

[95] 史淵表紙奥付等

<https://hdl.handle.net/2324/2244511>

出版情報 : 史淵. 95, 1966-02-15. Faculty of Literature, Kyushu University
バージョン :
権利関係 :

Historical Facts and Legends About the Introduction of Buddhism into Japan

Enchō TAMURA

Historical description must be made through the following two procedures. The first is the textual criticism, and the second is the reconstruction of history by making use of the sources which can stand the criticism. The textual criticism must be strict. Among the several sources which deal with the same contents, there are differences of the periods in which the texts were written. Therefore it is extremely important to decide the periods of the sources themselves. But the textual criticism is the condition to grasp the history, but is not all of historical studies.

The textual criticism of *Nihonshoki* (日本書紀) was prompted by Dr. Sōkichi Tsuda (津田左右吉). The achievements of Dr. Tsuda in this field of study must be inherited by the later historians. But as far as the ancient history of Japanese Buddhism is concerned, I think, Dr. Tsuda did not pay attention to the reconstruction of its history, though he advanced the textual criticism of *Nihonshoki*. In other words, the unified and comprehensive understanding of the ancient Buddhist history has not been accomplished.

Dr. Tsuda established the distinction between the legends and the facts among the records in *Nihonshoki*, and discarded the legends as unrelated to the historical facts. But I presume that the legends also reflected, directly or indirectly, the historical facts. It is wrong to argue that as the account of the Buddhist introduction to Japan in the 13th year of Emperor Kinmei's (欽明) reign was the creation by the editors of *Nihonshoki*, the fact of the introduction of Buddhism was a fiction. The task to reconstruct the history of Buddhism in ancient Japan through the textual criticism of *Nihonshoki* is still remained to be done.

**Studies on the Economic Regionalization
in the Pre-Revolutionary Russia**
— Its Historical Outline and the Present Estimates —

Kikuo ONO

Many geographers in Russia before the Revolution tried to make economic regionalization. In the middle of the 18th century, M.V. Lomonosov opened the new field of research, namely, “economic geography” and called attention to the regional differences of the Russian economy. A.N. Radishchev, in the late 18th century, developing this conception of Lomonosov, proposed the principle of economic regionalization, for example, saying that Russia could be divided geographically according to the economic character of each region, and argued that the administrative regionalization was to be related to the regional economic conditions. In the early 19th century, such scholars as K.I. Arseniev, K.F. German, and so on, basing on the abundant data, made regionalization of Russia according to the physical and economic conditions. In the middle of the 19th century, N.P. Ogaryov emphasized the significance of the industrial development and growth of productive power of the country in the study of economic geography, and argued that the economic regionalization had to be done by discovering the most dominant productive power in each region and by taking into account of the socio-economic relations of each region around its productive power, namely, that the regional divisions of productive powers were to be the basis of the economic regionalization, and showed the same idea as that of Radishchev as to the administrative regionalization. Ogaryov’s study is regarded today as one of the most excellent achievement among the economic geographical surveys before the Revolution. In the early 20th century up to 1917, there were the studies of economic regionalization by P. P. Semyonov = Tyan = Shansky, etc., but the most

important studies in this field were those of V. I. Lenin, especially his *Development of Capitalism in Russia*, to which I will refer at another occasion.

Among the various studies of economic regionalization before the Revolution, those of Ogaryov and Radishchev are, generally speaking, highly regarded today, but there is a considerable difference in the appreciations of the works by Arseniev and P. P. Semyonov, and so on. One group of scholars estimate that Arseniev and others built the basis of theory and practice of economic regionalization and that the ideas which they conceived had a progressive meaning in those days. However, other scholars argue that, though there were several merits in their studies, there could be found no theories, and criticize the scholars who give affirmative estimate to them saying that their opinions have some tendencies to underestimate their bourgeois limitations and to ignore the underlying essential difference between the pre-revolutionary era and the Soviet era.

One reason why there is a tendency to overestimate the pre-revolutionary studies is that those scholars who overestimate them are proposing the theory of “unified geography”, in which the economic geography constitutes one part of the geographic science. They say that Arseniev and others already proposed this conception. This opinion seems to have resulted in their overestimation of the achievements of the pre-revolutionary era, by relating it to their present theory.

I think that the adequate recognition on the essential difference between the pre-revolutionary era and the Soviet era is important when we examine the economic-geographical studies in the Russia before the Revolution. And addingly, it is necessary to take into account the Lenin's studies, and to use the idea of Lenin as one index.

LES CATHÉDRALES GOTHIQUES CLASSIQUES AU XIII^e ET LEUR FOND SOCIAL

—Les cathédrales de Chartres, de Reims
et d'Amiens—

(Quatrième partie — Fin)

Hiroshi MORI

Tous les évêchés dans lesquels on a construit les cathédrales de style gothique classique avaient, sous le règne de Louis VII au plus tard, été comptés parmi les «évêchés royaux». Leurs titulaires, lorsque le roi leur remettait la *regalia*, temporels de l'église retenus *in manu regis* pendant la vacance du siège, devaient lui prêter la *fidelitas*. Comme il était interdit au clergé, théoriquement et canoniquement, de prêter hommage aux mains laïques, on a très souvent présumé au serment de fidélité des ecclésiastiques les effets juridiques de l'hommage.

Le chapitre de Reims devait au roi le service de l'ost : cela n'était pas auparavant la coutume, mais au début du XIII^e siècle, cela devint subitement son devoir comme à «tous les chapitres français». Ce n'était pas, à notre avis, à cause de la mense capitulaire, mais à cause de la *regalia* que l'archevêque recevait par fidélité : le service dû à l'archevêque comme vassal du roi avait été imputé au chapitre.

Les archevêques de Reims devaient aux rois le droit de gîte, que les rois leur exigeaient à l'occasion du couronnement pour séjourner dans la ville de Reims. Les évêques de Chartres et de Soissons devaient aussi ce droit une fois par an, tandis qu'à l'évêque d'Amiens, Philippe Auguste abandonna le droit de gîte pour le dédommager de l'hommage qui lui était dû en raison du comté d'Amiens, hommage que le roi ne pouvait rendre. Ainsi les évêques royaux ont, en prin-

cipe, été assujettis aux devoirs féodaux de l' *auxilium*.

Quant au *consilium*, nous croyons qu'alors, le roi et les barons français ont considéré les titulaires des évêchés royaux assujettis à la justice féodale : les évêques royaux devaient donc toujours répondre à la semonce de la cour royale, car ils étaient hommes liges qui tenaient leur *temporalia* en prêtant au roi l'hommage lige. L'Église s'y opposait en insistant sur liberté de l'église gallicane et universelle : nous pensons que, cependant, un certain nombre des archevêques et évêques se soient en réalité considéré liés très étroitement aux Capétiens par le lien vassalique.

Parmi les archevêques de Reims, les évêques de Chartres, de Soissons et aussi d'Amiens, qui étaient en principe assez fidèles aux Capétiens, nous trouvons des personnages issus soit de la famille comtale champenoise, soit de familles qui étaient proches à celle-ci. Les archevêques et les évêques qui avaient le désir et l'intention de réaliser leurs cathédrales dans le style gothique classique étaient donc fidèles et intimes avec les Capétiens en même temps qu'avec les comtes champenois. La Champagne se trouvant juste au milieu de la Bourgogne et du domaine capétien, il a fallu sans doute l'intermédiaire champenois pour introduire dans le style gothique les éléments bourguignons et clunisiens, l'élévation aux trois étages et le chevet aux chapelles rayonnantes, éléments essentiels du style gothique classique.

The Division of Rice-Fields in the Yayoi Period (II)

Takeshi KAGAMIYAMA

After the World War II, the ruins of ridges and canals of rice-fields, similar to those of Toro site, were discovered near Numazu City, Shizuoka Prefecture. These were recognized as the ruins of rice cultivation in the late Yayoi period by the archaeologists who surveyed them. Because the place is situated in the low and wet land, it was necessary for the openers of the fields to dig ditches for the draining and to tighten the soft soil by hammering pegs into the ground.

Judging from the ditches and peg lines of this remaining site, the field division system of the Yayoi period provided the basis of the equal dividing of the Jori (条里) System, which began to be carried out at the middle of the 7th century in this region. The directions of the rice-fields and the roads were inherited from those of the early opening period. This illustrates that people executed planned and unified construction over wide area for the opening of the rice-fields of the Yayoi period. It is also reported that the ruins of small roads guarded by pegs and boards were found in the Tada site in Shizuoka Prefecture, which is also the ruins of rice-fields of the Yayoi period.

Investigating the facts about the rice-field divisions through collecting these fragmentary data, I wish to advance the survey on the sizes and characters of the opening of the rice-fields in the Yayoi period.

**The Single-petal Round Roof-tiles
of the Pèkché Origin**
—Study on the Ancient Roof-tiles of Korean
Origin Discovered in Kyushu (2)—

Fujio ODA

Since before the World War II, discussions have been made, by the archaeologists in kyushu, about the ancient round roof-tiles, discovered in northern Kyushu, the designs of which were descended from Pèkché of Korea, especially about their age and their lineage, but no conclusions were gained. The data have been increased, however, and I have succeeded to make clear the regional distribution of them, namely, 8 in Buzen (豊前), 4 in Chikuzen (筑前), 5 in Hizen (肥前), 4 in Chikugo (筑後), and 1 in Bungo (豊後).

The theories on the roof-tiles of Pèkché origin can be classified as follows according to their arguments on their lineage and age.

On lineage : (1) They were directly influenced by Pèkché.

(2) Their designs were descended from Pèkché to Kinki (近畿) region, from where they were introduced to Kyushu.

(3) They were influenced not by Pèkché, but by Silla tiles.

On age : (1) The example of their use was in the building of the Ōno (大野) Castle in Chikuzen in 665 AD.

(2) They were used after 665 AD.

(3) They were used in about 7th and 8th centuries.

(4) They were used in the late 8th century.

Through the analytical studies such as the comparison of the tiles themselves in detail, confirmation of the periods of the remaining sites by examining the old records and so on, I can argue as follows :

Whereas the old style tiles remain in Buzen in large numbers many

tiles are found in modified styles in Chikuzen, Hizen, Chikugo and Bungo provinces. Their age extends from 665 AD. to 774 AD. We can trace the historical process of tile-styles from the embryo stage to the growing and declining stages. Therefore each past theory on the age was concerned only to one period in which the tiles were used. In respect to their lineage, I think that they were imported by the Pèkché people who exiled to Japan as the result of the fall of the Pèkché Kingdom. Judging from the remaining roof-tiles of the mountain castles and Buddhist temples in the late Pèkché era, we must think that the roof-tiles of late Pèkché era themselves had changed gradually to the style similar to those which are discovered in Kyushu and they were used for the first time in the building of mountain castles in northern Kyushu which were constructed under the guidance of the Pèkché people. Afterward, through the adoption of the elements of the tile type of Silla, the Pèkché type of the tiles in Kyushu were changed to the type peculiar to Kyushu. But after the middle of the 8th century the Pèkché type tiles declined with the completion of the Ritsuryo (律令) system centering around Dazaifu (大宰府), and by the end of that century they were completely extinguished.