九州大学学術情報リポジトリ
Kyushu University Institutional Repository

[100] 史淵表紙奥付等

https://hdl.handle.net/2324/2244042

出版情報：史淵. 100, 1968-03-01. 九州大学文学部
バージョン：
権利関係：

KYUSHU UNIVERSITY

LETTRE DE FULBERT ÉVÊQUE DE CHARTRES

—Essai d'interprétation visant à éclaircir la≪féodalité≫ au début du XI[e] siècle—

par Hiroshi MORI

M. J. -F. Lemarignier a, tout récemment, constaté en se fondant sur la variation de la formule employée dans les diplômes royaux, que le caractère du gouvernement royal avait changé vers les années 1025/1028. Cette remarque est très importante à l'égard de la formation de la ≪féodalité≫, parce que M. F.-L. Ganshof a déjà constaté que l'apparition du nom ≪hommage≫ ne remonte qu'à 1030. Pour déterminer les notions juridiques concernant la relation dite ≪féodo-vassalique≫ à cette époque, il nous faudrait tenter une nouvelle lecture de la lettre très célèbre de Fulbert de Chartres adressée en 1020 à Guillaume le Grand, duc d'Aquitaine.

Les érudits ont bien remarqué qu'il s'agit dans cette lettre de deux catégories de devoirs : ≪fidelitas≫, devoirs négatifs et≪ consilium et auxilium≫ pour être digne du ≪casamentum≫, devoirs positifs. On a déjà trouvé que la plupart des six épithètes qui expriment les devoirs de la≪fidelitas≫avaient été empruntées aux≪*Etymologies*≫ d'Isidore de Séville. Il nous semble que la mention de ≪consilium et auxilium≫ avait aussi été écrite en consultant, entre autres, la ≪*Collectio canonum*≫ d'Abbon de Fleury. Fulbert a donc écrit cette lettre comme une *explicatio* canonique pour incorporer deux actes juridiques en un même système.

Les fidèles qui manquaient à ces devoirs, étaient coupables, selon lui, ≪de perfide et de parjure≫. ≪Parjure≫, notion purement canonique, s'appliquait évidemment à l'infraction à la ≪fidelitas≫. Quant au fidèle ≪qui est indigne du bénéfice≫, est-il, lui aussi, puni canoniquement ? D'après la lettre d'Eudes Ⅱ de Blois au roi

Robert (vers 1023), écrite tout vraisemblablement par Fulbert lui-même, on constate que le manquement à ces devoirs, non seulement au ≪consilium et auxilium≫, mais aussi au devoir de ≪commendatio≫ n'était sanctionné que par la perte d'***honor*** (bénéfice).

Nous pourrions donc conclure qu'au début XI^{e} siècle, il y avait parallèlement deux actes juridiques qui unissaient le ≪dominus≫ et le ≪fidelis≫. L'un, c'était la ≪fidelitas≫, canonique et ***ratione personae***. L'autre, c'était la ≪commendatio≫, ***ratione materiae*** causant le ≪casamentum≫ d'une part et le ≪consilium et auxilium≫ d'autre part. Nous pourrions aussi suspecter concernant la question de ≪Fidèles ou Vassaux?≫, deux idées qui appuieraient la théorie du vasselage : c'est à savoir d'une part, que l'hommage ne jouait qu'un rôle accessoire et, d'autre part, que l'hommage personnel l'emportait au XI^{e} siècle. Parce que ce fut l'hommage qui remplaça, vers 1030, la ≪commendatio≫, acte réel.

On the Controversy on Slavery in the Ante Bellum South —Since the Rise of the Revisionists—

Tetsuro HATTORI

The historians and economists in the United States have continued arguments on the ante bellum slavery for more than one hundred years. And still they have not reached a consensus on this problem. It might be nonsense to expect that this vexing problem will ever be resolved to everyone's satisfaction. I believe, however, it may give us some suggestions for substantial progress in solving the problem that we trace the development of this lasting dispute through the works of the most able participants in it. That is why I have tried here to have a perspective view of the history of controversy of the ante bellum slavery. By the way I was compelled to limit my view within the sphere of the modern controversy since the rise of the revisionists and to give up making a more detailed explanation of the works of some important disputants.

Bronterre O'Brien and the Irish Question

—A Study of "Schoolmaster of Chartism"—

Hideo KOGA

Bronterre O'Brien who was known by the popular nickname "Schoolmaster of Chartism" given by Feargus O'Connor, was one of the most educated Chartists, and occupied the unique position in the Chartist Movement. In many studies on Chartism O'Brien has been considered in agreement the advanced theoretician of Chartism likely as G. J. Harney and E. Jones, but the valuation of O'Brien has differed from each other in some degree. R. G. Gammage, E. Dolléan, J. Tildsley, M. Beer, A. Plummer and A. L. Morton were in the side of positive valuation for O'Brien, whereas G. Wallas in D. N. B. and M. Hovell and others were in the other side. Among these many studies G. D. H. Cole' s *Chartist Portraits* is most suggestive. But these studies have not dealt with O'Brien's attitude to the Irish Question almost at all, despite of the strong interest of this Irish-born Chartist to it.

This article aimed to examine the O'Brien's attitude to the Irish Question in the most critical years of 1840s, and from this point of view to attempt to reexamine the valuation of O'Brien till now.

Concerning to the Irish Question O'Brien critisized severely the bourgeois nationalist Daniel O'Connell, and though O'Brien had not supported the Repeal of Union or the complete secession of Ireland from Great Britain, he expected to the Young Ireland party, because he considered it could be the germ of the true national party. But this "true national party" is to say a very doubtful conception for the advanced Chartist and seems to me this conception is correspond to his compromising attitude to the middle class, differing from the assertion of A. Plummer's monograph. O'Brien had certainly the uncompromisng hostility to the landlord and usury, and the nationalization of land and the currency reform were O'Brien's essential

programm. But the hostility to the capitalists and the middle class was not so uncompromising. This attitude showed the insufficiency of O'Brien's understanding to capitalism, class and class struggle. If the above argument is correct, the valuation of O'Brien up to the present time may be need to revise in some degree.

„Neuer Mittelstand" und die Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland vor und nach dem 1. Weltkrieg (Ⅱ)

Eizaburo KOBAYASHI

Als der erste Weltkrieg ausbrach, befürchteten die „freien" Gewerkschaften ein Verbot. Aber die Regierung wollte sich wegen der Kriegsnotwendigkeiten auf die Organisationen der Arbeiter und der Angestellten stützen. Also kam es zu einem „Burgfrieden." Auf dem Opfer des Zusammenbruchs der Ⅱ. Internationale nahm der Einfluss der Gewerkschaften und der Angestelltenverbände zu. Die Zentralleitungen der Gewerkschaften und der Angestelltenorganisationen schrieben 26. April 1917 an den Chef des Kriegsamtes, Groener : "Arbeitseinstellungen in der gegenwärtigen Stunde sind zu vermeiden ; Erhaltung und Sicherheit des Reiches stehen an erster Stelle. (……) Die wesentlichste Ursache, die die Stimmung für die Arbeitsniederlegungen schuf, ist in den unzureichenden Massnahmen auf dem Gebiete der Frnährungspolitik zu erblicken. (……) Leider haben viele Unternehmer, vornehmlich in der Grossindustrie, auch während der langen Dauer des Krieges, sich nicht von den Methoden der Behandlung der Arbeitnehmer frei gemacht, die schon in Friedenszeiten zu grosser Unzufriedenheit und zu scharfen Kämpfen führten und die auch jetzt unausgesetzte Reibungen hervorrufen. (……)" (Dokumente und Materialien zur Gesch. der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung. Dietz Verlag Berlin 1958. Reihe II, Band 1, S. 626f.) In diesem Teil meines Artikels untersuchte ich die Bewegung der Privatangestellten und der Beamten während des 1. Weltkrieges, insbesondere die Arbeitsgemeinschaften und Interessengemeinschaften kaufmännischer Verbände, technischer Verbände, freier Angestelltenverbände, oder Beamtenverbände.

The Measure of Gold Seal of "King of Wa-Na country send from Han Empire"

「漢委奴国王」金印

Takashi OKAZAKI

In 1784, under the big stone, a peasant found a gold seal at Shiganoshima Island of Northern Kyusyu. Nanmei KAMEI, a scholor of that age have read the inscription of this seal as "漢委奴国王", and he emphasized this important discovery, because in the "History of Later Han", it was read that a king of Wa-Na country send the delegates to Han Empire, and a seal was given to the king from Han. Now it is preserved in the Tokyo Natinal Museum by favor of Marquis KURODA

Fortunately we could observe and measure the seal in the Fukuoka Bunka Kaikan where this seal was shown in the exhibition of "Ancient Fine Art of Japan". in 1966.

The height of this seal is 2.236cm, average lenghth of four edge is 2.347cm and weight is 108.729 g.

The button of this seal was copied from the shape of serpent. We know that the shape the seals-button of Northern nomadic people given from Han Empire were camel, and those of Southern people were serpent, by the remarkable animals of suitable climate. It is very important that the button of gold seal of Wa-na country is same with those of the gold seal of king of Shan Contry 〝滇王之印〟 of Former Han found at Shi-Shai-Shan tombs of Yünnan district of South China.

The measure of 2.34 cm represents 1 sun of Han dynasty. It is same measure with te bronze scale of 6 years of jian-chu 建和6年 (A.D 81) of Later Han. We can not doubt this gold seal, and also we can identify this gold seal as those that Guang-wu-ti 光武帝 of Later Han had presented to a king Wa-Na country in A. D 57.

The Coastal Route of the Arctic Ocean in 16th and 17th Centuries —Navigations to Mangazeya—

Masatoshi MIKAMI

It is evident that after the mid sixteenth century Russians were sailing to the Ob Bay in Western Siberia and to the country of Mangazeya in the east along the coast of the Arctic Ocean. Their aim was to exchange their shipped goods for the fur offered by Siberian natives. But the use of such a route was forbidden by the chief officer (*voevoda*) of Tobolsk in 1619.

Since then, to get to Mangazeya from Tobolsk, the first half of their course had been the passage down the river Ob to its mouth, and the latter half from there across the bays of both Ob and Taz finally to the destination. Mangazeya was the place where exchange had been made of a great deal of fur up to 1640's.

But thereafter the center of fur industry moved eastwards to the river Lena and, moreover, the main trade route in Siberia moved southwards. Thus its out-of-the-way location brought about Mangazeya's declination and, in turn, the prohibition of the sea route to it in the way mentioned above in 1667. But the coastal route of the Arctic Ocean was resumed by Russians toward the end of the seventeenth century.