of memory among memories, and this group’s intended interpretation in accordance with their needs are the three basic elements of making martyrs. Truly, martyr-making practice is part of the “optional reconstruction of historical facts and memories”\textsuperscript{11} through the decision process of commemorative interpretation with a specific ideological perspective in the present.

By cutting across the intersection of above Diagram 1, we can find its structure which is wrapped by those three elements: selected death-event in centre, collected memory in middle section, and the intended interpretation on the surface.
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As seen in the above Diagram 2, the ‘selected death-event’ takes the central part in the structure of martyr-making. The problem is, however, that in most cases the selected death-events are wrapped up with memories of the group or witnesses who want to make the death valuable. Furthermore, these memories are almost certainly beautified, embellished, expanded or even created to be a hindrance to the disclosure of its historical reality. In other words, the memories surrounding a selected death-event are not only a reflection of facts but also an interpreted product. Therefore it is like playing with a jigsaw puzzle to attain the reality of the death-event, reorganizing the event by collecting the facts from memories. Truly it is difficult to disclose the historical shape of the events from the ornamented and embellished memories.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{11} Kang, \textit{Hangukui Gaeshingyowa Bangongijuui}, 182.
\end{flushright}
Nevertheless bringing to light the historical fact of a Christian’s death out of the beautified, embellished and exaggerated memories and intended interpretations should be the first step in martyr-making. Martyr-making steered and even controlled by the intended interpretation, based on the beautified, embellished and exaggerated memories without a close investigation of historical actuality of the death-event, can become a means of supporting for the ideology of a specific group, remaking the story about the event with careful modifications to suit the cause. Once martyrs stories are embodied into a text, as A. G. Dickens and John Tonkin notably indicated, they become “weapons of propaganda”.12 Therefore, as Brad S. Gregory pointed out, martyrological writers easily become “overt propagandists” who write “with the aim, of made explicit, of commemorating their heroes, edifying fellow believers, denouncing religious opponents, and convincing readers that they were chronicling stories of the real witnesses of Christian truth”.13

There are examples of such phenomenon of martyr-making. Agathonice (‘Ἀγαθονίς’)’s ‘voluntary death’ is described in the Greek version as “…Let me do what I’ve come for!” And taking off her cloak, she threw herself joyfully upon the stake.”14 The Latin redactor of a later age revised the text to read: “she was sentenced to death by the proconsul for refusing to sacrifice, then hanged upon and burned by the proconsul’s servants.”15 This deliberate modification of Agathonice’s death in the Latin version reflects the fact that ‘voluntary death’ would have disqualified her death as martyrdom and was clearly rejected from the redactor, the power of martyr-makers at that time “attempting to colour the facts for a later age”.16

12 A. G. Dickens and John Tonkin, The Reformation in Historical Thought, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985, 39-57. Also, by examining the construction of martyrs’ accounts during the fourth and fifth centuries, Lucy Grig argues that martyrologies were “an important weapon in the process of Christianisation”. Grig, Making Martyrs, 1. Similarly, Joyce E. Salisbury argues that “the stories of their brave martyrdom were powerful weapons in the church’s battle against idolatry” and heresy observing the different surviving versions of St Vincent, the Spanish martyr. Joyce E. Salisbury, The Blood of Martyrs: Unintended Consequences of Ancient Violence, New York and London: Routledge, 2004, 173-87 (Citation in 177).
13 Gregory, Salvation at Stake, 16.
14 The Martyrdom of Saints Carpus, Papylos, and Agathonice 44 (The Greek Recension). Quoted from Musurillo, ACM, 29 (emphasis added).
16 Musurillo, ACM, xvi.
Let us consider another case. The Spanish martyr-saint Vincent, deacon of the church of Saragossa, had been martyred in 304 under the Diocletian persecution, his martyr account being initially written in the mid-fourth century. According to Joyce E. Salisbury’s investigation, in the late fourth and fifth centuries Prudentius and Augustine had emphasised Vincent’s victorious martyrdom conducted by his own efforts as represented by his brave confessional speech in response to the interrogation, in accordance with the church’s need of “heroes who were willing to speak loudly for the faith” at that time. However, Vincent’s passion account was rewritten by a hagiographer in the seventh century to place his passion under the authority of his bishop, Valerius. According to the seventh century’s author, Vincent’s speech to the inquisitor was made by the bishop’s permission, who “was known to have a speech impediment”. Valerius spoke to Vincent, “I shall commit the care of the divine word to you [Vincent]. For the faith by which we stand, I commit the response…Then Vincent, whose whole mind was now conscious of the crown, spoke to Dacian”. Even the seventh century’s hagiographer expanded the narrative adding an account of Vincent’s childhood, in which Vincent had studied under Valerius, the Bishop of Saragossa, and was appointed as a deacon of the church by the bishop. This seventh century’s narrative of St Vincent was ‘rectified’ to show clearly that the bishop had played a vital role in making Vincent a martyr-saint. In other words, any martyrs of the seventh century would certainly have been “under the jurisdiction of his bishop”. This modification of Vincent’s passion account from the mid-fourth century to the seventh century reflects, indeed, that by the latter point the Christian martyr was “one who was obedient to hierarchy” a view then attributed to the earlier event. Regardless of the reality of the event, as Salisbury concluded, in seventh century, at least, the martyrs “always shed their blood in the service of orthodoxy”.

18 Salisbury, _The Blood of Martyrs_, 180.
21 Salisbury, _The Blood of Martyrs_, 184.
22 Salisbury, _The Blood of Martyrs_, 184.
A more extreme example is the case of local martyr-making for the thirteenth century’s Guinefort of Lyons. As Paul Middleton indicated, though the grave of the designated martyr was reported as being a miraculous place for “the curing of children from illness”, it included the embarrassing fact that “St Guinefort was a dog!” According to Middleton’s explanation, Guinefort was mistakenly killed by its master who had supposed that it was attempting to attack his baby, but in fact it was protecting the baby from a snake, and was thus “declared” a martyr. That a dog became a martyr who has “the intercessory role” between God and human in the medieval period is theologically rather problematic now.

The Korean context is not different. For example, the first martyr-making in the history of the Protestant Church in Korea (PCK) involved the death-event of Rev R. J. Thomas (1839-1866) who died in the General Sherman Affair in 1866 in Pyongyang, North Korea, the materials of which were collected and recorded in 1926 by Oh Mun-Whan, a graduate of the Union Christian College in Pyongyang, and at that time a teacher in the Presbyterian Girls’ Academy at Pyongyang. However, the historicity of his death-event and its interpretation is still being debated among scholars. While those who approve Rev Thomas as ‘the first protestant martyr in Korea’ accept the depiction of his death on the basis of Oh’s records, opponents argue that the death-event of Rev Thomas is merely a “superficial praiseworthy episode” because Oh’s record itself is the result of beautification and exaggeration regardless of its historical reality. Those who want to call Rev Thomas ‘the first protestant martyr in Korea’ deliberately place the beginning of the PCK history and its rapid growth on the ground of his martyrdom back in 1866, as part of their competitive attitude towards the Catholic Church in Korea, while those who are reluctant to call him a martyr due to his aggressive attitude and the ambiguous or uncertain scene of his death in 1866 intend to emphasise their nationalism against the violent imperialism. The Thomas case will be fully discussed in later chapters.

24 Middleton, Martyrdom, 90.  
25 Gregory, Salvation at Stake, 35.  
27 Han Gyu-Moo, ‘General Sherman sageungwa Thomasui junkyo munje geomto’ (The Study for General Sherman affair and the issue of martyrdom relating Rev Thomas), Hangukgidokgyowa yeoksa (The Korean Church and History) 8 (1998), 9.
Truly it can be difficult at best to uncover the historical veracity of the event among the ornamented and embellished martyrdom texts. Nevertheless we must pay attention firstly to the investigational work of the death-event to designate martyrs. For this to be possible, I propose to adopt a ‘hermeneutic of suspicion’\textsuperscript{28} in reading martyrdom accounts. As martyrs’ stories are “generic hybrids”, none of these stories is “a pristine historical account”, therefore, “the historicity of any of these accounts can never be taken for granted and is always a negotiation”.\textsuperscript{29} Accepting this view of martyrological sources, suspicion of all such literatures should be the first thought in those who read them. By deconstructing and then reconstructing the existing dominant narratives in which the event was ornamented and exaggerated, we may be able to access the reality of the event much closely though it is true that we may never be able to represent ‘exactly what happened’ at that time. Moreover, in the process of adopting one way, we may expect to find counter stories about the event. If so, the event may be pictured more precisely as it was in the past. Through this process, we may be able to restrict the abuse or misuse of powerful interpretations based on martyr-makers’ collected memories. Furthermore, though using hermeneutics of suspicion would not be enough to reconstruct the past’s event correctly, using this approach may enable us to discern the intentions of the makers. Paying initial attention to the event, an analysis of the martyr-making process should then proceed to see how the dead person was selected, memorised, interpreted and finally posthumously designated as a martyr by a group which claims him or her.

2.2. Contesting Dual Power Practice in Martyr-Making

As we have seen above, a martyr is indeed made or remade by the commemorative interpretation. It is true that interpretation is the final act of making martyrs though it has a dialectical aspect in which a final interpretation, or need for it, may also underlie the initial step for another interpretation at a later point. However, we have to observe again the interaction of two acts, the individual choice of death


\textsuperscript{29} Moss, \textit{Ancient Christian Martyrdom}, 16.
and the social act of naming a death in which each act inherently involves *contesting* power practices, ‘prosecuting and persecuted’ in the past, and ‘naming, renaming and excluding’ in the present. The former as a death-event is a consequence of the power practice which led the witness to die at the time of persecution (Power Practice I in Diagram 3), and the latter as a social act occurs through the power practice of interpretation about the deaths *selected* by a group claiming them afterwards (Power Practice II). Though a martyr is finally designated by the latter act, without the former act the social act as an act of naming, renaming or un-naming martyrs would not be possible due to the absence of its object to memorise and interpret. These two sorts of power interactions indeed make, remake or unmake martyrs.

*Diagram 3: Contesting Dual Power Practice in Martyr-Making*

Let us more specifically examine the ‘Power Practice I’ in Diagram 3. Death-events in history take also place due to conflict between two directly-opposed groups. One who holds ruling power persecuted and executed, the other who challenged the fundamental social values or virtues with a new ideology and practice and was prosecuted and killed. In the political sense martyrdom can be said to be an active attempt to break the ideological and social boundaries between the conflicting groups with religiously based power.

Let us remind ourselves of the first chapter. The first Christians defied Jewish orders claiming Jesus Christ as Son of God and their messiah. The first three centuries’ persecutions of Christians by Roman authorities were caused by the Christians’ negative attitude towards Roman society. They were regarded as atheists who stubbornly refused to participate in any Roman gods’ ritual. They truly challenged the foundational ruling spirits of *pax deorum* through which Roman
Empire wanted to sustain *pax romana*. In this period Christians were regarded as enemies of Roman gods and thus of the state.

However, after becoming a state-sponsored religion through the edict of Milan in 313, Christians were no longer at risk because of their faith. Rather, the legitimacy of Christianity in the Roman society gave Christian authorities the power to kill those who did not belong to that authority. Since then in the accounts of Christian martyrdom, the element of “killing others for the faith” has emerged along with the traditional feature of ‘dying for the faith’. The face of Christianity was thus changed from the persecuted to the persecuting. To sustain the unity of *one* catholic, orthodox, and apostolic Christian faith, legitimated and state-sponsored Christians were willing to kill other Christians as heretics and pagans.

What we see here is a further development of the function and nature of the ideology of martyrdom. This functional progress led Christian authorities to another power practice apart from that which had led Christians to die under *secular* persecutions. Church authorities had to distinguish orthodox Christianity from various types of Christian groups, identifying one group as legitimate and at the same time, branding others as illegitimate. In the process of this *selection*, the state’s power played a vital role in both the picking out of the ‘heretical’ and then the threat of legitimated violence to deprive those heresy-branded groups of all authority and where necessary to deprive them of life.

We can easily find these Christian controversies between orthodoxy and heresy such as Donatism, Arianism, and Pelagianism in the fourth and fifth centuries, but intra-Christian persecution did not start then. A century earlier, there were already some arguments within Christianity about the issue of an authentic martyr’s death versus suicide or voluntary death (or ‘radical martyrdom’) in Paul Middleton’s

---


31 Paul Middleton clearly pointed out this idea through his recent book. See, Middleton, *Martyrdom*, 12, 89.

term). M. Reasoner rightly indicated that this distinction “is an established tradition within Christianity which became identified as orthodox, that those who intentionally sought martyrdom would not be recognised as martyrs”. At this juncture, it is worth noting that those controversies during the pre-Constantine periods were only controversies at the level of theological interpretation. There was no actual violence among various types of Christian group during those periods. However, the power to kill non-orthodox Christians by those of orthodox faith was actualised from Constantine’s Edict of Toleration in 313 onwards, when only one type of Christian group was granted, legitimated, and empowered by the state as orthodoxy. Wherever orthodox Christianity determined to achieve “unity and concord” of Christianity within that legitimated orthodoxy, there could be many sorts of violence against others who were outside that bounded group of the True Church. This suggests that ‘killing for the faith’ could be actualised only when one group become the state-sponsored majority in a society. Particularly in the Reformation period, wars occurred within Christianity between Catholic authority and Protestant power, with both rivals collaborating to remove the radical reformers, the Anabaptists, from their territories. In this respect, it is fair to say that the death event of Christians in church history have taken place through conflict between the directly-opposed power of two societies, or between a subgroup and the larger society.

At this point, we have to note that at the actual death-event, the perpetrator who executed an individual as a criminal and the victim who was killed by the executioner, accepting death for the faith in which he believed, are two side of the same coin. However, the roles for these two characters are not necessarily fixed, for the designation depends on the viewer’s stance. In martyr accounts the state’s law-enforcement officers are normally regarded as the perpetrators. Yet in the eyes of the state the term ‘perpetrator’ cannot be the right word to indicate those who ordered and killed the prosecuted person, for they merely executed felons. Roman proconsuls, inquisitors, or soldiers conducted their duties fairly, entrusted by the state authority

33 Middleton, Radical Martyrdom; Idem, Martyrdom, 48-56.
35 See, Michael Gaddis, There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire, Berkeley· Los Angeles· London: University of California Press, 2005 (Citation in 7).
to maintain society’s security and order. They were not thus perpetrators but faithful servants of the Emperor, and to call them perpetrators would be unfair. Rather, the dead were criminals, perpetrators who threaten the fabric of society by breaking the state laws or at least the ruling spiritualties. In the eyes of the proconsul Galerius Maximus, Bishop Cyprian was “an enemy of the gods of Roman and of our [Roman] religious practices”.36

The term, ‘victim’,37 on the other hand, is usually employed as an antonym of perpetrator to indicate one who made efforts to achieve morally right ends based on his or her strong conviction under the weight of unfair but powerful authorities. Therefore, victim is the word used for such a death by the group to which the dead belongs. In accounts of martyrdom the word ‘victim’ was employed to indicate martyrs, and their faith-confession in choosing death in public was regarded as a virtue imitating Christ, while the acts of the executing perpetrators were naturally represented as wrong and evil deeds. Whereas the Christians claimed the dead as a martyr, Roman or indeed other authority simply executed a criminal as an act of law-enforcement. Therefore, the judgment of ‘who is perpetrator or victim’ depends on the point of view and defines the character of the contesting two powers: which power practice is that of the perpetrators or martyrs, or which one is the persecuting power or the persecuted. Indeed in the Reformation period, as Paul Middleton notably remarked, “the difference between a martyr and a heretic was a matter of perspective”.38

Furthermore, it is worth noting that the contesting power practice shaping death-events between groups normally occurred in public places as a public spectacle.39 Arena, amphitheatre, or market place in the towns40 became a stage for

37 In Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English (6th edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), ‘victim’ is expressed as follows: 1. a person who has been attacked, injured or killed as the result of a crime, a disease, an accident; 2. a person who has been tricked; 3. an animal or a person that is killed and offered as a sacrifice. And ‘victimize’ means “to make somebody suffer unfairly because you do not like them, their opinions, or something that they have done”.
38 Middleton, Martyrdom, 94.
39 For instance, the Martyrs of Lyons, Maturus, Sanctus, Blandina, and Attalus were “led into the amphitheatre to be exposed to the beasts” to give pagans a public spectacle. The Martyrs of Lyons 1.37. However, in contemporary cases, it is also fact that while some contemporary martyrs were killed by assassinations or terror attacks in public places without a concrete executor or killer, some were killed secretly. For instance, Oscar Romero and Martin Luther King were killed by assassination in a public place during conducting mass or public address, but Dietrich Bonhoeffer was executed secretly in Flossenbürg concentration camp.
death-events. The crowd watching the death-event, therefore, appear in the martyr accounts as witnesses along with the martyrs and executors. This ‘publicity’ of the death-event by those present naturally carries various testimonies based on their often very different stand-points, and the varied responses can be categorised broadly under three headings: Hostility, compassion, and yearning.

Sometimes pagan spectators took a very hostile part\(^{41}\) in the arrest and execution of martyrs\(^{42}\) demanding certain punishments.\(^{43}\) In the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, for instance, “pagans and Jews from Smyrna” shouted out uncontrollably and asked Philip the Asiarch to burn Polycarp alive, collecting “logs and brushwood from workshops and baths” with “great speed”.\(^{44}\) Even the onlookers directly participated in the mob violence of “abuse, blows, dragging, despoiling, stoning”.\(^{45}\) Bystanders dragged the over ninety-year-old Pothinus “heartlessly” giving “all kinds of blows…in every way with their feet or their fists”.\(^{46}\) Seneca notes these bloody violent deeds of spectators: “In the morning men are exposed to lions and bears; at noon to the spectators themselves…Death alone puts an end to this business”.\(^{47}\)

This publicity can be perceived as a strategic demonstration of the authority of the state which hosts the event for the crowd. For the state, this public execution of criminals can function as a way to show the authority’s power to the people with a deterrent effect on potential deviants: anyone who contests the state authority could also die in such great pain. Such public punishment thus functioned as an institutional performance to control the people under the state’s power. In other words, though it was a sort of public entertainment in Roman society, the event was

---

\(^{40}\) For example, the Grassmarket in Edinburgh was one of the sites of public execution of the Scottish Covenanters. See, Dane Love, *Scottish Covenantanter Stories: Tales from the Killing Times*, Glasgow: Neil Wilson Publishing, 2005, xvi, 1. For a brief history of the Scottish Covenant martyr, see, Middleton, *Martyrdom*, 113-5.

\(^{41}\) *The Martyrdom of St. Polycarp* 12.2; *The Martyrs of Lyons* 1.3, 1.15, 1.17, 1.30, 1.39, 1.50, 1.53, 1.57; *The Martyrdom of Potamiaena and Basilides* 3.

\(^{42}\) *The Martyrdom of St. Polycarp* 3.2.

\(^{43}\) *The Martyrdom of St. Polycarp* 12.2-3; *The Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas* 18.9.


\(^{45}\) *The Martyrs of Lyons* 1.7, 1.44. Quoted from Musurillo, *ACM*, 63, 75.

\(^{46}\) *The Martyrs of Lyons* 1.31. Quoted from Musurillo, *ACM*, 71.

intended to control all the people, the Christians, regarded as a criminal group at the time, by being filled with fear and trepidation and those siding with the state by undergoing a structure-supporting catharsis. For the Christians, however, the place of death was their place of “public testimony” to the crowd, an opportunity offered almost in passing by the authorities of the state. They, not understanding the Christians’ perspective nor their impact on the supposedly compliant crowd, expected all in the crowd to abandon being or becoming Christian. However, the compassion or the yearning of the condemned and their public testimony of the martyrs in dying tranquilly without any reaction to the pain with “extraordinary patience” provoked amazement and sometimes admiration from some onlookers. Especially the military bystanders, such as Besas of the Martyrs of Alexandria and Basilides in the Martyrdom of Potamiaena and Basilides, became a Christian or revealed their Christian identity to the people after watching the dignified and courageous manner of a martyr’s death.

For the Christians the place of public execution consequently functioned as a place of “training and preparation” for potential martyrs of the future. By showing the crowd a different and unexpected manner of facing violent death penalties, Christians confirmed their presence in and attitude towards the society. Christian crowds even preferred to die with their martyrs rather than being terrified or threatened by the extremely painful execution. Whereas the pagan crowd showed their extreme hostility, regarding the death as a just punishment for the criminals, Christians were convinced in their faith by watching the death. Even on occasions, some among the non-Christian crowd were inspired to accept or disclose their

48 Middleton, Martyrdom, 62.
49 The Martyrdom of Saints Carpus, Papylius, and Agathonice, 36. Quoted from Musurillo, ACM, 27.
50 The Martyrdom of St. Polycarp 7.3, 12.1, 16.1; The Martyrdom of Saints Carpus, Papylius, and Agathonice 45; The Martyrdom of the Sainly and Blessed Apostle Apollonius, also called Sakkeas 44-45.
51 Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History 6.41.16-17: “But a soldier, named Besas, who stood by them as they were led away, rebuked those who insulted them. And they cried out against him, and this most manly warrior of God was arraigned, and having done nobly in the great contest for piety, was beheaded”. Quoted from, Moss, The Other Christs, 239 (note 129).
52 The Martyrdom of Potamiaena and Basilides 5-6.
53 The Martyrdom of St. Polycarp 18.3. Quoted from Musurillo, ACM, 17.
54 Bowersock, Martyrdom and Rome, 66.
Christian identity by watching the deaths. As Candida R. Moss notes, martyrs’ death yields not only “conversion to Christianity” of the non-Christians crowd but “conversion to martyrdom”, highlighting the point that “martyrs bred martyrs”.

Watching the death in public places from these various standpoints produced different stories about the same event. As Daniel Boyarin pointed out, “For the ‘Romans’, it didn’t matter much whether the lions were eating a robber or a bishop...but the robbers’ friends and the bishop’s friends told different stories about those leonine meals”. For the executor the event would be remembered as a story of a criminal punishment; for the fellow Christians of the dead, a martyr’s death; and for the crowd, on basis of their stand-points, an entertainment, a conversional moment, or a confirmation of faith. Various stories or memories inherently exist around a death-event amid this publicity of execution.

Due to those various stories from viewer’s or writer’s perspectives, a Christian’s death can be remembered in various ways. Besides the perspective defining the character of two contesting physical powers causing the death-event (perpetrator or victim), here another perspective is required to interpret the death (Power Practice II in Diagram 3). This perspective is a matter of selection among the various stories about a death which resulted by the publicity of the event: whose and what story is chosen and adopted or rejected and forgotten, or whose and from what standpoint the interpretation will make, remake, or unmake martyrs. This suggests that martyrdom is a result of an act of selection among the historical events, memories, or stories in accordance with the interpretative perspective of a future specific group, which is clearly distinguished from the dead Christian’s confession for the faith. This perspective evaluates a death and confers the final and legal title, ‘martyr’ on the death in accordance with the contextual shift of time, space, and a group’s needs in selecting that one death among many such deaths.

Our question on the issue of martyrdom, therefore, should be to shift from ‘who is the martyr?’ to ‘whose martyrdom is this?’ as Boyarin suggested in his research about the interrelationship between Jewish and Christian tradition of martyrdom. Naturally this leads to the following question of ‘who wants to make

56 Moss, The Other Christs, 104.
58 See, Boyarin, Dying for God, 96-126.
martyrs, and why? To answer this question the function of the discourse of martyrdom and role of martyr will be determined. At this juncture, it is fair to say that the practice of martyr-making is part of “ecclesiastical power politics” involved in the selection, representing the power of interpretation. As Paul Middleton indicated “to call someone a martyr is simply to say that it is a death of which the speaker/writer approves”.

2.3. Paradigm of Martyr-Making

Synthesising the above discussions and Diagrams, we can complete a paradigm of martyr-making in Diagram 4.

To declare a person as a martyr there should be three basic elements: a selected death-event in the past caused by an individual’s faith confession or proclamation by other means, a collected memory about the death-event, and an intended commemorative interpretation for the death in the present.

---

59 Grig, Making Martyrs, 3.

60 Middleton, Radical Martyrdom, 12.
As discussed above, the death-event in the past takes place through the conflict of power between two contesting groups: perpetrating/persecuting/prosecuting /killing (Power I) versus victimised/ persecuted/prosecuted/killed (Power I’). The character and position of power between Power I and I’ in above Diagram 4 is defined by the viewer’s perspective. Besides fixing the nature and location of these contesting powers in the past, the perspective also functions to create or discern various memories or stories about the event, which inevitably means selecting one death among a diversity of memories and stories to make a martyr. This selection is fundamentally an integral part of the interpretative act in the present in which a dead person is selected, memorised, and finally named as a martyr (Power II’) while others are excluded, forgotten, or demoted from the possibility of being made martyr (Power II), according to the intended ideological purpose of the maker, commonly called a martyrrologist. Once one death is selected others are abandoned. This synchronism of the contesting practice of Power II and II’ at the point of interpretation opens the possibility of competition and contestation between them. It suggests that a selected death-event through the intended interpretation act is also being placed under the act of reinterpretation about the selected death modifying the previous story as time passes.

Here again, contesting power practices arise between the original or old and the new ideological intention or purpose experienced by the group’s spatiotemporal transitions to designate a death as a martyrdom. While initially Power I (perpetrator) claims Power II (unmaking martyrs), yet at the same time Power I’ (victim) is evaluated by Power II’ (making martyrs), such that Power II’ is confronted with being reinterpreted at a later time amid the second linked round of contesting power practice: Power II (old intention) versus Power II’ (new intention). For example, as we have seen in St Vincent’s case, initially Power I, Dacian, the inquisitor opposed Power I’, Vincent, with Dacian claiming Vincent as a criminal (Power II): the mid-fourth century hagiographers and commentators such as Prudentius and Augustine evaluated his death as a martyr (Power II’). However, in the process of rewriting Vincent’s account in the seventh century, resulting from yet another shifting need of the church, his martyrdom as compiled by previous writers was modified to place him under the bishop’s authority. In the seventh century, the mid-fourth century’s martyrdom of Vincent (Power II) was, therefore, contested by the church hierarchy characterised by bishop Valerius (Power II’). Contesting power practice in interpretation of a death may be regularly repeated by contextual shifts in the church.
Moreover, it is true that there is a “temporal distance”\(^{61}\) between the death-event and martyr-making act. How does the past event appear in the present? This involves the construction or reconstruction of how a simple individual death in the past is being commemorated collectively in the present as a socially agreed martyr: this is memory which, as Augustine indicated, is “the time present of things past”.\(^{62}\) Therefore, logically, memory is located between the past and the present, interlinked as in Diagram 4.

This memory in which the past and the present are intertwined is initially produced by individuals who witnessed or experienced the event, but as an individual lives in a group his or her memory is always produced by interpersonal relationships in that group. Maurice Halbwachs explains this relation between individual and collective memory as “when I remember, it is others who spur me on; their memory comes to the aid of mine and mine relies on theirs”.\(^{63}\) And, as we have seen, various perspectives of the individual produce different stories to remember. It is also true that various groups to which individuals belong make different collective memories based on the groups’ intentions and needs in a particular context. Selection is, therefore, inevitable among various individual or collective memories, making just one valuable. Even an individual selectively memorises only what he or she wants to remember of past things. The decision to select something worthy is inherently part of the memory. In this sense, memories have a “selective character” based on the question, “are they useful or not? And to whom?”\(^{64}\)

This selection is always contestable because it always accompanies forgetting, whether intended or not. As scholars who study issues of memory remark, “forgetting is just as vital as remembering”.\(^{65}\) By struggling over meaning, the act of

\(^{61}\) This term is borrowed from Paul Ricoeur who uses the term to make distinction between ‘imagination’ arisen in the manner of “simple evocation” of memory and ‘recollection’ consisted in an “active search”. Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer trans., Chicago · London: The University of Chicago Press, 2004, 17-9 (Citation in 18).


\(^{63}\) Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 38.


recollection pushes “other things into the background”. On the basis of this memory-selection as an act of ‘obligating, manipulating, or blocking memory’, past events are being reshaped and reconstructed or rejected constantly in a group in accordance with a group’s particular ideological purposes or aims. Memory is, indeed, a socio-political tool to “serve changing societal interests and needs” remembering and forgetting the past.

Furthermore, an individual’s eyewitness and living memory, called “communicative memory” or “vernacular memory”, can only be maintained through face-to-face or oral contact with those who experienced the initial events for at most one hundred years, or three or four generations, due to the death of the living memory carriers. According to Assmann, this temporal limitation of living memory is resolved by taking the “figures of memory”, that is, “cultural formation (texts, rites, monuments) and institutional communication (recitation, practice, observance)”, which marks the transition of memory from communicative to cultural memory. In cultural memory, an individual and collective experience can be accessible across generations through those figures of memory. Assmann explains, “If we think of the typical three-generation cycle of communicative memory as a synchronic memory-space, then cultural memory, with its traditions reaching far back into the past, forms

---

66 Assmann, Religion and Cultural Memory, 3.
67 Ricoeur, Memory, 444.
68 Here, we can discern the role of ideology in a group’s act of interpretation in the martyr-making process. As Clifford Geertz indicated, ideology functions “to make an autonomous politics possible by providing the authoritative concepts that render it meaningful” (Clifford Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures, New York: Basic Books, 1973, 218) and this ideology always “revolves around power” (Ricoeur, Memory, 83). By making martyrs, therefore, a group can obtain socio-political authority and power. Having the space limitation of this thesis, full discussion about the relationship between martyr-making act and ideology will be left for further study because this issue involves other academic issues such as ‘Ideology and Religion’, ‘Church and State’, etc. For references on ideology, see, Paul Ricoeur, Lectures on Ideology and Utopia, George H. Taylor ed., New York: Columbia University Press, 1986; Timothy Fitzgerald, The Ideology of Religious Studies, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000; Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures.
72 Assmann and Czaplicka, ‘Collective Memory’, 127; Assmann, Religion and Cultural Memory, 24.
73 Assmann and Czaplicka, ‘Collective Memory’, 129.
In terms of martyrdom, as the communicative memory about a death-event in the past turns and evolves into the cultural memory by means of writing (*martyrium*, *passio*, *acta*, etc.), of oral or visual inscribing of texts in ritual performance or sacred spaces, and practices associated with a martyr or saint cult, the death-event in the past speaks to the present, providing a permanent but transformable meaning across time.

One purpose of martyrological writings and its practice is to commemorate martyrs. This commemoration as an act of intended interpretations brings individuals not only to place themselves into and remember the past death-events but also to see that act as part of an instructional scheme which will mobilise actions in the present, fixing and reinforcing the agreed meaning and purpose of the past to legitimate and justify a group’s current need or claim. For instance, reading Polycarp’s martyr account invites readers to remember and celebrate his martyrdom, and at the same time instructs and mobilises them to be potential martyrs like Polycarp in the future which is legitimated by “the Lord”: “Gathering here [Polycarp’s grave], so far as we can, in joy and gladness, we will be allowed by the Lord to celebrate the anniversary day of his martyrdom, both as a memorial for those who have already fought the contest and for the training and preparation of those who will do so one day.”

Given the fact that, in short, a past death-event occurred by a physical power confrontation (Power I vs I’ in Diagram 4), and selected by the contesting hermeneutical power practice (Power II vs II’) appears in the present through collected or cultural memory, we can presume two ways of martyr-making process with these three basic elements. First, the perception of martyrdom as a ‘historical event’ expects that a martyr is made in an orderly fashion: an individual act comes first, and then a social act follows, that is, ‘selection of death-event → collection of memory → intension of interpretation’ (Theory I in Diagram 4). However, understanding martyrdom as a ‘narrative’ goes in totally the opposite direction: a social act of martyr-making comes first, then in the story the act of one who died for God becomes martyrdom, that is, ‘intended interpretation → collected memory → selected death-event’ (Theory II). While Theory I of martyr-making starts from the

---


76 *The Martyrdom of St Polycarp* 18.3. Quoted from Musurillo, *ACM*, 17 (emphasis added).
past death-event, Theory II goes from the present intended interpretation. In other words, Theory I’s naming martyrs starts from the event itself but in Theory II the speaker’s intention or purpose has priority in the martyr-making practice.

Theoretically these two ways of martyr-making seem to conflict with each other, but in practice they are in a complementary relationship. On one hand, due to the fact that the historical reality of a past event can never be gained as the exact form or truth, it can be pictured only by a story, whether in a text or in an oral transmission, in which writer/speaker’s subjectivity or intention is inevitably involved. There is no pure objectivity but only subjective-objectivity. However, on the other hand, it is not fair to say that narrative does not represent the past at all. In any historical narrative, aspects of the past event are presented summarily or partially. In other words, though historical narratives are made by historians, it does not mean that they all are made-up in the fictional sense. Through the narrative, therefore, we can access the reality, or at least aspects of the reality, of the historical event though it is impossible to draw a perfect picture of the event-reality.

Placing these two martyr-making processes together, adopting Theory I enables us to grasp the truthfulness of the death-event distinguished from the rootless or baseless praiseworthiness of fictional episodes, preventing martyrdom from the risks or temptations of making false or artificial stories merely to justify or legitimate the writer/speaker’s or group’s intended current ideological purpose. On the other hand taking Theory II offers us diverse starting-points based on various perspectives to understand the meaning of the event, which may include counter-memories or stories which may be helpful in accessing what we might dare to call reality. In addition, we can discern the meaning of the death in our context and apply the meaning or message to our daily life. In this sense, Geoffrey Cubitt’s observation is fair: “Having a sense of the past gives a meaning to, but also draws meaning from, present experiences and expectations.”77 Taking two complementary ways of martyr-making process, though the process always involves power practice and power always has the risk of abuse or misuse, we can analyse the primary step of the martyr-making process in seeking to reconstruct the death-event as the centre of the structure of martyrdom.

77 Cubitt, History and Memory, 201.
Conclusion

The paradigm of martyr-making requires two basic acts made of three elements, which are inseparable in practice but should be distinguished from each other for analysis. One is a person’s act of confessing or proclaiming faith by choosing death rather than evading it. The other is the act of designating the death as martyrdom. While the former act can be conceived as a death-event caused by an individual’s belief-profession behaviour in the past, the latter can be regarded as a socio-political act of interpreting the death in the present community’s context. The first act (Death-event) transits to the second act (Interpretation of the death) through memory in which the basic image of a past death-event is established by articulating and reinforcing a particular ideological stance. In the mechanism of martyr-making, each act inherently involves power contests over the death-event, the selection of that event and not others, the collection of relevant memories, and the hermeneutical activity of making, remaking or unmaking martyrs. These two acts are interdependent, like two sides of the same coin of the paradigm.

Though a martyr is designated finally by the commemorative interpretational act, we have evoked two theories to comprehend martyr-making. Theoretically with a historical event, one starts from the past event but in practice it is more a narrative, while the other begins from the ideological intentions or aims of the makers and works backwards. The former claims the final interpretation should be come from the past event itself, however, the latter argues that the past event is only shaped or reshaped by intended interpretations in the particular context. This chapter has argued that when we place two theories of the martyr-making process in complementary relationship, having the attitude of a hermeneutics of suspicion, we can draw a picture of the reality of death-event as the primary step of the martyr-making process, which takes the central position in the structure of martyrdom, though we never gain its perfect figure. By doing so, we may prevent the discourse of martyrdom from being abused or misused by the dominant power inevitably involved in the discourse. “At the risk of being overly polemical, events appear to be a fundamental unit of experience, perhaps even the atoms of consciousness, and thus

---

should be the natural unit of analysis” for the martyr-making process. There may have been a pseudo-martyrdom without the individual’s death-event, yet at the same time it is impossible to be a martyr without the intended interpretation of the death by a society remembering the death meaningfully.

Let us now apply specifically this paradigm in the Korean context where the PCK is still struggling to make their own martyrs under the situation of physical and ideological division of the peninsula between North and South.

---
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Introduction

The paradigm of martyr-making in the previous chapter was based on the view that martyrs are made through the interaction between the past individual’s choice of death and the present social act of remembering and interpreting the death, and that this always involves contesting powers. In applying the paradigm to the Korean context, this chapter will focus on death-events and seek to identify the core power which led Protestant Christians in Korea to die, related to the state at the time of the death.

Whether in Korea or Rome, a death-event resulting from persecution by the political authorities traditionally took place when Christians experienced a clash of loyalties because of an oppressive State authority. In the period of the Early Church, the persecution occurred as a result of the conflict between the early Christians and
Jewish and Roman authorities. However, as we have already seen, when Christianity was granted toleration throughout the Empire in 313, the conflict entered into a new phase. The orthodox Church started to persecute ‘heresies’ with the state’s authority and support. It seems as if, although the conflict occurs between or within churches (orthodoxy vs. heresy), it still kept the traditional paradigm of persecution (Christianity vs. State authority) because the orthodox Church authority had been politicized. The church operated as a quasi-state.

This traditional paradigm of persecution of Christians can also be applied in the Korean Protestant Church context. As indicated earlier, this chapter will investigate Korean Church history focusing on the events of Korean Protestant Christians’ death caused by the oppression of the political authorities from 1866 to 1953. These death-events can be divided into three periods: (1) late Chosun Dynasty (1866-1905) deaths as a result of religious resistance against feudalist Confucianism, (2) Japanese colonial period (1905-1945) deaths caused by the ruling power of colonialism and communism, and (3) before and during the Korean War (1945-1953), when deaths resulted from resistance to communist ruling power. This chapter will examine and analyse the various powers which interacted with the death-events during those periods. Before starting this in earnest, this chapter will trace how the idea of martyrdom was established in the context of the PCK.

3.1. The establishment of the idea of martyrdom in Korea

Ham Seok-Heon, historian, philosopher, and social activist (called the ‘Gandhi of Korea’) perceived Korean history as a history of ‘suffering people’ who should find God’s providence amid the suffering.1 The Korean peninsula located between China and Japan was under intense political pressures especially during 16-17th and 19th centuries, being a battlefield between two countries due to geopolitical reasons. For the Japanese, Korea was a beachhead for the advance of their political influence into the Continent whilst China regarded the Korean peninsula as a station for entering the Pacific. That made Korea a battlefield in which the hapless Koreans tried to hold their claims of suzerainty over the Korean peninsula. For example, the two invasions in 1592 and 1597 under Toyotomi Hideyoshi, who succeeded in

---
1 Ham Seok-Heon, Tteuseulo Bon Hangukyeoosa (A Korean History Looked by the Meaning), Seoul: Hangilsa, 1996.
unifying Japan, were launched against Ming China through Korean territory, and the Qing (Ching) Manchu China, having conquered the Ming dynasty, invaded Korea in 1627 and 1636 to sustain its influence upon Korea. Indeed, the wars brought socio-political hardship into the Korean peninsula but ironically it is the case that Korea’s early contact with Christianity was linked to the wars. Koreans were first introduced to Europeans in 16-17th century through the reports of Jesuit missionaries who resided in Japan and China at that time, and whom certain Korean leaders met when taking tribute to China.

During Toyotomi’s invasions around 50,000 Koreans were captured and sent to Japan as slaves, and there in Japan about 7,000 among them converted to Christianity. According to reports hitherto researched, of those slave-converted Koreans, nine were beatified and eleven were designated as martyr-saints though they were killed with ‘Japanese’ names under the persecution of the Tokugawa shogunate from 1614 onward.

Another contact between Korea and Christianity occurred more personally. When Qing invaded Korea in 1636 the crown prince of Chosun (Korea), So-Hyeon, was taken hostage for eight years. In Beijing in 1644, still a hostage, the prince encountered Christianity through being befriended by Johann Adam Schall von Bell, a German Jesuit scientist. Prince So-Hyeon was deeply impressed both with Christianity and the scientific works introduced by Adam Schall, so when he was released and finally returned to Korea in 1645 he carried with him books on sciences and Christianity to introduce to the Korean scholars, accompanied by five Chinese Catholic eunuchs who were in charge of supervising Chinese court ladies serving the prince. Jesuit missionaries in China, supported by Qing government officials,

---

3 Although there are some who argue that Nestorianism was introduced into Korea in 8th century, taking the cross-shaped stones excavated from Bulguksa (Buddhist Temple in Gyeongju city) of 8th century as evidence, the theory of ‘Nestorianism in Korea’ is regarded as a hypothesis by most scholars because those stones are inconclusive. IKCHS, Hanguk Gidokgyoui Yeoksa I, 36-8.
5 IKCHS, Hanguk Gidokgyoui Yeoksa I, 59.
planned to establish a mission in Korea, but unfortunately the prince died within sixty days of returning from Beijing. Those books he had carried from the Jesuits in China were burned and his Catholic entourage was immediately sent back to China due to the superstitious rumours that the prince’s death was caused by the books and people he brought from China. Though the desire of Jesuit missionaries in China virtually vanished, it is worth noting that the story of Prince So-Hyeon contributed to the foundation of the Paris Foreign Missions Society (la Société des Missions Etrangères de Paris, SMEP) which dominated mission works in Korea after 1830.7

Given the links with Jesuit missionaries and Christian communities in Japan and China, the idea of martyrdom in Christianity in Korea began first when Catholicism was introduced into Korea from China in the early 18th century through Catholic books which were written in Chinese.8 At that period Catholicism was known to the young Korean scholars as ‘Western Learning’, regarded as a new subject to study. Those Catholic books were translated or adapted for Koreans by Mandarin speaking young scholars on the basis of the scholastic concerns of early Catholicism in Korea. In the process of those translations and adaptations, the word martyrdom was translated into Korean. Therefore, to understand the influx of the concept of martyrdom in Korea we have to investigate Chinese translations of the corresponding word used for martyrdom, 致命 ‘zhìmìng’, in the 17th century, which was used by the first Jesuit missionaries in China. Then we shall turn our attention to Japan where another new word for martyrdom, 殉教 (じゅんきょう) ‘junkyo’, was created in Japan in the late 19th century and flowed back into Korea.9

---

3.1.1. From 致命 ‘zhiming’ of Catholicism in China

The history of Christianity in China dates back to the 7th century with concrete visual evidences. From Persia a group of Nestorians led by their bishop Alopen (or Aluoben) arrived in the territory of Tang China in 635. They were formally welcomed by the emperor Taizong and permitted to stay in the capital Changan. Nestorian Christianity flourished till the 10th century but largely disappeared from China with the fall of the Tang dynasty in 907. Nestorianism revived or reappeared in China during the Yuan Mongol dynasty in 13th century, and at the end of that century Roman Catholic Franciscan and Dominican missionaries arrived in China to start their mission. However, neither Nestorianism nor Roman Catholicism were well-rooted in China and virtually vanished along with the collapse of the Yuan dynasty in 1368. The third historic breakthrough of Christianity into China took place in the late Ming dynasty in the 16th century when three Italian Jesuit missionaries in “Portuguese colonial territory”, Matteo Ricci, Alessandro Valignano, and Michele Ruggieri, under the Portuguese Padroado, came into


12 The teaching of Nestorian Christianity in China was known as the ‘Luminous Teaching’ (景敎 Jingjiao).

13 For the causes of the disappearance of Nestorianism from China in that period, see, Moffett, A History of Christianity in Asia, vol. I, 302-14; Bays, A New History of Christianity in China, 10-1.


16 The Padroado, the patronage system, is the agreement between the kingdom of Portugal and Spain brokered by the Vatican for the territorial division of political and religious influence for the non-European world initiated in 1493. By the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494, Japan and China were under the Portugal Patronage. For further information, see, Donal F. Lach, Asia in the Making of Europe, vol. I: The Century of Discovery, Book One, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1965, 230-45; Donald F. Lach and Edwin J. Van Kley, Asia in the Making of Europe, vol. III: A Century of
mainland China. Through the Jesuits, Christianity could for the first time be established as a continuing and permanent religion in China. Initially the mission work in China was led and dominated by the Jesuits under Portuguese patronage until other nations, orders and regulars were permitted to go to the Far East by the Constitution *Ex debito pastoralis officii* of Urban VIII in 1633, which exacerbated the Rites Controversy in China.

The Jesuits built the mission principles of cultural accommodation, adaptation and openness to Chinese culture, recognising that the best way of gospel propagation was to cultivate the literate elites and the emperors, introducing western scientific works to evangelise them indirectly. Shortly after Ricci took up residence in China in 1583 they started translating a large number of western scientific books on mathematics, astronomy, geography and physics, including some religious books, for the Chinese elites. As a consequence they gained a high reputation from the government officials, literati, and the emperors. Those Jesuits translation activities under collaboration with Chinese government officials continued to the late 17th century.

In the process of translations, books on the lives of saints and sages were introduced to Chinese young Christians as models (*exempla*) of Christian life to discipline and confirm their faith in Christ. In terms of martyrdom, Alfonso Vagnone, “an able Italian Jesuit”, the superior of Nanjing in 1609, wrote a book in Chinese about seventy two saints’ lives in 1629 titled 天主聖敎聖人行實 *Tianzhu shengren shengjiao xingshi* (Acts of Catholic Saints) placing them in seven categories as “apostles, teachers of the Church, martyrs, confessors, religious, virgins, and

---


women”. For the ‘martyr-saint’ he employed the word ‘致命-聖人’ zhiming-shengren as a term corresponding to what had already been semantically transformed from witness to death in the western Church tradition.

In China 致命 ‘zhiming’, a two-syllable word, was a traditional Confucian term: 致 ‘zhi’ means discard or give up, and 命 ‘ming’ means life. Therefore, the word ‘zhiming’ means giving up life, or death. Early usages of the term were found in the Confucius Analects. It appears in Chapter 19, where an intellectual is “willing to give up life [致命] when seeing danger”. By reading the Analects closely, it seems clear that if an intellectual was faced with a situation leading to the destruction or abandonment of ‘Jen’ (仁, pronounced rén), a resolute intellectual (as cited in Chapter 15) would “never wound Humanity [‘Jen’, 仁] to secure life. Indeed, to perfect Humanity [‘Jen’, 仁], they often endure death”. According to Tu Wei-ming, ‘Jen’ is a concept of “personal morality” which can be reached through “moral self-cultivation”, and at the same time, it is a concept of “metaphysical justification” as an “ontological basis of self-cultivation.” In other words, ‘Jen’ signifies, as Tu highlights, morality which is not simply confined to the ethical stage but also conveys “religious significance”. In Confucianism, therefore, ‘zhiming’ means ‘dying for the ultimate morality’.

However, when the term was employed to describe martyrdom in the early Roman Church in Mandarin by Vagnone in 1629, the meaning was transformed to ‘dying for Christ’[為主致命]. As semantically transformed, the deed of death itself

---

26 Tu, *Humanity and Self-Cultivation*, 6-10.
27 As the collaboration between missionaries and Chinese Confucian literati officials was common in translation activities in the late 16-17th century in China, it is easy to infer that when Vagnone wrote his book in Chinese in 1629 he received the assistance from Confucian literati who were familiar with
was the same but the cause of death, that is, the signification of death, was entirely changed. Indeed, Christ was taken to represent the ‘ultimate morality, the perfect ‘Jen’, 仁’.

For the young Catholics in China, literary and indirect ‘zhiming’ (martyrdom), experienced by reading the early church martyrs’ accounts, would be a rehearsal to prepare for their own direct empirical experience of martyrdom. The passion for martyrdom in the Catholic Church in China had taken place exponentially amid the persecution from the early 18th century to the late 19th century, officially initiated by the ritual controversy in the late 17th century in which the Jesuits mission policy of cultural accommodation was condemned and rejected by the Holy See,28 and reached its climax during the Boxer Rebellion from 1898-1901, fired by the intense anti-foreign and anti-Christian sentiment.29 Christianity in China in these severe times was regarded as a heterodox “evil cult”30 by the orthodox Confucians and ethnic nationalists of the state. As a result of the persecutions the death which was connoted in the word ‘zhiming’ was embodied for the young Chinese Catholic Christians reading Vagnone’s book as a contemporary direct experience, rather than the past indirect experience of those who suffered death for Christ in early Church history. That past event was, therefore, appropriated by them as part of their very own history in which they could endure as early Christians did.31 As a consequence of their experiences of death for Christ, the word ‘zhiming’ became a significant indigenous Catholic term in China.

When the word ‘zhiming’ was initially imported into the Korean Catholic community from China, its phonetic value was given in the Korean vernacular as 치명 chimyeong using the same Chinese character 致命, but the meaning remained fully as it was in Catholicism in China. It is said that the first usage of ‘chimyeong’ was made by the Chinese priest Chou Wen-Mo (Chou Moon-Mo in

the concept of ‘Jen (仁)’, thus easily made the semantic transform of the word from ‘dying for ultimate morality’ to ‘dying for Christ’. See, Hung and Pollard, ‘Chinese Tradition’, 372-3.


30 Bays, A New History of Christianity in China, 33.

Korean) who entered in Korea secretly in 1794 to instruct and encourage young Korean Catholics, addressing “the importance of martyrs’ graves in the Church tradition”. More concretely, the oldest written record of its usage is found in "The Acts of Martyrs in Gihae year, 1839" (The Acts of Martyrs in Gihae year, 1839), a document on Korean Catholic martyrs in 1839, collected and edited finally by Hyeon Mun-Seok in 1844. Around fifty years later, in 1895, Bishop Gustav C. M. Mutel, the eighth leader of the Chosun Diocese, wrote a book titled "Acts of Martyrs" (Acts of Martyrs), collecting stories of 877 martyrs who were killed under the Byeongin Persecution in 1866 and distributed it to all churches in Korea. The word ‘chimyeong’ was contained in the Korean-French dictionary compiled by the SMEP missionaries in Korea in 1880.

Catholicism had begun in Korea as a ‘religion’ in 1784 on the return of Lee Seung-Hun after being baptised in Beijing by the Qing-court French Jesuit Jean-Joseph de Grammont. At that time, Catholicism in China was already affected by the rite controversy which led to restrictions on practice after 1745, and in 1773 the whole Jesuit order was virtually dissolved and commanded to leave China by Pope Clement XIV. Some Jesuit missionaries still stayed in Beijing, supported by the Qing court, among whom was De Grammont. However, Korean Catholics turned to a Franciscan bishop, Alexandre de Gouvea, Portuguese Franciscan bishop in Beijing, in 1790 when wanting to discuss ancestor worship. His answer was clear that ancestor worship, a core basis of Confucian feudal Chosun (Korea) society accepted by Jesuits, was prohibited by Church law. That led Korean Catholics, with no priest, 32

32 Cha Gi-Jin, ‘Sungyoja Hyeonhang Undong’ (The movement of Catholic Martyrs Exaltation) in Hanguk Gatolik Daesajeon (Korean Catholic Encyclopedia) 8, 5164.

33 Cha Gi-Jin, ‘Hangukeseoui Sibok Siseong’ (Beatification and Canonization in Korea) in Hanguk Gatolik Daesajeon 8, 5329. The original one was lost but its transcription was survived.

34 Gustav C. M. Mutel, Chimyeong Ilgi, n.p., 1895; Cha, ‘Hangukeseoui Sibok Siseong’, 5331.


37 IKCHS, Hanguk Gidokgyou Yeoksa I, 76.
no Bible, but “the passion of a new faith”, 38 into cruel persecutions from the state, on the grounds that they were a group of heretics having “no fidelity at all towards parent and king”. 39 For the state, they were politically observed as a treasonable body challenging the system of the state: persecutions were inevitable.

Enduring smaller and greater persecutions from 1790s to 1871, especially the Sinyu Persecution of 1801, the Gihae Persecution of 1839, the Byeongin Persecution of 1866-1871, 40 initiated by the Jinsan affair of Yun Ji-Chung, who had burned his ancestor tablets in 1791 to comply with de Gouveia’s ruling of 1790, Korean Catholics carved the word ‘chimyeong’, suffering death for Christ, deeply into their heart as part of their own experience. For them, to be a Catholic meant potentially to endure a tortured death. As shown above, it is clear that the word ‘chimyeong’ perfectly performed its martyrological undertone in Catholicism in Korea through the experience of severe persecutions, and the word became an indigenous proper noun for Catholicism in Korea in Catholic circles.

Whilst ‘chimyeong’ had been a Catholic term from 18th century, and with solid theological credentials, it was not acceptable to Protestants. The PCK, which had a permanent resident missionary from 1884, tactically avoided using ‘chimyeong’ to distinguish Protestants from Catholics in Korea. Instead of ‘chimyeong,’ they chose ‘sungyo,’ created in Japan in the late 19th, as another universal term corresponding to martyrdom.

3.1.2. From 殉敎 (じゅんきょう) ‘junkyō’ of Catholicism in Japan

Christianity in Japan 41 was initiated by Francisco de Xavier, one of the founders of the Jesuits, who arrived in Kagoshima in 1549 under Portuguese

39 Dallet, Histoire de l’Église de Corée I, 40; IKCHS, Hanguk Gidokgyou Yeoksa I, 81.
patronage. Through Xavier’s two-year stay in Japan the Jesuit’s mission strategy of cultural adaptation was tentatively initiated in Japan, although not developed until Alessandro Valignano dominated the mission in Japan. Rival Franciscan missionaries under Spanish patronage entered into Japan in 1593, opposing accommodation as they had in China. In the early mission stage in Japan, therefore, without any cultural or ritual controversy, local feudal daimyos accepted and supported Christianity in order to take advantage of trade with Portugal which could offer economic growth followed by political power. As a result, Christianity was hugely successful, converts being said to have amounted to around 300,000 at the end of the 16th century though Japan was politically under constant hegemonic shifts between shoguns Oda Nobunaga (r. 1568-82), Toyotomi Hideyoshi (r. 1582-98), Tokugawa Ieyasu and the Tokugawa shogunate (r. 1600-1868) from the mid 16th century.

However, ironically, the numerical growth of Christianity during the 16th century which partly resulted by the political pragmatism of Japanese rulers (daimyos and shoguns), became a cause of political oppression of Catholics between Toyotomi Hideyoshi’s first anti-Christian edict in 1587 and the Meiji government’s lift of anti-Christian proscription in 1873 and the eventual publishing of the Meiji Constitution which guaranteed freedom of religion and conscience in 1889. For the shoguns, Christianity posed a twofold threat. Externally, the military power from Portugal and Spain which was supporting Jesuit and Franciscan


44 Drummond, A History of Christianity in Japan, 57.
mission activities made Japanese authorities anxious about a potential conquest or colonisation of the state, and the missionary orders’ chaotic conflict over the mission enterprise led to frictions between shoguns and the orders, creating negative attitudes towards Christianity. Internally, in the eyes of shoguns, Christians were regarded as inspiring popular uprisings threatening inner unity of the country, for which the state could arguably point to the Shimabara Rebellion of 1637-8.49

The shogunate persecuted Christians, issuing anti-Christian edicts from 1587, and finally closed the country to western powers by issuing the fifth exclusion edict in 1639.50 This excluded any destabilising influences from imperial western nations. Christianity was officially eradicated from Japan by around 1643, and subsequently the remnant Christians survived secretly as ‘Kakure Kirishitan’ (Hidden Christian)51 until their discovery in 1865.52 Persecution briefly resumed after the Emperor Meiji’s political power was restored after the demise of the Tokugawa shogunate (Meiji Restoration) in 1868, the Meiji government immediately reaffirming the anti-Christian edict of 161453 and proclaiming a “revival of the national faith, Shinto”,54 Buddhism, which had been the main tradition, loosing ground. Those hidden Christians who appeared in public underwent persecution until 1873.55

It is the case that Christian literature, translated and printed in Japanese by missionaries with native elite converts and circulated among believers, such as どちりいな-きりしたん Doctirina Kirishitan (Christian doctrine (Catechism)) in

49 Shimabara was a peasant uprising of people, many of whom happened to be Christian, and was used by the state to validate further persecution. See, Sawa, Ilbon Gidokgyoohoesa, 56.
52 Sawa, Ilbon Gidokgyoohoesa, 57.
55 Sawa, Ilbon Gidokgyoohoesa, 63.
1591, 御 パッションの 観念 Gopasshon no Kennen (Ideas of the Passion) in 1607 followed by スピリツアル修行 Supirituaru Shugyo (Spiritual Training) and so on, followed by spiritual training and so on, played a vital role to disciple and encourage suffering Christians in Japan amid those brutal persecutions from 1587 to 1873. By reading them as guidebooks they were disciplined to affirm their witnesses to Christ emphatically and repeatedly during the persecutions.

In the process of those translations and writings the corresponding term for martyrdom was rendered from Portuguese ‘martirio’ and ‘martir’ to ‘マルチリヨ’ (maruchiryo) and ‘マルチル’ (丸血留, maruchiru). Such usage clearly appear in the books written during late 16–7th centuries such as Santosu no Gosagyo (The Works of the Saints), dealing with the acts of the apostles, saints and martyrs printed in 1591, マルチリヨの心得 Maruchiryo no Simudoku (Sympathy to Martyrdom), and 丸血留 マルチルの道 Maruchiru no Michi (The way to Martyrdom) written between the years 1616 and 1623. Though early missionaries in Japan used to translate Christian books borrowing Buddhist terminology, difficult technical Christian terms such as ‘God’, ‘angel’, ‘confession’, ‘Holy Cross’ etc were translated phonetically from Portuguese or Latin. The term, martyr(dom), is one of the most difficult technical Christian terminology to translate into Japanese, for it must be distinguished from other types of death in Japan, for example, ‘seppuku’ (known as ‘hara-kiri’ in the West) and

56 For the literature translated or written in Japanese for and against Christianity during the late 16th to 17th century, see, Ebisawa Arimich et al., Nihon Shiso-Taikai 25: Kirishitansho, Haiyasho (Series of Volumes re Japanese Ideology 25: Writings for, and against Christianity), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970.

57 Sawa, Ilbon Gidokyochoesa, 72.


59 See, Ebisawa, Nihon Shiso-Taikai, 323-60, 557-8, 582-6, 623-6.

60 When Xavier with Anjiro first translated ‘God’ as ‘Dainichi’, “the cosmic Vairocano Buddha and lord of light”, Christianity was regarded as a sect of Buddhism among Japanese: he soon corrected the word by ‘Deus’ directly loaning from Latin. Moffett, A History of Christianity in Asia, vol. II, 72.


62 ‘Seppuku’ (せっぱく), a ritual suicide by disembowelment, is a traditional form of honourable death conducted by the samurai class for centuries. See, Toyomasa Fusé, ‘Suicide and Culture in Japan: A Study of Seppuku as an Institutionalized form of Suicide’, Social Psychiatry 15:2 (June
‘殉死’ (じゅんし, junsi). Thus, they rendered the term into Japanese ‘maruchiryō’ and ‘maruchiru’ taking the ‘direct loan technique’ from Portuguese. Unfortunately, however, the term ‘maruchiryō’ and ‘maruchiru’ were eliminated in those works written in Japanese within Japan during the missionary expulsion and persecution of Christianity. All loan-words from Portuguese became “the victim” of eradication by the fifth edict in 1639 that cut “all commercial and religious ties” with Portugal though some ‘Japanised’ Portuguese terms such as ‘Kirishitan’ etc survived. In this way the word ‘maruchiryō’ and ‘maruchiro’ disappeared from Christian literature in Japanese.

However, the concept of martyrdom was revitalised in the late 19th century. When the Meiji government accepted or imported wholeheartedly western ideas as part of modernising Japan, the word ‘religion’ was translated into Japanese as ‘宗敎’ (しゅうきょう, shukyo) in late 19th century. Influenced by the emergence of ‘shukyo’ the new corresponding word to martyrdom ‘殉教’ (じゅんきょう, junkyo) was created on the basis of the term ‘shukyo’. Once ‘junkyo’ obtained a universal stance in use, ‘maruchiryō’ was replaced by this neologism ‘junkyo’.

‘殉教’ (じゅんきょう, junkyo) is a portmanteau word composed of the first letter of ‘殉死’ (junsi) and the second letter of ‘宗教’ (shukyo). The former letter, ‘殉’ (jun), has a meaning of holy and elegant death in Chinese. The latter, ‘教’ (kyo), has multiple meanings of ‘to teach’ or ‘to imitate/follow/emulate’ as a verb, and ‘a religion’ or ‘a faith’ as a noun. Literally ‘junkyo’ means ‘teach/imitate/follow with death’ or ‘dying for a faith/religion’. Therefore it technically signifies or at least

---

Norihisa, government document but Shukyogaku kiyo Aihara Ichirosuke, 66.
connotes the concept of martyrdom. The earliest usage of ‘junkyo’ appears in 1878 in 日本西敎史 Nihon Seikyoshi which is a translation of Jean Crasset’s Histoire de l’église du Japon. In chapters 2-10, a history of mission and the acts of martyrdom in Japan, 67 ‘junkyo’ was using to describe martyrdom. Since then, ‘junkyo’ was consistently used for martyrdom in Japan. ‘Junkyo’ then flowed into Korea as ‘순교’, pronounced ‘sungyo’, using the same Chinese character ‘殉敎’ without any semantic change from ‘junkyo’ in Japanese.

It is not clear exactly when ‘junkyo’ (‘sungyo’ in Korean vernacular) was imported into Korea. We can state that ‘sungyo’ did not appear in Korean Christian literature from the late 19th century to the early 1920s, neither is ‘sungyo’ or ‘殉敎’ in the Protestant missionaries’ works such as Horace G. Underwood’s A Concise Dictionary of the Korean Language in 1890, 68 in James S. Gale’s A Korean-English Dictionary in 1897, 69 or in the Korean Dictionary compiled by Chosun chongdokbu (the Japanese Government-General of Korea) in 1920. 70 The usage of ‘sungyo’ is seen first in 1926 in Oh Mun-Whan’s book designating Rev Robert J. Thomas’ death in Korea as ‘the first protestant martyrdom in Korea’. 71 However, as the word ‘chimyeong’ does appear once in that book in ‘Writings of Recommendation’ written by Rev Chae Pil-Geun, 72 we might infer that some Protestants occasionally used ‘chimyeong’ mixed with ‘sungyo’ in individual writings until that time. But it is also fact that Rev Chae’s use of ‘chimyeong’ is exceptional in the PCK context, and apart from him, it is hard to find other cases in the PCK literature from 1926 onwards.

### 3.1.3. A Comparison of 치명 ‘Chimyeong’ in Catholicism and 순교 ‘Sungyo’ in Protestantism in Korea

---

67 Jean Crasset, Nihon Seikyoshi, Daiokan trans., Tokyo: Juan, Kurase, 1878. Also see, ‘日本西敎史’, Nihon Shisoshi Jiten, 781.


70 Chosun Chongdokbu, Chosuneo sajeon (Korean Dictionary), Seoul: Chosun Chongdokbu, 1920.

71 Oh Mun-Whan, Chosun Gidokgyohoeui Ilbunsuryongin Pyongyang Yangnan (Pyongyang Foreign Incident, A watershed in the History of Chosun Protestant Church), Pyongyang: Gwang Myong Seogwan, 1926.

72 Oh, Chosun Gidokgyohoeui, 1.
It is reasonable to assume from the PCK’s employment of ‘sungyo’ that they did not want to use ‘chimyeong’ officially though they had already recognized that ‘chimyeong’ was commonly used as the corresponding word to martyrdom in Catholicism. Nevertheless, the PCK needed to explain martyrdom as a legacy of the Early Church to the Korean Protestants. Prior to use ‘sungyo’ in their writings from the mid 1920s at the earliest, the PCK employed another word ‘슌도’ (殉道, sundo; xùndào in Chinese) from Mencius,73 literally meaning ‘death with or dying for ‘道’ dao (tao), the teaching/morality/doctrine’, evading the use of Catholic technical term ‘chimyeong’. For example, when Mrs M. H. Gifford translated The Book of Martyrs into Korean in 1912 she employed the word ‘sundo’ instead of ‘chimyeong’, titling it 술탕기록 sundo girok.74 However, ‘sundo’ quickly gave way to ‘sungyo’ from the mid 1920s onwards and was virtually replaced by it, perhaps influenced by the use of Japanese in administration, education, and all walks of life. One further reason for adopting ‘sungyo’ driven from Japanese ‘junkyo’ was the fact that Korea was under Japanese direct control from 1910 to 1945. Thus it was natural to employ a word of Japanese origin. Furthermore, recalling the fact that ‘junkyo’ was created in Japan in the process of modernisation in the late 19th century, adopting the word might be regarded as part of the importation of modernity into Korean society, coinciding with the early Protestants’ advocacy of ‘enlightenment’. Nevertheless, it cannot be ignored that the selection of the word ‘sungyo’ to correspond to the word ‘martyrdom’ for Protestants in Korea may have been somewhat uncritical, with ideological undertones related to the colonising power.

In terms of term-choice, the PCK purposely and tactically selected the word ‘sungyo’ instead of the Catholic term ‘chimyeong’ to differentiate themselves from Catholicism. The PCK seemed concerned that if they use ‘chimyeong’, they might be regarded as a sect of Catholicism in the eyes of the state and the populace, treated as a group of heretics committing an act of high treason as Catholicism, and proscribed or at least spurned. Therefore, one of the reasons for the Protestants in Korea to

73 孟子(Mencius) 13:42, 天下有道 以道殉身 天下無道 以身殉道. “When the correct way prevails in the world, it is carried out wherever the gentleman goes. When the correct way is overshadowed in the world, the gentleman adheres to it even at the cost of his life [殉道].” Quoted from Zhao Zhentao, Zhang Wenting, and Zhou Dingzhi trans., Mencius, Hunan: Hunan People’s Publishing House, 1999, 313 (emphasis added).
74 M. H. Gifford trans., Sundo girok (The Book of Martyrs), Seoul: Korean Religious Tract society, 1912.
select ‘sungyo’ was the political interests of the early Protestant missionaries in Korea.

When the western missionaries introduced Protestantism to the Korean elites in the late 19th century they emphasized their dissimilarity to Catholicism, ignoring all Catholic mission works, especially the Catholic martyrs in Korea. One point they picked out was that Protestantism was not a sect of Catholicism but a religion of “enlightenment”. This suited the Korean context, for the country was starting to open to the western nations and grasp the new knowledge of the outside world, which was rapidly entering and spreading throughout Korean society. Accordingly, the early Protestant missionaries presented themselves as people who could enlighten or modernise Korean society, especially in medical and educational fields. Though the early Protestant missionaries had great enthusiasm for evangelising Korea directly, the socio-political situation in Korea externally with the western powers and internally with Catholicism pressed them to take a different path. By distinguishing Protestantism from Catholicism, which had already experienced severe persecution as a result of their conflicts with government authority, the Protestant missionaries were more easily able to contact the elites without evoking hostility and were in a short time able to conduct their mission work in Korea without a struggle with the state. In other words, there was no clash between the state and the church as the state wanted something at least of what the church was offering. In the rivalry between Catholics and Protestants, Protestants initially won; but in the rivalry for perfection or at least demonstrated faith, the Catholics were clearly victorious as they had many martyrs, and the Protestants had none.

In the present context of Christianity - both Catholicism and Protestantism in Korea - the term ‘chimyeong’ has almost disappeared in public use, being restricted to a historic Catholic terminology while ‘sungyo’ has obtained the universal position in use as an established and living idea, clearly referring to martyrdom in a martyrological sense. Though it is hard to find exactly when the Roman Catholic Church in Korea started to use the PCK word, ‘sungyo’ rather than ‘chimyeong’, in


order to apply the concept of ‘sungyo’ in the PCK context, we need now to investigate the death-events of the PCK, which have to be considered as the first step in the process of making Protestant martyrs.

3.2. The Historical Stratum of Death-event in the PCK

Apart from the many death-events of the Catholics in Korea during the 1790s-1871, the largest of which saw around 10,000 killed in 1866, deaths of Korean Protestants at the hand of the political authorities took place from 1866 onwards (Catholics also died in these periods). It can be divided into three major periods, as noted above: the late Chosun Dynasty (1866-1905), under the rule of Japanese imperialism (1905-1945), and before and during the Korean War (1945-1953). In these periods, most Protestant Christians’ deaths, according to the PCK’s report, occurred as a part of the process of religious based activities against political power: first against late Chosun’s feudalistic government, then against Japanese colonial policy, and finally against communist rule. The Korean Protestant Christians sacrificed during those three periods were designated as Christian martyrs when the PCK started to collect and interpret their death around the idea of ‘sungyo’ after 1926.

3.2.1. The Late Chosun Dynasty: 1866-1905, Conflict with Chosun Feudalistic Power

In this period, two Protestant Christians, Rev. Robert Jermain Thomas (1839-1866) and Paik Hong-Jun (白鴻俊, 1848-1893), are referred to as sacrificing their lives to the Chosun’s feudal authority as a result of propagating the Bible which was banned by the law at that time. Though there are still debates on the cause and process of their death they are clearly designated and remembered as ‘the first Protestant’ martyr in Korea (R. J. Thomas) and ‘the first Korean’ Protestant martyr (Paik Hong-Jun) by Korean Protestant Christians. Their deaths, in fact, are made to seem similar by the Protestants to the great persecution of Catholicism in Korea which occurred in or around 1866. Let us see if that is actually the case.
The persecution in 1866 was carried out “to eradicate Catholicism and foreign influences from Korean soil”\(^77\) by the ‘Isolation Policy’ of the Chosun government under the Taewongun who was supported by a predominance of the nation’s Confucian literati. Lee Ki-Baik points out clearly that the fundamental purpose of that policy was to defend stubbornly their ruling principle, traditional Confucian teaching, against Western ideas.\(^78\) From the angle of Chosun governmental authority, Christianity was regarded as representing western ideas and heterodox doctrines which were opposed to traditional Confucian teachings during the second half of the 19\(^{th}\) century. Furthermore, if Korean Catholicism had become mixed up with Western imperialism in the 19\(^{th}\) century, Korean Protestants were not far behind. For example, Rev Alexander Williamson, a missionary of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the agent of the National Bible Society of Scotland (NBSS), who sent R. J. Thomas to Korea as the agent of the NBSS in 1865 and 1866, believed that it was “the duty and privilege” of Great Britain and America to open Korea, and if war was needed to do such, it would be thought as “a condition of progress” in a fallen world. He said,

> Let a large force, naval and military, which clearly – in the eye of the Coreans [Koreans] themselves – would be irresistible, appear at their capital, explain our motives, and demand such concessions as are consistent with natural justice.\(^79\)

It is often observed from history that the religious passion of missionaries, who had dual identities as “citizens of empire” and “citizens of heaven”,\(^80\) easily led them to support imperial power for the missions, as illustrated by mission enthusiasm for the earlier forced entry to Chinese ports advantaging missions.

Being alerted to such ideas, high officers of the Chosun court advocated the exclusion policy to secure the nation from western powers.\(^81\) For instance, Yi Hang-

\(^{77}\) Grayson, Korea, 144.

\(^{78}\) Lee, A New History of Korea, 263.


\(^{81}\) Lee, A New History of Korea, 262-6; Grayson, Korea, 144-5.
No, a widely esteemed conservative Neo-Confucian scholar, urged the formation of local guerrilla bands to remove Western “barbarians” from the territory in cooperation with government forces, rejecting any peaceful relationship with the barbarian West. On the basis of this extremely tense situation between the Chosun government and western powers, Rev. R. J. Thomas was killed in September 1866 in consequence of the ‘General Sherman’ affair which was known as the cause of the ‘Foreign Disturbance of 1871’, the first military clash with the American fleet. Let us look carefully at this first Protestant martyr’s ‘death event’ in Korea.

The Death-event of Robert J. Thomas

Welsh Congregationalist Rev. Robert J. Thomas was born on September 7th, 1839 at Rhayader, Radnorshire, Wales. In 1848 he moved to Llanover, Monmouthshire with his family, where his father, Robert Thomas (1810-1884), was called as the minister of the congregational Church: when he was 15 years of age in 1854 he became a member of the Church. Little appears to be known about his early life in Llanover. He spent three years at Llandovery College, and then in 1856 he worked as an assistant-master at Alfred Newth’s school in Oundle, Northamptonshire. On 28 September 1857, he was admitted on probation by New College, London, and then became a fully matriculated student on 1 February 1858. He got married to Caroline Godfrey of Oundle, Northamptonshire on 29 May 1863 while he was still at College. In midsummer 1863, he graduated, completing the five-year programme that the College required for the degree of B. A. Soon after his graduation from New College, London, he was appointed as a missionary of the London Missionary Society (LMS) to Shanghai, China; he had dreamed of becoming a missionary in China from 1861. On 4 June 1863, he was ordained to the ministry in his home church at Llanover where his father was the minister. Finally, Rev Robert J. Thomas and his wife embarked for China to conduct their first mission.

---


84 Minute of General Committee, New College, No. 133 Meeting (29 April 1861).
work on July 21 of that year, boarding the ship Polmaise. They reached Shanghai early in December 1863.

Three months after their arrival in Shanghai, Caroline Godfrey, Thomas’ wife, died due to “premature child-birth”, on 24 March 1864. Because of this great sorrow he seems not to have been able to conduct his mission work at all. During this period of indecision he resigned as a missionary of the LMS in December 1864 and visited Rev. Alexander Williamson (1829-1890), the agent of the NBSS in North China with whom he had travelled from England to Shanghai and spent the first year together in Shanghai. When they met, Williamson advised him to recover the passion of a missionary and persuaded him to resume. Under this influence, Thomas applied to the LMS for reappointment in 1865. While waiting in Chefoo for a reply he met two Korean Catholic Christians who had been smuggled into Chefoo to venture “across to Shantung for purpose of trade”. Thomas seems to have met them at the home of Williamson. After that, Thomas decided to do mission work in Korea, persuading Williamson to send him to Korea as the agent of the NBSS with a large stock of Chinese Bibles.

R. J. Thomas visited Korea twice in 1865 and 1866. Guided by two Korean Catholics who met at Williamson’s home in Chefoo, Thomas visited the west coast of Korea first in 1865 for “two months and a half”. During the first visit, he distributed some Chinese Bibles which he gave to native Koreans, and learned a little Korean, earnestly expecting to do mission work in Korea in the near future. After

---


86 In the first letter to Dr Tidman, General Secretary of the LMS, Thomas said, “My heart is well nigh broken. I must seek somewhere a complete change. All that could be done for a sufferer was done for my dear wife. Mr and Mrs Muirhead and Miss Gamble have earned my deepest gratitude. I cannot write any more, my sorrow bursts forth afresh as I go over the details. I trust to give myself more completely than ever to the noble work on which I have just entered, but at present I feel weighed down by deep grief.” R. J. Thomas, Letter to Dr Tidman, Shanghai, 5 April 1864.


88 They were Kim Ja-Pyeong (Oh, ‘The Two Visits’, 104) and Choi Seon-II. See, Kim Yang-Seon, Hanguk Gidokgyosayeongu (The Study of Korean Church History), Seoul: Gidokgyomunsa, 1971, 43.


90 Oh Mun-Whan, Thomas moksajeon (The Life of R. J. Thomas, who was killed at Pyong Yang in 1866), Pyongyang: Thomas moks sa sungyo ginyeomhoe, 1928, 18; Oh, ‘The Two Visits’, 101.

91 R. J. Thomas, Letter to Dr Tidman, Peking, 12 January 1866. This had been sent after his first visit to Korea.
coming back from Korea in January 1866 he received the news in Peking that his application for reappointment as a LMS missionary had been approved. In thanks for this, he wrote a letter to Dr Tidman, the general secretary of the LMS, reporting his first visit to Korea. Though Thomas was reappointed as a missionary of the LMS to China his mind already headed towards Korea rather than China. In the course of looking for a way of visiting Korea again, he embarked on an American trading vessel, ‘General Sherman’, whose owner, Mr. Preston, was anxious to go to Korea on a trading expedition. Despite the exclusion policy of Chosun government, the ship recklessly entered the Taedong River in Korea, being destroyed by the garrison of Pyongyang Province. All the crew was killed, including Thomas, in September 1866.

Though he was a missionary of the LMS and an agent of the NBSS when he visited in Korea in 1866, he did not present his identity as a ‘missionary’ of the LMS or agent of the NBSS clearly to Korean officers when he was questioned by the official investigator while the ship was anchored at Songsan and Changsapo on Taedong River. In the records of Kojong Shillok, the Annals of King Kojong, Thomas was recognized as an interpreter or spokesman of the schooner who seems to have had responsibility for the movement of the ship, although Oh Mun-Whan, the first martyr-maker of Thomas, strongly and repeatedly insisted that he was simply “a passenger” of the ship in his writings written from 1926 onwards. Yet the Pyongyang-Ji, Pyongyang Gazette, regarded him as “the head (or leader) of the ship”. Park Gyou-Su (朴珪壽, 1807-1877), the governor of Pyongan Province, recognized him not as a Protestant missionary or mere passenger but as an aggressive interpreter on the ‘General Sherman’, the ship in which he had travelled to Korea, in contravention of the governor’s strict ‘Exclusion Policy’ backed by military power. In a word, whether he was burnt on board the schooner, drowned in the river, or killed by a soldier, his death was the result of the clash between the military of the Chosun government and an American armed trading vessel. It did not result from any

92 Kojong Shillok (The Annals of King Kojong), 15, 18 July 1866 (by lunar calendar).
93 See, Kojong Sillok, 5 – 27 July 1866 (by lunar calendar).
95 Pyongyang-Ji (Pyongyang Gazette), cited from Oh, Thomas moksajeon, 52.
96 Oh, ‘The Two Visits’, 121.
religious deeds, such as the distribution of Bibles, against political authority. He was killed as a foreigner, perhaps as a trader, sailor or invader, but not as a missionary. For the PCK to call him a martyr demands a leap of faith and is based not on the record but, as will be discussed later, on the attempted appropriation of ‘glory’ for the PCK.

**The Death-event of Paik Hong-Jun**

Meanwhile, Paik Hong-Jun, who is known as ‘the first Korean Protestant martyr’, was an important pioneer of early Protestantism in Korea, though his whole life story is still unclear. He is said to be the first Korean Protestant Christian who was baptized by John MacIntyre, the missionary of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, with other Euiju (or Uiju) merchants in 1879 in Manchuria after joining J. MacIntyre and J. Ross’s bible translation team. When the Bible was off to the press he went back to Euiju to disseminate the Gospel. As a result of his propagation, Christians began appearing in his home town from 1879. In 1881 about thirty Korean Christians attended MacIntyre’s Bible class for a week, which was held in Manchuria.

At that time the influx of Christianity was, however, strictly forbidden by the isolation policy. Indeed, MacIntyre knew that there were serious persecutions of Christians in Korea, so he avoided sending Christian books into Korea “because the profession of the Christian religion is punishable with death, and such books would be sure to be seized at the customs’ barriers”. Despite the situation, in 1881 MacIntyre once tried to send a “parcel of Christian books and scientific books” through the aid of “very trustworthy men” for “the member who was baptized last year”. The parcel was unfortunately intercepted and, as a result, “the convert residing in Corea [Korea]” was immediately imprisoned and “the other member” was set free.

---


100 MacIntyre, ‘Newchwang’, 271.
“after a few months’ imprisonment”. In MacIntyre’s report we do not know clearly who “the member”, “the convert” or “the other member” was. However, Lee Man-Yeol, Emeritus Professor of Korean History in Sookmyong Women’s University, and Oak Sung-Deuk, a Korean Church historian in the UCLA Centre for Korean Studies, insist that these three phrases indicate Paik Hong-Jun, inserting Paik’s full name into the citation of MacIntyre’s report. According to them, Paik’s propagation of the Gospel and circulation of the Bible led him to suffer imprisonment, though he was set free from prison after a few months.

In fact, the first report of Paik’s death was seen in the letter of Rev Samuel A. Moffett (1864-1939) written on 12 January 1894 to Dr Francis F. Ellinwood (1825-1908), Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. In the letter Moffett reports his plan to travel to Euiju, Paik’s home town, on February 1894 to shepherd the remnant Christians in Euiju because of Paik’s death. But he does not discuss the cause of Paik’s death. One year later, another account of Paik’s death was given in C. C. Vinton’s report written on January 1895. It gives more concrete detail of Paik’s death than Moffett’s letter:

Some of its [Korean Church’s] members are feeble and halting, but many are true and stanch in the faith they profess, and not a few have been severely tested in the furnace of persecution. Old Paik, the Eui-ju evangelist, was the first Korean baptized by Mr. MacIntyre, and had borne a two years imprisonment, with many stripes, before his death last year [1894], rather than renounce his faith. Mok of An San, Chan of the Seoul vicinity, the Kims of Wonsan, have all endured bitter ostracism by family clan and village commune. Han of Pyeng Yang stood faithful to his trust in the face of Chinese and Japanese soldiers until driven to fly for his very life. And he and other of the Pyeng Yang Christians have gone to the farthest limit of suffering and of faith fullness when governor and populace combined to exterminate the foreign belief. Men like these are of the seed of the martyrs and may well defy the jibes of those who class all native converts as “rice Christians.”

101 MacIntyre, ‘Newchwang’, 271.
103 S. A. Moffett, Letter to Dr. Ellinwood, 12 January 1894.
Vinton linked up the cause of Paik’s death to his “two years imprisonment”, and its effect is given as “the seed of the martyrs”. However, it is doubtful whether that imprisonment was actually the cause of Paik’s death or indeed whether Paik was really imprisoned for ‘two years’. If the ‘two years’ before his death prior to January 12th 1894 said by Moffett means 1892 and 1893, Vinton’s report is not reliable, for it conflicts with Moffett’s letter, written on September 6th 1892 and on February 1st 1893, that Paik was still working in Euiju as an employed evangelist leading the Bible class for native Christians. If it was Paik, who was imprisoned for a few months or even a year in 1881, this cannot have been the cause of his death in 1893.

What is clear is that his imprisonment was caused by his religious activities. In the 1892 report, Paik, a pioneer of Protestant Christianity in Korea, was evaluated thus: “Steadfastness in persecution, and faithfulness in active witness-bearing, have caused him to be known by the name of ‘Paik the disciple’”, though his efforts to translate and spread the Gospel into Korea as a Korean Protestant Christian were in direct opposition to the ruling principle of Korean governmental authority. If he died in prison, as some say in that evidence, and his death was caused by the religious deed of distributing the Bibles or propagating the Gospel against the political authority, he could be considered a martyr. On the other hand, if he died naturally without any violence from the authorities, even though his life and works for his faith after conversion opposed the political policy which forbade the influx and circulation of the Gospel in Korea, it is surely more difficult to designate him as the first ‘Korean Protestant’ martyr. Until evidence becomes available that in 1893, while working as an evangelist, he was suddenly imprisoned and died as a result, his position as ‘the first Korean’ Protestant martyr is in doubt.

3.2.2. Japanese Colonial Regime: 1905-1945, Conflict with Colonial Power

While Catholicism in Korea was established and developed amid earlier conflicts between the Chosun government and western powers, Protestantism in Korea settled down into the local context during a period of national crisis.

---

105 S. A. Moffett, Letter to Dr Ellinwood, 6 September 1892, 1 February 1893; Minutes of the AnnualMeeting of the Missions, 1891-1893. Quoted from Rhie Deok-Ju, ‘Paik Hong-Jun’, HangukGidokgyosa Yeongu (The Studies of Korean Church History) 19 (April 1988), 32.

occasioned by an Asian power. Indeed Protestant Christianity appears to have functioned as a foundation for overcoming the national collapse especially after the Protectorate Treaty in 1905 and the Annexation in 1910 forced by Japan. Unlike Catholicism, which was still often regarded not only as a agent of western imperialism but also as a heterodox doctrine opposed to the modernising ruling principle of the government, Protestantism in Korea was positively and closely associated by Koreans with nationalism throughout the Japanese colonial regime.

In particular, during the early harsh ‘military’ rule from the Annexation in 1910 to 1919, when any political organization and action was banned by an iron fist military policy, Koreans used the Protestant churches and mission schools as the largest Korean community at the time for their socio-political activities. The organization of Epworth cheongnyeonhoe, the Epworth Youth League at Sangdong Methodist Church in 1905 to resist Japanese rule over Korea; the organization of Shinminhoe, the New People’s Association, in 1907, the strongest Korean nationalist organization at that time, whose promoters were Korean Christians; Gukche bosang undonghoe, the Association for Redemption of the National Debt in 1907, which was spread by most Korean Christians to launch a campaign to repay the immense amounts of debt from Japan; the faithful Korean Christian Jang In-Hwan’s assassination of Durham W. Stevens, who praised the record of the Japanese Residency-General in Korea as foreign affairs adviser in 1908; the March First Movement in 1919, and so on. This means that the most vital category of people to be put under the Japanese control at that time were nationalist Korean Christians. It is clear that under Japanese rule Protestantism in Korea and Korean nationalism were positively and closely associated each other. Naturally prominent church leaders such as Kim Gu, Seo Jae-Pil, Yun Chi-Ho, and Jeon Deok-Gi, became national leaders, though many of them collaborated actively with the Japanese in the last two decades of Japanese colonial rule in Korea, an issue which left bitter memories.

In the view of the Japanese government authority, therefore, the PCK, which worked as the well-organized headquarters of national liberation, was the first and major obstruction to their rule of Korea. Indeed, ‘Protestantism allied with nationalism’ was the core identity of the PCK under Japanese colonial rule. Recognizing this identity of the Korean Protestant Christians, the Japanese government undertook a variety of suppressions and persecutions to destroy the nationalism of Korean Protestant Christians.
The Conspiracy Case, 1911-1913

After the proclamation of the annexation of Korea by Japan in August 1910, the Government-General of Japan easily foresaw Koreans’ resistance and wish for independence, and immediately undertook to remove anti-Japanese movements in various ways. In fact, since the Protectorate Treaty of 1905 between Japan and Korea there had been various strong uprisings of the Korean righteous army (Euibyeong) against the Japanese troops escorting Ito Hirobumi who played the principal role in the treaty. Breaking opposition was essential in order to organise colonial policy in annexed Korea. Amid this situation, a major conspiracy case took place, the so-called ‘Terauchi assassination plot of 1911’ or ‘Case of the One Hundred Five’ (105 in Sageon), which indicates the number of the convicted in the first trial of the case in 1912.

The process was planned and carried out by Akashi Kenjiro, the inspector general, under direct instruction from the first Japanese governor-general of Korea, Terauchi Masatake, with two aims: to eliminate Korean Protestant Christian power in west-northern Korea, which supported nationalism, and to exile those missionaries who were regarded as the instigators of the case because they did not cooperate with the new rulers of Korea. The Japanese Foreign Office, however, stated their arrest of the suspects “had nothing to do either with the Church or their faith”. To achieve a show-trial, Akashi ‘discovered’ a conspiracy to assassinate the governor-general, Terauchi, at Shincheon (Syen Chuen) railway-station in North Pyeongan province during a tour of inspection there.

109 Indeed, it was an open secret that “those natives who were engaged in sedition and conspiracy against the Japanese protectorate were at one time or another under missionary influence, and made Christian churches and schools their rallying-points as well as their havens of retreat”. ‘Japan’s Clash with Korean Missions’, Literary Digest, 16 March 1912, 537.
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The arrest of those suspected of being engaged in the conspiracy began in October 1911, targeting religious and nationalistic Christians such as Rev Yang Jeon-Baek, one of the first seven ordained ministers of Presbyterian Church of Korea, Yun Chi-Ho (Methodist) and Yang Ki-Tak (Presbyterian), known as “the principals of the New People’s Society” (Shinminhoe). This was the strongest Korean nationalist organization at that time, and the so-called conspirators were all living in west-northern Korea, the core region of Korean Protestant Christianity since Protestantism had arrived from Manchuria, China. Though it is hard to find the exact number of suspects arrested from the written records, over 389 prominent Koreans were understood to have been detained by the Japanese police force during the preliminary interrogation. Of over 389 suspects, 123 were indicted on June 1912 for attempting to assassinate Terauchi, nine months after their arrest. Among those indicted 94 were Protestant Christians: 84 Presbyterians, 6 Methodists, 2 Congregationalists and 2 from other denominations; 24 resident missionaries were said to be linked to the case. During the first trial in 1912 questions implying complicity of foreign missionaries were repeatedly raised by the Japanese.

112 Yang Ki-Tak was charged with the vice-president of the Shinminhoe by the prosecutor at the Court but he defended himself that he was not its member. Special Correspondent, The Korean Conspiracy Trial (1912), 13.
113 Yoon, 105in, 72-6. At that time, over fifty per cent of total about 8,000 inhabitants in Shin Cheon city were identified as Protestant Christians.
114 The article of ‘Japan’s Clash with Korean Missions’ said that the number of imprisoned Korean Christians was “not fewer than 6,000” borrowing the assertion of missionaries of “the most trustworthy type” (Literary Digest, 16 March 1912, 536). Paik Nak-Chun, a pioneer in studying Protestant church history in Korea, estimated that between 700 and 6,000 were arrested (‘Hanguk Gyohoeui Pipbak: Sanaechongdok Mosalmisu Ummo’ui Ummoe Daehayeo’ (A Persecution of the Korean Church: Focused on the Korean Conspiracy of the Terauchi Assassination Plot), Shinhak Nondan (Theological Forum) 7 (1962), 26). Gwak Lim-Dae insists about 480 (‘Dosan – Lee Baksa Banmok Bansegi’ (A half Century of the Enmity of Dr Lee), Wolgan Jungang (Jungang Monthly), February 1971, 240). Guksa Pyeongchan Wiwonhoe (National Institution of Korean History, NIKH) said that it is over 600 (Hanguk Doklip Undongsa (A History of Korean Independent Movement), vol. 2, Seoul: Jeongeum Munhwasa, 1966, 81). The public procurator at the first trial in 1912 stated that there were about 300 concerned (Special Correspondent, The Korean Conspiracy Trial, 81). Yoon listed up the 389 suspects who were examined preliminarily by the Japanese police and prosecutors (Yoon, 105in, 26-7 (Table 1), 28) but he also estimated that actually over 600 suspects were arrested based on the record of the NIKH (Yoon, 105in, 72). Here I have followed Yoon’s research.
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prosecutors at the Court. Responding to those questions, A. J. Brown, Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church of the United States (BFMPC of the U. S.), said, “Now the Japanese see in the Korean Church numerous and powerful organizations which they do not control”. Certainly the BFMPC of the U.S. were sure that the Japan’s view of their ‘complicity’ was linked to Japan’s wish to gain control of the Korean Church. The list of those indicted Christians and the oft-repeated suspicion about missionaries’ involvement suggest that, for the Japanese colonial authority, as Count Terauchi himself highlighted in his speech on 17 December 1913 in Tokyo, Protestant Christians as “the most powerful force” in Korea must be kept under “especial watch”. Though Korean Christian groups were perceived as the “most hopeful” body for colonised Koreans, they were “the most worrisome element” in the eyes of Japanese colonial authority. In this sense, it is fair to say that the Korean Conspiracy case were the first persecution of the PCK during the Japanese colonial regime.

As even many Japanese and most foreign opinion already concluded the case to be blatantly fabricated by Japanese colonial power, it ended in trials from 1912 to 1913. Of the 105 indicted in the first trial in 1912, 99 were found innocent and acquitted, and only six were convicted at the final trial in 1913 but released from prison in a special amnesty in 1915.

Though all indicted were released, the crucial issue in terms of martyrdom concerns those who died from the severe torture and its after-effects of the torture inflicted by the Japanese military police during the preliminary interrogation. During the nine months of preliminary examination, over 389 suspects were severely tortured being required to confess unproved and improbable crimes regarding the so-called conspiracy to assassinate. One of the survivors, Sunwoo Hun, recalled that
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what gave them the power to endure “72 types of cruel torture”123 was the spirit of the Christian faith drawing on Job’s trials and Stephen’s martyrdom.124 Rigorous torture killed Kim Geun-Hyeong, Jeong Hee-Soon, and Han Phil-Ho in 1912: Rev Jeon Duk-Gee and Gil Jin-Hyong, son of Rev Gil Sun-Ju, died from subsequent after-effects.125 Yet only two of these, Rev Jeon Duk-Gee and Gil Jin-Hyong, are now designated as martyrs by the PCK.126

The March First Movement in 1919

Further persecution of nationalistic Protestants occurred after the March First Movement in 1919 which declared Korea’s fervent desire for independence. Though it was a pan-Korean nationwide movement in which over a million Korean people had been involved within two months of the start, the PCK clearly played a core role in leading the movement, providing leadership and organizational networks from the outset. Sixteen of the thirty-three national representatives who signed the Declaration of Independence were Protestant Christians, as were 7,835 major participants on the first day of the movement, 1,719 (22%).127 Not only as participants, prominent PCK leaders served to mobilise, organise and facilitate communication enabling the movement to spread quickly and coherently.128 For example, the demonstration in Euiju, northern Korea, was led by Rev Yu Yeo-Dae, one of the thirty-three national representatives, mobilising over 700 local

124 Sunwoo Hun, Minjokui Sunan: 105in Sageonui Jinsang (Ordeal of the People: The truth of the Korean Conspiracy Case), Seoul: Taegeukseowon, 1948, 88, 111.
125 Yoon, 105in, 133; Min Kyoung-Bae, Hanguk Gidokgyoahoesa (A History of the Korean Church), Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 2004 (new revised version), 305.
127 1,209 (15%) adherents of Cheondogyo (Tonghak), 3,808 (43%) lacked of religious affiliation, 1,099 not identified. NIKH ed., Ilje Chimryakha Hanguk Samsibyakteunyeonsa (The Thirty-six-year history of Korea under Japanese Imperial Regime) 4, Seoul: Tamgudang, 1969, 905-8.
residents;¹²⁹ that in Peongyang, guided by Moderator Rev Kim Seon-Du of Presbyterian Church of Korea, led thousands of the populace along with members of six churches;¹³⁰ that in Daegu organised by Rev Jeong Jae-Sun, Rev Lee Man-Jip and executives of Gyeongbuk Presbytery, together with students of Gyeseong mission school, rallied around 7-800 people.¹³¹ Borrowing Park Chung-Shin’s argument, the PCK perfectly provided all three elements of “leadership, activists, and organization” that are essential for such a nationwide mass demonstration to occur.¹³² Furthermore, though there had been serious bloody clashes between Korean demonstrators and Japanese military and police force since Japanese forces started an armed crackdown against the movement,¹³³ the March First Independence Movement was fundamentally grounded on the non-violence which was clearly proclaimed in the three covenants appended to the Declaration of Independence. The non-violent basis of the movement is said to show the strong influence of Protestantism¹³⁴ and the teaching of Cheondogyo (Religion of the Heavenly Way).¹³⁵ More concretely, the ‘Dokripdan Tonggomon’ (Notification Statement for the Participant) supposed to be distributed especially to the Christians during the early stage of the movement prohibited the partakers from making “any insult and violence of beating or stoning”

¹³¹ ‘Lee Man-Jip, Kim Tae-Ryeon, Jeong Jae-Sun deung Pangyeolmun’ (The Ruling on the Case of Lee Man-Jip, Kim Tae-Ryeon, Jeong Jae-Sun, etc) in NIKH ed., Hanguk Doklip 5, 1264-74.
¹³³ Up to 14 March 1919, the reported Japanese casualties caused by the movement totalled 24 (Six deads and seven injured gendarmes, two injured soldiers, nine injured civilians) while about five-thousands Koreans were arrested by the Japanese police force. Maeil Shinbo (Daily News), 17 March 1919. Until 15 April 1919, Koreans imprisoned due to the participation in the movement quickly increased to 14,586. Maeil Shibo, 15 April 1919. In reading Maeil Shinbo we must bear in mind that reports often distort facts to justify Japan’s rule over Korea because it was strongly pro-Japanese.
¹³⁴ Rhie Deok-Ju, ’3.1 Undongui Inyeomgwa Undong Noseone Gwanhan Yeongu’ (A Study of the Ideology and Line of the March First Movement), Gidokgyosasang (Christian Thought) 32:3 (March 1988), 117-8, especially the influence of Christian spirituality on the non-violent basis, see, 119-123; Idem., ’3.1 Undonge Daehan Sinangundongsajeok Ihae’ (Understanding the March First Movement as a Religious Movement), Gidokgyosasang 34:3 (March 1990), 139-41; Grayson, Korea, 160-1.
of Japanese, and required “three-times-prayer everyday, fast on Sunday, and Bible reading provided.” Taking this non-violent peaceful way of the movement, Protestants took part in the demonstrations to restore “freedom bestowed from Christ following God’s will.” Even Rev Shin Seok-Gu, one of the thirty-three representatives, confessed that he had participated in the movement because he had realised his ‘dual sin’ in accepting the “loss of the nation” and in making “no efforts for its restoration,” after hearing God’s voice during day-break prayer. Given the facts it might be said that the PCK’s major motif of participation in the demonstration was their religious consciousness. There was little gap between religious identity as a Christian and ethnic identity as a Korean. Their involvement in the independence movement was a way of participation in Christ’ suffering on the Cross. Indeed, both in physical socio-political activism and in metaphysical spirituality, the PCK played a significant role in the movement.

Accordingly, the PCK were “obnoxious” to the Japanese government, which was therefore harsh with Protestant churches throughout Korea. Of the brutal massacres of the Protestant Christians, 43 members of Sancheon Church were killed instantly and 20 heavily injured by indiscriminate gunshot; some Christians were killed by ‘crucifixion’ in Seoul; 29 burned (including 6 adherents of Cheondogyo) at Jeamri Church in Suwon; and so on. These are just representative cases of slaughter targeting Christians.

It is hard to determine the exact number of the Koreans killed, injured, and arrested during the movement. The range of estimated causalities is between “553 killed, 1,409 injured, and 12,522 arrested” from the Japanese record at the end of 1919 and “over 7,500 deaths, 15,000 injured, and around 45,000 arrested” from a
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Korean nationalist count.\textsuperscript{141} A more detailed nationalists’ count is given by Park Eun-Sik, a historian and national independence activist who wrote in 1920 that 7,509 were killed, 15,961 wounded and 46,948 arrested.\textsuperscript{142} Among them, according to a report issued by the Japanese military police at the end of 1919, 3,371 Protestants including 244 clergy were arrested, and 55 lay Catholics,\textsuperscript{143} and the PCK reported that at least 67 of those Protestants arrested, in particular Presbyterian and Methodist Christians, were killed by shooting or severe beating.\textsuperscript{144}

As emphasised by the Protestant missionaries who witnessed Japanese forceful suppression in Korea at that time, the wholesale arrest of pastors, elders, other church officers, and lay Christians and beatings were “simply because they are Christians”:\textsuperscript{145} their identity was Christian. This observation brings to mind the martyrs’ identification as Christian in front of the interrogators in the early Roman period. The Japanese military and police force’s “brutality torture inhuman treatment” and massacres towards Christians during the Movement were also perceived as “religious persecution”.\textsuperscript{146}

However, the March First Movement in which the PCK had played a crucial role providing the ‘leadership, activists, and organisation’ on the basis of non-violence had politically failed to gain Korea’s total independence from Japan. Though it had resulted in a change of Japan’s colonial policy from ‘military rule’ based on a gendarmerie-police system to a ‘cultural policy’ (\textit{bunka seiji}), under which in April 1919 Koreans were allowed limited rights to publish, assemble, and organised the Provisional Government in Shanghai, China, the mood of colonised Korea was deeply despairing as described in a poem written in 1920:

\begin{quote}
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\begin{quote}
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\begin{quote}
The \textit{Korean Situation}, 89.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
The \textit{Korean Situation}, 6-7.
\end{quote}
Our land of Korea is in ruins... In ruins lie all our defects and short-comings, inside and outside, physical as well as mental: emptiness, grievance, discontent and resentment, sighs and worries, pain and tears—all these evils will lead to extinction and death. As we stand before the ruins, darkness and death open their fearsome, cavernous mouths, threatening to gobble us up. Again, we are struck by the feeling that the old ruins spell extinction and death. 

Born in despair, those PCK leaders who had directly led the movement sought alternative ways to resolve the sombre mood. One was that of ‘transcendental mysticism’ led by Rev Kim Ik-Doo, Gil Seon-Ju, and Lee Yong-Do, concentrating on individual salvation waiting for Jesus’ second coming to give despairing Koreans an apocalyptic hope, and the other that of ‘social enlightenment,’ seeking to reform the world by conducting cultural movements such as the eradication of illiteracy, rural enlightenment, running night school in church, and promotion of Sunday school. Most PCK leaders turned their back on direct political involvement opting for ‘pure’ Christianity and an ‘apolitical stance’ though there were still some Protestants, for instance, evangelist Yi Dong-Wi, associate pastor Yeo Un-Hyeong, and elder Kim Kyu-Sik, who took part directly in various types of independent movements, including some open to socialist and communist ideas and activities which were rapidly penetrating Korea in the 1920s due to its anti-imperialism and anti-Japanese approach. However, most PCK leaders’ apolitical stance was challenged by the national Shinto issue in the 1930s when the colonial government forced all people to worship at Shinto shrines as a patriotic act under the ‘assimilation’ policy.

**The Shinto Shrine Controversy in the 1930s**

The 1930s was a period of rising of militarist totalitarianism in Japan. Japanese ultra-conservative military political group launched a series of aggressive wars. Provoking the Manchurian incident in 1931 and establishing the pro-Japanese puppet state of Manchukuo in 1932, the Shanghai invasion in 1932, the Sino-Japanese war

---


in 1937, and the Pacific war in 1941, the militarists implanted a strong ‘assimilation’ policy in their colonial countries propagating the idea of ‘Pan-Asianism’ or ‘the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere’ on the basis of the Emperor-god system, the spiritual and ideological basis of Japan during the war time. These ideologies justified Japanese expansionism and entangled the colonised in the war, rhetorically glorifying it as a “holy war”, and fortifying the common obligations toward the empire under the Kominka, the imperial-subject-making policy. From 1936 onwards, Minami Jiro, governor-general of Korea, coercively pressed a series of assimilation programs on colonised Korea under the Kominka policy such as bowing to the East, reciting ‘the Pledge of the Subject of the Empire,’ adopting Japanese names, and using only Japanese in public, claiming the discourse of naisen ittai, which means ‘Japan and Korea are one body.’ Among them, the enforcement of Shinto shrine worship marked an arguably religious aspect of Japanese imperialism.

The apolitical stance of the PCK in the 1920s was, therefore, seriously challenged by the Japanese colonial government’s incremental pressure to attend rites held at State Shinto shrines as a ‘patriotic’ act. This coercion of Shinto Shrine worship especially from 1938 faced Protestant Christians in Korea with a “two-fold problem: performance of the rituals would be contrary to their own sense of nationalism as Koreans, and idolatrous as Christians.” It was a conflict not only of beliefs between Protestantism and national Shintoism but also two national allegiances held by Japanese and Korean. Participation in State Shinto rites was not a
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religious problem for the Japanese Protestant Church which had already been
officially persuaded by the state in November 1936\textsuperscript{155} to conclude that the rituals
were merely memorial rites without significant religious content.\textsuperscript{156} Catholics in both
Korea and Japan revised their attitude to State Shinto rites through the announcement
of the Concordat between the Office of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda
Fide and the Japanese Government on 26 May 1936,\textsuperscript{157} the core content of which
was that the Vatican allowed Catholics to participate in State Shinto rites, accepting
them as a patriotic duty rather than an idolatrous act.\textsuperscript{158} As a result the participation
in Shinto rituals was a problem only for Korean Protestant Christians. However, by
1938, when the Presbyterian Church of Korea finally conformed, all Protestant
churches in Korea as a denominational level surrendered to the Japanese colonial
government admitting the attendance at Shinto rituals as a patriotic duty.

Though the Church officially surrendered to the coercive pressure, some
devoted Protestant Christians, most of whom were theologically conservative,
refused to conform, following literally the first three of the Ten Commandments.
Accordingly, the Japanese police force arrested over 2,000 Protestants who failed to
make clear answers to the three questions given to them: “(1) Was Shinto-shrine
worship a national rite or a religious rite? (2) Which was higher, Amaterasu
Omikami (Japan’s highest god) or Christ? and (3) Which was more important, state
or religion?”\textsuperscript{159} The imprisoned had been severely tortured and over 200 local
churches were compulsorily closed for resisting attendance at State Shinto rites. Of
those Protestant Christians, at least 50 were said to have been killed as a direct result
of their refusal to do shrine worship during the period 1938 to 1945.\textsuperscript{160} However, the
exact list of names and number who died for resisting shrine worship is not yet clear.
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\textsuperscript{157} ‘Pluries instanterque…’, \textit{Acta Apostolicae Sedis} 28 (Series II:3) (1936), 406-9;
\url{http://www.vatican.va/archive/aas/documents/AAS%2028%20(1936)%20-%20ocr.pdf} (Internet
accessed: 4 September 2011)

\textsuperscript{158} Holtom, \textit{Modern Japan}, 99.

\textsuperscript{159} Kim, \textit{Hanguk Gidokgyousa Yeongsu}, 201. Quoted from Park, \textit{Protestantism and Politics}, 156.

\textsuperscript{160} Min Kyoungh-Bae, \textit{Hanguk Gidokgyesso} (A History of the Korean Church), Seoul: Yonsei
University Press, 2004 (new revised version), 490.
Allen D. Clark, Samuel H. Maffett, and Min Kyoung-Bae insist the figure is 50 Protestants or more, following Kim Yang-Seon, whereas Bruce F. Hunt gives over 30, Kim Seung-Tae presents 25, and Yi Chan-Yeong listed 22 Protestants who died for their stand against State Shinto shrine worship.

The PCK could not take a unified stance, a significant conflict arising between those who resisted the Shinto shrine worship and those participating in it. Rallying the refusal in Gyeonsang province in December 1939 in order to transform sporadic individual resistance into a systematic one, Rev Han Sang-Dong, determined some principles for effective refusal. What is interesting is that their code of conduct included ‘aggressive separatism’ saying, “destroy the pro-Shinto worship presbyteries, reorganise new presbytery by the non-attendees, do not be baptised by those who participated in the rites, etc”, and in March 1940 in Manchuria, Rev Lee Gi-Seon declared, “refuse Shinto worship unto death, do not send children to the schools compromised on the issue, and do not attend the churches acquiescing in the requirement of attendance in Shinto worship.” They formed a separate community of resistance. Apart from the disunity between conformists and opposers on the Shinto shrine issue, the Korean Protestants’ internal conflict became a significant obstacle to declaring those who were killed amid the Shinto shrine controversy as martyrs.

Here again we touch on the political nature of martyr-making in this, perhaps the clearest example of the interweaving of religion and power. The post-independence polarisation of the PCK increased in large part due to this issue of pro-
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and anti-Japanese behaviour, exacerbating the division of the Church. Even under the immediate occupation of the Korean peninsula after liberation from Japan in 1945, the North being occupied by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and South by the United States of America (USA), there could be no clear historical resolution of the ‘pro- or anti-Japanese issue’ because it was linked to pro- or anti-communism. This impasse is still the basis of argument today, but in order fully to comprehend it, we need to look to the start of this political wrangle after the end of the First World War.

3.2.3. Before and during the Korean War: 1945-1953, Conflict with Communist Power

The first shedding of blood between the PCK and communists dated back to 1925 when 6 Baptist Christians, Yun Hak-Young, Kim Ih-Ju, Park Mun-Gi, Lee Chang-Hui, Kim Sang-Jun, and Ahn Seong-Chan, were killed by Korean communists in Kirin, Manchuria\(^\text{169}\) during the Japanese colonial regime. As briefly stated above, the communist movement\(^\text{170}\) had rapidly spread out among the colonised Korean nationalists escaped to or resident in Manchuria and Siberia after the failure of the March First Movement in 1919, who were looking for any means to resolve the desperate situation. Disappointed with the result of the Paris Peace Conference (18 January 1919 – 21 January 1920) and Washington Naval Disarmament Conference (Pacific Conference, 12 November 1921 – 6 February 1922) that had “nothing to do with Korean independence”\(^\text{171}\) and also with the PCK leaders’ apolitical stance, Korean nationalists sought other support for their independence movement. That was the Communist International (Comintern), who at

---


the First Congress of the Toilers of the Far East in Moscow in January 1922 declared
their support for the Koreans’ anti-Japanese independence movement, saying that

the present Congress will have to tell all the Korean revolutionaries, regardless of their particular beliefs, sincerely and in a brotherly manner, that they must once and for all rid themselves and their people of any remnants of hope that the Korean national question can be solved in any way other than by a close union with the advanced revolutionary workers.172

This support was part of Comintern’s strategy to encourage Korean nationalists’ independence movement against Japanese imperialism in order to use them as “board guards” in Eastern Siberia, where Japan’s military were stationed from August 1918 until October 1922:173 for the Korean nationalists at that time, Comintern and all it represented was perceived as a “new saviour”174 to restore the nation from Japan. How much the Korean nationalists leaned on the Comintern was seen by the fact that in the Congress of 144 official delegates of the Far East, more than one third, 54, were Koreans.175 It is fair to say, therefore, that from 1920 onwards, Korea’s national independence movement was rapidly tied up with communist movements in and beyond Korea, especially in Manchuria and Siberia which became the planning centre for the independence movement after the March First Movement for those who had escaped the severe oppression of Japanese colonial power.

Meanwhile, in the 1920s the PCK had already secured their position in Manchuria and Siberia establishing churches, schools, hospitals for their mission works for immigrant Koreans who moved into the regions whether in accordance with Japanese encouragement or to avoid Japanese economic exploitation and political persecution.176 Korean communists in the regions, though there was a

tension between the Irkutsk Faction, the *Russianised Korean* communist group, and Shanghai Faction, *Korean* revolutionary group, needed to overthrow the position of these securely-based Christian groups in order to take over hegemony in Manchuria and Siberia, and they did this by provoking anti-religious movements, especially targeting Christian groups. Amid those hegemonic struggles between communists and Christians, the first blood shedding conflict occurred in 1925 as mentioned above. Subsequent clashes were frequently reported to the home-church in Korea: over 13 churches were burned and 4 killed in East Manchuria in 1931; Kim Yeong-Jin, a minister of the Baptist Church in Korea, and his brother Kim Yeong-Guk killed in Kando region, southern Manchuria in 1933; Han Gyeong-Hee, a missionary of the Presbyterian Church of Korea, killed in northern Manchuria in 1935; and so on.

These and similar events suggested how deeply the violent conflict between Christianity and Communism might affect the heart of the Christian community in Korea after liberation from Japanese rule in 1945. Most Protestant Christians who were killed by communists and designated as Christian martyrs seemed to serve as icons of the ideological confrontation during this period, rather than, or perhaps as well as, icons of personal faith. It is therefore important to examine the cases presented in the literature as martyrdom.

Immediately following liberation from Japanese rule, the Korean peninsula was divided into two zones of occupation which lay under the influence of the Soviet Union and the United States. In northern Korea, the occupying communist Soviet troops desired to establish Korea as a pro-USSR communist nation, while in southern

---


Korea, the US Army established a military government introducing democratic capitalism. Accordingly two contradictory political systems took over Korea, leading to the Korean War in 1950. The fact that the dominant power of a free Korea was handed over not to Korea itself but to two foreign powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, means that Korea’s division was decided by the hegemonic ideologies of Western powers. In fact a month before the end of World War II, at the Potsdam Conference, four international powers, China, Great Britain, the USSR, and the USA, had already agreed to a “Four-Power Trusteeship for Korea” on June 1945 without any Korean voice. US President Truman proposed that this trusteeship “might last from 20 to 30 years” while Marshal Stalin of the USSR responded that “the shorter the trusteeship period the better”.

Under the agreement the USA and USSR entered the Korean Peninsula, which became a battlefield of two contradictory ideologies divided along the 38th Parallel after Independence from Japan in 1945. This ideological conflict deepened when the two occupying powers finally elected two returnees as the political leader in Korea, Rhee Syng-Man, Methodist Christian, from the USA in the South and Kim Il-Sung from Manchuria involved to the Comintern in the USSR. Nationalist political leaders at home such as Yeo Un-Hyeong in South, and Jo Man-Sik or Park Heon-Yeong in the North were ignored, even though there was a wide array of political leaders from conservative rightist to radical leftist in liberated Korea.

As a result two separated states were established in Korea: the ‘Republic of Korea’ (ROK) on 17 July 1948 with Rhee as the first

181 Noh Jong-Sun, one of the Korean Minjung theologians, insists that Korea’s division, instead of Japan, the defeated nation of World War II, is not an accidental one comparing the case of Germany which was also divided after World War II according to the hegemonic ideologies. Noh Jong-Sun, ‘The Effects on Korea of Un-Ecological Theology’ in C. Birch, W. Eakin and J. D. McDaniel ed., Liberation Life: Contemporary Approaches to Ecological Theology, New York: Orbis, 1990, 127-8.


183 Benninghoff, a political adviser in Korea, reported the political situation in Korea at that time to the Secretary of State, saying that especially in southern Korea “two distinct groups”, the democratic or conservative group (Korean Democratic Party) and the radical or communist group (the Korean Provisional Commission), were actively working. He was convinced “Soviet agents” were spreading communism throughout southern Korea through several “communist-inspired” parades and demonstrations in Seoul. ‘The Political Adviser in Korea (Benninghoff) to the Secretary of State’, No. 1 (15 September 1945) and No. 6 (29 September 1945) in FRUS, 1945 (The British Commonwealth, the Far East), vol. 6, 1049-53, 1061-5.
President, and the ‘Democratic People’s Republic of Korea’ (DPRK) on 9 September 1948, with Kim as the chair of the Supreme People’s Assembly in the North.

In those political situations, the PCK leaders began to actively participate in political action as a whole soon after Liberation. In North Korea two political parties were organised which were led by ministers and elders of the PCK, the Christian Social Democratic Party (Gidokgyo sahoe minjudang) in September 1945 and the Christian Liberal Party (Gidokgyo jayudang) in 1947. Especially the Korean Democratic Party (Chosun minjudang), launched and led by church elder Jo Man-Sik in November 1945, took a prominent initiative in northern Korea having “some 500,000” members by early 1946 when other communist parties had “only 4,530”. Furthermore, in October 1945 the Joint Presbytery of Five Provinces in the North (Ibuk odo yeonhaphoe) was organised by church leaders there to “coordinate collective action” both for church affairs and in opposition to Soviet occupation and Kim Il-Sung’s group. To the communists of northern Korea those Christian groups were seen as working in a key role to oppose the establishment of a communist nation in northern Korea. Consequently the Soviet authority and Kim Il-Sung group began to systematically suppress and uproot Protestant Christianity to impose their influence in northern Korea, in a not dissimilar way to that in which the Japanese sought to control Christianity during their colonial occupation of Korea.

The election of the People’s Committee on Sunday 3 December 1946, which was boycotted by the Joint Presbytery of Five Provinces in the North due to their “strong sabbatarian views”, stoked the conflict between Protestant Christians and communists in northern Korea. In addition, since the Federation of Christians in North Korea (Bukchosun Geurisdo Yeonmaeng) was formed on 28 November 1946 to support Kim Il-Sung government’s efforts to spread propaganda for communism, the communist authority required all church officers to join it by law. All who refused were imprisoned, ousted, and even liquidated. Moreover, church buildings

184 Grayson, Korea, 162.
185 Park, Protestantism and Politics, 163.
187 Grayson, Korea, 162; Min, Hanguk Gidokgyohoesa, 515.
and properties were confiscated and used for other purposes. Those who could escape those suppressions fled to southern Korea where the democratic government was established.

Meanwhile, in southern Korea, Rhee Syng-Man, who had been an exile in the USA during the Japanese colonial period, came back with the US army after Liberation. To gain political power at home, he allied with pro-Japanese, Americans, and Christian leaders under the slogan of anticommunism, vanquishing rival leaders such as Yeo Un-Hyeong or Kim Gu. Although Rhee was said to have worked for the independence movement during the colonial periods, that he would ally himself with pro-Japanese groups was anticipated. It is because he was supported by US Army Military Government in Korea (USAMGIK) which continually employed those Koreans who had served the Japanese colonial government during the colonial periods after Korea’s independence, judging that “there are no qualified Koreans” in liberated Korea at that time. The long-entrenched anti-Japanese nationalism was quickly transformed in the South into anticommunism in the post-1945 political situation to gain political power. Under the guise of anticommunism, most pro-Japanese maintained their power and position, few being branded as national traitors. While being anti-Japanese was the core nationalism during the Japanese colonial regime, anticommunism functioned as the new nationalism in South Korea in the postcolonial period.

The Protestant church followed this trend, PCK leaders solidly supporting Rhee. In 1946 under the USAMGIK, of 50 Korean Cabinet ministers 35 were Protestant Christians, and of 90 members of the Korean Interim Legislative Assembly, there were 21 Protestant Christians including seven ordained ministers. Of 190 seats in the first South Korean National Assembly 38 places were taken by

---

189 Grayson, Korea, 163; Min, Hanguk Gidokgyohoesa, 516.
190 FRUS, 1945, vol. 6, 1049.
Protestant Christians including 13 ordained ministers. This indicates just how firmly Protestant Christians were involved in Rhee’s anticommunist government during the global Cold War of that time. Furthermore, when the pro-Japanese Protestant Christian groups allied with Rhee’s anticommunist camp to overcome and elide possible problems of memory amid the new democracy, the ideological struggle between Protestantism and communism became deeper and deeper.

Thus those who stood against Rhee’s government in South Korea, such as the nationalist Kim Goo and Kim Gyu-Sik, insisting on the establishment of a unitary government between North and South Korea and the purging of the pro-Japanese group, were designated as pro-communists who should be expelled from the nation. In addition, when refugees who had experienced severe persecution in North Korea under the communist rule escaped to South Korea and joined the anticommunist Christians group supporting Rhee’s government, the conflict between them became more serious than ever because they repeated strongly their anticommunist discourse in South Korea, detailing their suffering under the communist regime.

The most severe conflict between rightist Rhee’s regime and leftist or communist power occurred in Jeju Island in southern Korea when the UN approved on 26 February 1948 a separate election to be carried out “only in the area where it is possible”. According to the USAMSIK investigation, “approximately two-thirds of the population” on Jeju Island were “moderate leftist”. Demonstrations inspired

193 Rhee Syng-Man had little political background in Korea compared to other nationalistic leaders because of his exile during the Japanese colonial period. Meanwhile, pro-Japanese Christian groups were called rebels or traitors of the Korean people after liberation. Thus these two needed a means to hide those disadvantages, which they found in anticommunism. Grasping each other’s hands, Rhee could obtain political power and the former pro-Japanese could avoid losing power. When the majority of the Korean people wanted to eradicate the Japanese legacy, Rhee claimed fighting communism had priority. In accordance with his claim, pro-Japanese people became national security guards against the Communists. See, Song Geon-Ho, Haebangjeonhusaui insik I (A Recognition of History Before and After Liberation I), Seoul: Hangilsa, 1981, 26-35.
by the local communists against the separate election after 1st March 1948 had developed into guerrilla warfare after 3rd April due to the cruel excessive use of police power. By the end of 1948 there were 102 recorded battles between the guerrilla army and the US army and Rhee’s government military force. \(^{197}\) Recent investigation conducted by the 4.3 Committee of ROK government makes clear that from 1948 to 1954, around 25,000-30,000 died in the conflict and of those 14,045 reported victims, 10,955 (78.1%) were killed by the punitive force of the US and ROK army and 1,764 (12.6%) by guerrillas. \(^{198}\)

Another conflict is the uprising by ROK soldiers which occurred in Yeosu on 20 October 1948 which was clearly marked for memory by PCK Christians as it led to the two sons of Rev Son Yang-Won being declared martyrs, which will be discussed in the last chapter. The cause of the uprising was the refusal of the Fourteenth regiments of the ROK army to embark on a mission against Jeju guerrillas. Some 700 soldiers stationed in Yeosu, south Jeola Province, arose in rebellion and immediately seized control of Yeosu and Suncheon city. Even leftist students of the Suncheon secondary school joined in the rebellion, assaulting rightist fellow students and even police officers, \(^{199}\) and killing the two sons of Rev Son Yang-Won. Rhee immediately reacted to the uprising, promulgating martial law and sending troops to the regions, the US army secretly playing a pivotal role behind the ROK force. \(^{200}\) As in Jeju, the suppression of the rebellion was brutal and cruel, with many rebels killed. Such awful retribution was predictable: “loyal troops were shooting people whom they had the slightest suspicion…of giving cooperation to the communist uprising.” \(^{201}\) James Hausman reported the scene of suppression in Suncheon: “they are out for revenge and are executing prisoners and civilians…Several royal civilians are already killed and people are beginning to think we are as bad as the enemy”. \(^{202}\) Kim Deuk-Jong estimates, based on research in the

\(^{197}\) Cumings, *Korea’s Place*, 221.

\(^{198}\) Jeju 4.3 wiwonhoe, *Hwahaewa sangsaeng: Jeju 4.3 wiwonhoe baekseo* (Reconciliation and Living Together: A White Paper of the 4.3 Committee), Seoul: Jeju 4.3 sageun jinsang geumyeong mit huaesaengja myeongyehoebo wiwonhoe, 2008, 107-8.

\(^{199}\) Cumings, *Korea’s Place*, 222.

\(^{200}\) Cumings, *Korea’s Place*, 222.

\(^{201}\) ‘Yeosou Operation, Amphibious Stage’, reported by ‘Special Agent no. 9016’, G-2 Intelligence Summary no. 166, Nov. 5-12, 1948. Quoted from Cumings, *Korea’s Place*, 222.

local institute in Yeosu, that around 10,000 people died amid the conflict and of those victims about 9,500 (95%) were killed by rightist forces of suppression while about 500 (5%) were killed by the leftist rebels.203

Amid those conflicts, the Korean War broke out on 25 June 1950, with grim results for the country in general and destruction and death for church buildings and leaders:

541 Presbyterian, 239 Methodist, 106 Holiness, 4 Salvation Army, and many other denominations’ churches were destroyed or lost. 177 Presbyterian, 44 Methodist, 11 Holiness, 6 Anglican Church ministers, bishops, and workers were killed or kidnapped and sent to North Korea by the communists.204

The Roman Catholic Church in Korea also suffered, although less than the PCK: in the South alone, 33 churches were destroyed or lost and besides the lay Christians, 150 bishops, priests, monks, sisters, and seminarians were arrested or killed.205

However, during the Korean War Christians were not only killed by communist troops. On Sunday 8th November 1950, about 250 Christians gathered for Sunday service at Sinuiju (North Korea) first and second Church were killed by “550 tons of incendiary bombs” dropped by “seventy B-29” US air force under the ‘wipe-out’ operation.206 The US air forces dropped a total 420,000 bombs during the war on Pyongyang, North Korea, resulting in 6,000 civilian deaths.207 Besides the bombing by the US air force, there were numerous civilian massacres carried out by the US infantry armies during the war: at Nogunri, South Korea about 400 civilians were killed on 28 July 1950; in Sincheon, North Korea, 35,383 civilians were killed.208

---

205 Kang In-Cheol, Jeonjaenggwa Jonggyo (War and Religion), Seoul: Hanshindaeahakgyo chulpanbu (Hanshin University Press), 2003, 292-7.
207 IKCHS, Bukhan Gyohoesa, 410.
The ROK armed forces also carried out numerous massacres under the pretext of “communist hunting”.209 Observing those massacres, Alan Winnington, a British correspondent in Korea, wrote on the front page of the “Daily Worker 9th August (1950)” that “7,000 people”210 had been “horribly butchered” near Taejon (Daejeon), South Korea “under the supervision of American Officers” providing “rifle, pistol and carbine bullets” to kill, and “trucks” and “some drivers” to transport their corpses. Though the vicious slaughter, “shooting, beating, and beheading”, was done by South Korean “puppet police”, he concluded that it was “an American crime, one of the worst the world has ever known”.211 Clearly some Christian civilians also died in these bombings and massacres, although Christians in the South were basically regarded as those who have strong pro-USA and ROK stance.

Mass executions committed by the North Korean People’s armies were also certainly brutal and uncountable. The largest scale was the massacre from 23 to 26 September 1950 at Taejon Prison, not far from the ROK army’s brutal execution carried out on 1st July cited above. According to the report of the War Criminal Division in Korea,212 over 5,000-7,500 people were killed by North Korean troops yet most executed were civilians,213 to avenge attacks by the US and ROK armies.

Given the fact that the US, ROK and DPRK army carried out countless civilian massacres during the Korean War, Christians were not spared such atrocities. A

Edinburgh, 2002, 160. For the massacre carried out by the US, ROK, and DPRK army during the Korean War, see, Kim Gi-Jin, Hangukjeonjaenggwa Jipdanhaksa (The Korean War and Massacre), Seoul: Pureunyeoksa, 2006. Kim provides full text of documents from National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) in the USA re massacres during the Korean War. Here I am indebted for the NARA documents to him. Also see, Seo Jung-Seok, Kim Deuk-Jung et al., Jeonjaeng Sokui ddo Dareun Jeonjaeng (The other War in the War), Seoul: Sunin, 2011.


210 According to the Counter Intelligence Corps (CIC) report, it occurred on “1 July 1950” and “14,000 civilians from Taejon and vicinity” were killed by ROK police. See, ‘Headquarters, 25th CIC Detachment, Subject: War Diary and Activity Report, 7 October 1950’, 2 November 1950, National Archive, RG 407, Entry 429, Box 3758. Quoted from Kim, Hangukjeonjaenggwa Jipdanhaksa, 287.

211 ‘General Headquarters, Far East Command’, 12 August 1950, MacArthur Library & Archives, RG 9, Box 77. Quoted from Kim, Hangukjeonjaenggwa Jipdanhaksa, 293 (emphasis added).

212 It was organised on 13 October 1950 and lasted until 31 May 1954. See, Yang Jeong-Sim, ‘Hangukjeonjaenggi Miguki Jeonjaengbeunjoe Josawa Cheori: Jeonjaengjosadaneul Jungsimeuro’ (War Criminal Investigation and Judgement of the US Army during the Korean War: Focusing on the War Criminal Division in Korea) in Seo, Kim et al., Jeonjaeng Sokui, 225-62.

213 Kim, Hangukjeonjaenggwa Jipdanhaksa, 178, also see, ‘Headquarters, 25th CIC Detachment’.
special correspondent in Korea pointed out those brutal situations in Korea during the War in *London Times* issued on 25 October 1950:

> Various abuses against the North Korean Government could be levelled as well against that of the ROK, the only difference between two governments being that “at present men and women accused of being communists or of collaborating are being killed or imprisoned under UN flag”…persecution and murder continue, reprisals being no less vicious than atrocities committed by Communists…being repeated throughout Korea…reprisals as numerous as reports Communist atrocities.\(^1\)

For the communists, Christians, especially Protestant Christians, were seen as representatives of capitalism, friends of the USA,\(^2\) supporters of Rhee’s government, and intellectuals.\(^3\) Accordingly it was seen as necessary to control, suppress and eliminate them to achieve the communist revolution. On the other hand, the Christians’ logic in rejecting communists was that the basic philosophy of communism was dialectical materialism which was absolute atheism opposing all religion. Moreover, communism in Korea was under the influence or control of the Soviet Union which was anti-American during the Cold War. Most of all, the Protestant Church leaders, just like the USAMGIK authority, regarded the Soviet Union as an imperialistic power which had planned to “sovietise”\(^4\) Korea, and thus all communists in Korea were branded as her henchmen. For those reasons, there could be no compromise between Christians and communists in Korea.

Most Protestant Christians in Korea who have been designated as martyrs come from this period. Yi Chan-Yeong has provided a list of 362 Korean Protestant ‘martyrs’ from the end of the 19th century to 1957. Of those 362 persons 325 Protestants (about 90 per cent) died between 1947 and 1951, executed by the

\(^1\) *Department of State, Telegraph Branch, From London to Secretary of State, No. 2475*, 31 October 1950, National Archive, LM 81, Reel 6 (Microfilm). Quoted from Kim, *hangukjeonjaenggwa jipdanhaksal*, 446.

\(^2\) Of 1,952 Protestant missionaries who worked in Korea from 1893 to 1983 about 1,710 seem to have been Americans, of whom 637 arrived in Korea before the liberation in 1945: the relationship between the PCK and the USA is clear. Lee Man-Yeol, *Hangukidokgyowa Minjok Uisik* (Christianity in Korea and Nationalism), Seoul: Jisiksaneopsa, 1991, 445.

\(^3\) *FRUS*, 1945, vol. 6, 1065.
communist regime. The Korean Martyrs’ Memorial, which was constructed by the Council for the 100th Anniversary of the Korean Church (CAKC) to commemorate the Protestant Church martyrs in Korea, displays the pictures of 191 Protestant Church martyrs with a brief résumé of each. Of those 191 martyrs 171 persons died as a result of their anticommunist attitude or behaviour.

At this juncture, it is important to point out that the fierce conflict between Christianity and Communism since the 1920s which deepened after Liberation in 1945 and became entrenched in the Korean War, is still part of the present socio-political and religious context of Korea. The ideology of anticommunism in *South Korea*, the so called the “Red Complex”, is thus one of the important elements in the discourse of Christian martyr-making there. Specifically, the construction of the “Red Complex” in the Protestant Christian community in South Korea truly rooted by Rhee’s political intention in the historical situation after Korea’s independence from Japan in 1945 parallels the PCK’s martyr-making process.

**Conclusion**

As has been shown in the first part of this chapter, the idea of martyrdom in Korea initially came from China when Catholicism was introduced into Korea in the late 18th century using the Chinese character ‘致命’ (zhìmìng) pronounced as ‘chimyeong’ in Korean vernacular without any semantic change. However, competing with Catholicism in Korea, the PCK tactically employed the Japanese word, ‘じゅんきょう’ (junkyo), created in the late 19th century in Japan and pronounced ‘sungyo’ in Korean, from the mid-1920s onwards as a corresponding word to ‘martyrdom’ rather than ‘chimyeong’ to distinguish themselves from Catholicism. ‘Sungyo’ has obtained a universal position in public use, though it is difficult to find exactly when ‘chimyeong’ disappeared in Korean Christian literatures, and now both Catholics and Protestants in Korea use ‘sungyo’ as a fixed and living idea of martyrdom.

\[218 \text{ Yi, } *Hanguk Gidokgyohoesa Chonggam*, 821-33. \]
\[219 \text{ Hanguk kidokgyo 100juneon saeophyeopuihoe (The Council for the 100th Anniversary of the Korean Church (CACK)), } *Hanguk Kidokgyo Sungyoja Ginyeomgwan* (Korean Martyrs’ Memorial), Seoul: CAKC, 2001, 37-40. \]
\[220 \text{ Seo, *Yeoksasokui Geu*, 377-379, 407-8.} \]
In order to apply the concept of ‘sungyo’ in the PCK context this chapter has examined the death-events of the PCK from 1866 to 1953 seeking to find exactly which power was linked to the death of Protestants (Power I in Diagram 4). During those periods, the PCK was suppressed mainly by the late Chosun feudalistic, Japanese colonial and communist powers. Christians were regarded as Western ‘barbarians’ by the late Chosun authority, as anti-Japanese nationalists by colonial power, and as communists by the pro-US Rhee’s government, and anti-communist by the pro-Russian North Koreans. Such political opinions led to their deaths.

Having set out in this necessarily detailed manner the events of this almost 90-year period, it is now time to investigate the second act of martyr-making paradigm, that is, the social act to remember and interpret the deaths. How were the deaths during those periods viewed by the PCK authority, and who and which were made martyrs according to specific ideological intentions and contexts? Which deaths were commemorated as martyrs and which deaths were forgotten or ignored? And why? Let us now move to investigate the PCK’s martyr-making process placing and displacing of martyrdom.
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Conclusion

Introduction

In the previous chapter we investigated Korean Protestant Christians’ death-events related to the martyr-making of the PCK. In this chapter we will deal with two other elements of martyrdom, the memories and interpretations about the deaths, in which the specific death-events were finally designated as martyrdom by electing them among various deaths in the Korean history.

But why does a Christian group desire to create martyrs? What do they expect from making their own martyrs?

Classically Christian martyrs are depicted as the closest imitation of Christ.¹ A martyr’s death is envisaged as a Christian’s last confessional act before following

---

¹ The Martyrdom of St. Polycarp 17.3; Ignatius, Letter to the Romans 6.3. For a full discussion about the aspect of ‘imitation of Christ’ in martyrs accounts, see, Moss, The Other Christs.
Christ’s death. Martyrs as imitators of Christ are also described as persons who are linked directly to divine authority and power. According to Candida R. Moss, authors or homilists in the early church present martyrs as the ‘other Christs’, “equal to Christ” who undertook “Christ-like services of intercession and judgement” in heaven. By assimilating the martyr to Christ, martyrs conduct Christ’s redemptive function and obtain divine status. Martyr’s stories, therefore, have been devised and worked on not only to maximize such individual power and authority for collective posterity but also to strengthen the community through providing the example of truly following Christ to the ultimate. Whilst martyrs gained divine dignity in heaven, their deaths functioned as a model for the living community. Paul Middleton notes: “Martyrdom was promoted as a means of strengthening fragile communities, invigorating the resolve of future martyrs and helping to define strong community barriers”. Through this martyr-making the Christian group is able to evolve and possess church traditions of bounded orthodoxy. Therefore, Middleton’s observation is right that “the number of martyrs a particular group produced easily identified their ‘orthodox’ credentials”.

In this sense, as Middleton indicated, the process of making martyrs functions as “a type of narrative which describes a death reinforcing a group’s (whether religious, political or national) view of the world”. This suggests also that the choice of numerous Christians in church history whose death has been selected in a martyrological sense for designation as a martyr is potentially very polemical.

Furthermore, as we have seen in Chapter 2, as martyr-making involves the exercise of power to ‘create’ a martyr in a ‘specific’ time under a ‘specific’ intention, and by the ‘specific’ agency of a Christian group, rather than an operation of ‘finding’ an undiscovered Christian’s death in church history, it can be used as an effective tool of political propaganda to confirm and sustain the ideology of one’s own community.

---

3 Moss, *The Other Christs*, 176, 149 (Citation in order).
4 Moss, *The Other Christs*, 46.
In the hands of a skilled propagandist, martyrdom and the convictions it
represents can be manipulated to attain predetermined aims. The capacity of the
martyr to infuse meaning and to inspire commitment can be used by astute
leaders to manipulate sentiments and actions during times of stress…The
narrative of a legitimate martyr reached deeply into the unconscious and forged
and association which inspired commitment and renewed conviction.⁸

Taking this aspect of martyr-making, this chapter seeks to reassess the martyr-
making process in the PCK, the frame of which was set out in the previous chapter.
As martyr-making or unmaking inevitably implied the possibility of politicisation by
the specific authority which interprets and designates the deaths as martyrs,
legitimately or not, by using the memories of a group or community which claims
them as martyrs, this chapter will consider the political trend of martyr-making in the
PCK in which political ideologies, nationalism and anticommunism, are deeply
involved.

4.1. A History of Martyr-Making in the PCK

The first appearance of the martyr-making process in public in the PCK was in
1926, to commemorate the death of Rev. R. J. Thomas who had been appointed as a
missionary of the London Missionary Society (LMS) to Shanghai in China in 1863,
and died in 1866 in consequence of the ‘General Sherman’ affair in Pyongyang,
North Korea.⁹ The most intense process of making Thomas a martyr was conducted
until 1932, when the Thomas Memorial Church was built in Pyeongyang.¹⁰ There
were also other Christians in the PCK apart from Rev Thomas, who were killed by
Japanese colonial power amid the Conspiracy Case in 1911-1913 and the March First
Movement in 1919. However, as we have seen in the previous chapter, though the
leaders and missionaries in the PCK clearly perceived and argued that those events
were carried out to persecute Christians in the PCK, those killed Christians were not

---

⁸ Weiner and Weiner, Martyr’s Conviction, 87-8.
⁹ See, Paik, The History of Protestant Missions, 47-51; Floyd E. Hamilton, ‘The First Protestant
Martyr in Korea’, The Korea Mission Field (KMF) 22 (New Series):9 (September 1927), 181-2. For
the whole life of Rev. R. J. Thomas, see, Goh Moo-Song, ‘Robert J. Thomas: A Historical Study of an
designated as martyrs at the time by the public or the institution. They were indeed uninterested in making martyrs before 1926 whether the PCK intended or not. Furthermore, after 1932, when the commemorative enterprise of the martyr Thomas reached its climax in dedicating the memorial Church, the practice of making martyrs in the PCK almost disappeared until after the Korean War. It is fair to say that there was no official martyr-making in the PCK during the colonial period except the case of Thomas. This does not mean that there were no events which could have led to martyr-making at all during the period, for there were some sporadic deaths caused by communists in Manchuria from the 1920s onwards which were cited as martyrdoms in the PCK. Rather, compared to the case of Thomas, such deaths were just single brief claims with no further commemorative event.

Kang In-Cheol has indicated that the silence of the PCK’s martyr-making concerning deaths during the colonial period was partly due to Korea’s colonial situation. The death-events which occurred during the colonial regime were closely linked with the independence movement, so any wrapping of the victims in the clothing of martyrs wasskillfully restricted by colonial authorities.11 Japanese governors clearly knew that if Christians’ deaths resulting from nationalistic independent movements were claimed as martyrdoms by the public, this would play a vital role in mobilising the living Korean Christians to imitate the model and sacrifice their lives for independence.12

The situation changed after independence from Japan in 1945. In 1946 those who had died amid the rejection of Shinto shrine worship immediately gained the


12 It is not only the case for the PCK. The Catholic Church in Korea (CCK) also twice failed to establish the Chosun Catholic Martyrs Exaltation Society in 1935 and 1939 due to Japan’s suppression, being founded in 1946 after independence. For the foundation of the Society, see, Noh Yong-Pil, ‘Chosun Cheonjugyo Sungyoja Hyeonyanghoeui Changlipgwa Baljeon’ (The Foundation of Chosun Catholic Martyrs Exaltation Society and Its Enlargement), *Gyohoesa Yeongu* (Studies of Korean Church History) 26 (December 2006), 219-47; Cha Gi-Jin, ‘Sungyoja Hyeonhang Undong’ (The Movement of Catholic Martyrs Exaltation) in *Hanguk Gatolik Daesajeon* (Korean Catholic Encyclopedia), vol. 8, Seoul: the CCK, 2006, 5164-6. However the CCK had already made many martyrs from 1838 under Laurent J. M. Imbert, the second bishop in Chosun (Korea). 82 Catholic martyrs were named Venerable in 1857, 79 of whom were beatified in 1925. Such processes were normally conducted or led not by the CCK but by missionaries, for instance, Antonie Dveluy and Gustave Mutel, in local churches. For Korean Catholic Venerable, see, Choi Seok-Woo, ‘Gagyeongja’ (The Venerable) in *Hanguk Gatolik Daesajeon* (Korean Catholic Encyclopedia), vol. 1, Seoul: the CCK, 2006, 1. For beatification and canonisation, see, Cha Gi-Jin, ‘Hangukeseoui Sibok Siseong’ (Beatification and Canonisation in Korea) in *Hanguk Gatolik Daesajeon* (Korean Catholic Encyclopedia), vol. 8, Seoul: the CCK, 2006: 5329-33.
title of martyr by local Christians and were commemorated by them. Yet, due to the internal conflict over pro- and anti-Japanese issues, especially between those who suffered in prison by refusing Shinto shrine worship and those who participated in it, the issue of martyr-designation for the deaths amid the Conspiracy Case and the March First Movement were delayed to the 1980s at official levels. Furthermore, given that pro-Japanese Christians held the major position both in secular and in sacred politics under Rhee Syng-Man’s regime it was very difficult to designate such nationalist’s deaths as martyrdom. The first and only memorial service for the martyrs at a denominational level was held in 1947, those named being limited to the deaths caused by the controversy over Shinto shrine worship.\textsuperscript{13}

However, after the Korean War broke out in 1950, the PCK authorities immediately launched martyr-making processes for the deaths occurring during the conflict. Commemorative enterprises such as building monuments and publishing martyrs’ stories were continuously created and re-created both at official and local levels. Whilst martyr-making for the victims of communists flourished, anti-Japanese nationalist victims during the colonial regime were set aside. However, the designation of martyrs for the war victims also shrunk especially when the Presbyterian Church of Korea, which was the leading denomination for such designations, divided in the 1950s.

A new wave of making martyrs of the PCK as a whole was launched in the 1980s preparing for the centennial anniversary of the Protestant mission for Korea. Though there had been some sporadic martyr-making processes in local churches in the PCK before that, and though the first pan-denominational service for commemorating martyrs of the PCK sponsored by ‘Gidokgyo Dongsimhoe’ (The Christian [Protestant] One-mindedness Association) was held on 18 December 1975 at Saemunan Presbyterian Church in Seoul, there was no collectively agreed list of martyrs at that time. The hosts of the service said that any documents about martyrs would be collected by 15 December at the Church,\textsuperscript{14} although the memorial service was held without any actual names of martyrs for commemoration.

\textsuperscript{13} Chosun Yesugyo Jangnohoe Chonghoe (General Assembly of Presbyterian Church of Chosun), 
Chosun Yesugyo Jangnohoe Chonghoe Je 33hoe Hoerok (The Records of the 33\textsuperscript{rd} General Assembly of Presbyterian Church of Chosun), 1947, 3.

\textsuperscript{14} Kyunghyang Shinmun (Kyunghyang Daily News), 9 December 1975; Maeil Kyungje (Maeil Business Newspaper), 12 December 1975.
Eight years later, a second pan-denominational commemorative service for the martyrs was held on 14th November 1983, again at the same church. This time the service was sponsored by the ‘Hanguk Gidokgyo 100 Junyeon Giyeom Saup Hyeopuihoe’ (the Council for the 100th Anniversary of the Korean Church (CAKC)) which was organized on 27 January 1981 to prepare the 100th anniversary of mission work in Korea. At the service Rev Lee Yeong-Chan, the advisor of the Korean Christian Martyrs’ Bereaved Family Association (KCMBFA) and the Vice-Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the Republic of Korea (PCROK), reported on the current status of the martyrs for the first time: ten-thousand was estimated, among whom 851 were able to be listed. At that time Elder Jeon Taek-Boo, Honorary General-Secretary of YMCA Korea, pointed out that there were no conceptual studies on martyrdom in the PCK, and no guide-lines for designating any person as a martyr. Though there had already been criteria suggested for designating martyrs by Rev Kim Rin-Seo (1894-1964) in 1962, it was not accepted officially by the PCK at the time.

Critics made clear that the process of martyr-making in the PCK was carried out officially without any criteria or principles, thereby ignoring individual suggestions. They argued that the outcome, therefore, could be fabricated in accordance with the intentions of specific authorities who wished to utilize the power of martyrdom in specific religious, social, and political contexts. One might suggest that Mr Jeon saw the potential for martyr-making in the PCK to be used to strengthen or weaken the competitive ideologies in Korean society. The argument here is that it
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15 The preparatory meeting, gathering delegates from 11 denominations, was held on 4 December 1980 at YMCA building in Seoul. In accordance with the decision of the meeting, the first General Assembly of the CAKC was held on 27 January 1981. CAKC ed., Hanguk Gidokgyo 100 Junyeon Giyeomsaup Chongram (The Comprehensive Bibliography on the Memorial Events of the CACK), Seoul: the CACK, 1987 (the first edition), 1996 (revised edition), 38, 464.

16 ‘Executive members of the KCMBFA’, Sungyobo (Newsletter of Martyrdom) 1 (26 June 1983), 6.

17 This number is used here literally not in the symbolic meaning of ‘very many’. It is however worth noting that the Roman Catholics in Korea say that they have about 10,000 martyrs through the persecution in 1801, 1839, 1846 and 1866-7. So the number chosen by the PCK equalled that of the ‘opposition’. For the number of the CCK martyrs, see, ‘Persecution of the Catholic Church in Korea’, Internet Accessed (5 May 2011): http://english.cbck.or.kr/history/1178.

18 Kyunghyang Shinmun (Kyunghyang Daily News), 16 November 1983; Chosun Ilbo (Chosun Daily) 16 November 1983.

19 Chosun Ilbo, 16 November 1983.

20 Kim Rin-Seo, Hanguk Gyohoe Sungyosawa Gui Seolgyojip (The History and Sermons of Martyrs of the Korean Church), Seoul: Sinang Saenghwalsa, 1962, 16-7.
had indeed already been used to empower those South Korean Church authorities who were adherents of ethnic nationalism or anticommunism in specific Korean contexts. Let us therefore examine the martyrdoms we have already noted to highlight the actual processes.

### 4.1.1. The First Protestant Martyr-Making: Rev R. J. Thomas

To commemorate the year 1926, which was the 60th year of the ‘General Sherman’ affair and the death of the ‘young and brave’ Rev R. J. Thomas’, Oh Mun-Whan, a graduate of the Union Christian College in Pyongyang, and at that time a teacher in the Presbyterian Girls’ Academy at Pyongyang, started to investigate the affair and collected Thomas’s works from late 1925 in response to a reporter’s request to him to write for the newspaper, *Gidoksinbo* (The Christian Messenger). According to Oh, the reporter wanted to commemorate both the event of the 60th year of the persecution of Korean Catholics (the so-called great persecution) which was initiated in 1866 by the regent Taewongun, and of Korea’s victory in the battle against the foreign vessel, General Sherman. As a Korean the reporter wanted to glorify the victory of Korea against the foreign trade vessel, General Sherman, but paradoxically as a Christian he wanted to commemorate the Christian victims who died amid the great persecution in 1866. This suggests that the Protestant reporter did not know about Thomas’ death amid the General Sherman affair at that time, for had he known that he would not tried to correlate Korea’s victory against the General Sherman with the Great Persecution. We can, therefore, infer that the initial designation of Thomas as ‘the first Protestant martyr in Korea’ is entirely the work of Oh Mun-Whan.

On the basis of the interviews he carried out with witnesses of the General Sherman affair, Oh published a small booklet of 30 pages in Korean in 1926 titled *Chosun Gidokgyohoeui Ilbunsuryongin Pyongyang Yangnan* (Pyongyang Foreign Incident, A Watershed in the History of Chosun (Korea) Protestant Church). After

---

23 Oh Mun-Whan, *Chosun Gidokgyohoeui Ilbunsuryongin Pyongyang Yangnan* (Pyongyang Foreign Incident, A Watershed in the History of Chosun Protestant Church), Pyongyang: Gwang Myong Seogwan, 1926.
the publication of the book he was invited both to the fifteenth General Assembly of Presbyterian Church of Korea and to the Association of Presbyterian Missionaries in Korea in 1926. There he spoke about Thomas, introduced his booklet, and sold about 300 copies. Through Oh Mun-Whan’s efforts in the same year 1926, a commemorative ceremony for the 60th year of ‘R. J. Thomas’ martyrdom’ was held at Seungdong church in Seoul (14th November), and subsequently the ‘Thomas moksa sungyo ginyeomhoe’ (the Commemorative Association for Martyr Rev R. J. Thomas) was organized on 28 May 1927.

Oh contributed his work briefly to Gidoksinbo three times serially in November and December 1926 after the first book was published in October 1926. Following Oh’s research work the missionary F. E. Hamilton contributed a short article about the story of Rev R. J. Thomas to the missionaries’ magazine, The Korea Mission Field, under the title of “The First Protestant Martyr in Korea” in September 1927. In 1928, Oh complemented his first work by publishing 62 pages of a revised version, Thomas Moksajeon (The Life of Rev R. J. Thomas), with a 22-page supplement explaining the organization of the Commemorative Association for Martyr Rev R. J. Thomas. His second edition was translated into English titled The Two Visits of Rev R. J. Thomas with some revision by himself to be read before the Royal Asiatic Society, Korea on 6th May 1932.

Contesting Power of Interpretation: Missionary or Invader

Thomas’s death amid the General Sherman Affair in 1866 appears to have been made to seem similar by the Protestants to the Great Persecution of Catholicism in Korea which occurred from 1866. Let us see if that is actually the case, firstly by setting out the various sources and then assessing the various versions.

24 Oh, Thomas, 5-6 (supplement).
25 Oh, Thomas, 6 (supplement).
26 Oh, Thomas, 8-9, 14-9.
27 Oh Mun-Whan, ‘Pyongyang Yangnan Hanhwa’ (A Story of Pyongyang Foreign Incident), Gidoksinbo (The Christian Messenger), 24 November, 8 December, and 22 December 1926.
28 Hamilton said in his article that “we are indebted to Mr. Oh for most of the facts in the following account of the life of Mr. Thomas”. Hamilton, ‘The First Protestant Martyr’, 182.
The Sources

Rev R. J. Thomas visited Korea twice in 1865 and 1866 but stayed for just four months altogether. Due to his short visit, resources about his works and death in Korea are quite fragmentary. Nevertheless, we can categorize the sources as of three types. First, almost all primary sources which directly show the fate of Thomas and General Sherman come from the relevant Koreans at that time. Second, some American diplomatic materials give brief information collected a couple of months later indirectly from French priests who escaped the Great Persecution of 1866, and the Chinese captain of the junk boat who guided the General Sherman to the mouth of the river in Korea. Third, sources appeared in Christian circles, though the documents are written many decades after the event on the basis of memories of a few old Christians who were said to be the witnesses of the event. Unfortunately, however, we have no voices from the side of General Sherman because there were no survivors – all the crew including Thomas being killed at the time. Among these sources, we can single out some documents which can be accessed, focusing on Thomas’ death to investigate his part in the event.

The sources can be listed: Kojong Sillok (The Annals of King Kojong) in 1866, Pyongan Gamyoung Gyerok (Reports of Pyongan Province) in 1866, H. G. Appenzeller’s article in 1892, ‘The Opening of Korea: Admiral Shufeldt’s Account of It’, ‘The Fate of The General Sherman: From an Eye Witness’ from J. S. Gale in 1895, Oh Mun-Whan’ works from 1926 to 1932, and Floyd E. Hamilton’s article published in 1927.

30 The first visit was from early September to December in 1865 (“two months and a half”) and the second visit was from mid August to early September in 1866. See R. J. Thomas, Letter to Dr Tidman, 12 January 1866; Floyd E. Hamilton, ‘The First Protestant Martyr’, 185; Oh, ‘The Two Visits’, 97.


32 5 – 27 July 1866 (by lunar calendar).

33 8 – 24 July 1866 (by lunar calendar).

34 The Korean Repository 1 (January 1892), 57-62

35 The Korean Repository 2 (July 1895), 252-4.
By reading the above sources about Thomas’ activities and death in Korea closely, scholars agree on some points. First, during the voyage towards Pyongyang, Thomas handed out some Bibles to the native Koreans. Secondly, the crew of the General Sherman kidnapped Lee Hyeon-Ik, a soldier of Chosun (Korea) which was the direct cause of the conflict. Thirdly, the ship voyaged towards Pyongyang ignoring the Chosun governor’s request to leave Chosun territory. Lastly, as one of the crew, Thomas was in charge of the negotiation between the crew of the General Sherman and native Korean officers. Though these agreements are granted among scholars, arguments about the cause and the process of Thomas’ death are still on going.

At this juncture, it seems worth noting that apart from the Korean official documents written in 1866, others are written on the basis of indirect collections, because any straightforward investigation of the affair as a whole was impossible at that time due to the Chosun government’s policy of seclusion, the ‘Isolation Policy’. It suggests that the primary sources setting out Thomas’s death thus directly reflect the viewpoint of the Chosun government. Bearing this in mind, let us move to the interpretations of Thomas’s death based on divergent and contested memories about the same event.

As noted above, there is still much argument based on grounds of historicity among scholars. Those who grant Rev Thomas as ‘the first protestant martyr in Korea’ accept the depiction of his death based on the first records of his life and death in Korea written by Oh Mun-Whan (in 1926, 1928, and 1932), while those opposed argue that the death-event of Rev Thomas is merely a “deep impression leading to a fruit of a superficially praiseworthy episode”38 because Oh’s record itself is the result of beautification and exaggeration regardless of its historical reality.


**Making Thomas as the First Protestant Martyr in Korea**

Oh Mun-Whan explained in his book, written in 1928 and in 1933, that he carried out the research for two years, interviewing about 200 of aged witnesses who met Thomas on “the coast of the three western province of Korea, Whanghai, South and North Pyenang (Pyeongan) Provinces,” and collecting written documents by writing “over three thousand letters to his relatives and friends, mostly in England and China”. He also used the relevant parts of the *Pyongyang-ji* (Pyongyang Gazette) and *Hwanje* (瓛齋) -jip, a collection of Park Gyou-Su’s works, who was the governor of Pyeongan Province at the time.

Tracking down Thomas’ activities in Korea through the resources he collected, Oh concluded that “Thomas gave his life for the Gospel on Sep. 3rd on the soil of Korea”. He was convinced that Thomas’ death was indeed that of a martyr. Especially in his final edition written in English in 1932, he dramatically described the last scene of Thomas’ life in Korea:

Moreover the Koreans sent burning pine boasts (not rafts) floating down to the schooner, which soon took fire. To save themselves, the crew had to jump into the water or get to land somehow. On shore they were met by the soldiers ready to pierce them with their spears. During these events *Mr. Thomas, of course, did not try to escape from the danger*, nor could he have got away anywhere to safety. As well as opportunity allowed, *he kept on with his sacred task of distributing the Scriptures from the boat, for which purpose he had come, and which he thought he must accomplish by all means…* He humbly knelt down before the soldier waiting for him, *begged him to accept the Bible, and shut his eyes to pray*. The soldier hesitated to execute him, but at last he had to do his duty.

On the basis of Oh’s narrative, Hamilton represented the scene of Thomas death as follows:

---

39 Oh, *Thomas*, 1 (Foreword).
40 Oh, ‘The Two Visits’, 97.
41 Pyongyang is one core city of Pyeongan Province.
42 ‘Hwanje’ (瓛齋) is Park Gyou-Su’s pen name.
43 Oh, *Thomas*, 1-2 (Foreword).
44 Oh, ‘The Two Visits’, 120-1.
45 Oh, ‘The Two Visits’, 120 (Emphasises added).
When Thomas, who at various times during the two weeks had held up a Bible and tried to talk to the crowds on the shore, but had been unable to make them understand, saw that all hope was past, he tossed his remaining stock of Bibles ashore to the crowds, and, with one or two last copies in his hands, jumped into the water and waded ashore. He was met by a soldier who started to kill him. *Thomas held out the Bible and urged the man to take it.* The man refused, and Mr. *Thomas kneeled on the sand, clasped his hands, closed his eyes and apparently prayed to God,* for the soldier afterwards stated that his lips were moving though he could not understand what he said. Then opening his eyes, he *smiled at the soldier and again urged him to take the book.* The soldier, who had been trying to get up courage to kill the kneeling man, at last steeled his heart and killed him.\(^{46}\)

In these depictions, Thomas was represented as a faithful agent of the National Bible Society of Scotland (NBSS) and missionary of the London Missionary Society (LMS) who was carrying out his “sacred task” bravely for the Korean natives who gathered there to watch the affair and even for the sake of the soldier who then killed him, without trying “to escape from danger”. Furthermore, Oh wrote, when Thomas was throwing the Bibles from the deck of the burning ship he was shouting “Jesus”, as the pioneer Presbyterian minister Rev Han Suk-Chin wrote in 1928 from an eye-witness’s testimony. In the letter, Rev Han reminisced that he had heard the testimony in October 1892 when he came to Pyongyang for the first time.\(^{47}\) In Oh’s view, Thomas was, indeed, a ‘humble’ and ‘pious’ missionary and God’s faithful servant\(^ {48}\) who prayed to God at the last moment of his life giving the last copy of the Bible to his killer. Those scenes certainly recall the image of Jesus on the Cross, Stephen, and martyrs in the early period of the Church to the readers. But now let us move to another interpretation about Thomas’ death.

**Making Thomas as an Invader of Western Imperialism**

As L. G. Paik, the first generation of Korean Church historians, indicated in relation to those sources concerning Thomas’ activities and death in Korea, Oh’s
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\(^{46}\) Hamilton, ‘The First Protestant Martyr’, 185 (Emphases added).


\(^{48}\) Oh, *Thomas*, 58.
viewpoint was “highly eulogistic,” 49 embellishing the death of Rev R. J. Thomas as a result of the General Sherman affair with false ornaments suitable for the death of a martyr who was killed because of his desire to introduce the Gospel to Korea.

Furthermore, as Oh himself indicated in his book, there were different accounts about Thomas’ death at that time which he confirmed, though he concluded that Thomas was killed by a soldier as set out above. 50 However, in the Kojong Shillok (The Annals of King Kojong) Thomas’ death was reported thus:

Choi Nan-Heon [Thomas] and Cho Nan-Bong appeared on the bows of the burning ship. They pleaded for their lives to be spared, but were quickly captured by the natives. Their hands were tied and they were dragged to the river bank. The natives and soldiers angrily murdered them and the other crews. None remained alive. After that the confusion in the city was finally brought to an end. 51

In 1892, H. G. Appenzeller, one of the first residential minister-missionaries of the Methodist Church in the USA, described the fate of the General Sherman based on the account of Admiral Shufeldt, who was in command of the U. S. S. Wachusett in 1866, that “the crew [of the General Sherman] landing and behaving in a lawless manner, were attacked and murdered by an enraged mob, which was entirely beyond the control of the authorities”. 52 Furthermore, James S. Gale, who was a missionary of the YMCA of Toronto University in Canada and then a missionary of the American Presbyterian Board, 53 presented Thomas’s death in his article about the fate of the General Sherman, written in 1895, as follows:

The wretched foreigners were now hacked to pieces by the furious mob. One or two who reached shore carried a white flag, which they waved while they bowed repeatedly. But no quarter was given, they were pinioned and cut to

49 Paik, The History of Protestant Missions, 47 (Footnote 144).
50 Oh, ‘The Two Visits’, 121.
53 Paik, The History of Protestant Missions, 143.
pieces, then the remains were still further mutilated, certain parts were cut off to be used as medicine, the rest gathered up and burned in a heap.\textsuperscript{54}

Even Oh himself had explained in his second contribution for \textit{Gidoksinbo} on 8\textsuperscript{th} December 1926 that Thomas was given to the natives who were the relatives of victims during the battle, and then was killed by them and not by a soldier\textsuperscript{55} though he reversed this narrative in his second edition in 1928 and the English version in 1932. Moreover, in 1899, the LMS, which had appointed Thomas as their missionary, recorded that he was supposed to have been “drowned while on a voyage to Korea,” presenting his missionary work in a rather negative light: “he never settled down to work in the capital”.\textsuperscript{56}

In fact, it is hard to come to a conclusion about the manner of Thomas’s death, as Oh himself indicated in his book in 1932:\textsuperscript{57} whether he was drowned in the river, killed by a soldier to whom he had given his last Bible, or killed by the unauthorized furious mob. If Thomas was not killed by a soldier, his “sacred task” at the last moment of his life as Oh concluded loses its value. Even begging for his life, if we grant the authenticity of documents other than Oh’s, presents him in a very different light from the image of martyrs who submitted to death without pleading for life. If he was killed by the enraged mob, the relatives of the victims, caused by the crew’s lawless behaviour, as Admiral Shufeldt indicated, his death resulted by his cooperation in works of military invasion rather than the “sacred task” as missionary.

Though Oh insisted that his research work on Thomas was based on about 200 ‘eye-witnesses’, it may be unwise to trust his conclusion, based on a long-ago event ‘seen’ by people some of whom were born long afterwards. Furthermore, the outcome is heavily influenced by the fact that most ‘witnesses’ were Protestant Christians including the relative of the man who was said to have killed Thomas. For example, Mr Nee Young-Tai, the relative of the man who was said to have killed Thomas was the secretary of Dr. Reynolds, one of the Bible Revision Board

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{54} J. S. Gale, ‘The Fate of The General Sherman: From an Eye Witness’, \textit{The Korean Repository} 2 (July 1895), 254 (Emphasis added).}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Gidoksinbo} (The Christian Messenger), 8 December 1926.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{57} Oh, ‘The Two Visits’, 121.}
members in Korea at the time, and Cheh Chi-Ryang, an elder in the Cha Ra Oat Presbyterian Church in Pyongyang, had been a twelve-year-old boy who picked up the bible which Thomas tossed from the head of the schooner before he was killed.\(^{58}\)

Gale’s article, ‘The Fate of the General Sherman’, written in 1895\(^{59}\) seems to have been the first Christian account of the General Sherman affair as a whole. There was little if anything about Rev R. J. Thomas except the one phrase, “the chief being Ch’oi Ranhun”\(^{60}\), which was assumed as a Korean name of Thomas.\(^{61}\) If Gale knew the ‘praiseworthy episode’ of Thomas he would surely not have stayed silent about the so-called ‘first Protestant martyr in Korea’. This suggests that Thomas’s story, especially the scene of his death, was not known or recognized as ‘the death of a martyr’ until after 1895 at the earliest. Moreover, when the Annual Meeting of Korea Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the USA was held at Seoul in September 1912, S. A. Moffett, F. S. Miller, and G. S. McCune were appointed to record the activities of Thomas through a ‘Special Committee of Memorial to Mr Thomas’. This special committee, they reported, did nothing because of the great pressure of other duties, and was discharged by its own request in 1915.\(^{62}\) If the death of Thomas was known to the committee as a memorable death in a martyrological sense as depicted in the story of Oh Mun-Whan, it would have been rather important to investigate it, more so than the other mission duties they did, because such work might have led to the designation of the first Protestant martyr in Korea.

Thus ‘after 1895’ stretches to ‘after 1915’ for at least until then, Rev R. J. Thomas’ death was not only stated as being solely the result of the General Sherman affair, but as a consequence, there was no question of designating him martyr. Even Alexander Williamson, the agent of the NBSS, generally known as the person who advised Thomas to go to Korea, did not mention Thomas’s death in Korea at all when he wrote his book in 1870, pointing out the “the destruction of the General


\(^{59}\) Gale, ‘The Fate’, 252-4.

\(^{60}\) Gale, ‘The Fate’, 252.

\(^{61}\) Though Oh Mun-Whan pointed out that Ch’oi Ran-Hun (崔蘭軒) is not Thomas but General Sherman, it is still not clear whether the ‘Ch’oi Ran-Hun’ indicates the transliteration of Thomas or General Sherman into Korean. Oh, *Thomas*, 4.

\(^{62}\) Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions*, 47 (Footnote 144).
Sherman.” As indicated above, even in Christian documents, Thomas held the title of ‘Mr’ or ‘Rev’ not ‘martyr’ until 1926 when Oh Mun-Whan called him ‘the first Protestant martyr in Korea’ in his book.

On the basis of the above views, some Korean historians such as Lee Man-Yeol, Kim Seung-Tae, Han Gyu-Moo, Hong Seung-Ho, and Kim Myoung-Ho argue that the cause of Thomas’ death was not the result of his mission works in distributing the Scripture to the natives as a missionary but a consequence of his activities as the leader of invaders. The angry natives and soldiers in Pyongyang killed him not because of his Gospel-propagating activity, which was forbidden in Korea at that time, but because he was actually one of the crew of a foreign vessel, who had kidnapped a native soldier and killed the natives by firing cannons “in a lawless manner”.

Taking the official Korean governmental records, they say that Rev R. J. Thomas was almost certainly killed because of his identity as crew not as missionary, and the illegal approach to Korean territory which the vessel chose. Though he was indeed a missionary of the LMS and the agent of the NBSS when he visited in Korea in 1866, his identity as such was not shown clearly to Korean officers when he was questioned by the official investigator on 18th July 1866 (lunar calendar). In Kojong Shillok, the Annals of King Kojong, Thomas was recognized as an interpreter or spokesman of the schooner who seems to have the responsibility for the ship. Even the Pyongyang-Ji, Pyongyang Gazette, regarded him as “the head (or leader) of the ship”. Park Gyou-Su (朴珪壽, 1807-1877), the governor of Pyongyang Province, acknowledged him not as a Protestant missionary but as an aggressive interpreter from the ‘General Sherman.’ In a word, whether he was burnt on board of the schooner, drowned in the river, or killed by a soldier, his death was the result of the

---

64 Han, ‘General Shermanho’, 31; Kim Myoung-Ho, ‘General Shermanho Sageungwa Park Gyou-Su’ (The General Sherman Affair and Park Gyou-Su), Daedong Munhwa Yeongu 42 (June 2003), 331.
68 Pyongyang-Ji (Pyongyang Gazette). Quoted from Oh, Thomas Moksajeon, 52.
69 Oh, ‘The Two Visits’, 121.
clash between the military of the Chosun government and an American armed trading vessel opposing Korean sovereignty rather than a Bible distributor. Calling him a martyr is thus an ideological statement and an attempted appropriation of ‘glory’ for the PCK. Opponents of Oh’s text insist, therefore, that Thomas’ death cannot be a martyr’s death. If we were to designate Thomas as a martyr, they say, his activity to propagate Gospel by any means would be justified, yet to “steal a candle to read the Bible” can never be acceptable.

At this juncture, one question arises naturally: when did Thomas become or be perceived as a martyr publicly to the Korean Christians? Was it in 1866 or 1926? As we have seen above, he was first designated as a martyr in 1926, 60 years after the event. This suggests that a martyr emerges not by dying but by the interpretation about the death. In this sense it may be fair to say that martyr-making as an act of narrative-constitution could function as an effective tool of manipulation. Moreover, even recreating the event of the past from present perspectives depends on intentions or at least the desires of the contemporary groups claiming someone a martyr. Thus any analysis of the process of martyr-making needs a close reading of the present context of groups which are “making” or “unmaking” martyrs. Thomas is both the first Protestant martyr in Korea for some groups, being so designated by Oh Mun-Whan’s narratives in 1926, 1928, and 1932, and also recognized ‘an invader’ of Western imperialism for other groups, especially nationalist Christians and secular historians in the 1980s as well as Korean officers in 1866.

Based on this discussion we can now draw a paradigm of martyr-making for Rev R. J. Thomas case as below:

\[\text{Han, ‘General Shermanho’, 33.}\]
Were there any particular reasons or advantages why the Presbyterian Church of Korea might want to make Thomas the first Protestant martyr in Korea, despite the distinct possibility that his death is not result of his mission work but his direct involvement in the aggressive activity of the General Sherman? This cannot be answered conclusively, but it is possible to say that the PCK might have expected some benefits by making Thomas a martyr. Firstly, they could proclaim that they also stood in the tradition of martyrdom which is one of the oldest and most universal legacies of the Church, as did the Catholic Church. The fact that 79 Korean Catholics killed in the persecutions of 1839 and 1846, including the first Korean priest Kim Tae-Gon Andrew, were beatified as ‘Blessed’ on 5 July 1925, seemed to stimulate the PCK to make Thomas the first Protestant martyr in Korea in 1926 because the Protestant late-comers had no martyrs up to that time. In finding its tradition of martyrdom dates back to 1866, when the great persecution of Catholic Church in Korea had taken place, the PCK made Thomas’ death an equally praiseworthy story of martyrdom. Secondly, by making Thomas a martyr, they could insist that

---


72 Some scholars such as Kim Seung-Tae, Hong Seung-Ho, Han Gyu-Moo, etc seek to find the hidden intention of the PCK questioning their making-martyr of Thomas. See, Kim Seung-Tae, ‘General
martyrdom is the motivating power behind the rapid growth\textsuperscript{73} of the PCK,\textsuperscript{74} thus strengthening their community to keep their faith against the pressure of Shinto Shrine worship requiring all schoolchildren to attend these ceremonies honouring the Japanese Emperor. This was especially vital from 1925 when the Shinto Shrine was completed at Namsan (northern mountain) in Seoul, Korea.\textsuperscript{75}

It is also important to point out that the martyr-making ceremony for Rev R. J. Thomas in 1926 was conducted alongside the 30\textsuperscript{th} foundation service for the British and Foreign Bible Society in Korea.\textsuperscript{76} This ‘coincidence’ may offer a clue as to why his last act before death was giving Chinese Bibles to the crowds and to a soldier who killed him: “When Thomas…saw that all hope was past, he tossed his remaining stock of Bibles ashore to the crowds…Thomas held out the Bible and urged the man to take it”.\textsuperscript{77} This story that the first Protestant martyr in Korea was sacrificed as a result of Bible propagation was certainly a valuable model to encourage the Bible Society in their future mission work of Bible distribution in Korea.

Analyzing the purpose of making Thomas a martyr, we can find a tendency that those groups claiming Thomas as a martyr tried to separate his secular from his religious activities in Korea, privileging the sacred. In the colonial period, especially after the failure of the March First Independence Movement in which the PCK had

\textsuperscript{73} The dramatic growth of the early Korean Protestant Church had already been shown through comments such as “Korea is today another miracle in modern missions” in 1889 (‘Progress and Results of Mission: Monthly Bulletin – Korea’, \textit{The Missionary Review of the World} 2 (new series):4 (April 1889), 312), and “This numerical growth, wonderful as it is…one of the marvels of modern history” in 1910 (World Missionary Conference 1910, \textit{Report of Commission I: Carrying the Gospel to all the Non-Christian World}, vol. 1, Edinburgh · London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; New York · Chicago · Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1910, 71); Paik, \textit{The History of Protestant Missions}, 4.
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played a vital role, this apolitical attitude of the PCK might seem wise to avoid disturbing Japanese colonialism and imperialism.

Yet some scholars, led by Lee Man-Yeol, are reluctant to call Thomas a martyr from the standpoint of nationalist historiography. They claim that Korean church history should be understood not just as a ‘history of Christians’ themselves but within the ‘history of the nation’ with its ethnic nationalism. Therefore, for them, the viewpoints of nation or natives are more important than that of the missionaries. This may partly be the reason that why they prefer to take more Korean official documents, such as the Annals of King Kojong and the Reports of Pyongyan Province, as evidence of their argument while Oh mostly leaned on Christian voices. Their approach, say Korean church historians, enabled them to achieve their responsibility towards the Korean nation’s present and future issues. Taking such a nationalist attitude in reading history, they closely examine Thomas’s death in the General Sherman affair, linking it as the direct cause of the ‘American Disturbance of 1871’. Lee Man-Yeol says,

Although it is true that Rev R. J. Thomas died tragically, the only fact that he died does not explain he is a great missionary in historical viewpoint. The American schooner he had taken was not for the mission but was a mere merchant vessel, even heavily armed by cannons. She illegally sailed towards Chosun (Korea) soil ignoring Chosun government’s prohibition on entering the territory…Rev Thomas had embarked as an interpreter and a mate of the ship. Therefore, Rev Thomas himself cannot be evaluated honourably. We recognize that many churches were built at every turn of Taedong River where Thomas was killed. However, to say that those churches’ establishment resulted from Rev Thomas’s death is merely a naive attitude of interpreting history. We have to reconsider whether his death was indeed a martyr’s death or not.

Standing on such a basis, Han Gyu-Moo argues that “there will be no sure foundation when we proclaim love and peace in the freedom of mission which has been obtained by the guns and swords of imperialism”. Indeed, it seems that their historiographic approach in the present context, based on anti-imperialism and

78 IKCHS, Hanguk Gidokgyouyi Yeoksa I, 9-10.
79 Lee Man-Yeol, Hanguk Gidokgyohoe 100nyensa (A Centennial History of Korean Church), Seoul: Seonggyong Ilkisa, 1985, 36.
80 Han, General Shermanho, 33.
autonomy of the nation or state in the post-colonial period, makes them reluctant to call Thomas a martyr.

As we have discussed in Chapter 2, in the field of martyrdom, perpetrators and victims are always placed together. However, the problem is that those positions might be able to be exchanged according to the viewer’s perspective and the contextual ideologies of interpreters’ time and space. Can we say that Thomas is a victim because he was killed by Korean natives or soldiers? Taking a wider view, can we say that Thomas is a perpetrator who led a Western imperial power to Chosun territory and killed some native Koreans? As shown above, some say that Thomas is the first Protestant martyr in Korea, focusing on his original desire to be a missionary and his deeds contributing the Bibles to native Koreans, whilst others argue that his approach cannot be justified in any way though he himself confirmed that he was a missionary. Even the ambiguity of his death prevents him being called a martyr. In this sense, we have to ask to ourselves: Can we judge one who has stolen a candle to read the Bible? If we answer these questions clearly, we may add some light to Thomas’s death in Korea in 1866 and reach the final question of whether he is martyr or invader. This will be attempted in due course by returning to the event and taking off the ideological clothes through close investigations.

4.1.2. Martyr-making of the deaths during Japanese colonial period

The second martyr-making era of the PCK is 1946, the second year of liberation from Japanese rule. Though Protestant Christians’ death took place through the Korean Conspiracy Case in 1911, the March First Movement in 1919 and the result of Shinto Shrine controversy during the late 1930s and 1940s, they were not designated as Protestant martyrs before independence from Japan because it would have been impossible so to designate any opposing Japanese rule during colonialism. However, when the nation was liberated, those who died in consequence of the Shinto Shrine conflict were immediately designated as Protestant martyrs. These martyr-makings were not carried out in the name of the whole PCK but each were performed by local Christian groups or local churches. They were designated officially as PCK’s martyrs in 1983. For instance, Rev Choi Bong Seok (1869-1944) of the Presbyterian Church and Deaconess Choi In-Gyu (1881-1942) of the Methodist Church, who died as a result of the Shinto Shrine conflict, were immediately designated as Protestant martyrs, and commemorative monuments built
in 1946 in the yard of Sanjeonhyeon church and Samcheokjeil church where they served as faithful workers.

Given the tensions during the colonial time between resisters against and conformists to Japanese rule, Methodists had a more unified response, the Presbyterian Church of Korea found greater problems in the aftermath of occupation. In 1947, they held a memorial service to commemorate only ‘the Presbyterian Christians martyrs’ who died in consequence of the Shinto Shrine conflict in Seungdon church in Seoul.81 The tension between conformists and resisters led to the division of the Presbyterian Church,82 central power being taken over by the group of pro-Japanese Christians during the USAMGIK (American) and Rhee Syng-Man’s regime based on the ideology of anticommunism. Accordingly, the martyr-making recognition of Christians who fought against Shinto Shrine worship, suffering from imprisonment and severe torture, and memorial events for them, were no longer carried out after 1947 given the dominance of the pro-Japanese church authority in the Presbyterian Church.

Despite the martyr-making process of the PCK for at least 50 Christians killed amid the Shinto shrine controversy, those Christians killed amid the Conspiracy Case in 1911 and the March First Independence Movement in 1919 still remained without religious identification or were deliberately excluded from those martyr-making processes even though those two situations were clearly perceived by the PCK authority and missionaries as Christian persecutions carried out by Japanese colonial power. Even the Japanese colonial authority had acknowledged that their suppression especially targeted Christian groups, characterising the PCK’s involvement in national patriotism, using a metaphor of Church and State relationship taken in particular from the case of Christianity in Roman period and the English Roman Catholics in Elizabeth and James I.83 It is, therefore, easy to infer that there might have been numerous Christians sacrificed amid those two cases. Yet the PCK

81 Chosun Yesugyo Jangnohoe Chonghroe, Chosun Yesugyo Jangnohoe Chonghroe Je 33hoe Hoerok (The Records of 33rd General Assembly of Presbyterian Church of Chosun), 1947, 3.
82 In consequence of that complication, Presbyterian Church in Korea underwent the first disunion in September 1952. Gathering around Rev. Joo Nam-Sun and Rev. Han Sang-Dong who were released from prison after national liberation, ‘Kosin’ or ‘Korea Pa (group)’ organized its own General Assembly. See, Min, Hanguk Gidokgyohoesa, 520-5.
counted only 69 PCK Christians, in particular Presbyterian and Methodist Christians, killed by shooting, torturing or severe beating amid two incidents. The PCK designated just a few martyrs among the 69, but other deaths still remained without any investigation or attention on the official ecclesiastical level. However, the PCK were swift to pay attention to those killed by communists outside Korea, especially in Manchuria and Siberia, in the 1920s and 1930s: those killed by Japanese military forces for their nationalist activities as Christians within Korea were largely ignored.

Indeed, the PCK’s selection of deaths in this period, in which those deaths caused by the Shinto shrine controversy immediately took precedence in making martyrs, whether official or local basis, while others caused during the Conspiracy Case and March First Independence movement were excluded from the martyr-making process, was a result of the PCK’s apparently apolitical but actually anticommmunist attitude. On one hand, by placing the Shinto issues only on sacred ground by paralleling it with the Roman emperor worship, they regarded those killed amid the controversy as true disciples of Christ who witnessed unto death as the early period of Christians did. For the PCK, it was, therefore, natural to make them martyrs: other deaths based on more nationalist causes were identified as deaths not for God but for the secular nation, which were patriotic not martyr’s deaths. On the other hand, by placing themselves on the ground of the anticommmunist ideology supporting the USAMGIK and Methodist Elder Rhee’s political group, pro-Japanese churchmen, including conformists on the Shinto issue, could maintain their power both in secular and sacred space. The result was those killed as Christians during the Japanese colonial regime were not made martyrs. However, PCK’s ‘apolitical’ attitude to the process of martyr-making dramatically changed under the entrenched anticommmunism in South Korea after the Korean War in 1950. Let us therefore explore the ‘making’ and also the ‘unmaking’ of martyrs in accordance with contextual ideologies.

4.1.3. Martyr-making of deaths before and during the Korean War

The sudden division of the Korean peninsula just after Korea’s liberation along the 38th Parallel was a result of the hegemonic ideologies of western powers in the

Cold War. In the process of that division and establishment of each government in North and South, the ideologies functioned as “an unyielding belief system, which often seemed stronger than their faith”: churches were inevitably forced into ideological choices. The PCK leaders even stood in the frontline of that struggle advocating and supporting the division of Korea. The political situation of the Korean peninsula during five years from Korea’s liberation on 15 August 1945 to the Korean War on 25 June 1950 saw Protestantism in Korea deeply involved in the ideological struggle against communism.

Consequently when the Cold War became real war in 1950 in Korean territory a majority of Protestant Christians supported it. For example, the Protestant churches organized Daehan gidokgyo gugukhoe (the Korean Christian National Relief Association) to cooperate with the department of Defence and Social Welfare in Rhee’s government. However, according to Kim Heung-Soo, the most important task of that Association was “mobilizing Christian young men and sending them to the battle line”. In August 1950, the Association mobilized about 3,000 Christian young men and in October sent about 1,000 Christians to the battle field.

Thus the Korean War from 1950 to 1953 was a turning point in the martyr-making of the PCK. Many Christians who died during the War were immediately designated as martyrs of the PCK amid the War, on the basis of an anticommunist ideological purpose. To commemorate those anti-communist martyrs, several monuments were built in South Korea. For instance, the memorial to 48 martyrs of Jinli church, Jeonnam province, was built in October 1950 just after the event; the memorial of the martyr Mun Jun-Kyong, evangelist of the Holiness Church in Korea, was built in August 1951 at Jeungdongli church, and the memorial of 24 martyrs who were slaughtered by the North Korean People’s Army was built at Yeongam church.

86 For this Association, see, Clark, A History of the Church in Korea, 247-95.
87 Kim Heung-Soo, Hangukjeonjaenggwa Giboksinang Hwaksan Yeongu (A Study of the Koran War and the Expansion of This-Worldly Blessings in Korean Churches), Seoul: IKCHS, 1999, 60.
Jeonam province, in December 1953. After the end of the War a new church building in Byeongchon at Nonsan, Chungnam province, was named as the memorial chapel of martyrs in 1956 and the monument of martyrs was built at that church in 1959. Finally in 1957 the National Council of Churches in Korea (NCCK) presented a list 212 anticommunist Protestant Church martyrs and kidnapped during the Korean War. This list was the first result of research work for martyr-making in the name of the whole PCK since the first martyr-making process carried out concerning Thomas’ death in 1926. However that list presented only martyrs who were killed by communists during the Korean War.

At this juncture, it is worth noting that those immediate martyr-designations show that the PCK’s apolitical tendency for making martyrs in the previous period had turned into the active politicisation of the martyr-making operation of those killed by the communist army during the Korean War under the ideology of anticommunism. Even the PCK martyr-making process intentionally excluded those Christians’ deaths caused by the US and South Korean troops amid the Jeju 4.3, Yeosun revolt and during the Korean War. As we have seen in the previous chapter, the number of victims executed by the South Korean and US armies was greater than those killed by rebels or guerrillas, especially in the Jeju and Yeosun uprisings. In particular, the PCK deliberately kept silence over the 250 Christians killed in Sinuiju church, North Korea, by US air force bombing. It suggests that the PCK’s collection and exclusion of Christian deaths caused before and during the Korean War was carried out to enforce the political anticommunist ideology of South Korea, abandoning their ‘apolitical’ stance which had been strongly kept after the failure of the March First Independence Movement. Taking up the anticommunist nationalism entrenched by Rhee’s political strategy in the post-colonial period in South Korea, the martyr-making process of the PCK was re-launched in earnest in the 1980s.

---


90 There was a break in martyr-making from late 1950s to the 1970s because most of the Protestant denominations experienced severe complications during that period. The Presbyterian Church in Korea was divided into four main denominations in the 1950s: the Presbyterian Church in Korea (Kosin) in 1952, the Presbyterian Church in the Republic of Korea (Gijang) in 1953, and Presbyterian Church in Korea (Hapdong) and the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Tonghap) in 1959. See, Min, *Hanguk Gidokgyohoesa*, 527-32, 545-7.
4.1.4. Martyr-making as a whole in the 1980s and afterwards

The PCK’s martyr-making process resumed in the late 1970s when the plans for the 100th anniversary of the PCK began and in the 1980s the martyr-making work hit the ground running. However, martyr-making in this period has very different aspects compared to earlier. Firstly, as many as 20 Protestant denominations participated in the martyr-making works under the name of the Council for the 100th Anniversary of the Korean Church (CAKC). However the CAKC committed the actual martyr-making work, especially collecting and listing of martyrs, to the KCMBFA which was initially organized on 28 June 1982 by the joint meeting of Presbyterian bereaved families of those sacrificed during the Korean War at ‘Sunhyewon’ (House of Grace) in Seoul and other denominations’ bereaved families in Pusan, to encourage and help each other. The KCMBFA then developed into the Korean Church Martyr’s Memorial Works (KCMMW) in 1986 and was finally renamed as the Korean Church Martyrs Missionary Association (KCMMA).

Given fact that the actual martyr-making works were initially operated by the KCMBFA indicates a paradox. On one hand, it could have authority from the fact that the martyr-making in the 1980s was conducted not by the specific denominations or individual churches but in the name of the whole PCK; on the other hand, it could be loose legitimacy through the fact that most of the ‘martyrs’ listed in the 1980s have been so designated by their descendants. For example, Paik Hong-Jun was designated as ‘the first Korean Protestant Church martyr’ by Rev. Kim Kwang-Soo, who is a maternal great-grandson of Baik Hong-Jun and the first director of the Korean Martyrs’ Memorial. It also suggests that the KCMBFA, the origin of the KCMMA, stood inherently on the ideology of anticommunism due to the fact that most of the members were the families of those killed by communists before and during the Korean War. Nonetheless, it was meaningful that the martyr-

91 Reports of the KCMMW, 1987; The CAKC indicates that the list of martyrs were supplied by the KCMBFA. See, CAKC ed., Hanguk Gidokgyo 100 Junyeeon, 240-3.
making work of the CAKC investigated the whole PCK’s history about 100 years since Protestantism was introduced in Korea in the late 19th century, to collect and select PCK martyrs, although though most martyrs collected and listed were those who were killed by communists during the Korean War. The work was carried out reasonably systemically and constantly for 7 years from 1983 to 1989 when the Korean Martyrs’ Memorial building was completed: it still continues.

The CAKC held the first united memorial service as a pan-denominational event to commemorate martyrs of the whole Korean Protestant Church at Saemunan Presbyterian church in Seoul on 14 November 1983. Two years later, it held the second united memorial service at Youngnak Presbyterian church on 14 October 1985. In 1989, the CAKC singled out, confirmed, and listed 130 PCK martyrs publishing the comprehensive survey book. The listed 130 martyrs’ portraits with brief résumé were displayed initially at the Korean Martyrs’ Memorial in 1989. After that, in 1992, the KCMMA published *Hanguk gyohoe sungyoja* (The Christian Martyrs in Korea) presenting 226 martyrs and in 2001, the CAKC revised the previous book adding 68 martyrs. Since that time the Korean Martyrs’ Memorial has become one of the core places for pilgrimage for Protestant Christians. The CAKC’s martyr-making work is still going on under the auspices of the KCMMA.

In short, the martyr-making process of the PCK for the death-events occurring in history can be listed as follows periodically.

- 1926, ‘The 60th anniversary of Rev R. J. Thomas’ Martyrdom’ and ‘The 30th anniversary of the British and Foreign Bible Society establishment in

---

96 In 1983 the CAKC conducted research on the actual condition and merits of martyrs committing the work to the KCMBFA. In 1987 the martyrs name was listed in the Comprehensive Survey book and then in 1989 in accordance with the list, the first fruits of that research work were displayed at the Korean Martyrs’ Memorial in Yangji, Yongin City. See, The CAKC ed., *Hanguk Gidokgyo 100 Junyeon*, 243, 465-6.


98 The CAKC ed., *Hanguk Gidokgyo 100 Junyeon*, 253, 466.


101 Kang, *Hangukui Gaeshingyowa Bangongjui*, 151-72. Collected from <Table 4-4> ~ <Table 4-10>.
Korea’ were held at Seungdong Church in Seoul (based on the materials and records of Oh Mun-Whan)

- 1927, Organized ‘Commemorative Association for the martyr Rev Thomas’ (Chairperson, Rev Samuel Austin Moffett)
- 1932, Construction of Rev Thomas’ memorial Chapel in Pyongyang
- 1947, Presbyterian Church of Korea held a memorial service to commemorate ‘the Presbyterian Christians martyrs’ who died amid Shinto Shrine conflict at Seungdon church in Seoul
- 1957, The National Council of Churches in Korea (NCCK) presented a ‘list of 212 Protestant Church martyrs and kidnapped to North Korea during the Korean War’ publishing The Yearbook of Korean Christianity
- 1982, Inauguration of the KCMBFA (developed into the KCMMA afterwards)
- 1983, the CAKC (20 denominations of the PCK participated) conducted a fact-finding survey and examined meritorious deeds for some 2000 Christians’ death committing the works to the KCMBFA; made a plan of the Korean Martyrs’ Memorial construction
- 1983, the CAKC held the first ‘united memorial service of martyrs’ at Saemunan Church in Seoul, in which Rev Lee Yeong-Chan reported 851 martyrs can be listed
- 1985, the CAKC held the second ‘united memorial service of martyrs’ at Youngnak Church in Seoul
- 1989, the CAKC completed the Korean Martyrs’ Memorial and held the opening ceremony displaying 130 martyrs’ portraits
- 1992, the KCMMA published Hanguk gyohoe sungyoja (The Christian Martyrs in Korea) presenting 226 martyrs.
- 2001, the CAKC published the Korean Martyrs’ Memorial representing 191 martyrs including the martyrs’ name massacred during the Korean War (Yeongam, Jinri, Sangwol, Yeomsan Church, etc.)

As shown above, from 1983 onwards, the martyr-making of the PCK was led by the CAKC and the KCMMA (KCMBFA). As the former is a pan-denominational body set up to carry out the 100th anniversary projects and the latter is an organisation composed of the pan-denominational bereaved families and those who want to share the spirit of martyrs with the families, it may be fair to say that the martyrs who were designated by those two institutions, the CAKC and the KCMMA, became the official martyrs of the PCK. Therefore, it is possible to identify the function and characteristics of martyr-making of the PCK by analyzing the martyrs presented by the two institutions, which is the representative organisation of martyr-
designation of the PCK. Let us analyse the characteristics of the PCK’s martyr-making by a close reading of the recent works of the CAKC and KCMMA.

### 4.2. The Characters of Martyr-Making in the PCK

To identify the designated Protestant Church martyrs in Korea it is important to classify the number of martyrs by time period based on the work of the CAKC and KCMMA which have played a leading role in making Korean Protestant martyrs with the authority of the PCK since 1983.

First of all, the 226 martyrs in Lee Hyeong-Geun’s book, *Hanguk gyohoe sungyoja* (The Christian Martyrs in Korea) published by the KCMMA in 1992, were listed on the Table 1 according the time sequence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number (People)</th>
<th>Rate (%)</th>
<th>Cause of death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late 19th C -1905</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Chosun government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-1945 (Japanese Colonial Rule)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>Japanese colonial power, Communist power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-1953 (Before/during Korean War)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>Communist power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Periodical Classification, Lee Hyeong-Geun, *Hanguk gyohoe sungyoja*, 1992**

Then, 191 designated martyrs in *Hanguk gidokgyo sungyoja ginyeomgwan* (The Korean Martyrs’ Memorial) published by the CAKC in 2001, were listed in the Table 2 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number (People)</th>
<th>Rate (%)</th>
<th>Cause of death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late 19th C -1905</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Chosun government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-1945 (Japanese Colonial Rule)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Japanese colonial power/ Communist power/ Shipwreck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-1953 (Before/during Korean War)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>Communist power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1953</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Pseudo-religion conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Periodical Classification, CAKC ed., *Hanguk gidokgyo sungyoja ginyeomgwan*, 2001**
As seen in Table 1 and 2 the number of martyrs in the colonial period, 1905-1945, was smaller than that before and during the Korean War, 1945-1953. Though the colonial period, 40 years, is longer than the period of the before and during the Korean War, 9 years, the number of designated martyrs in each period is 31: 192 in Table 1, 18:170 in Table 2. How do we explain this phenomenon? In addition, as we have discussed above, among death-events occurred during the colonial period, why did the PCK designate most of the dead caused by Shinto shrine controversy as martyrs? Why were other making-martyr processes delayed or abandoned? On the basis of those data, let us analyse the characteristics of martyr-making tendencies of the PCK.

4.2.1. Apolitical Attitude

Leaving other characteristics of the PCK’s martyr-making work for a while, let us look first at the PCK’s apoliticism, to discern why so few of those deaths amid the Korean Conspiracy Case and the March First Independence Movement were designated as martyrs by the PCK while those deaths caused by Shinto shrine controversy were immediately named as PCK martyrs.

The PCK’s apolitical attitude towards secular politics was launched after the failure of the March First movement in which the PCK was actively involved in various types of national independence movement. This attitude was sustained until the Shinto shrine controversy in the 1930s, especially in 1938. Ostensibly the anti-Shinto shrine movement was perceived as a type of independence movement carried out by conservative devotional Christians. However, their anti-Shinto shrine worship stance was also based on their view that it challenged their Christian identity, forcing idolatry not ethnic national identity as Korean Christian: the secular political authority, the colonial power, did not agree. Indeed the PCK wished clearly to distinguish the sacred from the secular, yet in actuality there could be no way for such a dichotomy, especially while their nation was under colonial regime. Whether the PCK perceived it or not, martyrdom is the most religious ideology, yet at the same time it is the most political one. Yet the PCK still asserts their apolitical attitude even as that relates to interpreting a death as martyrdom. Min Kyoung-Bae says that though anti-Shinto shrine worship can be represented as a resistance movement based on national identity, it was actually *fidelity* to God to follow his
commandments rather than idolatry concluding: “martyrdom is *loyalty* towards God not a resistance act”\(^{102}\).

As we have seen in the case of the R. J. Thomas martyr-making process initiated by Oh Mun-Whan, in placing Thomas’ martyrdom on the sacred ground he tried to distinguish it from Thomas’s secular activities relating to the General Sherman affair. By doing so, the arrogant and aggressive attitude of Thomas and the crew of the General Sherman could be concealed, highlighting his devotional and pious activities of distributing Bibles. This apolitical attitude also contributed to defend the church from secular oppression, in particular Japanese colonialism and imperialism, proclaiming that martyr-making work is only a sacred matter not a secular one, and they did not directly mobilise any Christian into the independence movements. According to this reasoning, as we saw above in Tables 1 and 2, the PCK honoured those deaths during the colonial periods, 1905-1945, caused by the Shinto shrine conflict, while other deaths occurring amid the Conspiracy case and the March First movement were largely ignored. For the PCK, deaths caused by those two incidents concerned secular politics, for which the better term for the dead is national *patriot* rather than martyr, though the PCK clearly noted that deaths amid the two cases were caused by the Japanese colonial power’s religious persecutions, as we have seen in the previous chapter. Criticising those PCK’s death-selection based on their apolitical stance, some nationalist historians such as Lee Man-Yeol say:

> Can we understand the blood of those senior Christians who shed their blood amid the March First Independence Movement as ‘martyrs’ blood’ in its wide concept? Among them there might be many people who did not shed their blood for the movement if they were not Christian.\(^{103}\)

Furthermore, while on one hand, the PCK collected death-events which occurred during the Japanese colonial period focusing on the Shinto shrine controversy, on the other they selected death-events caused by the communist power

\(^{102}\) Min Kyoung-Bae, ‘Hangukgyohoewa Sungyoja’ (The PCK and martyr), *Sungyobo* 2 (21 September 1983), 6 (Emphasis added).

\(^{103}\) Lee Man-Yeol, ‘3.1 undonggwa Sungyoja’ (The March First Movement and Martyr), *Sungyobo* 3 (1 March 1984), 7.
in Manchuria and Siberia rather than those killed amid national independence movements. In Table 1 above, among 31 designated martyrs in the Japanese colonial regime, only three, Jeon Duk-Gee, Yu Gwan-Soon, and Son Sang-Yeol, killed due to their involvement in the national independence movements, were finally accepted as PCK martyrs in the 1980s while 4 killed by communist in Manchuria and Siberia were designated as martyrs immediately after their death in the 1930s. During the colonial period, communists were strong armed independence nationalists, firmly anti-Japanese and anti-imperialist. Therefore, for the colonial power, as the PCK’s designation of those killed by communists as martyrs were beneficial to their colonial policy, such immediate martyr-making operations were permitted, while other deaths caused by the involvement in the nationalist movements were prohibited.

By starting to make anticommmunist martyrs, the PCK’s apolitical attitude actually became political, yet until now the PCK insists on their apolitical attitude towards martyr-making process and secular politics. However, in practice, under the ideology of anticommmunism they are the most politicised group, enthusiastically making anticommmunist martyrs and proclaiming those designated anticommmunist martyrs were killed to secure South Korean society, thus merging the sacred and the secular. In this sense, whether recognised or not, the PCK faced a serious dilemma in its making of martyrs: on one hand they still maintain an apolitical stance for investigating death-events before 1945 while on the other they make their best effort to collect deaths killed by communists after the 1920s when communism was introduced to Korean Christians. Let us now move to the PCK’s anticommmunist in marking martyrs.

4.2.2. Propaganda for Anticommmunist Nationalism

As shown in Table 1 and 2, the number of martyrs during the Korean War is far bigger than that of other periods. In Table 1, it was clearly indicated that in the period of 1945-1953, all 192 martyrs designated were killed by communists. In addition, 4 of the martyrs during Japanese colonial period were killed by communists in Manchuria. Thus that research which was conducted by Lee on behalf of the KCMMA indicates that of 226 total designated martyrs 196 persons (86.7 %) were killed by communists, that is, the majority of the Korean Protestant martyrs are presented as anti-communist.
This phenomenon also appears in the analysis of 191 martyrs presented in Table 2 of *Hanguk gidokgyo sungyoja ginyeomgwan* (The Korean Martyrs’ Memorial). Of total 191 martyrs, 171 (89.5%), including 1 from the Japanese colonial period who was killed by communists in northern Manchuria, were killed amid the conflict with communists. The following Table 3 shows the cause of 191 designated martyrs’ death:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of death</th>
<th>Number (Person)</th>
<th>Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communist Conflict</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinto Shrine Conflict</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosun government Conflict</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>191</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Cause of Death, CAKC ed., *Hanguk Gidokgyo Sungyoja Ginyeomgwan*, 2001

As have seen in above tables, most PCK martyrs were those who were killed by communists before and during the Korean War. This suggests that PCK’s martyr-making processes were mainly focused on research of those deaths amid the conflict with communism. In other words, in these processes, other deaths caused by Japanese colonial power and massacres by the South Korean and US army before and during the Korean War were not seen as martyr-making objects or were intentionally excluded by the PCK.

Prior to the publication of those two books shown in the two tables, in 1983 in the first united memorial service for the PCK martyrs which was held by the CAKC at Saemunan Church in Seoul, Rev Lee Yeong-Chan reported that the 604 Protestants (80.4%) of 851 martyrs were killed by communist during the Korean War.\(^{104}\) If the North Korean army’s massacres of protestant Christians during the Korean War are included in the martyrs’ list, it is more obvious that those Christians killed by communists were the main object of the martyr-making operation of the Protestant Church in ‘South’ Korea. Moreover, the PCK’s anticommunist attitude of

---

\(^{104}\) *Kyunghyang Sinmun* (Kyunghyang Daily News), 16 November 1983.
making martyrs was clearly shown by Elder Jeon Taek-Boo’s insistence that the PCK urgently needed an “anticommunist theology”.105 In addition, Min Kyoung-Bae, a church historian, deliberately inserted the death of the missionary L. P. Henderson in northern Manchuria in 1932, who was actually killed by the Japanese troops, among the lists of those killed by communists to strengthen the anticommunist ideology.106 This suggests that the martyr-making work of the PCK is closely involved in the construction of the discourse of anticommunism which was internalized in the whole of South Korean society and consequently became the ruling ideology through and after the Korean War. This also suggests that the PCK’s martyr-making functioned as an effective tool not of propagating gospel but of making propaganda for the ideology of anticommunism which was deeply rooted in the PCK and secular society. From 1983 until now, the driving feature of making official martyrs in South Korea has been to make anticommunist martyrs. This phenomenon seems to be a result of an intended interpretation based on the optional collection of death-events under the ideology of state power, anticommunism. In other words, the martyr-making process of the PCK was playing its role in the \textit{propaganda for anticommunism}.

As Kang In-Cheol has indicated, the PCK’s martyr-making works functioned as the “reproduction-mechanism of anticommunism in the PCK”, focusing just on anticommunist martyrs.

As a result of the ‘combination’ of discourse of martyrdom and anticommunism and its ‘synergistic effect’…the conservative group of the PCK jumped on the political stage taking the active anticommunism as a weapon, thus it was recognized as the strongest advocate of the weakened right-wing force in Korea at the time the power of anticommunism was sharply reducing as a whole in Korean society which is rushing into democratization.108

Here is another voice from Yun Jeong-Ran:

\textit{--------------------------}

105 Jeon Taek-Boo, ‘Sungyohasin Bundeuleul Saenggakhamyeo’ (Thinking martyrs), \textit{Sungyobo} 3 (1 March 1984), 11; The CAKC ed., \textit{Hanguk Gidokgyo 100 Junyeon}, 258.
107 Kang, \textit{Hangukui Gaeshingyowa Bangongjuui}, 141.
The tower of martyrdom, martyrs’ monuments and the brochures, images and other things which are presenting martyrs’ story are continuously spreading the anticommunist ideology, the product of the Korean War, among Christians. Accordingly these make Christians look at the South and North Korean society through dichotomous thinking, which is divided into ‘angel’ or ‘evil’… This seems to have provided the common denominator on which the Christianity coexists with the South Korean regimes.109

It is clear that the martyr-making process of the PCK was utilised not in inviting the believers to the witness or declaration of gospel, but to anticommunism. The PCK played a vital role in maintaining and proclaiming anticommunism quite apart from the propagation and declaration of gospel.

Furthermore, the PCK’s anticommunist attitude to martyr-making puts them on the track of martyr-making discussed in the paradigm of martyr-making in chapter 2: that is, their martyr-making process only followed the order ‘intended interpretation → collecting memories → selecting death-events’. In other words, based on anticommunism, they only collected anticomunist memories, and selected deaths caused by communist suppressions, serving the anticomunist narratives in South Korean society. Based on the socio-political intention to reconstruct or reinforce the anticommunism, especially during the Korean War, if a person was killed by communist troops and was then identified as Christian, he was immediately designated as a PCK martyr whatever the causes of death, to the extent of ‘modifying’ the cause of death as Min did for L. H. Henderson. This ignores the complementary understanding of martyrdom as an historical event. As a result, other death-events caused by Japanese colonial power, in particular the March First movement and the Conspiracy case, were irrelevant to the PCK’s martyr-making process, further investigations of death-events in history being delayed or abandoned. This tendency is linked to other characteristics of martyr-making of the PCK such as elitism and competitive martyr-making between churches.

4.2.3. Elitism

When the 191 martyrs, whose noble portraits were exhibited in the Korean Martyrs Memorial by the CAKC, were classified according to their jobs, it was clear that there were 114 ministers, 5 Salvation Army officers, 19 evangelists, 28 elders, 1 exhorter, 15 deacons, 4 ‘youngru’s, church leaders filling in for residential ordained ministers who were absent in the early periods of the PCK, 1 assistant of foreign missionaries, and 4 lay adherents. If those are classified into the three categories of Church workers (minister, Salvation Army officer and evangelist), person in charge (elder, exhorter and deacon), lay believer and others (leader and assistant), the numbers were 138 (72.3%), 44 (23%), 4 (2.1%) and 5 (2.6%) respectively. If the 4 people in ‘others’ category are regarded as leaders of the PCK, the so-called elite martyrs were 142 out of total 191 martyrs, or 74.3 per cent. On the other hand, only 2.1 per cent were lay believers.

In the same method the 226 martyrs presented by the KCMMA could be classified, and the result is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duty</th>
<th>Number (People)</th>
<th>Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Worker</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person in charge</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay believer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Duty, Lee Hyeong-Geun, *Hanguk gyohoe sungyosa*, 1992

Likewise, the rate of Church workers is 74.5 per cent or 175 of 226 martyrs. If the 3 leaders are included in the Church Worker category the number is 178, the number of lay believer being only 5 or 2.2 per cent.

Prior to these data, in the ‘list of Protestant Church martyrs and kidnapped to North Korea during the Korean War’ published in 1957 by NCCK, 212 martyrs’ names were presented. Among them 210 martyrs were Church workers plus two who
were the wives of Salvation Army officers. In addition, according to Jeong Jin-Seok, who recently investigated the number of protestant Christians killed during the Korean War, 139 Christians martyrs of 146 were Church workers and persons in charge.

Starting in 1983, the main object of making official martyrs in the PCK was focused on elites, the Church workers. Of course, it may be admitted that to find written records about lay believers was a difficult task. Nevertheless it may be assumed that the investigation on the historical reality of their deaths and the ‘achievement survey’ for church workers was easy and convenient. The fact that most of the members of the fact-finding committee themselves were Church workers seems to contribute to the formation of the discourse of martyrdom in elitism.

It seems that it is necessary to make efforts to collect the historical materials for the death-events more faithfully. Though the materials of death-events in the late Chosun dynasty or during the Japanese colonial periods must now depend only on written documents because there are almost no witnesses alive, for the death of Christians during the Korean War, there are some eye-witnesses still alive, such as survivors and bereaved family members, and it is thus an urgent task to secure their testimony which, though depending on their own memory, can be used as an important primary source to investigate the historical reality of the death-event, which is the core element of martyrdom.

4.2.4. Competition

Fourthly, competitive martyr-making between the Catholic Church in Korea (CCK), the PCK and denominations of the PCK can be a characteristic of the PCK martyr-making process. Kang In-Cheol described this tendency of martyr-making of

---


112 Elitism also appears in the CCK’s martyr or saint-making processes. For instance, those 103 canonised martyr-saints are mainly church workers, bishop, priest, catechist, or assister of them, whose social status are ‘Yangban’ the first class in Chosun society. Given this, elitism in martyr-making has indeed both ecclesiastical and social versions. For the 103 saints of the CCK, see, Kim, *Lives of 103 Martyrs Saints*, 1984.
the PCK as a “dynamics of double competition”, externally between the PCK and the CCK, and internally among the Protestant denominations. Externally, compared to the CCK, the fact that the first martyr-making process of the PCK took place in 1926, and full-scale martyr-making work was conducted by the organization of the CAKC in 1983 aiming at the 100th anniversary of the PCK in 1984, suggests that the PCK’s martyr-making was stimulated by the CCK’s beatification of 79 martyrs in 1925 and the canonization of 123 martyrs in 1984 when Pope John Paul II visited Korea to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the CCK. It would be difficult for Protestant Christians in Korea to venerate CCK’s martyr saints, and vice versa. Internally this competitive martyr-making among the protestant denominations seems to use the martyr, who should be the common property of the Church, to approve and extol their particular orthodoxy. For example, one of the representative martyrs, Rev Son Yang-Won, a minister of the Presbyterian Church of Korea (PCoK), killed by communist troops during the Korean War, is claimed by some scholars from Kosin Presbyterian Church in Korea (KPCK) on the grounds that as he had inaugurated and worked as a manager in 1948 for Goryeo sinhakgyo (Korea seminary), he is a martyr of the KPCK as well. The Korea Seminary was founded in 1948 by anti-Shinto shrine worshipers such as Han Sang-Dong, Ju Nam-Seon, etc separating from the PCoK which had accepted Shinto shrine worship in 1938: Kosin church (KPCK) had its first General Assembly in 1952, and as late-starters, they had no martyrs but needed some to obtain authority based on the legacy of martyrdom. Furthermore, recently two devout young Korean Christians, Rev Bae Hyung-Kyu and Shim Seong-Min, were killed by Afghanistan Taliban in 2007 during their short-term mission trip, sent by a local church of the KPCK and designated as their martyrs in September 2012. Yet the PCOK had already claimed

113 Kang, *Hanguk Gaeshingyowa Bongongjuui*, 182.
Rev Bae as a PCOK martyr in 2010 because he was ordained by them, his fellow Shim Seong-Min, a KPCK member, did not gain the title martyr until so designated by the KPCK in 2012. Competing with the KPCK, the PCOK built Rev Bae’s memorial monument on 5 September 2012 in Jeju Island, his hometown.

The report, *Witness unto Death*, which was composed by the Commission on Faith and Order of World Council of Churches (WCC) in Bangalore in 1978, declares that “in the martyrs the Church discerns Christ himself, the very heart of its faith, beyond all interpretations and divisions”. The martyrs should be “the common property of all Christians”, yet it is doubtful that the CCK, PCK, and various Presbyterian denominations wish to share out their martyrs.

### 4.2.5. Violence

Finally, we must discuss the *violence* operating in the martyr-making process, in which devout Christians were driven to death. The current discourse of martyrdom of the PCK is granting legitimacy to those churches which drove young devout Christians such as Rev. Bae Hyung-Kyu and Shim Seong-Min into the place of death.

“There should be 3,000 Christians more like Rev Bae!” That is the part of the sermon at Bundang Saemmul Church on 12 August 2007 preached by Rev Park Eun-Jo, who sent Rev Bae and his team to Afghanistan. It seems that he is instituting an internalisation of the discourse of martyrdom that though believers are intentionally throwing themselves into the place of death and facing death, it will be a glorified death because it is ‘martyrdom’. Shin Yong-Guk clearly indicates the violent figure of the discourse of martyrdom in the PCK, saying that “I noticed that

---

119 Deahan Yesugyo Jangnohoe Chonghoe (General Assembly of Presbyterian Church in Korea), *Daehan Yesugyojangnohoe chonghoe je95hoe hoerok* (The Records of 95th General Assembly of Presbyterian Church of Korea), 2010, 54.
121 WCC, *Sharing in One Hope*, 200.
122 WCC, *Sharing in One Hope*, 200.
124 This is not dissimilar to the way in the Iran-Iraq war in which young men on both sides were driven to fight sure in the knowledge that they would become martyrs merely by dying.
this is the very intention of abusing Rev Bae’s death in some church groups to obtain later legitimacy and power for their mission works, thus hiding their faults.” 125

In fact, the violent figure in the martyr-making work can be examined through the Crusades during the 11th-13th centuries and the Nazi propaganda of creating martyrs during World War II. 126 Likewise, as we have seen in this chapter, 127 during the Korean War, the PCK mobilised young Christians and sent them into the battle field as the ‘Christian anticommmunist Crusade’ regarding the war as the ‘holy war’. Therefore, the dead amid the war immediately named as martyrs. 128

However, in the recent context of the PCK this violence is a side effect of competitive martyr-making in which church leaders are trying to make their own martyrs in order to gain authority and achieve predetermined purposes. The expression ‘preparing for martyrdom…’ or ‘with or by the spirit of martyrdom…’ became a popular word both in the PCK and in secular society when a group or person needed to attain a specific goal. 129 This is an expression that shows the equation, ‘martyrdom = death’, and it may have been driven from the understanding of the concept of martyrdom which focuses only on the death itself excluding the factor of ‘witness to gospel’.

As martyrdom is inherently involved with contesting powers, the group which claims their martyrs always reproduces or remembers their enemies who killed martyrs. In this sense, martyr-making work is similar to or part of the work of enemy-making. Especially in the Korean political situation which is still divided between South and North physically and ideologically through the Korean War, the vestiges of the severe Japanese colonial regime, the pro-Japanese and the communists are usually seen as common enemies. At some points, these enmities are presented and represented as real violence. Deaths amid these conflicts are thus easily named as martyrdom. Indeed the vicious circle of making martyrs and enemies keeps repeating both in actual and in reading history. Therefore, the PCK especially needs to bear in mind the fact that though the martyr’s story is involved in the violent

125 Seoul Sinmun (Seoul Daily), 26 October 2007.
126 See, Weiner and Weiner, Martyr’s Conviction, 87-127.
127 See, section 4.1.3.
129 For example, see, Na Seung-Bin, ‘Sungyo Jeongsineposi Anboneun epoda’ (No National Security Without the Spirit of Martyrdom), Hanguknondan (Korea Forum) 206 (December 2006), 170-3.
death, the purpose of its writing is to encourage the readers “to quotidian imitation of the martyrs, not in dying a Christ-like death but in living a Christ-like life”. 130

Conclusion

In this chapter we have examined the second act of the PCK’s martyr-making paradigm: memory-collection and intended interpretation about the death-events which occurred from 1866, the late Chosun dynasty to 1953, the end of Korean War.

The first martyr-making work of the PCK was launched in 1926 by Oh Mun-Whan collecting memories and interpreting the death of R. J. Thomas. By 1926, Thomas was named as the ‘first Protestant martyr’ of the PCK. However, from the 1980s onwards, Thomas’ death was reinterpreted by nationalist historians such as Lee Man-Yeol in which his ‘the first Protestant martyr’ status was deferred. In the process we could discern that two interpreting powers were contested: Oh’s versus Lee’s part (Power II vs II’ in Diagram 4 and 5).

Though there were sporadic and limited martyr-making processes after 1926 conducted by local churches or some denominations of the PCK for death-events occurring during the Japanese colonial period and before and during the Korean War, the PCK’s martyr-making works started in earnest from 1983 onwards preparing the centennial ceremony of mission in Korea, for which CAKC and KCMMA were the leading organisations. In the process, PCK leaders controlled the social memories about deaths in specific historical contexts to maintain their socio-political views, placing and displacing some deaths to commemorate or deliberately exclude others. However, the martyr-making works operated to expose the PCK leaders’ tendencies: pseudo-apolitical attitude, anticommunist nationalism, elitism, competitive manner, and even provoking violence. For them, or at least for some, martyrdom is an effective propaganda weapon to achieve their social, political, or religious purpose predetermined on the basis of their contextual position and power.

Yet, does this all represent a prototype meaning and function of martyrdom? Though we clearly perceive that martyrdom is the most political ideology, nonetheless, it is still the strongest religious legacy to proclaim ‘good news’ to all

people through death. At least before the church was sponsored by the state power, as a minority, as a ‘lamb’ not lion, the early Christians’ interpretation of their fellows’ death amid severe persecutions was focused on imitating Jesus Christ who proclaimed and achieved God’s will through death. Taking this sense, let us move to a theology of martyrdom examining the pre-Constantine Christian martyrdom to overcome or at least challenge the PCK’s martyr-making tendencies.
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Introduction

Martyrdom is truly one of the important legacies of the Christian tradition. Initially the idea of martyrdom served to confess or proclaim Christians’ steadfast faith imitating Christ rather than apostatising from the belief in Christ amid violent persecutions. It was indeed the act of ‘dying for God’. Yet at the same time, when Christianity was secured by state power after Constantine’s conversion (or tolerance) in 313, the idea of martyrdom was used to empower the state-sponsored ecclesiastical authorities approving religious coercion of those who were outside orthodox Christianity. It became an act of ‘killing for God’. Since then, Christians have been dying for God to confirm their orthodoxy as well as killing others for God. This metamorphosis of the idea is verified through church history, especially in the Crusade, Reformation, and the nineteenth century’s imperialist mission enterprises.

Regarding, however, the event of Jesus’ crucifixion in which he accepted his death in accordance with God’s will without any resistance, it may be fair to say that
to use physical violence to kill someone for God is an obvious distortion of the idea of Christian martyrdom. In the early Christians’ martyr-making process in the pre-Constantine period, though martyrs were depicted as “the foot soldiers of God” in an eschatological cosmic war armed with the weapons of “faithfulness and endurance” expecting their participation in ultimate Christ’s victory, they practised no physical violence against their opponents. Rather they accepted the death they faced with “extraordinary patience” in “joy, peace, harmony, and love”. For them, the “strange victory” of Jesus on the cross in which violence was sealed or halted in his voluntary death proclaiming forgiveness for those who “condemned, executed, betrayed or deserted him” gave a model which martyrs should imitate as “the prototypical martyrdom”. The interpretation of the early Christians within the first three centuries for their fellows’ death caused by the persecution was, therefore, focused on imitating Jesus who proclaimed and achieved God’s will through death. Though according to the perceptions of Jesus the meaning of martyrdom can be narrow or broad, his death was central to their interpretation. In this sense, reading Jesus is essential to understand pre-Constantine martyr accounts.

Though martyrdom is, by nature, a product of commemorative interpretation, in the present context based on the social or cultural memory about the particular death which was caused by witnessing to faith, the discourse of martyrdom in the pre-Constantine period seems, at least, to be faithful to the function of witness to the faith and declaration of gospel. If we agree with the above statements, Oliver O’Donovan’s indication that martyrdom is “not a strategy for doing anything, but a testimony to God’s faithfulness when there is nothing left to do” is fair.

Compared to this, the martyr-making work of the PCK reveals their problematic tendencies, in that they appear to be collecting the memories of death through the frame of a strongly ideological interpretation, which is then exaggerated and embellished regardless of the historical reality. In this process, as we have seen

---

1 Middleton, Radical Martyrdom, 79-93 (Citation in 87).
2 The Martyrdom of Saints Carpus, Pupylus, and Agathonicē 36. Quoted from Musurillo, ACM, 27.
3 The Martyrs of Lyons 2.7-8. Quoted from Musurillo, ACM, 85.
in the previous chapter, the PCK utilised the idea of martyrdom *strategically* as an effective tool not so much of propagating faith but of maintaining their socio-political and religious authority and position, even provoking violence to drive devout Christians into the place of death.

Given this, and in order to criticise those problematic tendencies of the martyr-making process of the PCK, this chapter will first seek to derive a theology of martyrdom from the pre-Constantine period of martyr accounts in which martyrs were presented clearly as those who died for God without any use of physical violence, imitating Jesus’ death on the cross. Then, though there is a complex contest between ideological narratives on making martyrs, the Rev Son Yang-Won’s life and death and its social memories and interpretations will be introduced as a case study to set against the theology investigated from the early Christian martyr accounts. In so doing, I accept that there are problems with some of the material on Rev Son in that much is strongly hagiographic, although we do have many of his own sermons. In a sense, of course, this problem reflects that present in assessing early Christian writings, themselves a mixture of hagiography, history and sermons. Reconstructing Rev Son’s death-event on the basis of diverse memories about him, I will criticise the PCK’s martyr-making tendencies by placing and displacing Rev Son’s martyrdom in accordance with the PCK’s predetermined intentions in the present context.

5.1. A Theology of Martyrdom: Imitation of Christ

As a prototype, in early Christian community, martyrs were presented as the closest imitators of Christ (μιμέταις τοῦ Κυρίου) and regarded as the model that the community should follow. This imitation of Christ through “sharing in Christ’s suffering”⁶ was a fundamental part of early Christian identity.

For we worship this one, who is the Son of God, but the martyrs we love as disciples and *imitators of the Lord*, as they deserve, on account of their matchless devotion to their own King and Teacher. May we also become their partners and fellow disciples!⁷

---

Ignatius of Antioch also highlights this mimetic aspect of martyrdom in his epistle to Romans, “It is better for me to die for Jesus Christ than to rule over the ends of the earth. Him I seek, who died on our behalf; him I long for, who rose again for our sake...allow me to be an imitator of the suffering of my God”. He thought that through his martyrdom, the imitation of Jesus’ death, he would be a true disciple who can “reach God” and “reach Jesus Christ”. The early Christians held that the imitation of the suffering Christ is “the law of the martyr”. As Larry W. Hurtado pointed out, “martyrdom as devotion to Jesus” and “death for Jesus as a “testimony” (martyria)” marks the early Christian’s “treatment of death for one’s faith”.

Then, what exactly was it in Christ that martyrs were to imitate? The Greek idea of imitation means the imitation of the master’s specific actions. R. E. O. White said, “The imitation of Christ is, in truth, the nearest principle in Christianity to a moral absolute” and it remains “the heart of the Christian ethic”. Thus what martyrs as ‘disciples and imitators’ were to emulate of Christ was to follow Christ’s words and deeds when they came to face oppression.

First century Christians interpreted Jesus’ death as the sacrifice for others to redeem them, though he himself was the manifestly innocent (Mt. 20.28, Mk. 10:45, Rom. 8.32, 1 Cor. 15.3, 1 Tim. 2.6), and to achieve reconciliation between God and human beings and among human beings who are in conflict (2 Cor. 5.11-21, Eph. 2.14-16, 1 Cor. 12.24-26). Jesus’ mission was summed up as giving liberation for those who were under pressure (Lk. 4.18-19, Isa. 61.1-3). These are Jesus’ features

---

11 Hurtado, Lord Jesus Christ, 623.
that martyrs were imitating, although they were not all seen at the time of his death, for there was a lag.

Here, it is worth noting that those interpretations about Jesus’ life and violent death were initiated and settled down in Christian communities during the persecution before Constantine’s conversion. Whether the persecution took place through state authorities or public antagonism, under oppression pre-Constantine Christians did not dream of ‘earthly revenge’ against their persecutors. Rather they clearly proclaimed the spirituality of the Cross, that is, his death for others (atonement), reconciliation, and liberation. The oppressed Christian’s weapon for overcoming rigorous persecutions is not the sword against others but death for others just as Jesus clearly showed his disciples and followers by his public life and the crucifixion. This paradox of life and death in Christian tradition, that death in Christ is the gate of eternal life, was the core element of their interpretation of Jesus’ death and life, and this clearly came true and was proclaimed by his resurrection.

always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be made visible in our bodies. For while we live, we are always being given up to death for Jesus’ sake, so that the life of Jesus may be visible in our mortal fresh. So death is at work in us, but life in you.  

5.1.1. Martyrdom as Dying for Others and for their liberation

By interpreting Jesus’ death as redemptive sacrifice for others, Christian martyrs imitated the figure of Christ. The author of the Martyrdom of Polycarp pointed out that the death of “blessed Polycarp”, caused directly by confessing Christ and declaring himself as a Christian in public, was the “mark of true and steadfast love” for others “in accordance with the Gospel” in imitating Jesus.

For he [Polycarp] waited to be betrayed, just as the Lord did, in order that we too might be imitators of him, looking not only to out interests but to our


15 The Martyrdom of St Polycarp 1.1.
neighbours’ interests as well. For it is the mark of true and steadfast love to desire that not only oneself be saved but all the brothers and sisters as well.16

By the exemplary martyr’s death, others would be able to save their life. Polycarp “put an end to the persecution” by his martyrdom,17 and Vettius Epagathus in Lyons in Gaul was martyred “in defence of his fellow Christians” that they would be “innocent of atheism or impiety”.18 In the scene of Jesus’ arrest we can hear Jesus’ request to Roman soldiers to let others go free (Jn 18.8). Paul also pointed out Jesus’ death for others as paradigmatic, using the ‘Adam-Christ’ typology in Romans 5:18. A martyr’s exemplary death is, therefore, not simply the end of earthly life but becomes the seed of others’ new life in Christ. In this sense a martyr’s death is life for others, just as Jesus’ death redeemed others and brought them into new life in God. This also suggests that Jesus’ death on the cross in accordance with God’s will mean the participation in the manifestation of God’s love for his people though they were in an ungodly status (Rom 5.8). Therefore, a martyr’s death imitating Jesus’ death on the cross may be an instrument of sealing or halting persecution and protecting others who were under any sort of oppression.

We are writing to you, brothers and sisters, an account of those who were martyred, especially the blessed Polycarp, who put an end to the persecution as though he were wetting his seal upon it by his martyrdom.19

On the basis of this interpretation, Archbishop Oscar Romero indicated that his martyrdom marked life through death for the people of El Salvador not just for himself desiring to be a hero or saint of the Church:

As shepherd, I am obliged by divine mandate to give my life for those I love – for all Salvadorans, even for those who may be going to kill me. If the threats are carried out, from this moment I offer my blood to God for the redemption and the resurrection of El Salvador. Martyrdom is a grace of God that I do not

17 The Martyrdom of St Polycarp 1.1. Quoted from Musurillo, ACM, 3.
18 The Martyrs of Lyons 1.10. Quoted from Musurillo, ACM, 65.
believe I deserve. But if God accept the sacrifice of my life, let my blood be a seed of freedom and the sign that hope will soon be reality. *Let my death, if it is accepted by God, be for the people’s liberation* and as a witness of hope in the future.\(^{20}\)

#### 5.1.2. Martyrdom as Dying For Reconciliation

Jesus’ voluntary acceptance of death on the Cross was interpreted by Paul as God’s reconciliation between God and human beings who were in an ungodly status, and among human beings who are in conflict or under oppression, and thus imitating him means seeking reconciliation between God and world, and among people.

All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and has given us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting the message of reconciliation to us. So we are *ambassadors* for Christ, since God is making his appeal through us; we entreat you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God.\(^{21}\)

But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us. he has abolished the law with its commandments and ordinances, so that he might create in himself one new humanity in place of the two, thus making peace, and might reconcile both groups to God in one body *through the cross*, thus *putting to death that hostility through it*.\(^{22}\)

A martyr’s peaceful acceptance of violent death was through imitating Jesus’ peacefully dying on the Cross rather than calling on his Father’s help by calling up “more than twelve legions of angels” (Mt. 26.53), and pleading with the Father for forgiveness of his persecutor (Lk. 23.34) rather than revenge. No martyrs cursed their oppressor, but calmly accepted their fate, thanking God for giving them the holy opportunity of martyrdom. Sometimes, this martyr’s voluntary acceptance of death


\(^{21}\) 2 Cor. 5.18-20. Quoted from *NRSV* (Emphasis added).

\(^{22}\) Eph. 2.13-16. Quoted from *NRSV* (Emphasis added).
without any violent resistance so impacted on the crowd that some of them converted into the martyr’s faith.

Here, we have to listen to Ignatius’s address to the Ephesians about proper response against maltreatment from others:

Bearing imitators of God, once you took on new life through the blood of God you completed perfectly the task so natural to you…Pray continually for the rest of humankind as well, that they may find God, for there in them hope for repentance. Therefore allow them to be instructed by you, at least by your deeds. In response to their anger, be gentle; in response to their boasts, be humble; in response to their slander, offer prayers; in response to their errors, be steadfast in the faith; in response to their cruelty, be civilized; do not be eager to imitate them. Let us show by our forbearance that we are their brothers and sisters, and let us be eager to be imitators of the Lord.\(^\text{23}\)

In other words, violent response against opponents evokes more violence. In accepting death without violent resistance by imitating Jesus on the cross, martyrs halted violence through the touchstone of reconciliation.

On the basis of the theology constructed by Christians in the pre-Constantine period, though the discourse of martyrdom is defined as the product of the intended interpretation of a specific group in a specific period collecting the memories of the specific Christian’s death, one agreed base-line is that their crucial intention in submitting to death was ‘the faith-confession and gospel-proclamation’ participating in the final triumph of Christ “in accord with the gospel”:

We are writing to you, brothers and sisters, an account of those who were martyred, especially the blessed Polycarp, who put an end to the persecution as though he were wetting his seal upon it by his martyrdom. For nearly all the preceding events happened in order that the Lord might show us once again a martyrdom that is \textit{in accord with the gospel} (κατά τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μαρτυρίουν). For he waited to be betrayed, just as the Lord did, in order that we too might be imitators of him, looking not only to our interests but to our neighbours’ interests as well. For it is the mark of true and steadfast love to desire that not only oneself be saved but all the brothers and sisters as well. Blessed and noble, therefore, are all the martyrdoms that have taken place \textit{in accordance with the will of God} (for we must reverently assign to God the power over all things).

For who could fail to admire their nobility and patient endurance and loyalty to the Master?  

Taking the early period as the foundation for a proposed theology of martyrdom, and bearing in mind the two somewhat controversial cases discussed in the previous chapter, let us now move to the Korean context, to see how such a theology of martyrdom could be supported by the case of Rev Son Yang-Won.

5.2. Martyr-Making of Rev Son Yang-Won

As we have investigated in previous chapters, it is clear that the PCK tried to gain social power both in the secular and sacred realms by placing martyrdom in the context of the reproduction of anticommmunist nationalism in South Korean society from the 1930s onwards, and thereby exposing their elitism, competitive attitude vis-à-vis Roman Catholics, and violence-provocation. For the PCK, making martyrs is indeed a proper device for labelling communists and pro-Japanese bands as common enemies or persecutors in the context of the PCK, and the Rev Son’s case cannot be excepted from this trend of PCK’s martyr-making process.

The PCK emphasises Son’s life as a strong nationalist, deliberately presenting his imprisonment as being caused by the Shinto controversy during the Japanese colonial regime and representing him as an anticommmunist, stressing that he was killed by a communist army amid the Korean War. Even the diverse denominations within the PCK conflict with each other to attribute his public reputation to their particular group. However, in distinguishing Rev Son’s life and death from those social acts of the PCK, I will focus on his individual acts in a faithful Christian life following Jesus words thorough as an act of imitation of Christ, placing his martyrdom on the foundation of Christian radical virtue of love, forgiveness, and reconciliation rather than on the ruling ideologies of South Korean society which appear to advantage the PCK as a bastion of Korean society. I shall then propose this account as the basis of a theology of martyrdom for the PCK.

---

5.2.1. A Brief History of Rev Son Yang-Won’s Life

Known as “the atomic bomb of love”, Rev Son Yang-Won (1902-1950) is one of the representative designated martyrs in the PCK. His life spanned the ordeal of Korean history from the Japanese colonial regime to the Korean War. In remembering Rev Son Yang-Won, the PCK, therefore, recalls at least three events of his life. First, the five-year-imprisonment (September 1940 – August 1945) caused by his rejection of national Shinto rites during the late Japanese colonial period. Second, the death of his two sons, Dong-In and Dong-Shin, killed by one of Dong-In’s classmates tinged with communism and Son’s adoption of the killer amid the Yeosun (Yeosu-Sooncheon) revolt in 1948. Third, his death at the hands of the communist army in September 1950 amid the Korean War. His love for the lepers at Aeyangwon is said to have been the basis of his whole life.

Cha Jong-Soon, church historian, represents these events of his life and death as an “expression of Christian love and faithfulness”. He points out that Rev Son’s love for Christ and his faithful practice for Christ made him remembered as a ‘saint of love’ and ‘martyr of love’. Indeed, it is fair to say that Rev Son’s life and death was a thorough imitation of Christ in its practice. His life could be represented as a martyrological exemplar, full of self-sacrificial love, forgiveness, and reconciliation for others and martyred after all. For him, the title of martyr is evaluates his life of ultimate love for the killer of his two sons and the lepers he served for his life. Martyrdom is, therefore, a consistent result of and end to his life through his practice of Christian faith not just because communists killed him during the Korean War.

Lim Hee-Guk, church historian, evaluates his martyrdom as a martyr in life who was also a martyr in death. As Craig J. Slane highlighted, a martyr’s death construes his or her life and that life reckons with that death. Therefore, studies on Rev Son’s martyrdom should take a holistic approach, interpreting his death against the whole

---

25 After Ahn Yong-Jun, a colleague of Rev Son, wrote Rev Son’s story about his adoption of the communist killer of his two sons, Rev Son Yang-Won immediately gained such reputation from the public. “The Atomic Bomb of Love” is the title of Ahn’s book published in 1949.

26 See, section 3.2.3.


29 Slane, Bonhoeffer as Martyr, 39.
process of his life. Taking the view, let us briefly investigate Rev Son’s life and reconstruct his death-event from arrest to death.

Rev Son Yang-Won’s life

Born in 1902 in Chilwon, Gyueongnam Province of southern Korea, Rev Son Yang-Won became a Christian, following his father Son Jong-II who accepted the Christian faith in 1908. He was baptised in 1917 by Rev Frederick John Macrae (Maeng Ho-Eun in Korean), missionary from the Presbyterian Church of Australia (now the Uniting Church in Australia). Through the help of Rev Macrae, Son Yang-Won graduated from Chilwon Public Primary School in 1919 though under some difficulties caused by his refusal to bow to the East for the Japanese Emperor commanded in all public schools in Korea by the Japanese colonial government.  

Immediately after graduation he entered Seoul Jungdon Secondary School. However, he was expelled due to his father’s arrest and imprisonment for a year on a charge of leading the nationwide March First Independence Movement in Chilwon in 1919. After his father was released from prison Son Yang-Won went to Japan to study at Sugamo Secondary School in Tokyo in 1921. He came back to home in 1923 and married Jeong Yang-Soon. In 1924 he went to Japan again but returned in October of that year, being elected as a deacon of Chilwon church. From 1925 onwards, he started his pastoral life in earnest by entering Gyeongnam Bible School which was established and run by Gyeongnam Presbytery and the Australian Presbyterian Mission Board.  

In 1926 he was assigned to Sangaewon Church in Gammandong, Pusan which was located within a leprosy colony. Working there as an evangelist, assisting Rev Noble Mackenzie, an Australian missionary, Son seemed to cultivate his pastoral interest in and love for lepers. Before he obtained a place at the Pyongyang Theological Seminary in April 1935 as an itinerant evangelist,

---


31 Lee Hyeon-Chan, Chilwon Gyohoe Baekyeonsa (A History of Chilwon Church for One Hundred Year), Chilwon: Chilwon Church, 2009, 218.

he preached at churches that had no assigned ministers and also planted churches where the gospel did not reach within Pusan region. For instance, in 1928 he went to 16 churches to preach to the congregations.

After graduation from Pyongyang Theological Seminary in March 1938 he was assigned as an itinerant evangelist of the Inspection Board of the region of Pusan in Gyeongnam Presbytery. During the missions for the churches in Pusan, Kimhae, Yangsan, Haman etc, he frequently preached to the congregations, asking them not to take part in the Shinto shrine worship as idolatry although all Presbyteries in the Presbyterian Church of Korea to which Son belonged was denominationally and officially subordinated to the Japanese Government General of Korea in 1938. Accordingly the Church authority demanded Christians pay respects at the Shrine as a patriotic act. This Shinto shrine controversy caused a conflict between Son, a candidate of minister from Gyeongnam Presbytery, and the authority of the Presbytery. In consequence, he was discharged from his position of itinerant evangelist in 1939, as conflict which delayed his ordination till 1946. However, though he was not an ordained minister, in August 1939 he was assigned to the church within Aeyangwon, a leprosy colony in Yeosu, and Gugok church established for lepers’ families and staffs in Aeyangwon as a senior minister in Suncheon Presbytery. At that time, however, Aeyangwon was managed by two

34 Son Yang-Won, Sermon Note, Unpublished handwritings, 1928.
35 1st Protocol of Examination’ in Lee, Son Yang-Won, 49-50.
37 Aeyangwon, the Leprosy Colony (Leper Home) in Yeosu was initiated in 1909 in Gwangju by treating a female Korean leper brought by Dr Wylie H. Forsythe in Mokpo Mission Hospital of the Southern Presbyterian Church of America (SPCA) to Dr Robert M. Wilson in Gwangju Mission Hospital, who was a medical missionary from the SPCA. Dr Wilson built a leper home in Gwangju in 1912 by the financial supports from the Southern Presbyterian Mission (SPM) in Korea and the Mission to Lepers in India and the East. The Home moved completely to Yeosu in 1929 and was named Aeyangwon. For more detailed and lengthy information about the work for lepers in the SPM and Aeyangwon, see, Mrs. C. C. Owen, ‘The Leper and the Good Samaritan’, The Missionary 8 (August 1909), 408-9; R. M. Wilson, ‘Medical work in Kwangju’, Korea Mission Field (KMF) 8:1 (January 1912), 15-7; Idem, ‘Medical Report of Kwangju Station’, KMF 8:10 (October 1912), 290-4; Cha, Aeyangwongwa, 53-170; Aeyangwon 100nyeonsa ganhaengwiwonhoe (Publishing Committee of the History of 100-year-Aeyangwon), Gureum gidung, Bul gidung: Seomgimui dongsan, Aeyangwon 100nyeon (Pillar of Cloud, Pillar of Fire: Mound of Service, 100-year-Aeyangwon), Seoul: Bookin, 2009, 12-119.
38 2nd Protocol of Examination for Omura (Son) Yang-Won (20 December 1940)’ in Lee, Son Yang-Won, 51.
American Southern Presbyterian missionaries, James K. Unger and Robert M. Wilson, who had seceded from the Suncheon Presbytery in 1938 due to that Presbytery’s agreement on Shinto shrine worship, (they were also opposed to Gyeongnam Presbytery for which Son had worked) for they were entirely opposed to Shrine worship.\textsuperscript{39} Since then, Aeyangwon (the church, hospital, and lepers’ home) separated from the Presbytery\textsuperscript{40} until their relationship was restored after Korea’s liberation from Japan in 1945. Son’s assignment to the Church was carried out under conformity with the missionaries’ principle of faith on the Shinto shrine issue.\textsuperscript{41} His refusal to follow Shinto rites consequently led to his imprisonment for five years from 25 September 1940, a year after his ministry at Aeyangwon Church began, until Korea’s liberation in August 1945.

The socio-political situation of post-liberation Korea was not stable due to the immediate occupation of the nation by two world powers, the United States of America in South and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in North. This division caused a great tension between rightists and leftists in the society and was a fundamental cause of the Korean War in 1950. Amid that situation the Yeo-Sun Revolt, triggered by the 14\textsuperscript{th} infantry regiment of South Korea, took place in Yeosu and Suncheon city in 1948,\textsuperscript{42} during which Rev Son’s two sons, Dong-In and Dong-Shin, were killed by a unit of leftists. During his two sons’ funeral, he amazed those attending by offering nine thanks to God for his two sons’ deaths, though he and his family were filled with deep grief to have lost them.\textsuperscript{43} On that same day, Rev Son decided to practice God’s love by saving the killer from troops sent to quell the

\textsuperscript{39} Suncheon Presbytery, ‘Chosun Yesugyo Jangnohoe Suncheon Nohoe Je 22 Hoe Hoerok’ (Minutes of 22\textsuperscript{nd} Meeting of Suncheon Presbytery in the Presbyterian Church of Korea) (25 April 1938) in \textit{Suncheon nohoe hoeuirok} (Minutes of Suncheon Presbytery) I, Suncheon: Suheon muhwainswaesa, 1986, 271.

\textsuperscript{40} Protocol of Examination’, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1\textsuperscript{st} to the Prosecutor (24 May 1941), ‘Protocol of the witness Examination’: Kim Gyeong-Ho (1 February 1941), Shin Gil-Su (28 February 1941), Heo Ok (5 March 1941) in Lee, \textit{Son Yang-Won}, 51, 136, 69, 78, 93 (Citation in order).


\textsuperscript{42} For the ‘Yeo-Sun Revolt’, see, section 3.2.3.

Revolt, and finally adopted him as his first son. Further tragedy occurred after two years, for on 13th September 1950, soon after the outbreak of the Korean War, he was captured by communists who killed him two weeks later.

5.2.2. Reconstruct of Rev Son’s Death-Event

It is difficult to articulate concrete facts that surround the ‘Arrest-Interrogation-Death’ incidents which led to the deaths of many designated martyrs during the Korean War. This is because while interrogations and executions of early Christian martyrs were done in the open to arouse the public’s attention, the deaths of modern martyrs are mostly in the form of what we could call political assassination. Furthermore, there would have been no reason to keep the interrogation records of the dead during the war, where individual deaths are insignificant. This combination of facts makes it particularly difficult to re-enact the ‘death-event’ of the martyrs.

But in the case of Rev Son Yang-Won, testimonies detailing the time from his apprehension to his death witnessed by Kim Chang-Su, a classmate of Rev Son’s second son Dong-Shin, have helped to articulate his ‘death-event’ greatly supporting the investigation of his martyrdom.

Rev Son Yang-Won was arrested in the church in Aeyangwon on 13th September 1950 by the communist soldiers from the local police station in Yoolchon which was occupied by North Korean Communist Army, and spent the day in captivity. On the following day, he was transported to the Yeosu Police department, and received ideological re-instructional propaganda from the Communist army, lasting fifteen days until Seoul was recaptured by allied forces on 28 September. The Communist army then transferred Son Yang-Won and other captives to Suncheon, as “there were too many bomb droppings of US army in Yeosu”. During

44 Son, Naui abeoji, 238-9.
45 For the publicity of early Christians’ death-event, see, section 2.2.2. Also see, Middleton, Radical Martyrdom, 75-9.
46 While Cha Jong-Soon insists that his name is ‘Cha Jin-Guk’ (Cha, Aeyangwongwa, 268, 270), Son Dong-Hui argues that he is ‘Kim Chang-Su’ (Son, Naui abeoji, 290). Here I have followed Son’s one.
47 Son, Naui abeoji, 297.
48 Son, Naui abeoji, 298.
the transfer to Suncheon, Rev Son was shot dead in Mipyeong orchard valley, Yeosu city.

Let us briefly reconstruct the ‘Arrest-Interrogation-Death’ process and confirm his martyrdom based on the testimonies from his daughter Son Dong-Hui, Kim Chang-Su, and the patients and followers of Aeyangwon.

_Arrest by the Communists: 13 September 1950_

Following the outbreak of the war, the North Korean army started to rapidly occupy South Korea. Not even a month after the outbreak, the North Korean army occupied Daejeon on July 20, and entered Suncheon and Yeosu on the 23rd. At this time most missionaries, some Korean ministers and elders had already fled to Busan. However, even though many people had asked Rev Son to flee several times, he held a special service at the church called ‘let us die meaningfully’ to comfort the believers who remained to secure the church. He preached: “the first priority is martyrdom, the second is martyrdom, and the third is also martyrdom. Be prepared for martyrdom. It is time, thus do not wish to live well, but to die meaningfully. We have been served by the name of Jesus, thus it is time to be martyrs for the name of Jesus.” Moreover, when he heard about some ministers fleeing to the south from Seoul, he lamented that “the shepherds have left their sheep behind. This shall not stand” and attempted to move north to Seoul. He resolutely refused to flee even when one of his faithful fellows Rev Na Duck-Hwan suggested escaping on 12 July.

On 24 July Deacon Kim Hong-Bok was called by Rev Park Jae-Bong along with Kang Cheol-Min (alias), whom Rev Son had adopted in place of his two sons he had lost from the Yeo-Sun incident, to try to convince Rev Son to flee, but they did not succeed. Nevertheless, followers at Aeyangwon begged him to flee together with all of its members. Eventually, he held a farewell service and got on the boat to flee, but after singing his last hymn, he suddenly disembarked from the boat, and

______________________________
50 Son, _Naii abeoji_, 283-4.
51 Son, _Naii abeoji_, 279.
52 Son, _Naii abeoji_, 279-82.
returned to Aeyangwon alone.\textsuperscript{53} The only reason he did not flee was to care for the remaining ‘flock’.\textsuperscript{54} As a minister, he wished to die taking care of the flock and preaching the gospel. When Deacon Kim Hong-Bok asked Rev Son to escape, he refused, replying

in the midst of this crisis, what would be the most urgent thing to do? The shepherd must feed the sheep in order to strengthen their faith. The blood and sweat of God’s people must be offered to God now. Although I am unrighteous and inadequate, by the righteousness of our Lord Jesus Christ, I want to be His offering at this time, if the Lord wills.”\textsuperscript{55}

He could not leave behind “a thousand sheep”.\textsuperscript{56} He was finally arrested on Wednesday, 13 September, as the Red army thought that without the arrest, they “cannot establish the People’s Committee within Aeyangwon”.\textsuperscript{57} Rev Son’s attitude of ‘voluntary acceptance’ of death was part of his life: he wished to take care of his flock to the end, to preach the gospel, and to accept a predictable death at ‘God’s permission’. This is representative of early Christian martyrs, for instance, Polycarp, Ignatius, and so on, who were honourably arrested, interrogated, and killed during a persecution for which their life had prepared them.

\textit{Interrogation: 13–28 September 1950}

Rev Son was imprisoned with Kim Chang-Su in cell 3 at Yeosu police station. We have limited sources relying only on the testimonies from Kim’s “15 days” of

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{53} Lee, \textit{Sarangui sungyoja}, 35-6.


\textsuperscript{56} Ahn, \textit{Sarangui Wonjatan}, 402.

\textsuperscript{57} Cha Jong-Soon introduces that the quote is from the testimony of Cha Jin-Guk (Kim Chang-Su) based on the interview with the deacon Park Gae-Mun (14 May 2003, 2:00 pm). Cha, \textit{Aeyangwongwa}, 268.
\end{quote}
Son’s arrest on 13 September, his transfer to Yeosu police station and his death, but from Kim’s witnesses, we might say that his achievements during these 15 days were filled with active proclamation of Christian faith. He had already experienced ‘prison’ when he was arrested on 25 September 1940 by the Japanese colonial police for refusing to worship the Shinto shrine, and was released on the day of liberation on 15 August 1945. He might have intuitively known how to endure the Communist prison, for through his long imprisonment during the Japanese colonial period, he considered suffering to bring him closer to God and thus “a great blessing”. 58 As he believed that faith grows through suffering, he represented Jesus with his words and action. He shared half of his rice ball with the weakest, saying “I am a light eater so this half is enough for me”, 59 and protected other inmates from the guards who looked for one who made noise in the cell voluntary standing up, saying “I did it, so punish me!” though he was innocent. 60 He did not stop leading people to God through his deeds as a faithful Christian.

**Death: 28 September 1950**

On 28th September, inmates from the Yeosu police station were transferred to Suncheon on foot. When they arrived at Dundeokdong, Mipyeong orchard, the North Korean army formed groups of 10 prisoners, and executed them at 10 minutes intervals. According to the testimony of Kim Chang-Su, 62 who miraculously escaped from the execution, Rev Son tried even harder to spread the gospel during this event. Kim testifies that Rev Son was even attempting to introduce Christ to the North

---

58 Son Yang-Won, *Letter to Wife Jeong Yang-Sun*, 14 October 1942. Rev Son’s meditation about his suffering appears in his letters from prison and sermons. For example, the letter to his wife Jeong Yang-Sun on 14 October 1942, one to his father, Elder Son Jong-II on 5 November 1942, Sunday sermons, ‘Two paths in life’ on 18 January 1948, ‘Actual life of a Christian’ on 14 July 1946, etc. Especially in the letter to evangelist Hwang Sun-Deok (called Yang-Seon) on 4 September 1943, he said “To me, Job’s suffering is more precious than the riches of Solomon, and Job’s patience more appealing than Solomon’s wisdom…the one to be our closest friend is Job, who moaned and groaned in suffering from a severe skin disease. My dear sister! Think and meditate upon the suffering of Job, and make his patience your own experience. It is this older brother’s wish that you also become a person who endures till the end of suffering.” Quoted from Son Yang-Won, *Essential Writings: Son Yang-Won*, John S. Park and Nam Hee-Sun, trans., Seoul: The KIATS Press, 2009, 155.

59 Son Dong-Hui’s record based on the testimony of Kim Chang-Su. Son, *Naui abeoji*, 294.

60 Son, *Naui abeoji*, 294-5.


62 For the full story of Kim Chang-Su’s testimony at that moment of execution by the communists, see, Son, *Naui abeoji*, 303-6; Son, *My Cup Over Flows*, 305-8.
Korean soldier who was escorting him. When Rev Son was dragged to the place of execution, he looked back at Kim Chang-Su and said “Chang-Su, pray. No matter what the circumstance, don’t forget to pray. God will give you the strength you need. Let’s meet in Heaven”. 63 Son Dong-Hui remembered that his father Rev Son’s body was bloody, and “his mouth had been so smashed that his teeth were falling out of his lips, and his eyes were left wide open”. 64

As seen above, the PCK Christians remembered Rev Son Yang-Won as one who, being a minister, did not abandon the ‘sheep’, was arrested, and proclaimed Christ until the moment of death. The PCK immediately claimed him as a martyr who “lived according to God’s Word and who sacrificed his own life to keep that Word.” 65

5.2.3. Memories and Interpretations of Rev Son Yang-Won’s Life and Death

Sometimes Rev Son Yang-Won is appraised as a ‘nationalist’ due to his refusal to visit the Shinto shrine, while at other times he is referred to as an ‘anticommunist’ who was executed by the Red Army. This reflects the perception of reality by Christians who experienced Japanese colonial regime and the Korean War. Korea had been lost to its citizens for 35 years due to the Japanese colonial administration. Being named a nationalist for resisting Japan’s colonial regime in the hopes of independence is thus one of the highest praises and honour. Being named an anticommunist is also a commendable title for those who have witnessed ideologies dividing a nation just after celebrating its liberation, when the North Korean army performed horrendous acts of slaughter on its own kind.

Therefore it may not seem strange to praise Rev Son Yang-Won as a nationalist, anticommunist martyr and a person who has suffered under Japanese colonial power and was martyred during the Korean War. But does this ideological assessment properly represent his life and death as a martyr?

63 Son, Naui abeoji, 304. Quoted from, Son, My Cup Over Flows, 306.
64 Son, Naui abeoji, 309.
65 Son, Naui abeoji, 319. Quoted from Son, My Cup Over Flows, 316.
Academia in general has criticized the PCK’s martyr-making process for Christians killed by communists in wartime as “reproduction-mechanism of anticomunism in the PCK” or for “persistently spreading and announcing the anticomunist ideology”. These criticisms clearly say that the PCK’s martyr-making operations are being used to support a specific ideology. Earlier it was pointed out that martyrdom is one of the most religious and at the same time the most political concepts, but martyrdom is fundamentally an act of imitation of the Jesus Christ, that is, witness Jesus unto death. Therefore, no socio-political ideology can restrict the concept of the martyrdom, and where that is the case, there may well be a problem with the designation of a particular martyr. Rev Son Yang-Won also proclaimed in his sermon, “Take captive every thought and make it obedient to Christ”, that “abandon all legalism, humanism…nationalism and materialism…Take captive all these thought with the cross…[Christ] perfected the law through the cross”.

Let us move beyond an evaluation based on ideological reality, important though that is, and search for the final aspect of the designation of martyr: the meaning based on ‘Imitatio Christi’ taking Rev Son’s life and death as a whole.

**Martyrdom of Love for Others**

Son Dong-Hui describes the relationship between his father Rev Son and the lepers at Aeyangwon as a relationship of “inseparable love.” He spoke at length with patients while holding hands covered in blood and pus: when he heard saliva was effective in treating the leprosy wounds, he did not hesitate to suck out the bloody pus with his own mouth. Moreover, he even wished to catch leprosy so that he could stay with the patients all the time. All patients of Aeyangwon looked for this minister of love at their time of death, after being cared for by Rev Son’s love and devotion. Elder Baek Il-Bong, who was one of the lepers in charge of nursing the patients in Intensive Care Unit 14, witnessed his devotion and recalls him thus:

67 Yun Jeong-Ran, ‘Hanguk Jeonjaenggwa Gidokgyo’, 229.
In those days when lepers approached, everyone nearby would point at them and say, “Look, a leper is coming over her,” and then turn away with grimace on their face. It was a difficult time… but only Pastor Son touched us and comforted us out of love. Whenever I think about him, I often stop what I am doing and look up into the vacant sky, reminiscing deeply for hours.\textsuperscript{70}

Rev Son’s prayer, “Lord, let me love Aeyangwon!” shows how much he loved the patients at Aeyangwon. He even prays to love them more than his parents, siblings, his wife and his children. It is rather long, but here is the direct quote.

\begin{verbatim}
Lord, let me love Aeyangwon with all my heart.  
Let me love these people as you love them.  

...  
Even if all the people of the world despise them and  
Keep them at a distance  
Oh Lord, let me truly love them still.  

Oh Lord, let me love them more than  
My parents, my brothers and sisters, and my wife and children.  
Even if I were to become as one of them and live with a disfigured body,  
Let me truly love them still.  
If you will for me to live as one of them,  
I will shout for joy with them for as long as I live.  
Oh Lord, let me truly love them as you do with your gentle touch.  

Lord, even if they shun me and may betray me,  
Still, let me truly love them  
And never abandon them for as long as I live.  
Even if I were to be driven out of this place,  
Let me love them and pray for them  
With the love you have shown for as long as I live.  

Oh Lord, though I love them,  
Let me not love with an artificial, conditional love.  

...  

And Lord, let not my love  
Be out of selfish desires for glory in this world,  
Or for some reward after life.  
But let my love for these poor souls be pure,  
For I love only because you loved first.  

Oh Lord, though I don’t know how long my days are in this world,  

\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{70} Son Dong-Hui’s record based on the testimony of Baek Il-Hong. Son, \textit{Nau\‘i abeoji}, 58.
Let me entrust my body and soul to you,
And love Aeyangwon with all my heart, Oh Lord.
Amen.71

Rev Son could not abandon the patients of Aeyangwon with whom he had formed an inseparable relationship of love. While most religious leaders of the time left their flock behind on the battlefield to ‘survive’,72 Rev Son stayed at Aeyangwon and held sermons until the moment he was shot dead by the Red Army. His is the martyrdom of the self-giving love of Jesus who loved his people in the world to the end (Jn. 13.1) and literally gave his life for his friends (Jn. 15.13). When the Red Army threatened to kill all the patients in Aeyangwon unless the Rev Son came out of the church, he willingly accepted arrest. This was an act based on his resolve, similar to the time when he shared his rice ball with other inmates even when the whole was not enough for one person, and also when he swore to the guards that he was the leader, when the prison riot has started and the guards were looking for the leader. All of this supports the view that his martyrdom was the martyrdom of love for others through Christ, being not simply, or even at all, an expression of ideological anticommunism, but rather the practice of love fulfilling the law (Rom 13.10) and the realisation of Imitatio Christi.

Martyrdom of Forgiveness and Reconciliation

Forgiveness and reconciliation are the other aspects of Rev Son’s practice of Christ’s love which could be observed from his life. One day in the spring of 1946 after the Liberation, he visited Gwangju and met one who had arrested, interrogated, and prosecuted him as a police officer in the time of the Japanese Government-General of Korea. He was forgiven, saying that it was “the time and the job that has forced it upon you and that it has all been forgotten”. It would be hard to forgive someone who has harassed and tortured you for 5 years as a superior. But the reason Rev Son could face him and forgive him in peace was because as a “Jesus addict”.73

---

71 Son, Naui abeoji, 53-4. Quoted from Son, My Cup Over Flows, 65-7.
73 Son, Naui abeoji, 320.
his life was based on the words of the Bible which says to forgive “not seven times, but seventy-seven times” (Mt 18.22).

On the 21st of October, 1948, he found out that a leftist student Kang Cheol-Min who had executed his two sons, Dong-In and Dong-Shin, during the Yeo-Sun incident was about to be executed. Rev Son rescued him and adopted him as his own son, an action that could only be explained as the behaviour of a ‘Jesus addict’ and not with any forms of ideologies. It can only be explained as Rev Son’s emulation of Jesus Christ, who has gladly accepted death from the hands of the political persecutors of religion, even praying “Father, forgive them” (Lk 23.34) while being on the cross facing death.

If we speak of ideologies, Rev Son’s adoption of the assailant responsible for killing his two sons could be assessed as achieving reconciliation between the leftist and the rightist ideologies in times of turmoil and strife. Son Dong-Hui accompanied Rev Na Deok-Hwan to the Army official hunting down suspects, in order to convey Rev Son’s intent to adopt Kang Cheol-Min, who had killed his two sons. She recalls the moment of reconciliation through forgiveness as follows:

When I finished the story [Rev Son’s will to adopt Kang Cheol-Min as his son] and burst into tears, the colonel who was determined to kill Kang did not even realize that the cigarette in his mouth had fallen, and took a handkerchief to wipe his tears while saying that the Pastor was a “great person”. Even Kang was sobbing while staring at the ground. Rev Na [Deok-Hwan], I, and other bloodthirsty students became one in tears. This was the moment where we all became one with the enemies… My father who has begged to adopt the enemy that killed his two sons because we need to love the enemy! Rev Na who ran here and there to save Kang because Rev Son has asked to! The Army, who was asserting laws to kill Kang! And finally myself, who rushed to convey my father’s words to save Kang when even moments before, I was gnashing my teeth in anger to take revenge for the death of my two brothers! It seemed as if we were all walking backwards in the world where love, laws, and rights were getting all mixed up… My father’s bomb of love is a bomb that shatters the very foundation of the wicked society that does not know forgiveness. In this society which suffers not from the famine of food, but from the famine of love, I hope my father’s bomb of love falls onto those who only believe that revenge is the greatest form of victory.74

---

74 Son, Naui abeoji, 249-50.
The tragic conflict between the leftist and the rightist who considered that ‘revenge is the greatest form of victory’ had led to the war, and ultimately cost the life of Rev Son.

Rev Son’s life of forgiveness which led him to adopt the killer of his sons and achieve reconciliation through the incident are the core elements in understanding his death. Though he was executed by the Red Army, he cannot simply be called an anticommunist martyr, because he “sacrificed himself from the bottom of a heart that truly, honestly, simply, and sincerely loves God”. In other words, his was the martyrdom that has been prepared with his whole life, the ‘Imitatio Christi’ that transcends any biases or closed ideology. According to the memory of Son Dong-Hui, Rev Son never uttered words such as ‘the communist party or the left wing’. He hated any ideological bias including any political clans or principles, indeed he said that even when someone is ideological, that person can communicate with any individual or group who follow the Christ, and his words. As Son Dong-Hui said, Rev Son was a “Jesus addict, who could not live without Jesus, and died in Jesus”. Hence, the death of Rev Son is the martyrdom of forgiveness and reconciliation thoroughly learned from Christ who is the “root of faith that overcomes our doctrines and schism”.

Conclusion

Martyrdom is death based on the confession of faith. According to the level of understanding of ‘faith’ and the form of ‘confession’, that death may occur in various forms, but Jesus Christ is always at the core. In the first century, Christians interpreted the crucifixion of Jesus Christ as the definition of forgiveness showing love to the perpetrators rather than revenge and punishment even in vicious times of persecution, and understood it to have occurred by ‘God’s will’ to achieve reconciliation in this earthly world. The Church found the image of Christ through martyrs with their self-sacrificing love, forgiveness, and reconciliation.

---
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At this juncture, we have to consider the relationship between death and life. Rev Son said that loyalty to God is the cohesion of a Christian’s words and deeds imitating both Jesus Christ’s life and death, and death as a result of that loyalty could be called a martyr’s death. In other words, in order for a death to be a martyr’s death, besides an intention of a specific group in a particular context to make a dead martyr as a socio-political act, his or her life should have been lived on the basis of imitating Christ. An individual’s choice of death may not be actually his or her intended death but a natural result of his or her faithful life. Indeed, a martyr’s death interprets his or her life and at the same time that life reckons with that death.

The interpretations of Jesus’ death on the cross as forgiveness and reconciliation for the first century Christians were truly grounded on the interpretation of Jesus’ life. If Jesus had not presented his radical virtues in his life, we may dare to assume that his crucifixion would not have been interpreted as more than killing. Without his loving, forgiving, and reconciling life, there would have been no such death. This is part of argument about whether Rev R. J. Thomas is a martyr or not. Some argue that his life in Korean nationalist terms was that of an invader being armed and aggressive, leaving aside the vexed issue of whether he accepted his death or begged for his life: people holding this view are very reluctant to call him a martyr. On the other hand, others argue that his bible propagating life was enough to interpret his death as a martyr. The ambiguity of the relationship between his life and death makes it difficult to come to a firm conclusion, though taking martyrdom of a life imitating Christ, the balance is in favour of the former view.

In the case of Baek Hong-Jun discussed in Chapter 3, though his life was clearly shown as a faithful Christian distributing Bibles amid life-threaten risks at that time, despite it being unclear whether he accepted his death voluntarily in prison or died naturally, he is called a martyr with perhaps a little more reason than the previous case. However, we may agree that Rev Son’s life and death was that of a faithful Christian imitating Jesus Christ, and though his death-event has been reconstructed from limited testimony, few may argue, whether both secular and sacred historians will surely agree that if anyone achieved martyrdom, he counts in their number.

The fact that the discourse of martyrdom was used to reproduce prejudiced nationalism and anticommunism cannot be denied, nor can the way in which
anniversaries for the martyrs become anti-Japan or anticommunist festivals. Early Christians, on the contrary, interpreted the crucifixion of Jesus as the self-giving love, salvation, and forgiveness of perpetrators and then practiced ‘love, forgiveness, and reconciliation’ to their communities which persecuted them. Robert Schreiter points out that the duty of reconciliation of God starts with the victims.\(^8\) In other words, God heals victims to recover their human nature during their struggle to dispel the actions of a perpetrator. An unreconciling death is in this sense no martyrdom. Based on this view, the image that was actually shown by the martyrdom of Rev Son went far beyond the socio-political ideology of hatred and enmity, saving others with self-sacrificing love ‘imitating Christ’ and achieving reconciliation through forgiveness. This is the essential meaning of the martyrdom of the Jesus addict, Rev Son Yang-Won. Therefore, the theology of martyrdom is the theology of love, forgiveness, and reconciliation beyond resistance.

The Korean Peninsula is still tied up with the remnants from the Japanese colonial period. In addition, it is divided into the South and the North in a conflict of extreme ideology with hatred and distrust. At a time like this, Rev Son advises us to be practitioners of love: “the method to eliminate war and return to the unified country of peace is only through the love of the Cross.”

CONCLUSION

This thesis has investigated the phenomenon of making martyrs in the PCK uncovering the power structure and the institutional aspect of their martyr-designations. In the process, it is clear that PCK leaders controlled the social or cultural memory about deaths in the specific historical contexts to sustain their socio-political status in the present context, placing and displacing some death-events to commemorate some or exclude intentionally others under the ruling ideologies of South Korean society, mainly anticommunism and ethnic nationalism. To analyse critically the operation of PCK’s martyr-making this thesis has argued that martyrdom is an act of imitation of Christ placing the pre-Constantine martyr accounts as a prototype of Christian martyrdom (dying for God), taking the ‘Jesus-centred’ approach. Yet at the same time, this thesis has criticised the perception that post-Constantine martyr accounts served to empower the state-sponsored ecclesiastical authorities granting religious coercion (killing for God) to those were outside the orthodox church legitimated by the Christian emperor. This metamorphosis from dying to killing for God is a distortion of the tradition of martyrdom.

Tracing the development of the ideology of martyrdom in history linguistically and semantically, the thesis pointed out the obvious fact that martyrdom is not a fixed or universal concept but is rather a transforming ideology employed differently in different times, settings, and places to justify and legitimate a death in a specific group. Once the Greek word μάρτυς and its cognates gained the meaning of ‘witness unto death’ through linguistic transformation, it clearly became the cause of death. In history, according to one’s perspective, the cause of death was transformed from Christian identity in the early period of church to heresy or treason in the Reformation era and to the Kingdom of God in the modern period.

Martyrdom is also directly linked with the identity of one oppressed community setting a clear boundary between it and the antagonistic persecuting group. Furthermore, martyr-making work is a social act carried out by the living not the dead. In other words, martyrdom is a part of the interpretive semantics of a particular death seen by particular lives for particular purposes. Martyrdom pertains indeed to the politics of death, yet at the same time to the politics of the living.
The martyr-making process essentially requires two acts made of three elements: death-event in the past, memories about the death, and interpretation based on the collected memory. The first act is an individual voluntary choice of death in times of persecution in the past, and the second is a socio-political act of naming, collecting and interpreting the death in accordance with a particular purpose in the present. The past’s death-event transits to the present’s social act through memory. These two acts are inseparable in any martyr-making practice. There may have been a pseudo-martyrdom without the death-event, yet at the same time it is impossible to be named as a martyr without the intentional social act of interpreting the death. Furthermore, each act inherently involves power contests over the death-event, the selection of a particular event, the collection of relevant social memories, and interpretation of making, remaking or unmaking martyrs. We have termed this mechanism of making martyrs as a ‘paradigm of martyr-making’.

Meanwhile, though the idea of martyrdom initially came from China when Catholicism was introduced into Korea in the late 18th century using the Chinese character ‘致命’ (zhiming) pronouncing ‘지명’ (chimyeong) in Korean vernacular, the PCK strategically employed the Japanese word, ‘じゅんきょ’ (junkyo), invented in the late 19th century in Japan (pronounced ‘순교’ sungyo in Korean) from the mid-1920s onwards rather than ‘chimyeong’ to distinguish themselves from Catholicism. Once ‘sungyo’ obtained a universal position in public use, both Catholics and Protestants in Korea employed it as a fixed and living expression of martyrdom.

Applying this paradigm of the martyr-making mechanism based on the concept of ‘sungyo’, this thesis investigated the PCK’s martyr-making works in earnest. The PCK presented three major periods in which Korean Protestants’ death-events occurred: the late Chosun Dynasty (1866-1905), under the Japanese colonial regime (1905-1945), and before and during the Korean War (1945-1953). During those periods, most Protestant Christians’ death-events took place as a result of clashes between them and the political power: the clash with Chosun feudalistic, Japanese colonial, and communist power. Taking those death-events the PCK, however, only started to make martyrs by collecting and interpreting the first deaths after 1926 and from 1983 onwards. In those processes of martyr-making, the PCK leaders exposed themselves to problematic tendencies of apolitical and pseudo apolitical attitudes, anticommunist nationalism, elitism, competitive manner, and even provoking the
violence leading to death, thus misusing, deliberately abusing, or distorting the concept of martyr. The PCK’s martyr-making work, therefore, becomes an effective propaganda weapon of political ideologies, in some cases manipulating the historical reality of the death-event. Martyr-making processes in the PCK context indeed functioned politically to define the ‘persistently common enemy,’ usually communism and anti-nationalism, mobilizing Christians to be against them, and justifying religiously such ‘martyrdom.’ Thus it has been argued that martyr-making is part of the power structure of the PCK, and this power, as any power in nature, always has the potential to be wrongly used.

To analyse the operation of PCK’s martyr-making more specifically, this thesis included two case studies. The first is of the Rev R. J. Thomas who is said to be ‘the first Protestant martyr in Korea’, designated in 1926, and re-emphasised in the 1980s. The second is of Rev Son Yang-Won, widely known as ‘the atomic bomb of love’ from 1948 when he adopt the killer of his two sons amid the political conflict between the leftist and rightist, whose reputation as the ‘martyr of love’ increased widely from 1950 immediately after being killed by communists in the early stage of the Korean War. The Thomas case uncovers the ethnic nationalistic tendency of the PCK’s martyr-making, and their anticommunist attitude in the treatment of Rev Son, for they utilized only his leaving life, not his living.

Furthermore, this thesis has attempted to find a theology of martyrdom to overcome the PCK’s socio-political attitude of making martyrs by carefully reconstructing the life and death of Rev Son who followed thoroughly the words of Jesus Christ as an act of imitation of Christ. Displacing the PCK’s martyr-making works of ideological reproduction, this thesis has argued conclusively that martyrdom should be set against the achievement of Jesus Christ’s radical virtues, love, reconciliation, and forgiveness, even amid severe violent situations, as an act of imitation of Christ in the way of the early Christian martyrs. When we place martyrdom on this basis, we can open a way to resolve the hostile relationship in history between Japanese and Korean, and South and North Korean.

“The recognition of martyrs already transcends confessional boundaries and brings us all back to the centre of the faith, the source of hope, and the example of love for God and fellow human beings.”

1 WCC, Sharing in One Hope, 200.
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