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Abstract

In 1900, as the Boxer Uprising raged in China, two Chinese translations of the work Histoire de l’Église de Corée (Gaoli zhiming shilüe and Gaoli zhuzheng) were published to encourage Chinese Catholics, given the difficult history of persecutions faced by Korean Catholics. A close examination of these translations, along with the translator of Gaoli zhiming shilüe’s earlier work on the history of Korean martyrs, reveals that they relied on different Korean source texts and even embellished the original narrative in places. These modifications, in turn, demonstrate the complex chain of translation and information within East Asian missions, working between several languages and incorporating a variety of sources for information. In particular, a study of these texts highlights connections between the Catholic mission in Shanghai and Korea throughout a period when both faced intense opposition and the latter outright suppression. This article is part of the special issue of the Journal of Jesuit Studies, “Jesuits in Modern Far East,” guest edited by Steven Pieragastini.
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According to Korean historians, *Shilüe* and *Gaoli zhuzheng* contain erroneous information, hence they have been deemed worthless records. Gijin Cha, the author of the *Shilüe* section and the editing department that analyzes *Gaoli zhuzheng* in the *Korean Catholic Encyclopedia*, concludes that these two books lack historical significance due to their numerous faults and flaws, which has led to no research being dedicated to the texts. However, the types of errors in these texts reveal the intricate relationships between Catholic missionaries in nineteenth-century Joseon Korea and China, particularly the M.E.P. and Jesuits.

*Shilüe*, which was supposed to inspire Chinese Catholics frightened by the Boxer Uprising, was also transcribed and shared among Korean Catholics.4 The translation of *Gaoli zhuzheng* was finished in Chongqing in 1879, and the bishop of Korea, Marie-Jean-Gustave Blanc (1844–90), borrowed a manuscript of it from the M.E.P. in Shanghai to use as a reference when translating the

---

1 This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2022S1A5C2A02093698).
4 The National Library of Korea and Korea University possess *Shilüe* manuscripts, called *Koryeo chimeyeong saryak* in Korean. The National Library’s manuscript was written with a brush while the manuscript at the Korean University was written with a pen.
The errors and defects in *Shilüe* and *Gaoli zhuzheng* are different. Notably, Korean names are written in different Chinese characters (漢字 hanzi or hanja). For instance, Yi Seunghun, the first Catholic in Korea, was written as 李承訓 in *Gaoli zhuzheng* but 李承薰 in *Shilüe*. Gang Wansuk, a famous female Catholic leader, was written as 姜萬秀 in *Gaoli zhuzheng*, while in the *Shilüe* her name was written as 姜完淑. These incongruities show that the Korean sources for the two texts were different.

Dallet only wrote names in their Korean pronunciations without Chinese characters in his *Histoire*, and the Korean pronunciation of Chinese characters was different from the Chinese pronunciation. Thus, the translation of the martyrs’ names presented problems for Basin and Shen. In contrast to the prior assessment of the two volumes, there are fewer flaws than one might expect given that the translators relied on the *Histoire*. Surprisingly, most of the names Shen wrote were accurate. In Basin’s case, some names were incorrect, but they were acceptable mistakes within Korean linguistic conventions. It is not likely that either Basin or Shen knew Korean; their errors suggest that they had collaborators who were Korean or skilled with the Korean language, or that they had other Korean reference materials, as I will show below.

Second, these two books were disparate in organization. There was a discrepancy between their selections and deletions; notably, Basin decided to change the order of *Histoire* to list all the martyrs chronologically. Shen followed this order, but he chose only representative martyrs. He also dealt with the three major persecutions of Christians before 1866, while Basin hid these persecutions in the anecdotes of martyrs. Shen chose a few martyrs who represented other martyrs in his view; he crafted a grand narrative while Basin focused on describing each martyr’s life. It shows that Basin and Shen had different perspectives on which items should be considered.

All these facts demonstrate that, despite their inaccuracies, the two texts are worth studying. Errors and flaws that have been neglected for more than a century reveal how missionaries in Korea and China collaborated to write and publish Korean Catholic history. In particular, *Shilüe* allows us to approach the relationship between the Jesuits in Shanghai and the M.E.P. in Korea. Although Shanghai was the most crucial hub for the East Asian Catholic mission after the First Opium War (1839–42), few studies have explained the link between Shanghai and Korea. The letters, diaries, and reports of M.E.P. missionaries

---

offer some useful information about this connection, but not enough to fully understand how Chinese and Korean Catholics cooperated and what they shared. In this regard, the errors and defects in *Shilüe* could lead us to link the scattered sources of this connection and show the complicated linguistic context underlying Catholicism in East Asia.6

2 Underlying Features in *Shilüe* Veiled by Its Purposes

According to his preface, Shen's intention in publishing *Shilüe* was to emphasize the close relationship between Korea and China.7 Korea was the closest country to China in the Chinese world order system. Not only were there cultural connections between the two countries, but there were also strong relationships between the Korean and Chinese churches. He also wanted to enlighten people using the example of martyrs, believing that Korean people's bravery in sacrificing themselves for their faith and church should be respected. Chinese Catholics who were intimidated by the Boxer Uprising would be inspired by their stories.8

Shen gave an example to emphasize the close relationship between Korean and Chinese Catholicism. It was the first Korean priest Kim Daegeon Andrea (1821–46),9 who came to Shanghai for his ordination with eleven Korean laypeople on a small sailboat in 1845.10 The French Jesuits who led the Shanghai (Jiangnan) mission (Mission du Kiang-nan 江南代牧區) supported him in many ways. For instance, Claude Gotteland, S.J. (南格祿, 1803–56) listened to the Korean laypeople's confessions at Kim Daegeon's request a day before his ordination. He also provided Kim an opportunity to hold his first Mass at Hengtang Cathedral (橫塘聖母領報天主教堂). Gotteland had met Kim

---

6 In 2010 and 2011, the Catholic Bishops’ Conference of Korea released and circulated six documents that were typed copies of the manuscripts of A-MEP documents. The conference had found and collected documents related to the Korean Catholic Church, which have been in many archives including the Vatican and the MEP archives since 1997. The typed copies in 2010 and 2011 are volumes 577, 579–82, and *Les Documents de Mgr Daveluy IV: Notes pour l’histoire de Martyrs de Corée*. These copies were used to research this article.


10 They were Hyeon Seokmun 玄錫文 (1799–1846), Yi Jaeui, Choi Hyeong. No Eonik, Im Chihwa, Kim Inwon etc. See the footnote of Kim Dageon's thirteenth letter in Choi Seungryong, trans., *Seong Kim Daeguen Andrea sinbu ui seohun* [The letter of Saint Fr. Andrea Kim Daegeon] (Seoul: The Institute of Korean Catholic History), 199.
before 1845 when Kim was a seminary student in Macau, and they met again in Jiangnan when Kim passed through on his way to Korea in 1842.11

Shen referred to Kim Daegeon with a special name, “Liupin 六品,” which means “deacon.” Why did Shen call him Liupin even though Kim Daegeon had become a priest? Shen dealt with Kim’s missionary work and martyrdom in Chapters 14 to 16, and the title of Chapter 14 is “Kim Liupin (deacon) took a small boat to receive the shepherd 金六品扁舟迎牧.”12 Shen wrote Kim’s appellation as “Priest 司鐸” in Chapters 15 and 16, distinguishing Kim’s appellation before and after ordination. Then, why did he call Kim with the title before the ordination in the preface? There is no evidence offering a clear answer. However, it is plausible to imagine that the Jesuits in Shanghai, including Shen, had called him Liupin as a term of endearment since 1845, remembering the young deacon they had met decades ago.

Let us go back to the errors of Shilüe. Before publishing Shilüe, Shen wrote the martyr series, including Korean martyrs’ anecdotes, in Shengxin bao (聖心報, Messager du Sacré-Coeur), the monthly newspaper published by the Shanghai Xujiahui Cathedral (上海徐家匯天主堂) from 1895 to 1898.13 Many errors in his writings in Shengxin bao were rectified in Shilüe, including modifications in names, expressions, and sentences as well as the addition of new information, which are all crucial to understanding Shilüe and its background.

Shen gathered information on the martyrs and picked the Korean martyrs’ stories from Histoire. His first choice was the story of three Korean female martyrs, Gang Wansuk Columba (1761–1801), Mun Yeongin Bibiana (文榮仁, 1776–1801), and Yun Jeomhye Agatha (尹占恵, c.1778–1801).14 He introduced them as one episode of martyrdom around the world, not as martyrs for the Korean Church, per se, as in the Histoire. Before he published the translation serially, he had, since 1888, written articles introducing martyrs from many places, such as Vietnam, Africa, Macedonia, and China.15

11 Dallet, Histoire, 2:288.
12 In this case, the shepherd means priest, though it is unclear who exactly Shen is referring to in the title.
13 On Shengxin bao, see Joachim Kurtz, “Messenger of the Sacred Heart: Li Wenyu (1840–1911) and the Jesuit periodical press in late Qing Shanghai,” in Cynthia Brokaw and Christopher A. Reed, eds., From Woodblocks to the Internet: Chinese Publishing and Print Culture in Transition, circa 1800 to 2008 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 81–109. Shengxin bao newspapers were compiled into two volumes by Shanghai Shengxin baoguan and the first volume was published in 1906. See Shanghai Shengxin baoguan ed., Shengxin bao 1 (Shanghai: Shanghai Shengxin baoguan, 1906) [hereafter referred to as Shengxin bao].
It is also notable that Shen was especially concerned with female martyrs. Gang, Mun, and Yun were therefore not chosen as Korean martyrs but as cases of female martyrdom.\textsuperscript{16} In \textit{Histoire}, Dallet included both male and female martyrs, but male martyrs were more significant in his description. The Korean Catholic Church began without a missionary, and Korean \textit{literati}\textsuperscript{17} read the catechism written in Chinese by the Jesuits first, so (elite) men played essential roles in the spread of Catholicism in this initial stage.\textsuperscript{18} Gang Wansuk Columba, part of the first generation of Korean Catholics, was an important figure who converted her family (especially her stepson), led laywomen, and protected the Chinese Father Zhou Wenmo 周文謨, who proselytized in Korea before being executed by the Joseon government in 1801. However, there were many critical male figures whom Dallet mentioned before Gang. Therefore, Shen’s choice of the three female martyrs seems to be meaningful and intentional.

After he published the Korean martyrdom stories, he quickly translated the other parts of \textit{Histoire}. Then, by and large, he published the translation in parts according to the order of the content in \textit{Histoire}. The whole series of Shen’s translations in \textit{Shengxin bao} consisted of twenty-five articles, with the last three articles reorganizing information from \textit{Histoire} into appendices. In the appendices, he introduced significant figures who had played important roles in expanding the church in Korea. They were usually from aristocratic families, and some were famous scholars. Yet, when he published \textit{Shiliüe}, he did not make any appendices but followed \textit{Histoire’s} order.

Books and documents always tell us more about linguistic conventions and structures than the author intended. The close relationship and cultural similarity between Korea and China justified the introduction of the Korean Church’s history to a Chinese audience, but it is difficult to understand the full context of \textit{Shiliüe} from this motivation alone. The authors of the \textit{Korean Catholic Encyclopedia} only mention the background of \textit{Shiliüe} in their explanation of the Boxer Uprising. However, the significance of the book cannot be reduced to this one event as Shen’s errors and corrections suggest that the text’s background is more profound and extensive.

\textsuperscript{16} In \textit{Shengxin bao}, Shen wrote about female martyrs from around the world, including China, Vietnam, and Macedonia.
\textsuperscript{17} See \textit{Histoire}, Table of Contents.
\textsuperscript{18} The intellectuals from noble families such as Yi Seunghun (1756–1801), Yi Byeok (1754–85), Kwon Ilsin (d.1791) filled crucial roles in the first stage of the Korean Catholic Church.
Discrepancies, errors, and corrections between *Shengxin bao* and *Shilüe* give us more information than we might expect. The main content was not changed from *Shengxin bao* to *Shilüe*, while names were modified and more information and stories were added that were not found in either *Shengxin bao* or *Histoire*. Shen did not know the martyrs’ Chinese character names until 1898. In *Shengxin bao*, he treated the Korean names as phonetic symbols and transliterated them somewhat arbitrarily.

The most important source for *Histoire* was Bishop Marie-Nicolas-Antoine Daveluy’s (1818–66) report, *Notes pour Histoire des martyrs de Corée* (hereafter, *Notes*). Daveluy did not write any Chinese characters in *Notes* either. The Korean martyrs became known via the reports of M.E.P. missionaries in Korea; however, their names in Chinese characters were barely known. The martyrs’ names were not marked with Chinese characters even in Korean documents because the transcribers only used the Korean vernacular (*han'gul*).

The martyrs’ names in Chinese characters were only recorded in government documents related to the judicial trials against Catholics, anti-Catholic texts circulated among intellectuals, Hwang Sayeong’s “Silk Letter” (*Hwang sayeong bækseo* 黃嗣永帛書, hereafter, Hwang’s Letter),19 and a “Letter from Korean Catholics to the Bishop of Beijing” 東國敎友上書于主敎書.20 Then, how could Shen write Korean martyrs’ names in Chinese characters in *Shengxin bao*? Evidently, he treated the names as pronunciation keys.

---

19 Anti-Catholic documents and the trial records were all written in Chinese whereas the Catholic records of martyrdom were either written in French, Latin or Korean. See Yi Manchae, ed., *Byeokwi pyeon* 闢衛編 (Book of expulsion [of wickedness] for protection [of civilization]; Gyeongseong: Byeokwi sa, 1931); The Institute of Korean Catholic Church, *Sahak jingui* 邪學懲義 (A warning against Catholicism; Seoul: Bulham Munhwasa, 1977); The Institute of Korean Philology, *Chuan geup gukan* 推案及鞫案 (Interrogation Records; Seoul: Asia munhwasa, 1980–84).

20 Korean Catholics wrote two letters to the pope and to the bishop of Beijing in 1811 in order to ask them to send them priests and to report the persecution of 1801. In the letter to the bishop of Beijing, they enumerated the main martyrs. The names of the martyrs were written in traditional Chinese characters. The letters have been translated twice, once in Italian and once in Portuguese. The copy by Yu Siding 俞斯定 (1813) has survived, but the original texts have not. The letter to the bishop of Beijing is appended to the back of the letter to the pope, which Yu combined into one letter. The copy is now held in the collection of Academia Sinica in Taiwan. For the Italian translation, see *sc Cina* 4, fols. 336–354 and Yun Mingu, trans., *Yun Yuil baoro wa dongryoo sungyojaedui ui sibok jaryo jip*, (Collection of documents on Yun Yuil and his companion martyrs; Seoul: The Institute of Korean Catholic History, 2000), 5140–241.
Comparing the names in Notes, Histoire, Shengxin bao, and Shilüe, we find differences in names between the texts. As Table 1 shows, Dallet spelled Korean names differently than Daveluy did. Dallet served as a missionary in India until 1867 when he returned to France due to illness.\(^{21}\) There, he organized materials in the M.E.P. archive, including Korean papers such as missionaries’ letters and Daveluy’s reports and paperwork. Stanislas Féron (1827–1903), an M.E.P. missionary in Korea, wrote to him on May 15, 1867, to help correct the Korean pronunciations of the martyrs’ names,\(^{22}\) indicating that he was able to analyze the Korean language grammatically with the assistance of M.E.P. missionaries in Korea.\(^{23}\)

Daveluy’s method of phonetic transcription was modified by Dallet. Daveluy wrote Korean names exactly as he heard them. He did not, therefore, distinguish between a name and the meaningless ending mark “i,” which is no longer used in modern Korean. This common usage is more obvious when a name ends with a consonant rather than a vowel. Shen was unfamiliar with the usage, unlike the missionaries in Korea. As a result, he misspelled the Korean names in Shengxin bao, such that every name in Notes and Histoire ends in “i” or “-i.”

For instance, in Choi Ingil’s case, Daveluy wrote his name as “In kiri” but technically, “In kir” is the name (see Table 1, row 8 and Table 1, row 16). Because of this confusing marking system, the names were not properly recognizable, causing Dallet to omit those names he could not recognize. When Dallet recognized the names, then he used a dash to distinguish a name and the ending mark. Otherwise, he simply wrote baptismal names. In the Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Nineteenth cases of Table 1, we can find that Dallet only wrote the baptismal name, omitting Korean names.\(^{24}\)


\(^{23}\) In the introduction of Histoire, Dallet mentioned the Korean grammar book and the dictionary, which would be published. See Histoire, lxxix.

\(^{24}\) Daveluy would also merely record the baptismal names of martyrs when their Korean names were uncertain. Until Bishop Gustave Charles Marie Mutel, M.E.P. (1852–1933) discovered and compiled additional documents on the martyrs, the Korean names of some martyrs were unknown.
The same thing happened when Shen Zekuan translated *Histoire*. For him, some Korean names in *Histoire* were invalid or unrecognizable. Shen omitted the Korean names more than Dallet did. For example, when he mentioned Yi Jonchang Ludovicus Gonzaga, he only wrote “Ludovicus” in Chinese because Yi’s Korean name was barely recognizable, having been written as “Ni Tson T’siang Tan Ouen i” or “Ni Tson-t’siang Tan-ouen-i” (see Table, rows 3–5). Tan ouen, Danwon in modern Korean, was Yi Jonchang’s pen name, which Shen was unaware of, so he deleted both Yi Jonchang’s name and the pen name and wrote only Ludovicus into Chinese. Except for Yi Seunghun and Yi Byeok, he omitted all the martyrs’ given names (see Table 1, rows 3–20).

The ending mark also caused Shen’s other mistakes, as can be seen from Yi Seunghun and Yi Byeok’s cases (see Table 1, rows 1, 2). Shen wrote Yi Seunghun as Sun Fengyi 孫鳳儀 and Yi Byeok as Bi Yi 畢義. There were no people who had these names in Korean Catholic history. If we compare *Shengxin bao* with *Notes, Histoire*, and *Shilüe*, their anecdotes correspond to Yi Seunghun and Yi Byeok’s lives. Then why did Shen confuse their given names?

One possible explanation is that he was unaware that “Ni” stood for their surname. Dallet wrote Yi Seunghun’s name as “Ni Seng-houn-i” and Yi Byeok as “Ni Piek-i.” Here, Ni is Yi 李, one of the most common East Asian family names. Shen could not identify Ni as a family name since the Korean pronunciation system was different from the Chinese one. Instead, he thought Sun and Bi were their family names. Then, why did he pick Sun Fengyi and Bi Yi as transliterations? In the *Petit Dictionnaire Français-Chinois* (1903), Sun 孫 was transcribed as Suēnn; Feng 鳳 and Yi 儀 as Foung and I; Bi 畢 and Yi 義 as Pi and I. “Suēnn Founghi” and “Pi-i” look similar to “Seng-houn-i” and “Peik-i.” It tells us that Shen matched Chinese characters with the Korean names according to their pronunciations via the French-language *Histoire*. All the Korean family names in *Shengxin bao* followed this principle. Kouen 權 became 廣 Kouang (Table 1, rows 3, 4), Ni 李 turned to 倪 I (Table 1, rows 5, 6, 7), and T’soi 崔 was transliterated into 邵 Chao or Ts’ao (Table 1, rows 8, 9). As a result, Shen’s...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Modern Korean pronunciation of names</th>
<th>Chinese characters of the names</th>
<th>Latin baptismal names</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Histoire</th>
<th>Shengxin bao</th>
<th>Shilüe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yi Seunghun 李承薰</td>
<td>Seng-houn i (Ni Pierre)</td>
<td>Petro</td>
<td>Ni Seng-houn-i Pierre; Seng-houn-i Pierre</td>
<td>孫鳳儀 伯多祿</td>
<td>李承薰 伯多祿</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yi Byeok 李檗</td>
<td>Ni Pieki</td>
<td>Johannes Baptistæ</td>
<td>Ni Piek-i Jean-Baptiste; Piek-i</td>
<td>畢義 若翰</td>
<td>李檗 若翰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kwon Ilsin 權日身</td>
<td>Kouen il-sini or Kouen Xavier</td>
<td>Franciscus Xaverius</td>
<td>François Xavier Kouen Il-sin-i</td>
<td>廣方濟各沙勿署</td>
<td>權老三 (權三) 方濟各沙勿署</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kwon Sangyeon 權尙然</td>
<td>Kouen Jean, Siang ien Iacobus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Kouen Siang-ien-i</td>
<td>廣雅各伯</td>
<td>權雅各伯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yi Jonchang 李存昌</td>
<td>Ni Tan Ouen i Tson T'siang i</td>
<td>Ludovicus Gonzagæ</td>
<td>Ni Tan-ouen-i, Louis de Gonzague; Tson-t'siang-i</td>
<td>倪類思</td>
<td>李類斯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yi Suni 李順伊</td>
<td>Ni Luthgarde, Niou hei Lutgardis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luthgarde Ni or Niou-hei</td>
<td>倪呂忒茄爾特</td>
<td>李呂忒加爾特</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yi Jaeui 李在誼</td>
<td>Ni Thomas</td>
<td>Thomas Ni</td>
<td></td>
<td>倪多黙</td>
<td>李多黙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Choi Ingil 崔仁吉</td>
<td>T'soi Mathias in Kiri</td>
<td>Matthaeus</td>
<td>Mathias T'soi In-kir-i</td>
<td>邵瑪弟亞</td>
<td>趙瑪弟亞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Korean pronunciation of names</td>
<td>Chinese characters of the names</td>
<td>Latin baptismal names</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Histoire</td>
<td>Shengxin bao</td>
<td>Shilüe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Choi Pilgong 崔必恭 Thomas</td>
<td>T'soi Mathieu p'il kong i</td>
<td>Thomas Tsoi Pil-kong-i</td>
<td>曹多黙</td>
<td>曹多黙</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jo Sincheol 趙信喆 Carolus</td>
<td>Tsio Charles</td>
<td>Charles Tsio</td>
<td>加祿</td>
<td>加祿</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sim 沈 Barbara</td>
<td>Sim Barbe</td>
<td>Barbe Sim</td>
<td>辛巴爾巴</td>
<td>辛巴爾巴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yun Jeomhye 尹占惠 Agatha</td>
<td>Tsiem hiei or Ioun Agathe</td>
<td>Agathe Ioun</td>
<td>熊亞加大</td>
<td>熊亞加大</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mun Yeongin 文榮仁 Bibiana</td>
<td>ieng in i or Moun Bibianne</td>
<td>Bibiane Moun</td>
<td>孟彼彼亞納</td>
<td>孟彼彼亞納</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bak Chuideuk 朴取得 Laurentius</td>
<td>Pak Laurent, t'souiteuki</td>
<td>Laurent Pak</td>
<td>巴老楞佐</td>
<td>巴老楞佐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Won Sibo 元 Sibo Iacubus</td>
<td>Ouen Jacques Si po</td>
<td>Jacques Ouen</td>
<td>文雅各伯</td>
<td>文雅各伯</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Korean pronunciation of names</td>
<td>Chinese characters of the names</td>
<td>Latin baptismal names</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Histoire</td>
<td>Shengxin bao</td>
<td>Shilüe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kang Wansuk 姜完淑 Columba</td>
<td>Kang Colomba Oan Sieouk i</td>
<td>Colombe Kang Oan-siouk-i</td>
<td>康高隆巴</td>
<td>姜高隆巴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yu Jungcheol 柳重哲 Johannnes</td>
<td>Niou Jean</td>
<td>Jean Niou Tsioung-sien-i</td>
<td>牛若望</td>
<td>牛若望</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yu Jingil 刘进吉 Augustinus</td>
<td>Niou Augustin, Iong Sien i</td>
<td>Augustin Niou iong-sim-i</td>
<td>牛奥斯定</td>
<td>劉奥斯定</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yun Yuil 尹有一 Paulus</td>
<td>Youn Paul, You iri</td>
<td>Paul Ioun Iou-i</td>
<td>保禄</td>
<td>尹保禄 (尹保祿)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ji Hwang 池璜 Sabas</td>
<td>Tsi Sabas, t’siang hong i</td>
<td>Sabas Tsi Tisang-hong-i</td>
<td>撒巴</td>
<td>池撒巴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
transliterations were far different from their original Korean names in Chinese characters.

Unlike in *Shengxin bao*, in *Shilüe*, most of the names were corrected according to Korean linguistic convention. First of all, Yi Seunghun and Yi Byeok were corrected as 李承薰 and 李檗. Most of the family names were properly corrected except for Jo Sincheol, Sim Barbara, Bak Chuideuk, and Yu Jungcheol. Considering the corrections in *Shilüe*, we cannot help but speculate that someone helped Shen correct the Korean names properly. This collaborator indisputably remembered the Chinese characters of most martyrs' names.

In this regard, Kwon Ilin's case is noticeable (Table 1, row 3). In *Shilüe*, Shen wrote his name as Kwon Nosam 權老三 or Kwon Sam 權三. A type of idiomatic word is "Nosam": “No” was a sign of respect, while “Sam” denoted “the third son.” Kwon Ilin actually was the third son of Kwon noble family. The nickname for Kwon Ilin was not mentioned in *Notes, Histoire, or Gaoli zhuzheng*. It indicates that the collaborator was not only familiar with the names of the martyrs in Chinese characters but was also knowledgeable enough about the Korean martyrs to refer to Kwon Ilin as Kwon Nosam.

The collaborator appeared to be knowledgeable about the political history of Korea. In writing the martyrs' names, the names of Korean kings, and the names of political factions in Joseon, Shen made mistakes in *Shengxin bao*. Describing the Korean Catholic Church's situation in the first stage, he mentioned King Jeongjong (正宗, r.1776–1800) who was tolerant of Catholicism. Shen wrote King Jeongjong as Qingzong 清宗 according to “Tsieng Tsiong” in *Histoire*, since Qing was transcribed as Ts’ing and Zong as Tsoung in the French transliteration of Chinese characters, which was influenced by Shanghainese. He also transliterated the conservative faction (Byeok pa 僻派) into Bi bei 毕杯, and the progressive faction (Si pa 時派) into Xi bei 西杯 following Dallet's use of "Piek-pai" and "Si-pai." These mistakes were all corrected in *Shilüe*. As a result, between 1898 and 1900, the majority of translation errors were fixed. The identity of Shen's valuable collaborator becomes a question in light of this.

---

29 Shen might not have recognized that “T’soi” represented the sound of 崔 (Choi), so he transliterated it as 趙 (Cho in Korean, Zhao in Chinese). However, these mistakes were comprehensible for Koreans because 趙, 申, 申 were common names in Korea. (Table 1, rows 3–10) and 楊 (3–14) were not used for family names, but their Korean pronunciations were similar to Jo 趙 and Pak 朴.

30 King Jeongjo 正祖 (r.1776–1800) was called as Jeongjong 正宗 until 1899.

31 *Petit Dictionnaire* (1903), 311.

32 *Petit Dictionnaire* (1903), 123.

33 *Petit Dictionnaire* (1903), 255; 564. It is because each sound was transcribed as Pi 毕 or Pei 杯, and Si 西 respectively.
4 A Collaborator with the Shanghai Jesuits and the New Context of Korean Catholic History

The unnamed collaborator was Gustave Charles Marie Mutel, M.E.P. (1852–1933), the eighth bishop of Korea. He was able to provide greater access to Korean documents than previous missions due to improved conditions, including the establishment of diplomatic relations between France and Korea. According to his diaries, Mutel traveled in 1898 to Shanghai to recover his health. On March 4 of that year, the Jesuit Aloysius Beck (1854–1931)34 presented him with the Chinese abbreviation of Dallet’s *Histoire* and asked for revisions to the names of martyrs and locations. Mutel was also invited to a banquet in Xujiahui.35

Mutel was an excellent archivist. After he came to Korea in 1880, he continued to gather Korean Catholic Church documents.36 Mutel’s collection was enormous, so much so that the famous Orientalist Maurice Courant (1865–1935) completed the *Bibliographie Coréenne* (1894–1901) with his help.37 Mutel had multiple opportunities to verify the names of the martyrs written in Chinese characters. The manuscript of *Gaoli zhuzheng*, which Bishop Blanc acquired from the Shanghai-based M.E.P., and Hwang’s Letter, which was discovered in the pile of government documents in 1895, were probably crucial for him to check the names.

After his 1880 arrival in Korea, Mutel tried to find documents from before the Gihae persecution of 1839. Fortunately, Blanc, the seventh bishop of Korea, borrowed *Gaoli zhuzheng*’s manuscript from the M.E.P. in Shanghai in order to use it as a reference for the Korean translation of *Histoire*.38 Unlike *Shilüe*, *Gaoli...
zhuzheng concentrated on Korean martyrdom—the total number of martyrs Gaoli zhuzheng dealt with was 280, including fourteen missionaries. Although some martyrs’ names in Chinese were inaccurate, the pronunciations of the Chinese characters for names corresponded to their names. Therefore, the text was useful for matching the names of martyrs with government or anti-Catholic documents.

Due to the dearth of documentation from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Hwang’s Letter is essential for understanding the early Korean Catholic Church. In fact, the original version of Hwang’s Letter had not been seen for nearly one hundred years, as it had been preserved in the Uigeumbu, the criminal justice agency of the Joseon dynasty. During the Gabo Reforms (1894–85), the government discarded the old documents when substituting old offices with new ones. The same situation happened in Uigeumbu. All the trial records and materials were incinerated, including Hwang’s Letter. Before the incineration, one bureaucrat found the Letter and gave it to his Catholic friend Yi Geonyeong. Mutel obtained the original version from Yi.39 In 1801, writing a letter to the bishop of Beijing, Alexandre de Gouvea (1751–1808), Hwang Sayeong depicted the situation of the Korean Catholic Church and the martyrs’ lives in Chinese including their names. With these good sources of information, Mutel gained knowledge of the early Korean Church’s history in Chinese.

Sometimes, Shilüe’s accounts of martyrs are inconsistent with Histoire, indicating that Shen may have used different sources than Dallet. One good example of this is the depiction of a female martyr Gang Wansuk in Shilüe. Gang was a leader among female Catholics although she was from a concubine’s family, which Dallet called a family of “semi nobles” or “noble bastards.”40 In premodern Korea, semi-nobles or noble bastards were called “Seo eol,” which indicated children with a father from a noble family and his concubine. Unlike in China, people from the Seo eol stratum in Joseon were discriminated against and restricted from choosing a spouse or a profession. In Shilüe, Gang Wansuk was portrayed not only as a prominent church leader but also as a well-educated noblewoman. This exaggeration can also be seen in Shengxin bao, where she was referred to as “a noble lady,” while in Shilüe, Shen used the term “daijia,” which refers to a prominent aristocratic family.41

40 Dallet, Histoire, 13, 74.
41 Shengxin bao, 1171; Shilüe, 34.
Shen said that she was influential since her ancestors were high-ranking capital administrators, although Dallet never emphasized her ancestry. Dallet simply said that Gang was influential because she was acquainted with many ladies from prominent noble families, including the royal family, and therefore was able to convert them. Shen also provided evidence of her nobility by stating that she was well-educated. According to him, Kang was from a noble family because her father taught her to read ancient Chinese so that she was well-versed in the Confucian classics. Dallet however only stated that she exhibited great insight and a courageous and moral character from an early age.

What makes Shen so certain that Gang was a woman from a noble family? We could say that his claims were based on his inaccurate imagination of her. His detailed explanation in *Shilüe* however leads us to question whether he had other sources. Mutel might have shared the insights he had learned from Hwang’s Letter with Shen. Actually, Hwang Sayeong used a particular term to refer to the Gang as *Ilmyeong* — a woman from a semi-noble (*Ilmyeong*) family. She was gifted and brave. Her aspirations were lofty. This statement can also be read as “Gang Columba was a lady of a prominent noble family.” In Hwang’s era, *Seo eol* were referred to as *Ilmyeong*, which meant “a descendant of an aristocrat’s concubine.” It was used intermittently in Korea between the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries; thus Chinese readers may have been confused by the name.

Another possibility is found in “Lettera dei Cristiani della Corea al vescovo di Pekino,” a letter from Korean Catholics to the bishop of Beijing (1811). The letter was translated from Chinese to Portuguese and then from Portuguese to Italian. The Chinese manuscript that has survived is not the original version but a transcribed copy. Interestingly, the front page of the manuscript is stamped with the year 1812. Two Chinese translators translated the letter into Portuguese, and the translated letter arrived at Lisbon in 1814. The letter was sent to Rome in 1816 and was translated again into Italian by D. Giovanni de Cettem. For the Italian translation, see “Lettera dei Cristiani della Corea al vescovo di Pekino,” Archivio di Propaganda Fide, *Scritture riferite*.
with a seal of “BIBLIOTHECA MAJOR Xujiahui 徐家匯,” the Jesuit library in Shanghai, which indicates that Shen was able to read it.\textsuperscript{48} In the manuscript, Gang Columba is described as a descendant of a noble lineage. Likewise, she is described as a noblewoman in the Italian translation.

All of these serve as circumstantial evidence regarding Shen's alterations. We are uncertain as to whether he modified the lines by accident or embellished the story to impress his Chinese Catholic audience. However, his added details suggest that other sources, such as Hwang's Letter or a letter from Korean Catholics to the bishop of Beijing, were possibly woven into the text.

We should recall that some Koreans and M.E.P. missionaries visited Shanghai before 1900. Kim Daegun and Choi Yangeop, the first two Korean priests, were ordained in Shanghai. M.E.P. missionaries stayed in Shanghai before they came to Korea. When persecutions in 1866 began, the missionaries and Korean Catholics escaped to Shanghai for safety, where they also engaged in Catholic intellectual circles. Missionaries such as Félix Clair Ridel (1830–84) M.E.P. went to Shanghai and were immersed in writing and transcribing Korean-French dictionaries, Korean grammar books, and reports.\textsuperscript{49} It is plausible to assume that many records pertaining to Korea remained in Shanghai before 1900. After revising \textit{Shilüe}, Shen may have perused these manuscripts.

Additionally, notable about \textit{Shilüe} are its additions. Shen addressed Jesuits and their associates with ties to Korean affairs. M.E.P. missionaries Dallet and Basin did not name Xu Guangqi (1563–1633) and Johann Adam Schall von Bell, S.J. (1563–1666), but he did. During the Ming era, Xu was a prominent convert, administrator, and one of the “three pillars” of the Chinese Catholic Church. It was known that Xu was interested in missionary work in Korea. When Japan attacked Korea in 1592, Xu insisted with the emperor that he be dispatched to save the country, but his true intention was to engage in missionary work. He

\textsuperscript{48} For the Chinese copy, see note 23. For the description of the front page, see Yun Mingu (2000), 245.

\textsuperscript{49} Ridel, the sixth bishop of Korea escaped the persecution in 1866 to head to Shanghai. He accompanied three Korean laymen and worked on the Korean-French dictionary with a layman Choi Jihyeok. See Félix Clair Ridel, \textit{Documents of Ridel = Ridel Munseo I} (Seoul: Institute of Korean Catholic History, 1994), 86–93; 181–84; 191–99. See also note 26.
was one of the bureaucrats in control of diplomacy and the military at the time; therefore it was not implausible for him to have planned such an endeavor.\textsuperscript{50}

Shen also mentioned Prince Sohyeon (昭顯世子 1612–1645), who was kept hostage by the Qing Dynasty for eight years. Sohyeon was able to speak with Adam Schall in China, whereupon they became friends. Dallet made no mention of the friendship between Sohyun and Schall, nor did he include the tale in which Schall presented Sohyun with astronomical tools and Catholic texts translated by Jesuits upon Sohyun’s return to Korea, which Shen did.\textsuperscript{51}

These anecdotes were likewise excluded from Shengxin bao, showing that Shen compiled additional Jesuit materials pertaining to Korea and included them into Shilüe.\textsuperscript{52}

Shen also inserted the story of the Chinese Catholic priest Shen Zi (沈梓) into the text. Shen Zi was a priest who tried to find a route for a Korean mission before Pope Gregory XVI (r.1831–46) established Korea as an apostolic vicariate in 1831. Instead of crossing the border by himself, he opened a pharmacy at Yanghe (洋河, in Yantai) to meet Korean Catholics. He went to Yanghe because the trade market between China and Korea opened twice a year there.\textsuperscript{53}

He set a time and place to meet with a Korean intermediary in Beijing. Their secret code was “fish,” which meant Jesus among Christians. Their plan was as follows: Shen Zi found a certain Korean shop and asked them if they would sell fish. If their answer was yes, it meant a boat was prepared for him. The Korean man whom Shen Zi was supposed to meet was Kim Hyobang 金效芳. Shen Zi waited for him, but unfortunately, there was no one named Kim in the shop.

\textsuperscript{50} Dallet only said that some envoys who met Jesuits in Beijing could have gotten the catechism and the Catholic books. Usually, Daniello Bartoli’s Delle opere del Padre Daniello Bartoli della Compagnia di Gesù (1825) or Li Di 李杕’s edition of The Collected Works of Xu Wending Xu Wending gongji 徐文定公集 (1890) are the best sources to know Xu’s interest in the Korean mission. The anecdote on the encounter between the Korean prince and Adam Schall is usually quoted from Schall’s Historica Relatio de ortu et progressu fidei orthodoxae in regno Chinensi per Missionarios Societatis Jesu (1672).

\textsuperscript{51} Shilüe, 12–14. Dallet only wrote about Korean literati who went to China and met Jesuit missionaries, but he did not mention the missionaries’ names. See Histoire, 110–12. For the friendship between Sohyeon and Schall, see Ahn Jaewon, “Adam Schall, Sohyn Prince and Shunzhi Emperor: A Comparative Research on some Differences between Shunzhi Emperor and Sohyn Prince," Ingan-Hwangyeong-Mirae 8 (2012): 147–82.

After missing the chance to go to Korea, Shen Zi kept searching for alternative ways but failed.\textsuperscript{54}

Shen Zi’s story appears in a letter of the bishop of Beijing, Joaquim Souza Saraiva, C.M. (1764–1818)\textsuperscript{55} to the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, which provided a report on Korea. Two Chinese missionaries, Florianus Xin Vellozo and Joannes Vam, were willing to enter Korea for missionary work, according to the letter. Florianus Xin Vellozo was in fact Shen Zi, who resolved to go and meet Korean brethren at the border between Korea and China.\textsuperscript{56} There is a similar story in Gihae Ilgi (Diary of the year of Gihae), by Hyeon Seokmun (1839).\textsuperscript{57} In it, Hyeon recounts the failed attempt of Jeong Hasang (1795–1839) to meet a priest near the Korean-Chinese border. Jeong disguised himself as a horseman of the Korean embassy in Beijing during the 1810s in order to visit missionaries to petition for a priest. But when he arrived at the designated location, he was unable to locate any priest.

If we compare the documents above, Shen Zi’s story of Shilüe is reliable. Since 1811, the Korean church sought priests: they had sent letters to Gouvea (1751–1808), the bishop of Beijing, and the Holy See. After their effort did not come to fruition, Jeong Hasang went to Beijing to plead with the bishop. He had been to Beijing nine times between 1816 and 1830.\textsuperscript{58} If we combine Shen Zi’s and Jeong Hasang’s stories, we can assume that the Korean Catholic Church did not just wait for priests: they organized people, prepared money, collected information, and sought Chinese collaborators. If we recall the organized and systematic efforts to have priests enter Korea in the 1830s, it is plausible that there was a complex, active, and continuous relationship between Catholics in China and Korea.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{54} Shilüe, 70–72.
\textsuperscript{56} Shen Zi was described identically in Shilüe and in the Letter of Bishop Souza Saraiva. Shen Zekuan and Souza Saraiva, for instance, mentioned that Shen Zi became a priest following the death of his wife.
\textsuperscript{57} Hyeon Seokmun, trans. Ha Seongrae, Diary of the Year of Gihae = Gihae Ilgi (Seoul: Seong hwangseok duruga seowon, 1986), 75–80.
\textsuperscript{58} For the Korean Catholic Church’s effort and the movement to bring missionary priests into Korea, see Choe Seokwu, A History of Korean Catholic Church = Hanguk cheonjukyohoe ui yeoksa (Seoul: Institute of Korean Catholic History, 1982).
\textsuperscript{59} In his letter, Bishop Laurent-Joseph-Marius Imbert (1797–1839) mentioned the similar method to come to Korea. According to him, there were two main routes to enter Korea: one was a land route and the other was sea route. Imbert took the land route to come to Korea. See Histoire, 2:24.
5 Conclusion

*Shilüe* is not a simple text to evaluate. It raises a significant methodological debate on how we interpret texts. We must inquire what translation entails and what translators undertake. Translation has always been essential for intercultural dialogue. When we consider prominent political theories, significant philosophers’ works, and world-renowned literature, we readily accept this notion. However, when dealing with documents deemed relatively unimportant, and in the event that they include inaccurate information, they are readily excluded and eliminated in the list of reference.

*Shilüe* is the case in point. As we have seen, the defects and errors in it show the intricate relationships in the Catholic missionary network in Asia during the nineteenth century. Shen’s aims, as indicated in the introduction, are simple. However, we should not reduce all of the interpretations of the text to the author’s intentions. Especially the documents by missionaries that have been translated into multiple languages, such as *Shengxin bao* and *Shilüe*, should be treated with greater caution because they reveal not only the authors’ and translators’ linguistic conventions but also their collaborators, sources, context, which are not reflected in the text in an obvious way. All the faults, flaws, and revisions in *Shengxin bao* and *Shilüe* are not historical errors, but rather invaluable sources for reconstructing the multilingual setting of Catholicism in Shanghai and East Asia.